

Democrats benefit from feminist support

By KEN LEONARD

Are feminists really happy with the world as they have made it?

Sexual harassment, their current cause of the day, has been confirmed as a charge against Republicans, not men in general. Clarence Thomas, of course, was presumed guilty because no woman would make up such charges. (Even ones who changed their stories under oath and had to be lying in order for the time-tables to work out.) Bob Packwood is guilty because no woman would make up such charges. I tend to grant that he is actually guilty, but it is because the story checks out.

Senator Daniel Inouye (D-Hawaii) has been under accusations of sexual harassment for about 14 years. The woman has an audio tape of the incident, and made the charges promptly. Yet the official Democratic position is that she's a liar. What? I thought women didn't lie. Or is it simply that women don't lie to accuse Republicans?

Senator Carol Moseley Braun, the first welfare cheat elected to Congress, (running on a platform of "make history") vilified the all-male Judiciary Committee for its treatment of Anita Hill. (They failed to notice that she was telling the truth because Thomas is a Republican). But one of her staff has been accused of harassing

employees. So she has declared that they are merely disgruntled employees. You see, he's a Democrat. He has to be innocent.

Mayor David Dinkins (D-New York City) appointed a man to fill an education post, and then discovered he was also accused of harassment. Of course, the women were lying.

We conservatives, who have been attacking feminism for decades, now need to realize that feminism is just another part of the Democratic coalition. It isn't even a principled ideology that will attack anyone who violates its mandates. It's just another game.

The feminists are also going to get themselves an Attorney General. This is because President Clinton promised to appoint one. Never mind the stuff about treating both sexes equally and evaluating them on merit alone. Just give them an Attorney General.

Janet Reno was asked whether it mattered that she is inexperienced in dealing with federal law. Clinton said that integrity mattered. While some integrity would be nice in that Cabinet, I think that there is probably someone who has both integrity and knowledge of the federal law. There's probably even a woman, since that's what Clinton wants. Yet every woman candidate is the best choice according to these people.

The appointment is meaning-

Opinion

less if it is done just for the sake of putting the first woman into the office. Unlike Zoe Baird and Kimba Wood, Reno has a completely unimpressive record and lacks the experience needed to lead the Justice Department.

President Clinton rejected a list of potential Defense appointees because there were "not enough

women" on the list. He didn't look at qualifications, he just set up some quotas. In other words, he has decided not to treat women as equals but as numbers to fill in certain spots and make them happy.

Since they have no real principles, the leading women's groups accept this little pat on the head and run along on their merry little way, so happy that they are being treated as they want to be — as little children to be given

meaningless concessions in order to make them leave people alone.

If feminists really wanted to celebrate all successful women, they would point to Phyllis Schlafly, Suzanne Fields, Elizabeth Dole, and Jeanne Kirkpatrick as models to live by rather than vilifying them for their political beliefs. The simple fact is that feminism is not about promoting women.

It is about promoting Democrats, male or female.

'Field of dreams' nightmarish because of off-field behavior

(Continued from Page 4)

needed to return to Economics 101. But among all these cries the owners spent \$225 million on 35 players in three days. I call that a crisis: how can we spend that much money on a baseball player while our education system is the pits?

Then came the Marge Schott incident, and the reinstatement of Steve Howe. Baseball went to Capitol Hill to enter hearings about anti-trust standings and again raised the question of how baseball fits in regard to American law. The winter soon became more turbulent than usual.

The Marge Schott incident proved that baseball considers itself to be outside the law. The Constitution gives you the right to say anything you want (check the First Amendment if you were wondering). Baseball seems to

think that this right does not apply to them. Jefferson in 1776 proclaimed all men as equal, and it took until 1947 before baseball accepted that fact. Schott may have used racist terms: she might have used the word "nigger," "Jap," and "money-grubbing Jew."

Although she has the right to say what she wants, that does not mean that it should not be dealt with. Baseball just chose to deal with it the wrong way. You can't punish someone for what they say, you can only punish them for what they do. Schott could have put up a fight in court and more than likely won her case. What her comments should have led to was an investigation into baseball's hiring practices and an examination of racism in general. Thanks to baseball's above-the-law view, the whole issue was

swept under the rug again.

The reinstatement of Steve Howe added another pitfall into the baseball off-season. Howe's lifetime suspension was overturned by an arbitrator, and baseball stands by and does nothing. If a guy who has been suspended more than two times for drug abuse can come back and pitch again, how can gambling, even gambling on baseball, keep baseball's leading hitter, Pete Rose, out of the hall of fame?

Baseball, the American pastime, the business that kept American morale high through wars and other times of trouble, now is traveling down a path of uncertainty. Something must be done. Somehow baseball fans must use their voice to set the sport back on a path of prosperity. We must make baseball a *Field of Dreams* again.

Making will spurs examination of life

(Continued from Page 4)

quilts made by my father's mother? And was there any material around that I would *not* want anyone to find?

Why wasn't this easy, why did I start this, who cares, I cried as I dumped some questionable picture books (all artistic, I assure you) into the garbage. At least they won't find *those*, I swore.

I then reminded myself that I had no intention of shuffling off this mortal coil anytime soon, and that I was kind of buying another insurance policy. But that led me to another job — listing my assets, those intangibles and tangibles that would be part of the estate.

It was that word that did it. I

laughed like a madman and quickly finished my instructions and threw them into the maw of legal validation. Estate? Give me a break; I'm not going to make anyone rich; no one has to fight over this little pile.

I remember cleaning out my grandmother's house and being amazed at what an intricate and varied life she had led. Every last dish and button was an object which had defined who she was. So I can rest a little easier now that I've given my instructions and left my wishes in lawyer's language.

I think I also might start leaving little notes to whoever cleans out my house: "WARNING: I THREW OUT ALL THE GOOD STUFF."

PROPOSED DESIGN FOR OIL SPILL CLEANING DEVICE:

