The Feminists' Hypocrisy and Double Standards

May 26, 1994 *by Phyllis Schlafly*

Those who say Republican leaders should focus on the "real issues" instead of on the Clintons' scandals are correct. There is plenty to say about Clinton's proposed takeover of the health care industry, the impending federal takeover of the educational system, and the sell-out of American interests to multi-national authorities.

However, it is irresistible to ponder the fix that Paula Jones has put the feminists into, and their contortions in their vain effort to extricate themselves and defend the man they voted for. It remains to be seen whether Paula will be able to convict Bill Clinton, but she has already convicted the feminists of hypocrisy and double standards.

Now the feminists are saying that a man should be considered innocent until he is proven guilty. Oh, really? Anita Hill has been traveling the college campus circuit expounding on her theory that a woman's accusations should be believed on their face, and we haven't heard any feminist repudiation of this extraordinary doctrine.

Now the feminists are claiming that Paula Jones and her backers just want to "undo the 1992 election" - they just can't stand it that Clinton won. Oh, really? That's exactly what the Anita Hill testimony was all about, namely, trying to undo George Bush's victory in the 1988 election by denying him his right to name a conservative Justice to the Supreme Court.

Now the feminists are saying Paula Jones shouldn't be believed because she "waited too long." But how long is too long? How can Paula's two-year wait be "too long" when Anita Hill waited ten years? Paula's charges are not, like Anita Hill's charges, a last-minute ambush to prevent her target from achieving high office.

The feminists claim that Paula should not be believed because she failed to bring her charges during the 1992 presidential campaign, when it really could have damaged Clinton. Even some of Clinton's most faithful backers admit that, if she had, Clinton might not have been elected.

But this argument cuts in favor of Paula, not against her. It more likely indicates that she doesn't have any political motive at all.

The classic model of sexual harassment, according to feminist ideologues, is the Big Boss asking sexual favors of a female subordinate. According to the feminists, this "power relationship" demeans and intimidates women and makes them vulnerable.

In feminist dogma, this power relationship automatically creates such a hostile work environment that the Big Boss need not threaten the woman in order to be guilty of the sin of sexual harassment. That's exactly the model of Bill Clinton and Paula Jones, a minimum-wage clerk with limited education, just two months on the job, being summoned by His Honor the Governor.

Anita Hill, on the other hand, was a Yale Law School graduate who knew the law and her rights and how to invoke them, and who could not have been fired from her civil service job. Besides, a lawyer is simply not credible as a victim.

The feminists are now saying that Paula's claim doesn't amount to sexual harassment. But neither did Anita Hill's assertions, even if true. She never alleged that Clarence Thomas ever touched her or exposed himself to her, and she apparently was so comfortable in his company that she even invited him into her house to repair her stereo, something no woman would do if she were worried about harassment.

The feminists are now alleging that Paula Jones should be disbelieved because her case is assisted by some of Bill Clinton's enemies. Well, well! Anita Hill was surrounded, promoted, and coached by feminists and liberals who had identifiably political motives to block the confirmation of Clarence Thomas as Supreme Court Justice.

Anybody who attended the Thomas confirmation hearings would have seen the whole assortment of feminists and liberals clustered around her and cheering. They included the National Organization for Women, the National Abortion Rights League, and the staffs of Senators Ted Kennedy and Howard Metzenbaum.

The feminists accuse Paula of malicious motives because she was willing to settle out of court before filing her lawsuit. But that's exactly what Anita Hill tried to do - in what William Safi.re of the *New York Times* called a "conspiracy to blackmail Clarence Thomas" into withdrawing quietly.

When it comes to sexual allegations that cannot be positively proved one way or the other because no eye-witnesses exist, most people decide what is credible based on a pattern of behavior. In Clarence Thomas's case, despite all the investigative efforts of the liberal media and the liberal Senate staff, no Second Woman was unearthed to come forward with similar charges.

On the other hand, Paula's charges have credibility because of Clinton's pattern of behavior. So, where are the feminists who are usually so eager to march to the tune of "he just doesn't get it"?