The Question of Motives

by Phyllis Schlafly

October 24, 1991

Hour after hour, the Democratic members of the Judiciary Committee and the media commentators kept saying that Anita Hill “must be credible because she didn't have anything to gain" by making those sordid charges against Clarence Thomas. As Senator Biden said, “Does anybody have any reason to believe she had any motive to lie?”

The Sunday hearings proved that jealousy and revenge could be the motive. But there's another motive as plain as the nose on her face -- Anita Hill is a feminist.

The feminist ideology teaches women (a) that they should put their own, self-fulfillment above every other goal (including marriage, children, morals, and fairness), (b) that men are the enemy because they are by nature oppressors (and sexual harassers) of women, (c) that the goal of the feminist. movement should be to take power over men, and (d) that unborn babies should be considered the property of their mothers who can do whatever they want with them at any time during nine months of pregnancy.

Given that ideology, Anita Hill's motivation in attacking Clarence Thomas is obvious. She was just carrying out the feminist political goal of destroying any man who stands in the way of feminist goals -- and Clarence Thomas can reasonably be expected to vote pro-family instead of pro-feminist as a Supreme Court Justice.

The nature of Anita Hill’s charges is wholly in harmony with longtime feminist activist tactics. They delight in destroying and humiliating a man -- just as Thelma and Louise stuffed the police officer into an automobile trunk and locked it shut.

If Anita Hill had succeeded in her attempt to stop the confirmation of Clarence Thomas, she would become the new heroine of the feminist movement, which surely has been needing a fresh face. Anita would become an instant, star of the Phil Donahue circuit.

Not only did Anita Hill have plenty to gain by her ugly lies against, Clarence Thomas, she also had nothing to lose. She has tenure as a university professor, a

lifetime job from which she cannot be fired, and with no limit, on outside honoraria.

If she had been successful in torpedoing the Thomas confirmation (which all the expensive campaigning by NOW, NARAL, and People for the American Way did not accomplish), she could reasonably expect career advancement in the leftist academic community, such as a position on the faculty of a more prestigious law school, Indeed, the principal attorney advising her at the Thomas hearings was Harvard Law School Professor Charles Ogletree who has been vociferous in demanding affirmative action black women on the 1aw school faculty.

As an EEOC lawyer, Anita Hill knew exactly how to cope with sex harassment, if she had truly suffered it. She was not, a vulnerable, uninformed victim who needed to be protected from the wolves in the workplace.

According to the testimony of her office associates on Sunday night, Anita was known to her co-workers as tough, aggressive, unyielding, patronizing, and one who “wouldn't take anything from anyone.” They described her as opinionated, arrogant, and quite capable of telling any man to button his lip.

Anita Hill's own admissions were enough to convict her of lying and to exonerate Clarence Thomas. She deliberately followed Thomas from the Department of Education to the EEOC. The Senators should have laughed j-n her face when she gave as an excuse that she went because she was afraid the Department night be abolished or she might be out of a job.

That had to be a lie because she knew she was a Schedule A attorney in federal civil service. Schedule A employees, as a practical matter, cannot be fired, and she served in the Office for Civil Rights which could not have been abolished even in the unlikely event that the Department of Education was.

After Thomas helped her get her law professorship in Oklahoma, she admitted she phoned him a dozen times (after first denying she called him). Obviously, she was pursuing, not fleeing, the Thomas association.

The real conclusion we can make about motives is this -- no one could show any motivation for Clarence Thomas’s alleged harassment and dirty talk. He had everything to lose and nothing to gain by such conversation with Anita Hill. Her fantasy that this dirty talk was part of trying to get a date with her is just not believable.

Senator Biden said it well in his impassioned speech just before the Saturday night recess. Since Clarence Thomas had carefully planned a career to advance in the judiciary, it would just plain dumb for him to have done what, Anita Hill alleged. And Clarence Thomas isn't dumb.

Anita Hill's lies make her the Tawana Brawley and Janet Cooke of 1991. Her fictional tale was a savage eleventh-hour ambush to destroy an honorable man in order to achieve feminist goals. The feminists deserve the backlash of public opinion that I believe they will get.