

Before Judge Clarence Thomas won his appointment as Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, he and Professor Anita Hill of the University of Oklahoma faced each other in a ^{preliminary} hearing conducted by the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee. Judge Thomas was charged by Professor Hill with sexually harassing her while she was in his employ.

This hearing was one of the more ~~memorable~~ ^{socio-politically} catastrophic events of the year 1991. I am not concerned here ~~as to what was~~ with the ~~principles~~ whether or no Professor Hill ~~of~~ or then Judge Thomas was lying or telling the truth — that question will likely never be resolved. No doubt for a great many of our population the event will signify nothing more than another skirmish in the ages old battle of the sexes. For some, however, the manner in which the hearing was conducted will remain a profound shame for the U.S. Senate which did nothing official to question

the manner in which at least two Senators questioned Professor Hill. Senators Specter ^{of Pennsylvania} and Hatch of Utah ^{theatrically} savaged her in an ^{apparent} self-serving bid for political advantage and, in doing so, advertised to the world that woman essentially commands us more respect at the end of the twentieth century than ever she did before.

I am not concerned here to argue whether this or that woman deserves respect in one or more particulars; rather, my objective is to raise anew the question of western civilization's attitude toward woman; an attitude shared by woman and man alike throughout the long centuries ^{during} which a doctrinaire view of our biblical mother Eve has prevailed.

Like millions of others, glued to their television sets, I watched and read the media's display of the ~~the~~ Thomas/Hill hearing procedure and was arrested by ^{me} Professor Hill's witnesses, Judge Susan Hoerscher, who reminded the Senators on the judiciary

panel that the prejudicially
 prevailing view of woman goes
 back to The story of The Fall in The
 Garden of Eden. This was surprising
 at this stage of our increasingly
 secular culture. Biblical images are
 today less and less apt to be recognized
 than they were, say, twenty to thirty
 years ago. I recall ~~that~~ ⁱⁿ the early
 1960's, whilst teaching philosophy
 at the university, how easy and
 rhetorically economical it was to
 refer to a biblical image during a
 class lecture. For instance, if ^{during} in those
 days, a class on moral philosophy a student
 asked a question ~~on~~ ^{about} the nature of
 charity ~~we~~ could ^{have} introduced one or
 more aspects of it by saying, "To begin
 with, remember The Good Samaritan".
 At least fifty per cent of the class would
 have been able to recall the ^{gospel} parable
 and the other half the general force
 of the allusion. Not so today. During
 the 80's I would have been lucky to
 have reached ten per cent. I mention
 this as it highlights by contrast the
 confidence Judge Herscher showed in her

14.

for Professor Hill

testimony that she would have been understood in ^{recalling} ~~the~~ ~~Genesis~~ ~~story~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~Fall~~. Patently, it indicates that the dreadful press that Eve has had continues as virulent ~~as~~ and contemporary as ever. The women's liberation movement has done nothing to abate it except, perhaps, ^{among} ~~the~~ ~~minority of~~ women who have troubled to consider the matter in depth rather than at the theatrical level of slogan ~~hurling~~. How little the women's movement has liberated woman ~~what~~ economically (where it counts most) is ~~seen~~ evident in that she still earns but sixty cents on the dollar.

I am not writing these remarks as a feminist but as one who believes that wherever injustice is done to woman or man discontent and bitterness are sure to follow. These sap energy and deform genuine creativity. Thus we are all losers, where and when ^{man} ~~we~~ or ^{woman} ~~the~~, or both are kept from ~~flowering~~ ^{the} their natures call for the crippling