



The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 25, NO. 9

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

APRIL 1992

Feminist Goals vs. Fairness and Truth The Feminists Just Don't Get It

The feminists are unwilling to accept the verdict of the American people that they lost the Clarence Thomas-Anita Hill battle last fall. They are trying hard (through Anita Hill's lectures at \$10,000 per appearance and a super-friendly interview on CBS 60 Minutes) to keep the controversy alive and sell a revisionist version of what we all saw on live television.

The feminists complain that men "just don't get it." The truth is that the feminists just don't get it — they don't understand that the American people, including women, "voted" nearly three-to-one against Anita Hill's attack because it offended our fundamental feelings of fairness.

The first offense against fairness was that it was an unscrupulous last-minute attack, a political dirty trick in the style of a campaign smear launched the weekend before the election when there is no time to respond. One of the many jokes that made the rounds was about the Anita Hill doll, supposedly a best-selling toy at Christmastime: "You pull the string, and ten years later the doll talks."

The second offense against fairness was that Hill attempted to use group victimology, a favorite current tactic designed to make the public feel sorry for a group and then demand a governmental remedy. The American people are tired of hearing demands from organized groups of alleged victims. Furthermore, we certainly are not going to accept the notion that a lawyer is a victim and can't protect herself against words in the workplace.

The third offense against fairness was that Hill tried to fashion a fabric of male group guilt. Her supporters constantly peddled the line that, since most men are guilty of sexual harassment, Clarence Thomas must be guilty — and anyway, guilty or not, he should pay the price for the sins of his gender. The Hill testimony was an attempt to make "sexual harassment" a tool to be used against any man who stands in the way of the feminist agenda.

The fourth offense against fairness was the feminist assertion of a flexible standard of guilt. Over the centuries, English-American law has developed a standard for guilt and negligence that we call the "reasonable man." In these days of sex-neutral semantics, this has translated to the "reasonable person" standard. The American people would even be willing to accept the notion of a "reasonable woman"

standard in those circumstances where a reasonable woman would judge behavior somewhat differently from a reasonable man. But that doesn't satisfy the feminists; Hill and her friends wanted a subjective "flexible woman" standard, that is, whatever the individual woman complains about (even ten years later) makes the man guilty.

The fifth offense against fairness was the demand of the feminists to have it both ways. They say they want to be "one of the boys," to serve in military combat, and to sleep in the firehouses as firepersons, but at the same time they want Big Brother to protect them against a dirty joke in the office and to punish any man who tells one. In the 1970s, the feminists said that they wanted to repeal all the protective labor legislation so that women could realize full employment equality with men. Protection in the office or factory against "sexual harassment" is essentially a demand to reinstate labor legislation to protect women workers.

The feminists are still crying because all the Senators on the Committee that conducted the hearing were male. Anita Hill complained to CBS's Ed Bradley that "there would have been more sensitivity if the Committee had included one woman Senator." The problem with this argument is that the feminists supported all those white male Democratic Senators who ran the Committee. Ted Kennedy is one of their all-time favorites, and the feminists even backed two of those white male Committee members against a female opponent in 1990, electing Paul Simon over Lynn Martin, and Herb Kohl over Susan Engeleiter.

Feminists want affirmative action quotas to get more women in Congress — but not just any women; they want only feminist women in Congress. Their demands are incompatible with the democratic process as well as with fundamental fairness.

Now that Gloria Steinem has revealed that her personal problem was a lack of self-esteem, and NOW president Patricia Ireland has told a gay magazine that she divides her time between a husband and a female "companion," and Sally Quinn has admitted that the women's lib movement "is more and more perceived as a fringe cause," and the *Time/CNN* poll reported on March 2 that 63 percent of American women do **not** consider themselves feminist, feminism is experiencing its "Final Exit." It is a merciful death that doesn't even need Dr. Kevorkian; the feminists did it to themselves without any assistance.

Helping George Bush to Understand Feminists

President George Bush has taken his lumps this year, but some good news has appeared on the horizon. The economy is picking up, the incumbent conservatives won in Britain, the Democrats seem to be hopelessly saddled with the Bill and Hillary sideshow, and the *Washington Post* has explained why Republicans don't need to be afraid of the abortion issue.

Just a few short months ago, Bill Clinton thought his biggest problem was Gennifer Flowers, but now it turns out that it is his wife, Hillary, with whom he is trying to ride side by side into a "co-presidency." As she boasted, "If you vote for him, you get me."

Hillary's statement on CBS 60 Minutes that "I'm not some little woman standing by her man like Tammy Wynette" must have been a calculated thrust. She was willing to alienate the millions of country music lovers in order to telegraph her assurance to the feminists that she is one of them. Feminists sneer at the woman who stands by her vow "for better or worse, till death do us part." A feminist makes her career advancement her top priority.

Hillary even refused to take her husband's name until it became obvious that this flaunting of feminism contributed to his defeat for Governor in 1980. Now, as her aggressive feminism reveals itself on television, the more we see of Hillary, the better we like Barbara Bush.

The cookie gaffe illustrates Hillary's personality even more clearly. Instead of responding factually to a question about conflict of interest between her law firm and the Governor's office, she answered with a typical feminist putdown of fulltime homemakers: "I suppose I could have stayed home and baked cookies and had teas."

This wasn't just a slip of the tongue. Ms. Hillary's principal avocation has been to serve as chair of the Children's Defense Fund (CDF), the chief organization lobbying for federally regulated daycare for preschool children, a.k.a. taxpayer-funded babysitting. Hillary and the CDF have the elitist mind-set that little children should be raised and regulated by social service professionals instead of by their own mothers (who are presumably not educated enough to do anything more important than baking cookies).

For three years CDF carried on a tremendous media and lobbying campaign to get Congress to pass the so-called ABC bill to set up a Commissioner of Child Care in the Department of Health and Human Services in charge of daycare for all children, middle-class as well as poor. The sponsor was Senator Chris Dodd (D-CT), who has no children of his own but aspired to be the Big Daddy of federal daycare.

Fulltime homemakers reacted vigorously to the patronizing attitude that fulltime mothers are an anachronism in the '90s and that what they do is of little significance. Smart politicians realized that there was no public demand for a federal nanny, and so even the current liberal Congress rejected the extravagant Swedish-style ABC bill.

Hillary is also an advocate of the "children's rights" movement. That's an off-the-wall ideology that promotes giving the government the authority to interfere in family decisions by asserting a child's right to sue his parents on such issues as schooling, abortion, medical care, and employment.

The feminists had a big rally in favor of legal abortion on April 5 in Washington. The *Washington Post's* survey on *who*

was doing the demonstrating shows clearly why George Bush and the Republicans can stop worrying about the abortion issue in the upcoming elections.

Only 5 percent identified themselves as Republican, while 59 percent identified themselves as Democrat. Only 4 percent identified themselves as conservative, whereas 79 percent identified themselves as liberal or very liberal. One-third of the demonstrators said that they had attended a rally in support of gay or lesbian rights, and one-third said they had participated in an organized demonstration against the Persian Gulf War. The people marching for abortion rights would never vote for George Bush anyway.

President Bush should take a lesson from the mess the Catholic Bishops have gotten themselves into by spending a decade trying to write a pastoral letter on "women." Its third draft has just been released, and it has successfully enraged women across the spectrum, liberal to conservative, feminists and homemakers.

It is a mistake to negotiate with, dialogue with, or try to appease the feminists. George Bush would be well advised to ignore the feminists, their histrionics, radical tactics and unreasonable demands.

Busybodies, Crybabies, and the Glass Ceiling

Maybe it was just coincidence in a slow news week. *Time* Magazine came out with a cover story headlined "Busybodies & Crybabies: What's Happening to the American Character?" and the same week the feminists launched a media initiative called the "Glass Ceiling."

Time described how the busybodies, those self-appointed, overbearing wardens of behavior and political correctness, are infecting American society with a nasty intolerance. Pitted against the busybodies, according to *Time*, are the crybabies, those who position themselves as victims, blaming everybody for their problems except themselves.

The peddlers of this new industry called "victimology" argue that every plight, condition or momentary setback is not a matter to be solved by individual effort but is a social problem in itself. The victims' "greatest talent," according to *Time*, is the ability to hand out guilt, and indeed they are adept at using every tool of modern communication and law courts to dump the blame on others.

A good example of the crybabies was an Op-Ed piece in the *New York Times* written by a young woman complaining that, although she is "young, urban, professional, literate, respectable, intelligent and charming," she is unemployed.

She realizes that plenty of jobs are available, but she thinks it is "absurd" that she should take a job beneath her expectations such as a typist, so she and her unemployed peers have "bounced checks to keep ourselves in oxford shirts and Ann Taylor dresses." She adds, "We expect rewards and recognition."

For what, Miss Crybaby? Al Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers, says that 90 percent of those who go to college today are only learning what their parents learned in high school.

One thing *Time* didn't report on was the way that busybodies and crybabies cooperate with each other to achieve their goals. The bureaucratic busybodies who want to use the power of government to direct our lives always need

new groups of victims in order to rationalize expanding their regulatory turf and spending more of the taxpayers' money; and the crybabies are always glad to have a government agency sanctify their status as victims.

The Glass Ceiling initiative is a good example (not mentioned by *Time*, of course) of how busybodies and crybabies work in tandem. The crybabies are the feminists who think they should, at the very least, be vice presidents of Fortune 500 corporations, and the busybodies are their pals who want to use the affirmative action power of the Federal Government to place them there.

Glass Ceiling is the feminists' code word for affirmative action quotas for executive women, just as "civil rights" has become the code word for affirmative action quotas for minorities. A Glass Ceiling proposal is part of the controversial Civil Rights (Quota) Act which passed in 1991.

The 25-page U.S. Department of Labor report on Glass Ceiling is filled with carrot-and-stick quota rhetoric. It pledges that the government will "assist firms in meeting their affirmative action obligations," an "assistance" that companies surely don't want. Promotions of women are expressed in numerical percentages, layers of guilt are heaped on corporations for not promoting more women and for not producing a mountain of paperwork to defend their personnel decisions, white males are devalued (you're going to be "only 15 percent" of the growth in the U.S. workforce), and companies are promised special rewards for promoting more women (it's irrelevant whether the women deserved the promotions or whether the company prospers).

The report talks about the Department's plans to remove "artificial barriers." But the chief barrier is not artificial but the result of women's own choices. The Yankelovich survey found that a majority of women (56 percent) would quit their jobs permanently if money were not a factor — a dramatic shift in opinion from the previous year.

The attitudes of executive and professional women are even more striking. A survey conducted by the executive recruiting firm Robert Half International found that 82 percent of the professional career women surveyed said they would choose a career path with flexible hours, more family time, and slower career advancement rather than a more demanding path with faster advancement.

In other words, the typical '90s woman wants the mommy track, not the fast track. That's why we are having a boom in home-based employment and in births to women in their '30s and '40s. Reaching the top echelons of big corporations requires 20 to 30 years of 60 to 80-hour work weeks, extraordinary motivation, and commitment to a lifetime in the labor force. The majority of women do not make that choice.

The Real Costs of Federal Mandates

If unemployment and the recession are our principal domestic problems (as television news tells us every evening), then this is no time to place more restraints on business that will reduce jobs. But that's what the feminists are trying to do through the Federally Mandated Family Leave bill.

This bill would empower Department of Labor bureaucrats to set up a new division to investigate, regulate and threaten still another aspect of small business. It would force employers to hold a job open for 12 weeks while any employee takes

time off to care for a child or an ill family member. Businesses with fewer than 50 employees would be exempt from this requirement. So what would you do if you ran a business with 50+ employees? You would probably lay off a few to drop below the threshold and thereby escape the legal, financial and personnel hassles caused by this law.

This federal mandate for Family Leave poses the threat of lawsuits with potential double damages. That monster really scares off the hiring of new workers.

The mandate requires that any health insurance be continued both for the employee taking the leave and for her replacement. Of course, the bill doesn't require businesses to carry any health insurance on their employees, so some companies would probably terminate their plan. What if the employee taking the leave fails to return to her job, in other words, takes the "leave" while retaining the benefit of the health insurance, and then just decides not to go back to work?

Here are some other costs of federally mandated family leave: finding, interviewing, employing and training a new worker (assuming one can be found at all) as well as the loss of productivity during this period, the salary of the temporary worker which is usually higher than that of the regular employer, overtime pay for other workers if a replacement cannot be found, decline of morale for other workers pressed into involuntary service, unemployment compensation for the temporary worker after the fulltime worker returns (which is required in most states), and lost productivity because of having to deal with a new set of government regulations and regulators.

The 50-employee threshold which triggers the inclusion of a company under the law is illusory. The "count" includes part-time employees and companies that maintain several stores within a 10-mile radius. The bill allows the company to exempt the top 10 percent of its payroll. That's not much help. The most costly employee to have absent, such as the bookkeeper, may not be in the top-salaried 10 percent.

All advocates of this bill openly admit that it is the foot in the door for a policy that will soon include all employees and mandate paid instead of unpaid leave. Senator Ted Kennedy boasted last year, "This legislation represents a significant and fundamental principle which, I believe once established, will be expanded over the years ahead."

Family leave is not a workplace safety issue. It is not a national issue of justice. It is a fringe benefit that would be enjoyed by only a limited few employees at the expense of the others whose work would be increased and benefits reduced.

The liberal Democrats are beside themselves with frustration at their inability to pass new spending programs because the public won't tolerate new taxes. A powerful anti-tax sentiment is on the march, socialism is in disarray all over the world, and cradle-to-grave policies have even been repudiated in Sweden.

So, the liberals have seized on the government mandate as the way to achieve their goals. If the government can no longer provide new services and pander to more constituencies through spending the taxpayers' money, then the liberals hope to pass laws that make businesses spend the money while the politicians take the credit.

It's a simple formula. The cost is the same, but the cost is concealed. Instead of being funded by higher taxes which

cause voter backlash, the new benefit is financed by higher consumer prices, higher unemployment, and lower productivity, innovation and expansion, so the voter doesn't know whom to blame.

Let's Hear the Whole Truth About Combat

The cutting edge of the feminist drive for a gender-neutral society has always been the assignment of women to military combat. In March 1992, President Bush appointed a Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces to study this objective and make recommendations.

When the Senate Armed Services Committee held hearings on this subject in 1991, the heads of all four military services were unanimous in opposing this feminist notion. Gen. Alfred M. Gray, Jr., USMC: "I see no need to change the law or the exclusion policy." Gen. Merrill A. McPeak, USAF: "I would like it to stay on the books, personally." Adm. Frank B. Kelso II, USN: "It's my personal view that the law should remain as it stands." Gen. Carl E. Vuono, USA: "I do not believe you should change the law. You should keep it the way it is."

The hearing showed that repeal of the combat exclusion laws would not make combat optional for servicewomen, but would subject them to involuntary assignment to combat. Sen. Sam Nunn: "If we expand the opportunities of women into combat arms, could we sustain as a matter of policy a distinction between men and women in terms of involuntary assignment?" Gen. Vuono: "Should you change it and open up all those positions to women soldiers, then they would be involuntarily assigned to those positions."

Sen. Nunn: "What effect would it have on women being willing to go in the military for the jobs they now hold?" Army Staff Sgt. Susan Leifeste: "That would change my mind." Marine Gunnery Sgt. Jean A. Amico: "Sir, if the law did that, I believe that enlistments of women in the Marine Corps would definitely go down. . . . I do not think we would have very many women Marines left."

Contrary to what we've been told for the last several years, the hearing showed that the U.S. Armed Services give servicewomen preferential treatment through double standards on physicals and "gender norming" on tests. Sen. Nunn: "So there are differences in the physical test in the Army?" Gen. Vuono: "Yes. The test is the same, the standards are a little different."

Sen. Nunn: "To achieve passing grades on that test, there is a lower criterion [for women], is that right?" Gen. Vuono: "Yes." Adm. Kelso: "We have a fitness standard and the standard is different for males and females."

Sen. Nunn: "Admiral, . . . [is there] a distinction between what the women have to achieve and [what] the men have to?" Adm. Kelso: "Yes, sir." Gen. McPeak: "Yes, sir, the physical fitness standards in the Air Force are different for men and women." Gen. Gray: "The physical standard requirements are definitely different between male and female in the Marine Corps for the obvious reasons of physical strength and the like."

The hearing showed that the enlisted women oppose the idea of assigning women to combat. Marine Sgt. Amico: "I do not wish to go into an offensive combat role. . . . We do not wish to carry a rifle and lug a pack around and live the way the grunts do."

General Robert H. Barrow, former Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps: "I know the [female] Marines; they're terrific; [but] . . . I've never met one who wanted to be an infantryman. Who wants them to be an infantryman? The hard-line feminists do. . . . They have their agenda, and it doesn't have anything to do with national security."

The hearing reminded us that repeal of the combat exclusion would remove the basis for exempting women from the draft and from draft registration. Gen. Barrow: "I do worry about this thing called the draft. . . . I believe if this thing persists . . . somewhere down the road that women would not only register for it, but if we had a draft they would be compelled to serve, and yes, they would end up in the infantry."

Sen. John Warner asked Gen. Barrow to "put aside modesty" and tell about some of his combat experiences." Gen. Barrow: "I was in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam — in command in all three. And I found nowhere any place for women to be down in the ground combat element. I [was in] . . . the Chosin Reservoir, 40 years ago, December 1950, North Korea, probably one of the greatest epics of all times — the First Marine Division confronting eight Chinese divisions spread out over a long 25-to-40-mile linear disposition, north-south, in extreme cold, minus-25, winds out of Siberia bringing the wind chill down to God knows what, mountains, constant attacking, they attacking us, we attacking them, for days, night and day, death all about, frostbite, inadequate clothing. Suppose we had 15 percent women, 20 percent women. . . . I wouldn't be here. I guess Kim Il-Sung would be taking care of my bones along with everybody else's in North Korea."

Gen. Barrow concluded: "I know about my service. If you persist in pushing [women] down into the combat area, it would destroy the Marine Corps. Simple as that — something no enemy has been able to do in over 200 years."

We hope the new Commission will expose the whole truth about women in combat.

Phyllis Schlafly has served on several governmental commissions, including the Commission on the Bicentennial of the United States Constitution (by appointment of President Reagan), 1985-1991; the Administrative Conference of the United States, 1983-1986; and the Illinois Commission on the Status of Women, 1975-1985. She is an attorney, admitted to the practice of law in Illinois, Missouri, the District of Columbia and the U.S. Supreme Court. She is the author of 13 books, a syndicated columnist, a radio commentator and host, and has testified before more than 50 Congressional and state legislative commissions. Her books that relate to family and feminism are: *The Power of the Positive Woman* (1977), *The Power of the Christian Woman* (1981), *Equal Pay for Unequal Work* (1984), *Pornography's Victims* (1987), *Who Will Rock the Cradle?* (1989), *Stronger Families or Bigger Government* (1990), and *Meddlesome Mandate: Rethinking Family Leave* (1991).

The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002
ISSN0556-0152

Published monthly by The Eagle Trust Fund, Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002. Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois. Postmaster: Address Corrections should be sent to the Phyllis Schlafly Report, Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Subscription Price: \$20 per year. Extra copies available: 50 cents each; 4 copies \$1; 30 copies \$5; 100 copies \$10.