

Feminist Hypocrisy and Double Standards

Those who say Republican leaders should focus on the "real issues" instead of on Bill Clinton's scandals are correct. Republicans ought to be talking about Clinton's persistent efforts to take over control of classroom curricula and to move us incrementally into nationalized health care, as well as his sell-out of American independence and self-government to a global "web" through treaties, United Nations conferences, executive agreements, and the assignment of U.S. troops to faraway phony "peacekeeping" expeditions.

However, it is irresistible to ponder the fix that Paula Jones has put the feminists into, and the feminists' contortions in their vain effort to defend both their ideology and the President they love. It remains to be seen whether Paula will be able to convict Bill Clinton in court, but she has already convicted the feminists of hypocrisy and double standards, and even the media are laughing at them.

The funny thing is, the feminists did it to themselves. As the old saying goes, they made their bed and now they have to lie in it. They invented the current use of "sexual harassment." There is nothing in Title VII, the employment law that prohibits sex discrimination, that defines or prohibits sexual harassment. Sexual harassment is wholly judge-made law, and the feminists have been responsible for its widespread use.

Without the feminists' campaign against sexual harassment that began with Anita Hill, and their claim that it is a pervasive problem, there would be no Paula Jones lawsuit. And without Paula Jones's lawsuit, we would never have known about Monica, Kathleen, Dolly, Clinton's perjury, Clinton's obstruction of justice, and the intimidation of Clinton's bimbos who didn't keep their mouths shut.

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 hearing 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.

Judge Susan Webber Wright, who dismissed Paula's case without giving her a day in court, said that Clinton's actions were not sexual harassment because there was only one incident and that wasn't an "outrage." Judge Wright seems to be trying to invent a new rule that, since a dog gets one free bite before he is punished, a boss gets one free grope. If what Clinton did to Paula Jones isn't an "outrage," then it's hard to say what would be an outrage in the workplace.

The classic model of sexual harassment, according to feminist ideologues, is the Big Boss asking sexual favors of a female subordinate. 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, and even escorted to His Presence by the state police. Anita Hill, on the other hand, was a lawyer who knew her rights and who could not have been fired from her civil service job.

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, including the National Organization for Women, the National Abortion Rights League, and the staffs of Senators Ted Kennedy and Howard Metzenbaum.

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"?

Paula Jones has done more to damage and discredit Clinton than all the Republicans. As Pat Buchanan wrote: "Paula Jones may not have gotten her day in court, but she got her pound of flesh." Clinton will go into the history books as an embarrassment to our nation.

Paula Jones has made it easy for the Republicans to treat Clinton and his propositions with the disdain they deserve. Why don't they do it?