

FEMINISTS KILLED THE CLASSICS

One anthology originating at the Feminist Press consolidates the evidence of why English majors have declined by over half since 1978, why English department faculty have such poor reputations, why creative writing faculty must teach their students to be politically correct in order to get published, why readers are complaining that contemporary fiction is dull, why readership of literary fiction is declining, why literary awards no longer mean anything, why the Modern Language Association is the butt of jokes, why tenure is disappearing, why many English departments are being eliminated or consolidated with other departments, why there are no jobs for most English Ph.D.s, why about 75% of faculty in English departments are now adjuncts, why so many white males are rejecting higher education, why so many colleges are closing due to declining enrollment, and even one of the reasons why Donald Trump defeated the Feminist candidate for President of the United States: *The Heath Anthology of American Literature*, Vols. I & II (1989) was published the same year as the Makowsky biography demeaning Caroline Gordon and was edited by some of the most radical Feminists and leftist males in higher education.

The project to create this anthology began in 1968, the same year the Modern Language Association got politicized by Feminists. The General Editor describes the goal as "reconstructing American literature"--"a textbook that truly displayed the enormous richness of the *cultures* of America." Not the richness of American *literature* itself. Feminists shifted the focus of literary study from literature to *culture* because most of them are incapable of teaching the classics and the Feminist works they want to teach instead are clearly inferior to the classics. "Cultural Studies" is a leftwing academic field invented by the Communist professor Fredric Jameson of Duke. The study of culture is Social Science--Sociology and Anthropology. Leftists replaced literary subjects with political advocacy in higher education throughout the United States. They replaced the traditional anthologies of American literature published by Norton, Scott Foresman, and Harpers, making it possible to ask hiring applicants what anthology they would use in an American literature survey course in order to determine whether the applicant is politically correct. The inclusion of many anti-American works also made it possible for leftist faculty to advocate their own politics and to indoctrinate students simply by claiming to be teaching a text.

The title of the anthology is a lie. It purports to be literary but is really identity politics. The editors are political activists who think like Communist sociologists rather than literary scholars. They allot a whole section of their anthology to 7 Communist writers and a Chippewa Indian named Tom Whitecloud, a writer and physician who has absolutely nothing to do with Communism but is included in this section in order to imply that Indians are Communists by nature, although no Indians at that time were trying to overthrow the government--actually an insult to Native Americans, but intended to associate Communists with admirable qualities they do not themselves possess (a case of nobility by association) and with unjust persecution rather than with the infamy they deserve, an exploitation of a minority group like their use of blacks as exposed by Ralph Ellison in *Invisible Man*. Feminists did the same by forming a coalition in higher education with blacks and other minorities and were so successful their academic revolution has been cited as a model of political action by Communists.

The 7 honored Communists: John Dos Passos, who later became a fierce anti-Communist; George Samuel Schuyler, a black Communist who later became an anti-Communist; Michael Gold, the prominent enforcer of political correctness in the U.S. Communist Party; Albert Maltz, a scriptwriter and one of the infamous Hollywood Ten who defied Congress; Meridel LeSueur, a proletarian writer who lived in an anarchist commune with Emma Goldman, joined the Communist Party in 1925 and was embraced by Feminists in the 1970s; Clifford Odets, author of the formulaic strike drama *Waiting for Lefty*, who got blacklisted by fellow Communists after testifying before Congress; and Lillian Hellman, a hardline Stalinist whose defense of her own treason, *Scandal Time* (1976) is excerpted. The novelist Mary McCarthy, herself a Trotskyite, called Hellman a liar--"Every word she writes is a lie, including *and* and *the*." Her notorious feud with Hellman is not mentioned in the anthology. Like the mainstream liberal media, Feminists do not present both sides and suppress information contrary to their politics. They should have called their anthology *The Heath Anthology of Anti-American literature*.

The Heath anthology is explicitly anti-American in the Feminist commentary on Hellman. The critic is naively pro-Communist, calling the national defense against Communist spying and subversion a "black comedy" and a "witchhunt." She blames everything on "McCarthyism," whereas the translation of Soviet cables in the 1990s proved that Senator Joe McCarthy had been right and that in fact he had underestimated the number of Communist spies and traitors liberals had hired in the U.S. government. The Feminist editor waxes hysterical over the "frightening horror of Watergate," an absurd exaggeration in retrospect, after the Obama administration used the IRS and other agencies to suppress the other party in the election of 2012. Hellman is portrayed as an heroic defender of free speech and civil liberties, hiding the fact that Stalinists brutally suppressed free speech and civil liberties. Hellman and other Communists worked to overthrow the democratic government of the United States and replace it with a totalitarian state governed by the Soviet Union. Communists murdered an estimated 110 million people in the 20th century and they threatened Americans with nuclear annihilation for decades.

Most of Volume I is conventional, though it includes dozens of Hispanic writers who have nothing to do with American literary history and over a dozen women poets of debatable significance. These editors ignore literary traditions, which are part of literature, and replace the concept of tradition with sociological groups, which is irrelevant to literary quality. Their commentaries are not reliable. For example, the introduction to the legendary speech of Chief Seattle presents it as valid without reporting that there are several revised versions of the speech, which was made more politically correct and remote from the actual speech every time a white man revised it to advance an environmentalist agenda. This editor claims that "the speech penetrates to the genocidal guilt" of whites. That falsifies Chief Seattle, who meant nothing of the kind. His own tribe was genocidal in its many defensive attacks on neighboring tribes.

Most revealing is the exclusion of *Alcuin* (1797) by Charles Brocken Brown, the first tract in American history advocating women's rights, a short dialogue between a man and a woman. In a massive volume of 2,935 pages that includes merely historical documents, songs and ballads, excerpted memoirs, and letters of no relevance to American literature, *why would Feminists have excluded the first tract in American history advocating women's rights?* Can you guess? Because what Brown reports contradicts Feminist propaganda: When the woman objects to women's "exclusion from the class of physicians," the man replies, "To a certain extent the exclusion is imaginary. My grandmother was a tolerable physician." He points out that there are also many women running domestic industries, and others who practice law, adding that some religious sects "admit females into the class of preachers," and that "places of public education, which are colleges in all respects but the name, are, perhaps, as numerous for females as for males." Finally, "Madam, there are female geometricians, and chemists, and scholars, not a few." (pages 9-17) Feminists also want to conceal the fact that the first tract advocating women's rights was not written by one of them, but by a man. Rather than publish Brown's historic tract advocating women's rights, the Feminists published his essay on *sleepwalking!* The Feminist who introduces the essay mentions *Alcuin* in passing as "a dialogue arguing in behalf of women's sexual freedom," reducing its comprehensive scope as if to imply that sex is the only freedom for women that men have ever advocated.

Volume II of the anthology is another paperback monstrosity--2,615 pages long. Most of the writers are included because of their gender or ethnicity and are unimportant in literary history, many of them minor poets represented by only one poem each. Feminist priorities are clear as the book opens with 8 women's narratives. There is also room in this incoherent anthology for African-American folk tales, blues lyrics, Ghost Dance songs, graffiti by Chinese immigrants, and Communists, but no room for Thornton Wilder's *Our Town*. Wilder is a Christian you see. Likewise omitted are Caroline Gordon and New Criticism, though the lesser pastoralist Elizabeth Madox Roberts is allowed 4 entries. Also excluded are Wallace Stegner, the major Realist of the 20th century, and Marilynne Robinson, the best living American novelist. Four of the greatest American short story writers are represented by a total of only 7 stories: Hemingway (1), Faulkner (2), Porter (3) and O'Connor (1). For comparison: Mary Wilkins Freeman (3), Henry James (1), Charles Chestnut (3), Kate Chopin (6), Edith Wharton (5), Willa Cather (1), Zora Neale Huston (2), Eudora Welty (1). Wilder, Hemingway, Faulkner, Cather, Porter, Gordon, O'Connor, Welty, Stegner, Robinson--all are Christians you see, all minimized and excluded to make room for Feminists and Communists. In "reconstructing American literature," Feminists replaced mountains with molehills.

FEMINISTS DESTROY GORDON'S REPUTATION

Also in 1989, the biography of Caroline Gordon by Veronica A. Makowsky, a professor of Women's Studies, killed her reputation by giving Feminists an excuse to ignore her. Makowsky is a molehill who belittles a mountain. She opens with a quotation from Gordon's memoirs describing a suicidal mood in her childhood. In her *first* sentence of commentary, the Feminist robs Gordon of her heroic life with the lie that she was suicidal all her life--too weak and cowardly to become a dogmatic Feminist like Makowsky: "The sense of abandonment to menacing presences, the moment of panic and despair, the seemingly miraculous recovery, and the resolution to confront the danger once more--these elements constitute the continual scenario of Caroline Gordon's life, the pattern that made her the good artist she was and prevented her from becoming the great artist she might have been."

The pattern Makowsky denigrates as disempowering is in fact the life pattern of a hero, one brave enough to "confront the danger once more." Makowsky deems Gordon second-rate because in her life and art Gordon is politically incorrect, disproving Feminist dogmas. Gordon was victimized less by men than by Feminists such as Makowsky and she was heroic in standing alone against a Feminist tide of hostility, slander and snobbery. For decades Feminists accused men of not respecting strong independent women, yet they themselves do not *tolerate* strong independent women. Gordon was not suicidal all her life, she grew up to become one of the strongest women in American history, and one of the greatest writers.

On what basis does this uneducated Feminist demote Gordon from the canon and call her a failure? She does not reveal her subjective criteria until 212 pages later, where she quotes Gordon saying readers are more interested in action than in the thoughts of characters. It is certainly true that readers often find "women's writing" to be self-centered and reduced to women's feelings. Makowsky exaggerates Gordon's accurate observation into a "credo" for all of her writing: "This credo is one reason Caroline Gordon is a writer's writer, not a popular author [with Feminists]. Her works are often beautiful examples of technical mastery, but the thoughts, the feelings, the wit, and the humor that enlivened her letters and her conversations are absent from her characters and her authorial voice. In some ways the very seriousness with which she regarded the art of fiction barred her from the serendipitous, impulsive plunges into the human heart that often make for great fiction." Makowsky accuses Gordon of being *too serious!* She implies that a "writer's writer" is inferior to a "popular writer," demoting Henry James, Joyce, Porter, O'Connor and other greats to a status below the author of the Harry Potter children's fantasies.

The intolerance of Makowsky is juvenile. She requires that Gordon write like a "woman writer," the very limitation that all the best women writers transcend. She subordinates "beautiful technical mastery" to her preference for "women's fiction," faulting Gordon for not taking "impulsive plunges" like a giddy Romantic female instead of being a scrupulous artist. Because this women's studies professor has had no literary education, she requires an author to explain her thoughts and feelings in a story so that she can understand her. And she wants tragedies to be funny. Gordon is an objective symbolist like Joyce and writes according to the "iceberg principle" defined by Hemingway. Makowsky gives no evidence in her biography that she has any familiarity with Modernism. She is ignorant of literary history and aesthetics. The term Modernism does not even appear in her book.

Makowsky is one of the Feminists who took over English departments during the 1980s in order to replace literary study with their "Me Studies." She is an agent of the academic police state called Political Correctness. The term "police state" derives from *The Language Police* (2003), a study of Feminist censorship in the publishing industry by Diane Ravitch, a Democrat. Makowsky and other dogmatic Feminists set out to destroy the reputations of the best women writers because none of them agreed with their sexist dogmas. Another example of Feminist betrayal is the malicious biographer of Gordon's close friend Katherine Anne Porter--Joan Givner, a leftist Canadian professor and jealous mediocre fiction writer who sides with the Communist Josephine Herbst against Porter the patriot.

Joan Givner lied about Porter throughout the first edition of her biography in 1982, then published a second edition in 1991 in order to smear her some more. Porter died in 1980 and Gordon in 1981. Feminists like to attack their victims after they are dead and cannot defend themselves. Their propaganda does that to almost the entire American female population of the 19th century. Feminist biographers like Makowsky

interview their subjects, gain their trust and then betray them. Makowsky is the coward, Gordon is a female Hemingway. Throughout her book Malowsky refers to Gordon condescendingly as "Caroline," as if she is a friend. Fortunately, two of America's greatest writers did not have to read the slanders about them by women who pretend to honor the greatest women writers then stab them in the back. Feminists advocate "women's rights" except for the right to disagree.

Only because intolerant Feminists now control Wikipedia entries on women writers, the commentary on Caroline Gordon's page is very short and none of her books are discussed. Nor are any of the books about her listed. This is an example of Politically Correct censorship at its most blatant. While "rediscovering" and publishing many mediocre women writers, Feminists who control literary publishing have not brought out Gordon's novels in paperback since she converted to Christianity, they have published no collection of her essays--despite her importance in the history of New Criticism--nor any collection of critical essays on her novels or her short stories. Lack of paperback editions in effect censored works by Gordon that offend Feminists, since instructors were unlikely to require students to buy expensive hardbacks--now long out of print--by a Politically Incorrect writer.

FEMINISTS CENSOR A GENIUS

Gordon is called a "genius" in *The Underground Stream: The Life and Art of Caroline Gordon* (1995) by Nancy Lee Novell Jonza. But Jonza does not prove Gordon's genius with analysis of her fiction in the context of literary history. Her biography is much superior to the hit job by Makowsky in 1989, but is likewise uninformed by literary history, as evident in the same failure even to mention literary Modernism: "Until recently Caroline Gordon's literary reputation has been based in large part on misleading and inadequate portraits of her as a woman and a writer. Gordon was almost always judged in the context of her relationships--especially her marriage--and not as a woman and writer in her own right." This accurately describes the prevailing Feminist judgment of Gordon, which is "misleading" and "inadequate" and based not on analysis of her fiction but on feelings about her as a woman rather than as a writer, especially feelings of disapproval because Gordon remained with an abusive husband (which is politically incorrect unless the woman is a Feminist running for President).

As a Feminist, Jonza herself gives the highest priority to gender--to being a woman. She too focuses on relationships, with a petty emphasis on Gordon's anger at betrayal, and projects her own irrelevant attitudes as Feminist critics always do. She reverses the priorities of Gordon, who gives the highest priority to art and to being a writer who transcends gender. Jonza sets out to dispel what she calls the "public myth" that Gordon created for herself--"in part as an attempt to falsely reassure Tate that he was the most important influence on his wife's life and talent." Jonza sees deception and "self-protective posturing" rather than integrity, generosity, and self-sacrifice. She tries to downplay the literary influence upon Gordon of the evil male Allen Tate and emphasizes the Feminist obsession that Gordon was a victim of spousal abuse. As a result, Jonza makes her seem pathetic rather than heroic.

ILLITERATE FEMINISTS PREVAIL

The Feminist critic Anne M. Boyle reinforces the negative stereotype of Gordon in *Strange and Lurid Bloom: A Study of the Fiction of Caroline Gordon* (2002). Her title actually describes her book rather than Gordon: She asserts falsely that Gordon consistently portrays "the failure of heterosexual love," as if homosexuality is the only alternative: "I am particularly influenced by my reading of the works of Adrienne Rich." Makowsky was Boyle's editorial advisor and Jonza "inspired" her. Whatever the sexual orientation of this author might be, her book is an attack on heterosexual relations from what is essentially a lesbian perspective: To her, matriarchy is Good, patriarchy is Evil. She emphasizes the power enjoyed by Southern matriarchs in Gordon's life and art, yet claims the South was totally patriarchal. On the contrary, she quotes Gordon referring to "the belief so long prevalent that the 'Old South' was matriarchal in organization." "By 1880," Boyle admits, "the majority of schoolteachers in the South were women, and social and civic reform societies were proliferating in the South as well as the North."

Also as a Feminist, Boyle hates "patriarchy" so much she has rejected God: She dismissively spins "the 'sins' of Eve" to "knowledge, voice, and assertiveness"--falsifying the Bible, where the sins of Eve are pride

and disobedience to God. Boyle makes generalizations that subvert religious faith and attributes them to Gordon, claiming for example that Gordon had a "darkening vision": "Mortal men and women cannot rise above nor offset the chaotic trends of their constructed world." It is gender-bound Feminists like Boyle who cannot transcend their constructed world, not Gordon, who became a Catholic. Boyle argues that "the authority of the Catholic Church" was a betrayal of women and Gordon herself as a writer. She claims that religious faith and deference to men were choices she made "at the expense of her developing genius and voice." Having no knowledge of literary tradition or aesthetics, Boyle does not realize that Gordon was elevating her art to the standards set by the classics of past centuries, not just catering to "a literary circle" of men she knew. Most astonishing, as an uneducated Feminist, Boyle does not know how stupid she looks to deny "genius" to writers because they have literary values and religious faith--so even Shakespeare does not qualify as a genius--and to grant that status only to dogmatic radical Feminists who take impulsive but politically correct plunges writing Atheist "women's novels."

Like other Atheist critics feeling insecure in their own faith, Boyle insinuates that Gordon's religious faith is actually dubious or insincere, that "From her first published novel...to her last...there is evidence that feminine power, perhaps the power of the Great Goddess, existed prior to...the creation of patriarchy." She insists that Gordon "remained haunted by the possibility that a feminine power, perhaps the Great Goddess, ruled the world earlier and could return and destroy the constructions of men." This is a Feminist fantasy. Gordon was not a secret Feminist worshipping women or Nature. She knew well that worshipping a Nature deity is one of the worst sins in the Old Testament, repeatedly condemned by God, and that it would be Christ, not Gaia, who would destroy the constructions of men and of Feminists.

FEMINISTS DEFAME INDEPENDENT WOMEN

Boyle's first sentence suggests that Caroline Gordon is contaminated by Politically Incorrectness, sick in the head--"infected" by Southern values--and her first paragraph exposes Boyle as just as ignorant of literary history and aesthetics as Makowsky and Jonza. One might counter that Boyle, in her reductive prejudices, is infected by Feminist values: "From the forties on [she converted to Catholicism in 1947], Gordon is seen [by Feminists] in a much more negative light as divorced wife, vengeful autobiographical novelist, difficult and demanding critic, proselytizing Catholic, and conservative social critic.... Most representations tend to fix Gordon in a one-dimensional pose." Boyle herself, for example, as when she argues that Gordon should have written "women's fiction" instead of writing "for a literary circle that would never fully accept her." On the contrary, men canonized Gordon. It is bigoted Feminists like Boyle who defamed and never fully accepted her. Just like Malcolm Cowley and his male friends excluded Gordon, so Boyle excludes her from her Feminist "community"--reducing her to a "marginal figure."

Throughout her book, Boyle complains that Gordon was independent, that she "resisted the label 'woman writer'" (as have all the best women writers); that "she disparaged 'women writers'" (those who cannot transcend their gender); that she was "alienated from a community of writing women" (in fact, she was a close friend of women writers including Katherine Anne Porter, Flannery O'Connor, and Sally Wood); that she rejected "the tradition of women writers" (and identified with the canonical tradition that includes both genders); that she "never established a female community" (she welcomed males at Benfolly); that she did not "locate herself in a community of women artists" (she had a family).

Boyle says, "Although Gordon does not explain what the 'womanly novel' is, one can be fairly certain that she is criticizing domestic fiction or the romantic or 'sentimental' literature usually ascribed to the popular woman novelist of the day." The feminist Nina Baym defines the "womanly novel" as displaying "allegedly female qualities, as the product of a timid, sentimental, narrow, trivializing sensibility... Some recent feminists, agreeing with this depiction, have seen the authors as hacks and traitors to their sex.... A reexamination of this fiction may well show it to lack the esthetic, intellectual, and moral complexity and artistry that we demand of great literature." (*Women's Fiction: A Guide 1820 to 1870*, 1978: 18)

DELIBERATE IGNORANCE

Ignorance of literary history and aesthetics is a Feminist goal, in defiance of "The Patriarchy" and to avoid unfavorable comparisons of their chosen texts to the classics. Boyle explicitly rejects literary values:

"the high cultural valuation of figuration, transcendence, and other modes of flight from the literal." To her literal mind, all literature is fantasy--"flight from the literal." Here the uneducated Feminist actually confesses to disliking literature because she has not been taught by liberals how to understand it and wants to get rid of it to make room for Feminist autobiographies, PC political tracts, and fantasies of power by "women writers." "Figuration" (including figurative language--metaphor, symbolism, allegory) is the language of great literature and transcendence is its prevailing spirit. The language of the "womanly novel" is only literal, whereas literary language is *both* literal and figurative. Because she has no understanding of literature, when she mentions a woman writer who is in fact one of the best, such as Chopin or Jewett, she is reducing her to a woman writer without understanding her. She has never learned that *The Awakening* is not Feminist but a Realist satire of the Romantic New Woman, she misses the transcendental point of "A White Heron," and she thinks a "modernist" is merely a character like J. Alfred Prufrock or Quentin Compson (who is not a modernist but a diehard traditionalist).

Boyle ignores most of Gordon's short stories, snobbishly dismissing "The Ice House," one of Gordon's best according to all other critics, as "a rather tedious story of Northern meanness and greed." No doubt it is tedious to her because there are no women in it. She is too prejudiced to tolerate a story about men only and too ignorant to discern the complexity of the story--in particular the irony that the Southerner is just as guilty of meanness and greed as the Northerner. Her terse dismissal is evidence of how shallow and cursory her reading is. Boyle lumps all women writers together and judges them on the basis of personal taste and Political Correctness, according to the criteria set forth by Cheri Register in *Feminist Literary Criticism* (1971): "The final test must be the subjective response of the female reader [men can go to hell]. To earn feminist approval, literature must perform one or more of the following functions: (1) serve as a forum for women; (2) help to achieve cultural androgyny; (3) provide role-models; (4) promote sisterhood; (5) and... consciousness raising." No literary classic meets these standards.

Ignorance of literary history and a literal mind leads Boyle to criticize Gordon for being objective and subtle, writing according to the iceberg principle, refining herself "out of existence" like Stephen Daedalus in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* by Joyce. Boyle calls this sophisticated Modernist technique "inadequacy of expression." She thinks this is why Gordon "perplexes rather than satisfies readers." Uneducated Feminist readers like herself that is. Boyle refers to the "artistic detachment required by the New Critics" yet she blames Gordon's use of detachment on a deception practiced only by her, intended "to mask her gender, to subdue feminine power." Yes, the technique is intended to "mask" not just gender but the entire author. It is sexist to deny a woman the right to use a technique used by many men and philistine to see it as a fault. Boyle sees only the literal surface of a narrative. It is Feminists who "subdue feminine power" by promoting ignorance and depriving women of an education.

FEMINIST NARCISSISM

The narcissism characteristic of Feminists is evident in Boyle's discussion of how Gordon revised "Summer Dust" into "One Against Thebes." Boyle likes the first version best because it is Politically Correct, "about the choices a young, sensitive girl will face as she grows up in a society that denies her values and her value." [Feminist distortion]. She thinks the story "should be read" as one of the many stories by women that challenged the interlocking power hierarchies present in not only the political and social world but also in literature." The story "should be read" as furthering the Feminist agenda, reduced to gender power rather than read as art according to its own pattern of implications. Boyle complains that in Gordon's revision 32 years later, under the influence of her father the girl she identifies with "loses her name, her singular perspective, her contentious voice, and her lonely stand against violent and unfair power." Projecting herself, Boyle objects to bringing the girl into the real world where she must relate to men. She prefers the first version in which the girl turns "toward an alternate world governed by a fairy godmother." Boyle is an adolescent Romantic objecting to Realism.

Boyle condemns broadening the vision of the girl to include other people: "Using an omniscient narrator rather than a central intelligence, Gordon broadens her focus to include other characters." Feminists like Boyle are so self-important they want the spotlight entirely on themselves--*all the time!* Boyle goes on to complain about literary values: "Overt sexual symbolism and classical allusions reinforce theme and make more apparent this girl's place in a traditional and...stable society.... Rather than providing more insights

into Sally's character, the older Gordon chose to develop characters and forces in the environment that shape Sally's identity. Gordon expands Sally's connection to the male community by enlarging...the part of one male character." Boyle objects to any positive connection between a male and a female because Feminists want to polarize the genders. She also complains that the later version of the story reduces the threat of rape. Boyle even resents the normal relationship of the girl with her father, seeing the male parent as having "unfair power" over his daughter--a threat to her "contentious voice." Feminists are opposed to fathers as personifications of The Patriarchy and Boyle loses sympathy with the story completely because in her feverish eyes gender relations are always a competition for power: Gordon "pits the masculine voice of the father against the feminine voice."

As is true of Feminists on campuses all over the country today, Boyle wants to silence the male voice and to encourage little girls to become as contentious as they can. Her ignorance of Modernist techniques leads her to accuse Gordon of repeatedly "silencing the female protagonist." She is not able to detect the implications in the silence. To men, the most comical Feminist dogma is that women "have been silenced." Women have always censored male writers as much as they can--totally if possible, as on campuses today--and have always dominated the fiction marketplace, for the most part as sentimentalists who are popular with women because they "do not plumb the abyss." Boyle is most absurd when she downgrades Gordon because she "does not plumb the abyss." Boyle does not know what the abyss is. She cannot define it: "the abyss" is "the undefined territory that threatens her fictional characters."

Boyle is the one who does not analyze in depth; she summarizes plots and applies her template of Feminist dogmas to them, making political stock responses and judging works according to who has "dominance," men or women, and whether female characters "are allowed" to express feelings congenial to radical Feminists of the late 20th century--who gets to win the gender war. Because she cannot define the abyss herself, let alone "plumb" it, Boyle blames Gordon, accusing her of using narrative strategies "to divert attention from the specific nature of the abyss." Boyle is so shallow it is ironic when she declares, "I strive to understand the depth of Gordon's personal and cultural uneasiness with the world." So to this Feminist, the abyss is not death or existential meaninglessness, it is merely "uneasiness." This woman could not see an abyss if she fell into one.

FEMINISTS DISEMPOWER WOMEN

Boyle does not acknowledge the power Gordon exerted on the teaching of literature throughout the United States with her anthology *The House of Fiction* (1950) and her demonstration of New Criticism *How to Read a Novel* (1957). Gordon was a *leader* of the New Criticism movement. Men give her credit for that, but Feminists are opposed to objective analysis because they cannot be objective and do not want to be--they are political activists, subjective by definition. Gordon personifies what Feminists oppose--objectivity, literary rather than political priorities, the classics, respect for males.

Accordingly, Boyle punishes Gordon for heresy by saying that "Gordon's close relationship with these men and her support of the practitioners of the New Criticism, who exerted a most powerful influence over the discussion of literature from the 1940s through the 1970s, may very well have facilitated her movement away from exploring and affirming women's thoughts and values [Feminism] in her work." Boyle takes away Gordon's distinction as a leader of a major revolution in literary criticism and gives it entirely to men. She depicts Gordon not as a leader but as merely giving "support" to the movement.

Similarly, by rejecting traditional literary values and calling them "masculine criteria," Boyle rejects the best literature by women as "masculine." This implies that being great writers makes women "traitors to their sex." By demeaning and ignoring the best women writers, rejecting their classics, Feminists deprive them of the recognition they deserve and deprive students of exposure to the best writing by women, giving the impression that what they teach instead is the best that women can do. In killing the classics by both genders, destroying literary study, persecuting males, denying them due process, prohibiting free speech, reducing enrollments and funding, provoking opposition to higher education, making English departments liabilities, and accelerating the demise of colleges, Feminists have appeared to validate the old stereotypes of women as childish narcissists--irrational, intolerant and totalitarian. Their monopolies in education and publishing have been disastrous for both. They have reduced opportunities for women of future generations

and will subject them to men who distrust them and do not want to hire them because they might be Feminists who will accuse men unfairly and sue them. Feminists are the real "traitors to their sex." They are half-brained in excluding half the human race, proving that Gordon was correct that "women's culture" is "inherently inferior to men's"--which includes both men and women.

Anne Boyle is most obviously a radical Feminist when she indicates that her own goal is matriarchy--a "woman-centered world"--not equality but the "dominance" of men by women, as is already true now in the education system. As she sees it, dominance over men is the only way a woman can feel comfortable in this world (pages 34-35). She advocates total control over men. Her book perpetuates the gender war and indoctrinates by spreading politically correct falsehoods, still another proof of how Feminists have corrupted education. Boyle was a literature student in the 1970s (in her 40s) when the radical Feminist movement began to replace literary studies with their "Me Studies." She earned a Ph.D. in 1982 with a dissertation on Gordon that must have been directed by a radical Feminist, taught at Wake Forest and published her book on Gordon in 2002, just three years before she died. Surprisingly, she was married, had a number of sons and was buried in a Catholic cemetery. She dedicated her anti-male book to her husband and one of her sons and appears to have had a good relationship with them.

Nevertheless, Boyle's book is neither Christian nor tolerant of males. She flashes her Politically Correct credentials repeatedly, over and over again--*See how PC I am!*--with abundant citations and quotations of PC Feminists, reduction of Gordon's poet husband Allen Tate to an evil embodiment of "The Patriarchy," ridiculous complaints that women have been "silenced," and the pious lie that black writers have been excluded like women--this from a Feminist participating in a movement that silences and excludes men wherever possible--including black men. Boyle needed a recommendation from a Feminist to get her book published in 2002 and used Makowsky, whom she calls a "feminist." Her bibliography and citations reflect her own dogmatic radical Feminism: Makowsky (8 citations); Jonza (5); Annette Kolodny (5)--Kolodny is a notoriously inaccurate and vicious anti-male critic; Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar (2)--the most famous radical Feminist critics; and Adrienne Rich the distinguished lesbian poet (2). Not cited is William Stuckey, a New Critic whose *Caroline Gordon* (1972) provides the best close analyses of her fiction of any book. Feminists suppress objective analyses that contradict their subjective misreadings.

A professor at the University of Pennsylvania Wharton School and Editor of the *Journal of Forecasting* studied academic writing and concluded that anyone wishing to be published in the PC academic press controlled by Feminists after 1980 must: "(1) *not* pick an important problem, (2) *not challenge existing beliefs*, (3) *not* obtain surprising results, (4) *not* use simple methods, (5) *not* provide full disclosure of methodology, sources and findings, and (6) *not* write clearly." (J. Scott Armstrong, quoted by Charles J. Sykes, *ProfScam: Professors and the Demise of Higher Education*, 1988: 105-06.)

To the few teachers out there still teaching literature, the following courses are examples of how Gordon might be included: Faulkner and Gordon; Ford and Gordon; Porter, Gordon, O'Connor, and Welty; Gordon and the Southern Renaissance; Gordon and the Agrarians; Gordon and New Criticism.

Michael Hollister (2018)