

FEMINIST PERIOD

(1970-present)

ORDER OF TOPICS: four modes of Feminism, paradigms, double standards, literary education, Victorian matriarchy, rise of radical Feminism, "What It Would Be Like If Women Win," Sylvia Plath, self-destructive victims, female "Patriarchy," "ignored" women writers, "excluded" women writers, canon formation, strong women characters, stereotyping males, fairy tales, Feminist writing since 1970, homicidal bigotry, woman as "slave," radical coalition, sexism, war on boys, war on males, takeover of education, Women's Studies, women writers oppose Women's Studies, Feminists and science, Feminist editors, survey of Feminist criticism, subjective critical theory, Marxism, polarization, dehumanization, negativity, political standards, censorship, thought crimes, examples of Feminist criticism, Feminists harass Feminist, fascism and persecution, Feminist religion, "lookism," date rape, sexual harassment, adolescent groupthink, regression to infantilism, Feminist decline, writers criticize Feminists:

FOUR MODES OF FEMINISM

In the 17th century the rebel Anne Hutchinson transcended her gender by following a male preacher and believing in a male God. In the 19th century (1) VICTORIAN feminists were matriarchal but transcended gender in much the same way: Belief in a male God and in the perceived nature of Man and Woman created by Him. (2) The TRANSCENDENTAL feminism of Margaret Fuller and of many male writers transcends gender in being egalitarian rather than matriarchal. (3) POPULAR feminism transcends gender by professing a belief in "equality," but wants the best of both paradigms--Victorian *and* radical Feminist. In the late 20th century the only authority for (4) RADICAL Feminists is the subjective self, as documented in "Feminist Literary Criticism," *The War against the Intellect: Episodes in the Decline of Discourse* (1989), by Peter Shaw. Radical Feminists are gender-bound, self-centered and polarized. They do not transcend self-interest, they aggressively pursue it.

PARADIGMS

Black Elk says "the power of the man encircles and protects the power of the woman." Pioneers did this when circling their wagon trains. This circle paradigm has been the norm in most human societies until the Feminist movement of the late 20th century. Feminists have claimed that the prevailing gender paradigm has always been hierarchical only, always subordinating women to men in everything.

On the contrary, in 17th-century Puritan Massachusetts, Anne Bradstreet described her complementary relationship with her husband: "If ever two were one, then surely we." She identifies herself as a woman with the "heart" and home, her husband with the "head" and the world outside the home. This became the traditional American paradigm of gender roles. As soon as a farmer could afford it, he liberated his wife from hard labor in the fields. Complimentary outside/inside gender roles were a practical adaptation to circumstances, especially on farms—in particular for the sake of children. The depiction of husband and wife as mutually benefiting partners in *Letters from an American Farmer* (1782) by Crèvecoeur is idealized but representative of agrarian America where a majority of the population lived until 1919.

The Feminist claim that women have always been subordinated to men in every way is contradicted by the observation of Alexis de Tocqueville in *Democracy in America* (1835) that "The Americans have applied to the sexes the great principle of political economy which governs the manufactures of our age, by carefully dividing the duties of man from those of woman, in order that the great work of society may be the better carried on. In no country has such constant care been taken as in America to trace two clearly distinct lines of action for the two sexes, and to make them keep pace one with the other, but in two pathways which are always different.... As for myself, I do not hesitate to avow, that, although the women of the United States are confined within the narrow circle of domestic life, and their situation is, in some respects, one of extreme dependence, I have nowhere seen woman occupying a loftier position." In the Victorian paradigm woman is so lofty she is idealized as "The Angel in the House" with a divine authority,

as expressed in all the women's magazines of the 19th century and epitomized in Irving's "The Wife" (1819). The role model of Victorian women including feminist Margaret Fuller was Queen Victoria.

The first convention of Victorian feminists did not take place until 1848. In *Woman in the Nineteenth Century* (1845) Fuller proposed a compromise, arguing that about one third of women are suited for equality in the workplace with men and about one third of men are suited for domestic work at home. The Victorian paradigm worked for most people until a majority of the population shifted to the cities, many women rebelled during the 1920s and women began working outside the home in great numbers during World War II. Most women welcomed the greater opportunities for women after the war, but like Louisa May Alcott they wanted the best of *both* paradigms—Victorian *and* Feminist. However, radical Feminists wanted total revolution and attempted what Hawthorne describes in *The Scarlet Letter*: "As a first step, the whole system of society is to be torn down, and built up anew. Then, the very nature of the opposite sex, or its long hereditary habit, which has become like nature, is to be essentially modified..." Accordingly, since the 1960s radical Feminists have been attacking the vital archetypes that sustain civilization: male, father, husband, wife, mother, child, family, nation, God.

DOUBLE STANDARDS

In taking over higher education in the 1980s matriarchal radical Feminists established a gender role paradigm of double standards—sexual liberation for women, sexual peril for men. The very word *feminist* is a declaration of bias and double standards: Patriarchy is evil, matriarchy is good; masculinists are evil, feminists are good; men are evil, women are good. Biased hypocrites are not scholars or good academics, they are incompetents who corrupt education.

Feminists demanded unisex bathrooms and promoted a "hook-up culture" in which young women have been encouraged to be sexually loose "like men." Pornography has become part of their curricula, "sex workers" now give workshops on orgasms, "Sex Weeks" celebrate promiscuity, "Slut Walks" are routine, girls now post naked pictures of themselves in the social media and strip as pole dancers to pay off education debts. Women teachers do porn tapes, increasing numbers have sex with their underage students and thousands of academic women now advertise themselves online as for sale to Sugar Daddies. "Feminists prefer to view virgins as people who are repressed rather than a smart person avoiding the mistakes made by her peers. Shouldn't they be saluting this girl for not falling prey to the male pig?" (Greg Gutfield, *Not Cool: The Hipster Elite and Their War on You*, 2014)

Radical Feminists have insisted that women are also the equals of men in military combat. Yet on most campuses they have retained the Victorian paradigm in severely punitive speech codes, sexual harassment policies, and punishments for "micro-aggressions"—hurt feelings: Women are weak, genteel, unable to defend themselves and not responsible for their actions. Feminists have established "safe spaces" and "cry closets" where girls can hide from ideas. Men are always guilty of any accusation and do not deserve due process. Feminist academics turned schools into sex traps, like prostitutes who mug customers. "On many campuses, in most feminist-studies programs, rape is now the paradigm and central metaphor of male-female relations.... Man-hating and galloping heterophobia are absolutely routine." (John Leo, national columnist, *U.S. News & World Report*, 10 February 1992)

LITERARY EDUCATION

Feminists since the 1960s have complained that women writers in the 19th century were deprived of a literary education by men. On the contrary, as Charles Brockden Brown observes in *Alcuin* (1797), the first tract advocating women's rights in America, "Places of public education, which are colleges in all respects but the name, are, perhaps, as numerous for females as for males."

The Feminist scholar Susan P. Conrad reports in her study *Perish the Thought: Intellectual Women in Romantic America 1830-1860* (1978): "Between 1830 and 1860, new educational experiments in women's seminaries and colleges were designed to create or maintain a perfect balance between the intellectual and feminine nature...A new age demanded a new woman, equipped with reason, knowledge, and the scientific skills necessary to domesticate the continent [Victorianism]...The period witnessed the transformation of

the female academy, the rise of the public school system and of teacher training schools, the beginnings of collegiate coeducation in the West, and the establishment of several women's colleges (27-28)...The 'Seven Sisters' colleges in New England began their rise to equal status with men's institutions of higher learning...The degree was equal to that granted in any male institution of higher learning, and they also witnessed the entry of women into previously all-male colleges. Female literary intellectuals could now get advanced degrees—usually in Europe—return to America, and teach in women's colleges...These reading women provided enthusiastic support for 'female scribblers' and ladies' magazines...." (244-45)

Frank Norris observed in "Why Women Should Write the Best Novels" (1903): "From almost the very first the young man studies with an eye to business or to a profession. In many State colleges nowadays all literary courses except the most elementary...are optional. But what girls' seminary does not prescribe the study of literature through all its three or four years, making of this study a matter of all importance? And while the courses of literature do not, by any manner of means, make a novelist, they familiarize the student with style and the means by which words are put together. The more one reads the easier one writes... Women should be able to write better novels than men. But under modern conditions there are many more reasons for this success of women in fiction than merely a natural inherent gift of expression."

VICTORIAN MATRIARCHY

Feminists since the 1960s have charged that American women were "oppressed" in the 19th century. On the contrary, "The demands of the women at Seneca Falls [1849] were being granted... [Women] exercised an increasing control over the churches, the schools, the cultural life of the country. They spent more and more of the family income... The emasculation process continues.... In the degree and manner that women suffered they repaid the score, and took their turn at being selfish, domineering, inconstant, intemperate, ruthless, and often surpassed their instructors.... Equality might have satisfied that vociferous minority agitating far and wide for women's rights but the...sweetly smiling ladies at home sought...another goal—complete domination... Domestic novelists, all women...veiled calculating aims and techniques under misty clouds of pious sentiment, fragile innocence, artless gaiety and heroic martyrdom. Has the time come for a masculine counterattack or should the victors press their advantage and exact higher and higher tribute?" (Helen Papashvily, *All the Happy Endings: A Study of the Domestic Novel in America*, 1956: 207, 211-12, 57)

The feminist Nina Baym confirms the cultural dominance of women in *Women's Fiction: A Guide 1820 to 1870* (1978): "This fiction was by far the most popular literature of its time, and on the strength of that popularity, authorship in America was established as a woman's profession, and reading as a woman's avocation. (11) The success of an enormous number of women's books in the 1850s written by many different women suggests a virtually unlimited market open to any woman who could demonstrate drawing power with an audience... *The writers who suffered in the 1850s were not the women but the men* who were aspiring to classic literary greatness. (179) While these writers and the critics enlisted in their cause have suffered, hundreds of women authors (I do not exaggerate here) and millions of women readers have enjoyed a mutually profitable relationship. (227) Although the novelists of this period now considered important are all male, from 1850 until well after the Civil War (some would say until the 1920s) the novel was chiefly a form of literary communication among women. (32) The major repeated story is that of the struggle of good women against the oppressions and cruelties, covert and blatant, of men. (115) The novels of Southworth, Hentz, Holmes, and Marion Harland all permitted their heroines to triumph in satisfying ways over their enemies [men], thereby indulging the readers' wish for revenge. (252) [italics added]

The 'cult of domesticity' that pervades this fiction is not equivalent to a later generation's idea of such a cult, as a simple injunction for woman willingly to turn the key on her own prison.... Domesticity is set forth as a value scheme for ordering all of life, in competition with the ethos of money and exploitation that is perceived to prevail in American society. The domestic ideal meant not that woman was to be sequestered from the world in her place at home but that everybody was to be placed in the home, and hence home and the world would become one. Then, to the extent that woman dominated the home, the ideology implied an unprecedented historical expansion of her influence. (27) The modern age is to be woman's age, an age of virtue, family harmony, and love. (58) The cult opposed the radical demands of the women's righters. (29) Class exercises a greater limitation on potential than gender...Upward mobility is

the heroine's destiny, but the rise of servants when it occurs is an occasion for satire rather than celebration. (69) [Again, women writers including Fuller and Emily Dickinson used the aristocratic metaphor of Queen Victoria to define the ideal social position of Woman.]

As Christians and as Victorians [they] were disinclined to acknowledge the body and physical sexuality as elements of self either inherently spiritual or capable of being spiritualized.... They had a...certainty that men and women were essentially different... They saw this distinction as significant enough to warrant a stratified society based on it, with appropriately different behavior and occupations for the two sexes. (18) Within the marriage relation, women appear historically to have exercised control over sex by inhibiting its expression. Some historians feel that their primary purpose here was to free themselves from the dangers and difficulties of childbearing and child-rearing and thus make their lives safer and more free. But the psychological purpose, expressed in so much women's fiction, of controlling men's attitudes toward women also remains relevant within marriage... The liberated woman was sexually liberated, not in the modern sense but in the sense of being liberated from sex." (254-55)

In *The Feminization of American Culture* (Avon 1977) Ann Douglas documents how women in the 19th century used their social power to create a "sentimental" popular culture and made "anti-intellectualism the tradition in American culture." (398). "Foreign travelers to the United States frequently remarked on the deference which seemed in their eyes to be a trademark of the middle-class American male's relation with the female. (70) Paternal authority was a waning force in the middle-class American family...The American father, locked into tightening business patterns, was less and less likely to be at home. (87) 'It is the women who read. It is the women who exercise the ultimate control over the Press' [writer Nathaniel Willis]. (122) The sales of all the works by Hawthorne, Melville, Thoreau and Whitman in the 1850s did not equal the sales of one of the more popular domestic novels." (114)

In 1886 a fellow male novelist congratulated William Dean Howells for defying genteel Victorian women, who constituted 80% of their readers: "I admire most of all, your honesty & courage. How dare you speak your beliefs as you do? You spare neither manhood nor womanhood, & especially not the latter, though it furnishes four fifths of our novel-reading public. It is a wonder that the females of America, at least the common born & bred of them, do not stone you in the street." (John W. DeForest, Letter to Howells, 6 December 1886)

Whatever the "Patriarchy" was, it facilitated dominance of the culture and the literary marketplace by women. Feminists in general have ignored objective feminist scholars such as Papashvily, Baym, Douglas, and Conrad because the facts they report contradict Feminist propaganda. Feminists ignored their own best authorities while they complained of being ignored by men. With even more cultural power than women in the 19th century, they have carried on the tradition established by Victorian women of being censorious anti-intellectuals. Enforced conformity to "the genteel tradition" was called Victorianism. Today, enforced conformity to radical Feminism is called Political Correctness.

RISE OF RADICAL FEMINISM

Although Feminism began to rise again in the 1960s, the Countercultural Decade was dominated by the anti-Vietnam War and black civil rights movements. As early as 1965 radical Feminists were appearing on television arguing contradictory dogmas: that (1) women are more virtuous and wise than men—according to the old Victorian paradigm of genders; and that (2) there are no differences whatsoever between women and men except their genitalia—the radical Feminist paradigm.

The Woodstock Festival (1969) was emblematic of the pastoral ideals of the Counterculture, in a period when young males expressed their *feminine* sides and grew their hair long and got "laid back." On the contrary, Feminists were in a puritanical mode asserting their *masculine* sides. Traditionally, according to the Victorian paradigm, women civilized men and facilitated their spiritual growth from adolescence by educating their hearts and sensibilities through manners and marriage. After the 1960s, radical Feminism inverted the Victorian paradigm, changing the dominant relationship of the genders from cooperation to competition. Feminists adopted the male values that Victorian women had counterbalanced and modified.

Consequently, today many males remain adolescent, or worse. Just when males were beginning to become “sensitive,” radical Feminists demonized them.

Betty Friedan (1921-2006) is usually credited with initiating the “second wave” of American Feminism in the 20th century with her book *The Feminine Mystique* (1963). She was unhappily married and wanted more career opportunities and argued that all other married women were like her. She established the Feminist practice of claiming to speak for all women. In 1966 Friedan founded the National Organization for Women to bring women into “fully equal partnership with men.” Friedan was a Marxist who radicalized the women’s movement by demanding a total inversion of the Victorian paradigm: To attain “fully equal partnership with men” would require a total commitment by all women to careers, giving themselves priority over children and establishing the radical Feminist paradigm as politically correct for all women. Yet later Friedan criticized more radical Feminists for attacking men and housewives. She had diagnosed “the problem of women” (clearly not including poor or single women) as merely “a strange stirring, a sense of dissatisfaction, a yearning”—but the more radical Feminists wanted a gender war.

“WHAT IT WOULD BE LIKE IF WOMEN WIN” (1970)

Gloria Steinem was an editor of *New York Magazine*, a founder of *Ms.* magazine (1971), and a leader of the Feminist movement frequently interviewed. She spoke on many campuses and became a role model—a chic, stylish, attractive professional woman who wore oversized *Vogue* magazine glasses tinted lavender. Her article “What It Would Be Like If Women Win” appeared in *Time* and was reprinted in many anthologies. The title indicates that the radical Feminist movement was not about equality but about victory over men and taking control, establishing a matriarchy. Yet Steinem promises that if women “win” there will be “no more domineering wives, emasculating women [or] Jewish Mothers.” All women must have careers. There will be “free access to good jobs—and decent pay for the bad ones... Free nurseries... Free legal abortions and free birth control.” There will be a four-hour workday, higher wages, further mechanization, and peace on earth. No more wars. Marriage “will probably go right on,” but there will be no more Romance novels. The goal is matriarchal Socialism and the model is Sweden, where the native-born population is declining toward extinction. Radical Feminism is utopian genocide.

SYLVIA PLATH (1925-63)

“In Sylvia Plath’s work and in her life the elements of pathology are so deeply rooted and so little resisted that one is disinclined to hope for general principles, sure origins, applications, or lessons. Her fate and her themes are hardly separate and both are singularly terrible. Her work is brutal, like the smash of a fist; and sometimes it is also mean in its feeling.... A woman whose stack of duties was laid over the ground of genius, ambition, and grave mental instability....[she attended] Smith College...[and] went on to a Fulbright to Cambridge University. She met and later married the distinguished poet Ted Hughes... She was separated from her husband, came back to London with two small children, tried to live and work and survive alone in a bare flat during one of the coldest years in over a century. *The Bell Jar* was published under a pseudonym just before she died, in February 1963....

Many of the poems are *tirades*, voiced at such a pitch of eloquence and passion they take your breath away.... She has the rarity of being, in her work at least, never a ‘nice person.’ There is nothing of [the] mystical...about her.... She is, instead, all strength, ego.... It is not recklessness that makes Sylvia Plath so forbidding, but destructiveness toward herself and others.... There is a taint of paranoia in her novel and also in her poetry.... Neither is she moved to self-criticism or even self-analysis... Committing suicide is...edged with pleasure and triumph in Sylvia Plath’s work.... Always, behind every mood, there is rage—*for what reason we do not know*, not even in the novel where the scene is open and explicit. In some poems the rage is directed blankly at her father, in others more obliquely, but with intensity, at her husband.... Indeed, the celebrated poem ‘Daddy’ is as mean a portrait as one can find in literature....with its...shameful harshness...one of Sylvia Plath’s most popular and known works.... All the hatred in our own hearts finds its evil unforgiving music there.... ‘The Applicant’ is a very bitter poem about the woman’s part in marriage.... [italics added]

With Sylvia Plath suicide is a performance. 'Lady Lazarus' describes it with a raging, confident pride.... Suicide is an assertion of power, of the strength—not the weakness—of the personality.... Sylvia Plath always seems to be describing her self-destruction as an exhilarating act of contempt....heartless ...decadence.... She insists that she is the victim—poor and white, a Jew, with a pretty red heart. But she is a dangerous and vindictive casualty.... She was not religious; instead she is violently secular... Her lack of conventional sentiment, her destructive contempt for her family, the failings in her marriage, the drifting rootless rage, the peculiar homelessness...[Postmodernism] She brings a sense of combat and brute force new in women writers.... She is spoken of as a 'legend' or a 'myth'..." (Elizabeth Hardwick, *Seduction and Betrayal: Women and Literature* 1975: 108-26)

SELF-DESTRUCTIVE "VICTIMS"

Sylvia Plath became a martyr of the Feminist movement because her characteristics cited by Elizabeth Hardwick were common to so many radical Feminists: (1) "not religious"; (2) "violently secular"; (3) she insists that despite her social privileges she is a "victim"; (4) yet she is "all strength, ego"; (5) "neither is she moved to self-criticism"; (6) her writing is "brutal, like the smash of a fist"—"tirades"; (7) she was "never a nice person"; (8) "dangerous and vindictive"; (9) displayed a "heartless decadence"; (10) "grave mental instability"; (11) "a taint of paranoia"; (12) "destructiveness toward herself and others,"; and (13) "hatred." (14) "Behind every mood there is rage—for *what reason we do not know.*" Eudora Welty observed, "We are like flies with our feet not in honey but in venom. It's not love that is the gluey emotion, it's hate.... This is a devastating emotion. It could kill us." Sylvia Plath was a real life example of the self-destructive liberated woman character in American literature, though far less sympathetic--Hester (who redeems herself) and Zenobia in Hawthorne, Daisy Miller in James, Lily Bart in Wharton, Edna Pontellier in Chopin, Sula in Morrison, and many others. Character is fate.

John Irving satirizes self-destructive Feminists as Ellen Jamesians who cut out their own tongues in *The World According to Garp* (1978). Irving's metaphor has expanded in pertinence since 1978: (1) by creating a drunken "hook-up" culture on campuses Feminists have incited sexual "assaults"; (2) by teaching young women students to imitate men they have fostered "toxic" masculine characteristics of promiscuity, vulgarity, bullying, and violence; (3) by imposing a nationwide regime of "political correctness" they have suppressed the independence of women to think for themselves; (4) by demonizing all men they have alienated half the population and provoked contempt for "higher education"; (5) by persecuting men on campuses, depriving them of due process, acting as thought police and suppressing free speech they have lowered male enrollments; (6) by hiring based on identity rather than merit they have increased the numbers of incompetent faculty; (7) by coddling women students as crybabies they have crippled them for competition in the workplace and the real world; (8) by corrupting the educational system they have legitimized reduced funding by taxpayers; (9) by propagandizing for "social justice" (for themselves) they have deprived students of a true education.

(10) By establishing Women's Studies and other duplicative advocacy programs Feminists have increased administrative bloat and raised the cost of a college education by over 1,000 percent since 1978, deflating the higher education bubble; (11) by inflating costs they have increased the replacement of tenured professors by adjuncts; (12) by increasing dependence on untenured adjuncts who have no time for political activities and no job security Feminists have "cut their tongues out"; (13) by reducing the value of college they have accelerated the bankruptcy and closing of small colleges, reducing opportunities for women; (14) by destroying the tradition of objective scholarship and losing public respect for English departments, Feminists have assured the reduction of jobs and the demise of journals and other outlets for expression by women in future generations; (15) and by taking vindictive offense at perceived slights—some schools now even require males to obtain signed consent forms before *complimenting* a female--Feminists have contributed to a culture of petty intolerance nationwide that has even incited murders, most recently exemplified by the gay black male in Virginia who killed two journalists on camera because they used harmless words such as "field." (16) In 2016 the tyranny of Feminist political correctness contributed to provoking a populist rebellion that elected President Donald Trump over the self-destructive Feminist candidate.

FEMALE "PATRIARCHY"

Feminists charged that women writers were oppressed by "The Patriarchy." This is the complaint of 19 contributors to *The Gender of Modernism: A Critical Anthology* (Indiana U 1990), edited by Bonnie Kime Scott. Yet she acknowledges that for almost 20 years the most influential Modernist was Gertrude Stein. Male writers courted her favor, including Sherwood Anderson, e. e. cummings, F. Scott Fitzgerald, and Thornton Wilder. Ernest Hemingway sat at her feet, literally. She was the most patriarchal personality in Paris. And women edited most of the top little magazines where poets and fiction writers got their start: "Dora Marsden and Harriet Shaw Weaver (*Freewoman, Egoist*)...Harriet Monroe (*Poetry*), and Margaret Anderson (*Little Review*)." (p. 8) Ezra Pound worked for Monroe as a correspondent. All three of the major little magazines in America were edited by women: *Poetry*, *Little Review*, and the *Dial*, by Marianne Moore. Scott documents that Moore had more literary connections than any other Modernist.

Scott is blind to the facts she reports: "James Joyce has enjoyed the central position in the modernist canon... Joyce's critical, daily support...came from intellectual women, who began as publishers and became much more. Harriet Shaw Weaver of the *Egoist* was an early publisher and his lifelong patron... Sylvia Beach, the American proprietor of...the bookstore Shakespeare and Company, was his amanuensis during his first decade in Paris and became a publisher to bring out *Ulysses* when no one else would... Margaret Anderson and Jane Heap were willing to brave jail to publish *Ulysses* in the United States... Additional help in Paris came from Adrienne Monnier, Beach's partner in life, an editor, and proprietor of the French bookshop Les Amies des Livres, and from Maria Jolas... He accepted letters of introduction and modest financial help from...Lady Isabella Augusta Gregory." (196-97) For Joyce, poor and supporting a family--as for other male writers at that time--the "Patriarchy" was composed of women.

The Modernist literary establishment was not matriarchal, because women were not able to impose their taste on men anymore. Gertrude Stein and Virginia Woolf hated *Ulysses* but they were not able to prevent Sylvia Beach from publishing it. Modernist women like Sylvia Beach liberated themselves from the genteel dictates of the Victorian matriarchy after the Realist movement led by Howells at the end of the 19th century. For the most part, among the best writers in the early 20th century the aesthetics and minds of both genders converged in Modernism. The gender war continued but the smartest women were not polarized against men. Many literary women and men cooperated and helped each other. They "fertilized" each other creatively--to use the metaphor elaborated by Virginia Woolf, who affirmed the masculine side of herself as well as the feminine side. Radical Feminists reject both sides. Modernist women had larger minds than postmodern Feminists. To speak of the "*Gender of Modernism*" is an oxymoron—a contradiction that misses the whole point of Modernism—transcendence. Modernists transcended gender. After decades of "Women's Studies" and a deadly avalanche of Feminist criticism, it is ironic that gender-bound Feminists display such ignorance of liberated women.

"IGNORED" WOMEN WRITERS

Feminists charged that male critics "ignored" deserving women writers in the 19th century. On the contrary, the feminist Susan Conrad contends in *Perish the Thought* (1977) that women novelists of the period—she calls them "scribblers"—were deliberately anti-intellectual... Nina Baym admits in *Women's Fiction: A Guide 1820 to 1870* (1978): "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. I confess frankly that...I have not unearthed a forgotten Jane Austen or George Eliot, or hit upon even one novel that I would propose to set alongside *The Scarlet Letter*. (14)... Earlier critics castigated this literature for certain allegedly female qualities, as the product of a timid, sentimental, narrow, trivializing sensibility, and some recent feminists, agreeing with this depiction, have seen the authors as hacks and traitors to their sex. Others, however, have claimed a covert feminism for these works, discerning beneath their sugary texture a poisonous brew. (18)... Could these talented women who failed to produce literature of the first rank have done better? If so, why didn't they?... They saw themselves not as 'artists' but as professional writers with work to do and a living to be made." (16)

“EXCLUDED” WOMEN WRITERS

Feminists charged that male critics had “excluded” women writers from the canon of American literary classics recommended for study. On the contrary, in *An Introduction to American Literature* (1902) Henry Pancoast discusses 30 women writers, including Anne Bradstreet, Phillis Wheatley, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Rebecca Harding Davis, Louisa May Alcott, Mary Wilkins, and Sarah Orne Jewett. In *American Literature* (1933) Stanley T. Williams discusses 23 women writers including Bradstreet and Jewett but not Wheatley, Stowe, Davis, Alcott, or Wilkins. He adds Mary Rowlandson, Sarah K. Knight, and Margaret Fuller. He also includes writers who had not yet been published or recognized in 1902: Emily Dickinson, Edith Wharton, Gertrude Stein, Amy Lowell, Ellen Glasgow, Willa Cather, Edna St. Vincent Millay, Sarah Teasdale, and Elinor Wylie.

Very little American literature was taught in universities until the 1920s. No “canon” even existed until male New Critics in the universities began publishing in volume during the 1940s-60s. Their reputations depended on objective analysis that persuaded other critics of the literary merits and influence of particular works—by either gender. They invested in works of literature the way people invest in real estate: The gender of the property-owner is irrelevant, only the value of the property. The “canon” emerged by consensus, but individuals remained free to define it for themselves and to argue for the recognition of additional writers, according to aesthetic, intellectual, and historical criteria.

Leading scholars who specialized in American literature published 3 editions of the *Literary History of the United States* in 2 volumes, History and Bibliography, beginning in 1946. The most authoritative definition of the “canon” is the last edition in 1963, with contributions in their specialties from over 60 scholars—nearly all of them male: 19 women writers are included in the Bibliography: Alcott, Bradstreet, Cather, Dickinson, Hilda Doolittle, Mary Wilkins Freeman, Fuller, Ellen Glasgow, Zona Gale, Jewett, Lowell, Millay, Marianne Moore, Mary N. Murfree, Stein, Stowe, Teasdale, Wharton, and Wylie. The index to the History lists mention and discussion of over 120 women, including Djuna Barnes, Elizabeth Bishop, Pearl Buck, Kate Chopin, Lillian Hellman, Zora Neale Hurston, Denise Levertov, Mary McCarthy, Carson McCullers, Harriet Monroe, Flannery O’Connor, Dorothy Parker, Katherine Anne Porter, and Muriel Rukeyser.

Nearly all of the women writers cited here were discovered, edited, published, reviewed, analyzed, promoted, and canonized by men. For examples, Ezra Pound promoted Hilda Doolittle, T. S. Eliot wrote introductions for Djuna Barnes and Marianne Moore, H. L. Mencken praised Cather, Thomas Johnson edited and raised Dickinson to literary sainthood, Yvor Winters promoted all the best women poets, male New Critics saved Kate Chopin’s *The Awakening* from oblivion, and so on. In 1925 male critics regarded Edith Wharton as the greatest living American novelist. Alfred Knopf hired Willa Cather as an editor, Flannery O’Connor was the first writer born in the 20th century to be published in the *Library of America* series, Eudora Welty was the first *living* writer published in the *Library of America*, and so on. Since 1963, as evinced by published criticism, additional women have been added to the canon--the consensus of critical judgment--including at the least Chopin, Hurston, Barnes, Porter, Gordon, O’Connor, Welty, Bishop, Toni Morrison, Louise Erdrich, and Marilynne Robinson.

In 1973 Malcolm Cowley, the major American literary critic, responded to the Feminist movement by declaring himself “a gentleman (read ‘male chauvinist pig’)” and by listing 385 American literary writers born from 1891 to 1905 who were included in *Twentieth Century Authors* (1942), edited by Stanley Kunitz and Howard Haycraft, and in their supplement (1955). Then he added writers who had become prominent since 1955. 165 of the 385 were fiction writers. 74 of the 385 were women. Cowley laments that the total of women writers is less than 20 percent and notes that “there would be a much larger proportion of women in any list of writers born after 1905.” Statistically, the odds of canonization have been better for women than for men. In contrast, Feminists attacked the canon, devaluing many of the best women writers by replacing them with mediocre women writers more useful to the Feminist agenda.

Feminists condemned all male writers, excluded them and established sexist curricula of women writers only. Because they have no aesthetic values, Feminists have no literary judgment. Ironically, they are too illiterate to recognize that most of the best American fiction writers in the 20th century are women--

Wharton, Cather, Porter, Gordon, O'Connor, Welty, and Marilynne Robinson. Because these writers are all politically incorrect--Christians who treat men and women as spiritual equals--Feminists tend to belittle, falsify, or simply ignore them, most conspicuously in the case of Caroline Gordon. It is not men who have most excluded deserving women writers from curricula, it is Feminists themselves.

CANON FORMATION

"According to representative Feminist critics, 'The canonical writers...are all white and all male, except for Dickinson' [19 females are "canonical" in *The Literary History of the United States* (1946-63)]. And this, according to current cant, can lead to only one conclusion: that white males...have 'constructed' the canon after their own image, admitting Dickinson as a sort of token pet or mascot. Many recent critics, expressing this opinion, willfully refuse to see that most of the writers 'excluded' from 'the canon' are also white males; but this is only the most egregious suppression of fact by those convinced that canon-formation is wholly political and 'hegemonic.' White male writers are in fact 'excluded' in greater numbers than any other group, since there are proportionally more of them in our publishing history.

The first question of those interested in canon-formation ought to be: Which white males have made it into the canon, and which have not, and why? This would eliminate all the dishonesty and tedium about the 'exclusion' of women and blacks, and would focus on the real question, which is not about politics, but about the degree of talent in verbal expression.... A decent level of education is necessary for distinguished literary production, and the rise in the number of well-written books by women and blacks is directly proportional to the accessibility of higher education for those groups.... But 'the canon' is not made from possibilities; it is made from publications. And for this reason, class privilege in itself gets you nowhere as an author. Not all the class privilege in the world can get you into the canon....

Canon-formation relies on...informed comparative judgments, not on a conspiracy of 'exclusions,' as political criticism would have us believe.... It is a slander against writers and critics to suggest that they can admire only people of their own gender or class.... Over time, writers and critics have historically 'excluded' from the canon those who publish feeble, conventional, unmusical, and unimaginative verse, no matter how intelligent or morally worthy or passionate its sentiments.... Critics who would idly promote any politically correct or sociologically representative text to canonical status have contempt for the taxing work entailed in the writing of a genuinely powerful poem... Society has never been able to 'set' taste, as the entire failure to indoctrinate writers in Socialist Realism bears witness.... Lesser writers, though they may be philosophically or morally or descriptively representative, do not exemplify or teach the power, discipline, and enacted insight of aesthetic form....

A strong element among [Feminists] is quite prepared to attack or abandon academic freedom, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press in their protests and crusades for good causes. And furthermore anyone who seeks to defend these freedoms may expect to be denounced as a conservative or a reactionary.... And yet these same critics accuse their opponents of politicizing the academy. Thus they attempt to turn the tables on the defenders of freedom by bringing the same charges against them that are leveled against the assault on freedom... All canons and curriculums, they contend, are instruments of cultural propaganda, and all pedagogy is, consciously or not, engaged in the indoctrination of students for political ends.

The university is not a political institution and must not be misused as such.... Furthermore, it is not a club seeking to promote good fellowship and amicability...The university is a place where the unthinkable can be taught, the unmentionable can be discussed, and the unchallengeable can be challenged. Such a place must encourage and protect to the fullest the rights of dissent and complete freedom to express views that some will find offensive, even painful." (Helen Vendler, "Anxiety of Innocence," *Our Country, Our Culture: The Politics of Political Correctness*, *Partisan Review* 1994: 269, 272, 276, 279, 281)

STRONG WOMEN CHARACTERS

Feminists claimed that male writers had created no "strong independent women characters." On the contrary, among the most well known examples are Clara in *Wieland* by Brown; Cora in *The Last of the Mohicans*, Ellen and Mrs. Bush in *The Prairie* by Cooper; "Ligeia" by Poe; Hester in *The Scarlet Letter*,

Zenobia in *The Blithedale Romance*, Phoebe in *The House of the Seven Gables*, Hilda in *The Marble Faun* by Hawthorne; Lucy and Isabel in *Pierre* by Melville; Daisy in *Daisy Miller*, the Baroness in *The Europeans*, the Governess in *The Turn of the Screw*, Isabel in *Portrait of a Lady*, Olive in *The Bostonians*, May Bartram in "The Beast in the Jungle," Madame de Vionette in *The Ambassadors* by James; Mrs. Larue in *Miss Ravenel's Conversion* by DeForest; Miss Watson, Widow Douglas and Mary Jane in *Huckleberry Finn*, Roxy in *Pudd'n'head Wilson* by Twain; Celia Madden in *The Damnation of Theron Ware* by Harold Frederic; Rose Dutcher in *Rose of Dutcher's Coolly* by Hamlin Garland; Nelly in *Maggie* and Henry's mother in *The Red Badge of Courage* by Crane; Carrie in *Sister Carrie* by Dreiser; Moran in *Moran of the Lady Letty* by Norris; Helen in *Winesburg, Ohio* by Anderson; Carol in *Main Street* by Lewis; Luce in *Honey in the Horn* by H. L. Davis; Jordan in *The Great Gatsby* by Fitzgerald; Marjorie in "The End of Something," the pregnant woman in "Hills Like White Elephants," Brett in *The Sun Also Rises*, Catherine in *A Farewell to Arms*, Pilar in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* by Hemingway; Dilsey in *The Sound and the Fury*, Addie in *As I Lay Dying*, Judith in *Absalom, Absalom!*, Drusilla in "An Odor of Verbena" by Faulkner; Queen Willalate in *Henderson the Rain King* by Bellow; Susan Ward in *Angle of Repose* by Stegner; Jenny Fields in *The World According to Garp* by John Irving; and many others.

STEREOTYPING MALES

In contrast, 19th century American women consistently stereotyped men, according to Nina Baym in *Women's Fiction: A Guide 1820 to 1870* (1978): "The major, repeated, varied story is that of the struggle of good women against the oppressions and cruelties, covert and blatant, of men." (115) "The novels of Southworth, Hentz, Holmes, and Marion Harland all permitted their heroines to triumph in satisfying ways over their enemies, thereby indulging the readers' wish for revenge." (252) "In the fourteen novels from the fifties that form the subject of my analysis, I have found only one thoroughly good man, the father in *The Lost Hieress*. Most are of limited intelligence and overwhelming vanity" (115).

According to David S. Reynolds, during the early 19th century "The novelists who were most successful in registering [a] hardy frontier spirit among women were Catherine Maria Sedgwick, John Neal, James Fenimore Cooper, and William Gilmore Simms." (346) "It should be noted that through the publication of *The Scarlet Letter* (1850), male authors were most successful in fashioning heroines that were complicated or iconoclastic.... Hawthorne's stature as the period's earliest fabricator of truly complex heroines owes much to this phenomenon of male authors giving fictional life to cultural stereotypes that were provoking political action in women's reform circles." (366-67) (*Beneath the American Renaissance*, Harvard 1989)

FAIRY TALES

"Now Cinderella, and most of the major fairy tales, have attracted a set of critics who deride them as sexist. Feminists argue that the clever and strong women in folk and fairy tales are almost always hags, witches or deranged stepmothers. The heroines, says author Ethel Johnston Phelps, 'are good, obedient, meek, submissive to authority and naturally inferior to the heroes.' Phelps, a writer in Rockville Centre, N.Y., spent three years sifting through thousands of fairy and folk tales looking for brave and clever heroines. She found enough for two books: *Tatterhood and Other Tales* (The Feminist Press 1978) and her just published *The Maid of the North* [1982]. Here the fables are turned: women rescue men, outwit demons and fight like Cossacks.... Phelps is careful to avoid the word beautiful because she considers it sexist.... Phelps also adds a brush stroke here and there to make the females more active... Phelps' updated dialogue offers a feminist case against marriage: 'A wife is a house dog tied with a rope. Why should I be a servant and wait upon a husband?'

Though Phelps celebrates females who have brains and energy, her feminist lens at times distorts the drama beneath the folk tales. As Bruno Bettelheim made clear in *The Uses of Enchantment*, most protagonists in fairy tales are passive because the children who listen to them feel at the mercy of events and want to be reassured. Beauty or handsomeness is a routine signal to the child of moral worth. Marrying and living happily ever after tells children that they are worthy of love and can find it when the time comes. Typically, Phelps flattens out the story of Scheherazade by leaving in the logic and removing the magic: Why should the heroine fall in love with the murderous king or beg for her life?... Bettelheim pays more attention to the hidden message of the tale: Scheherazade and the king represent warring forces within the

psyche: depressed and destructive vs. good and reasonable. The peace between Scheherazade and the king says that the child can be whole one day.

The real business of fairy tales is not propaganda. It is to help the young deal with anger, sibling rivalry, fear of separation and death and the eerie omnipotence of the adult world. 'The fairy tale,' adds Bettelheim, 'offers solutions in ways that the child can grasp on his level of understanding.' For girls and boys, those solutions do not invariably come through identification with the strong, but often with the bewildered, prefeminist likes of Cinderella and Snow White." (Review, *Time* 1982)

FEMINIST LITERARY WRITING SINCE 1970

One notable Feminist novel is *Black Water* (1992) by Joyce Carol Oates, whose vision is anti-American. Oates has equated the U.S. military with Islamic terrorists. Students whose Feminist professors refuse to teach classics by white males would not be able to recognize Oates' parallel between Senator Ted Kennedy and Daisy Buchanan in *The Great Gatsby*. Oates writes like she herself is chirping and gurgling under black water. While sinking, she is estimated to have gushed up over 100 novels. That is only an estimate because they all popped like bubbles as soon as they surfaced. Oates recalls Emmeline Grangerford in *Huckleberry Finn*: "She didn't have to stop to think."

One novel particularly useful in helping people to understand the Feminist mind in the late 20th century is *Surfacing* (1972) by the Canadian Margaret Atwood, depicting a representative liberated woman as having aborted her humanity in the process of switching gender roles, so that she now illustrates what she hates. Atwood is one of the few prominent Feminist novelists, along with Morrison, who hold women responsible for their actions as well as men. During the 1970s Feminists opened the floodgates of the sexual revolution, as in *Fear of Flying* (1973) by Erica Jong and *Looking for Mr. Goodbar* (1975) by Judith Rossner, popular for depicting the adolescent pursuit of sexual intercourse. Alice Walker's *The Color Purple* (1982) became very popular but is drenched in self-pity. A far more entertaining, humanistic, and artistic representation of lesbian experience is *Kinflicks* (1976) by Lisa Alther.

One of the most taught Feminist works is *The Woman Warrior* (1976) by Maxine Hong Kingston, in which the liberation of a Chinese-American woman contrasts the patriarchal culture of China with America, showing how much less American women have to complain about. As a matriarchal Afrocentric Feminist, Toni Morrison is a severe critic of white Feminist women, especially at the end of *Tar Baby* (1981). Her *Sula* (1973) is one of the two most complex and incisive Feminist novels, after *Surfacing*. Feminists accused men of treating women like sex objects for three decades, then made a Feminist classic of *The Vagina Monologues* (1996) by Eve Ensler, a reduction of women to their genitalia so popular among Feminists that celebrities have joined the casts and it has been staged internationally. Not intended to be self-parody, the play "equates men with 'the enemy'—heterosexual love with violence" and includes the "good rape" of an underage girl by an adult woman. (Wendy McElroy, *iFeminist*)

HOMOCIDAL BIGOTRY

The most common type of white Feminist novel is bitterly polarized against men, such as *The Lathe of Heaven* (1971) by Ursula K. LeGuin, who calls for a gender war and an invasion by wimpy space aliens to establish a matriarchy in America governed by women like Ursula K. LeGuin.

The most influential Feminist novel was *The Women's Room* (1977) by Marilyn French, an international bestseller that sold 20 million copies worldwide and was called "a classic of feminist fiction" and a catalyst that launched thousands of book groups. "It became a touchstone for millions of women." (Sharon Krum, *The Guardian*, 16 June 2006) "The harsh vision of marriage in Marilyn French's *The Women's Room* looks cartoon-like today. But the first bestselling novel to emerge from 1970s feminism still strikes a chord." (Nuala O'Faolain, *The Guardian*, 13 September 2003). The novel was so popular among women academics that many of their male colleagues were shocked into an awareness of how much they were hated because of their gender. The TV movie adaptation (1980) was also hugely popular with vindictive women and inspired several copycat murders of abusive husbands who were set on fire while they slept. French acknowledged, "I had been angry all my fucking life."

“*Female Parts* is four skits played in bravura fashion by Joanna Malandrucolo, the lone performer. It’s a feminist-socialist broadside cast in the hectic populist style of television situation comedy.... The poison is strong in Darlo and Franca Rame’s *Female Parts*.... Lack of generosity may be the key to the distastefulness of this production. Malandrucolo plays her women-victims with an unrelenting, hard edge, a passionate anger that curls with a sneer toward hatred. The venom spills out against men in general (all men are depicted on stage by stuffed dummies), lovers and husbands in particular, social conditioning and the chains of motherhood. If men are tyrants who keep women from fully realizing themselves, the play says, so are children. The resentment against parenthood is sometimes astonishing; the play’s arguments for free abortion rights come off as so blatantly selfish they could almost be turned around and used as I-told-you-so propaganda by the Right to Lifers. Nowhere is the play’s anti-male, anti-child bias so strong as in the final skit, a reworking of Euripedes’ *Media*.... Her murdering of her children is presented as an act of heroic selfhood rather than unhinged passion that flies against the tenets of civilized life.... Pure rage helps no one... What should we expect from a school of theater that by definition embraces half the human race and excludes the other half.” (Bob Hicks, “Anti-Male, Anti-Child Slant Hurts Women’s Production,” *The Oregonian*, March 1988)

“Women will begin to stop talking about castration, and make it a reality...start carrying guns. Women will begin to kill men if they have to.” (Kristen Asmus, student, University of Colorado, 1989, quoted by Dinesh D’Souza, *Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus* 1991: 11) “Ms. Dworkin’s argument, proceeding from pain, may be moving, but it is also intolerant, simplistic and often just as brutal as what it protests. Ms. Dworkin advocates nothing short of killing men.” (Wendy Steiner, “Declaring War on Men,” Review of *Mercy* by Andrea Dworkin, *NYTBR* 1990) “Dworkin views all men as beasts and all women as innocent (and strangely passive) victims. Men, from her tortured perspective, are incapable of compassion, decency, or honor and only refrain from the most brutal acts out of fear of revenge.... What men do to women is worse than what the Nazis did to the Jews.” (Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, *Feminism without Illusions* 1991: 93)

WOMAN AS “SLAVE”

Feminists claimed that women are just as “oppressed” as current African-Americans because they were seen as “a typical minority-group stereotype—woman as nigger—if she knows her place (the home), she is really a quite lovable, loving creature, happy and childlike.” (Naomi Weisstein, “Woman as Nigger,” 1969). On the contrary, women were a majority, not an oppressed minority—they were 51% of voters. And in the 1960s white women had more disposable income than white men, due to the longer lifespans of widows. Feminists also compared themselves to slaves, whereas in fact, in the 19th century, white women owned more slaves than white men, due in part to the fact that many single women owned slaves to do the work of a husband. This is why in *Huckleberry Finn* Twain makes the owner of Jim a single white woman, the puritanical Miss Watson. Ironically, Miss Watson has personality traits in common with many of the later Feminists who compared themselves to slaves. Feminists have shifted all of their “white guilt” for slavery from themselves onto white males and used blacks for their own advancement.

Ralph Ellison satirizes the unbalanced political coalition of blacks and white Feminists in chapters 19 and 24 of *Invisible Man* (1952). In *Tar Baby* (1981) Toni Morrison compares white Feminist women to warrior ants and rebuts their values with her own: “Why you little white girls always think somebody’s trying to rape you?”; “American women killed their babies with their fingernails”; “You are up to your kneecaps in rot”; “Forget her.... She has forgotten her ancient properties.”

RADICAL COALITION

“A rainbow coalition of blacks, leftists, feminists, deconstructionists, and Marxists” have infiltrated academia and are ‘ready to take control’.” (Henry Louis Gates, quoted by Danish D’Souza, *Illiberal Education*, 1991: 172). “Feminists used the civil rights issue to seize power in the universities. They now have the chairs and tenured positions.... We helped this to come about, yet we blacks have reaped very thin gains.” (Professor Glenn Loury, Harvard Afro-American Studies and Kennedy School of Government, quoted by D’Souza, *Illiberal Education*, 205)

“HOLLISTER RIGHT-WING BIGOT”: “Hollister’s contention that ‘feminist courses will further politicize the diversity requirement’ is absolutely true.... We do not feel that lack of focus on gender in the diversity requirements in the nation’s universities is justification for Michael Hollister to categorically dismiss the importance of these issues.” (Letter signed by 27 students, *The Vanguard*, 28 January 1992) [In no other university in the country were Feminists included in a diversity requirement focused on ethnic minorities. At Portland State, the Feminists “pimped off the black movement” to force students to endure their own indoctrination, making it possible for whites to avoid taking a course in ethnic studies, perverting the intended effect of the requirement. M. Hollister]

“A lot of blacks are upset that the feminist movement has pimped off the black movement,’ said Lou Palmer, a black radio show host in Chicago, to *The New York Times*. ‘Now here comes the gay movement. Blacks resent it very much, because they do not see a parallel, nor do I.’ The feminist movement does not necessarily have any warmer feelings toward the black movement.... Women’s Studies courses have mechanisms structured into them to ensure that resentment against men remains high.” (Heather MacDonald, “The Diversity Principle,” *Our Country, Our Culture: The Politics of Political Correctness*, *Partisan Review* 1994: 145)

SEXISM

“Why do we need an economy? All they [sic] have brought are war and destruction and were they not the work of men?... Prepare for the new world of women. One without control.... I am very sane and everyone else is insane.” (Sonia Johnson, 3-time Feminist candidate for President of the U.S., “Going Out of Our Minds: From Women’s Movement to Women’s World,” quoted by Edmund Yeh, *The Stanford Review*, 27 January 1992)

“With their rough, shaggy coats, their deep, senseless voices, their stupid affection, and their dirty habits, surely dogs supplied the want for all that is precious in masculinity to literary spinsters.” (Ellen Moers, *Literary Women*, 1977: 260) “Why are sexist pronouncements treated as noteworthy when uttered by women? If a man prattled on about supposed special male insights, would anyone have deemed those reflections worthy of the effort to reprint them? It seems that one of the results of the feminist movement is not the elimination of sexist attitudes, but rather the acceptability of sexist attitudes when expressed by women only.” (Robin Lawson, Letter, *Time* 1982) “Straight, white men at Stanford felt especially ‘oppressed’ by PC thinking. Some told me they felt blamed for every past transgression against women, minorities and gays.... Some overzealous PC folks did want to squelch debate.” (Marcus Mabry, Stanford student, “My Life as a Member of the PC Patrol,” *Newsweek*, 24 December 1990)

“‘If you do not subscribe to all the tenets of radical feminism, you would do well to exercise caution before enrolling in a course in the English department.’ [Professor Ward Parks] described...the ritual demonization of men by faculty feminists including one who lectured her students that if men knew they could get away with it, they would commit rape at once. Parks contrasted the routine hatred of men by feminist professors which was part of the allowable norm in classroom discourse with the department’s morally punctilious affirmative action guidelines which condemn as anti-female such offenses as insufficient eye contact.” (Ward Parks, Professor of English, Louisiana State, “LSU’s War against Men,” *Heterodoxy*, September 1992)

“Her first job was as an English teacher at the University of New Hampshire where she was twice denied promotion to the rank of associate professor and then denied tenure on a 10-0 vote.... [Annette Kolodny] came in [to the U of Arizona] ‘as if she had ridden into the land of Oppressive White Males on a dragon.’... She placed an absolute ban on the hiring of white males... One male professor says, ‘She’s an angry woman. She uses foul language and she outright lies.’ When the poet Carolyn Kizer quit the faculty, she wrote of Kolodny: ‘The Dean’s bullying attitudes, her inability to listen to others, her rearrangement of the facts to suit her selective memory, her Leona-Helmsley-like capriciousness, make it impossible for me to continue here.’” (“Annette Kolodny, Dean, University of Arizona,” *Heterodoxy*, April 1994)

“[There is a network of] PC spies.... Could a bad grade be construed as failure to encourage? If you don’t talk to a woman you dislike, are you guilty of not making her welcome?” (Professor Paul Lewis, Political Science, Tulane, quoted in *Newsweek*, 24 December 1990: 53)

WAR ON BOYS

“The AAUW [American Association of University Women]...relentlessly promoted the idea that boys were unfairly advantaged while girls were neglected. The AAUW had not merely *ignored* boys’ problems, it had *dismissed* them... Surveying the perceptions of schoolboys and schoolgirls, the AAUW had learned that it is boys who feel neglected and girls who feel favored by their teachers...The media can help by publicizing the studies by the U.S. Department of Education, MetLife, the Search Institute, and the Horatio Alger Association, as well as the academic research... All such studies expose the falsehoods disseminated by the girl partisans, and all show that the very term ‘short-changed girls’ is a travesty of the truth....

The fear of ruinous lawsuits is forcing schools to treat normal boys as sexist culprits... Besides wasting precious classroom time, what effect do these ‘sensitivity’ exercises have on the students? Girls cannot fail to be provoked to anger against the male sex... As for the boys in the class, they can only feel confused, hurt, or helplessly defiant.... Boys are under siege: ‘Boys feel continually attacked for who they are. We have created a sense in school that masculinity is something bad.... Sad to say, normal youthful male exuberance is becoming unacceptable in more and more schools.... Boys feel blamed for history, and a school culture has grown up which is suspicious and frightened of boys’.... Boys at University High School in Pacific Heights, California, are obliged to sit quietly through an annual ‘Women’s Assembly’ in which women are celebrated and men are blamed.... Boys are told that we live in a patriarchy in which men are unfairly ‘in control of our country, our businesses, our schools and...the family’.... What [about] boys living *without* fathers...? ‘[Boys] are informed that they should be critical thinkers, but then they are evaluated on whether they think the same way their teachers do’.... The public has given no one a mandate to pursue a policy of privileging girls.... Few parents share Gloria Steinem’s belief that boys should be raised like girls.” (Christina Hoff Sommers, *The War Against Boys: How Misguided Feminism Is Harming Our Young Men*, 2000: 41, 54, 57, 58, 132, 204, 207)

In 2001, for example, the ratio of youth suicides by gender showed that boys killed themselves at an increasing rate in comparison to girls as they passed through the Feminist educational system: Ages 10-14 the ratio is 3-1; ages 15-19, the high school and early college years, the ratio jumps to 5-1; ages 20-24 the ratio of males to females killing themselves continues rising to 7-1. (*familyfirstaid.org*, 2013)

WAR ON MALES

“The trend against boys and men has become so widespread that numerous books and articles are documenting today’s ‘sexual disequilibrium’ and the harm it is causing boys and men; indeed, the trend harms all of society. Dr. Helen Smith, in her latest book, *Men on Strike*, declares that ‘American society has become anti-male’ and as a result, boys and men are dropping out of ‘participation in a system that seems to be increasingly stacked against them.’ Smith’s findings, said one analyst, are not ‘simply about [men’s] feelings,’ instead, she documents the problems and injustices faced by boys and men to prove that there is solid ‘political, legal and material basis’ for cultural revolution that not only allows but encourages ‘laws and actions against the male sex that would never be allowed against the female one.’ Some analysts believe that the feminist agenda of ‘socializing away from conventional maleness’ is putting boys at risk; [Christina Hoff] Sommers says, ‘schools today tend to be run by women for girls. Classrooms can be hostile environments for boys.’ Boys are square pegs being forced into round holes....

Frankly, numerous authors have stepped forward to try to recalibrate the balance between the sexes. Some blame the men for immaturity and avoidance of responsibility; others dig deeper to explore the societal forces that are producing disparities between the sexes. Kay Hymowitz wrote, *Manning Up: How the Rise of Women Has Turned Men into Boys*, Hanna Rosin wrote, *The End of Men and the Rise of Women*, and Kathleen Parker wrote, *Save the Males: Why Men Matter, Why Women Should Care*. In addition, some men are courageously addressing the issue. Michael Kimmel wrote, *Guyland*, Leonard Sax wrote, *Boys Adrift: The Five Factors Driving the Growing Epidemic of Unmotivated Boys and Underachieving Young Men*, Warren Farrell wrote, *The Myth of Male Power*, and Richard Whitmire wrote, *Why Boys Fail*... Feminist Christina Hoff Sommers, author of *The War against Boys*...tried to describe the ultimate outcome of the anti-boy attitudes in public schools and throughout society. She said, ‘My guess is that vast numbers [of boys] will just stop trying and withdraw: It would not be an organized strike—it

would just happen. It is happening'.... Between 2000 and 2010, the number of male full-time post-baccalaureate students increased by 38 percent, compared with a 62 percent increase in the number of females." (Janice Shaw Crouse, Ph.D., "Where Are the Boys?" (*americanthinker.com*, 28 June 2013)

As Feminists increasingly subjected all students to Political Correctness from 1980 to 1990, the suicide rate of all young people ages 15-24 spiked from 8.8 per thousand to 13.2. (*suicide.org*, 2013)

TAKEOVER OF HIGHER EDUCATION

After Feminists took over higher education beginning in 1970 the cost to students skyrocketed: In the 30 years after 1978 the average cost of a college education rose 1,120 percent! (*Bloomberg Business*, 15 August 2012) Nationally, from 1971 to 2011 bachelor's degrees in English fell from 7.6 percent to 3.1 percent. (U.S. National Digest for Education Statistics) Feminist priorities and political correctness are primarily responsible for the current national trend in higher education of eliminating much of the liberal arts and reducing English departments to composition and rhetoric taught by adjuncts.

"In December 1968, at the convention in New York of the Modern Language Association...insurgent members assembled a slim majority to pass four resolutions heavily charged with political commitments.... The next year, the business meeting was taken up with further radical issues, including the rights of women in the profession.... [Professors] have introduced into the curriculum trivial courses barren of professional 'standards of achievement'..." (Kermit Vanderbilt, *American Literature and the Academy*, 1986)

"Whereas in December 1970 the MLA Commission on Women reported that one hundred courses were being offered throughout the country in Women's Studies, a year later there were over seven hundred, in nearly two hundred institutions—an increase of more than 600%.... There are three new scholarly journals devoted to Women's Studies, and several new publishing houses. But the statistics only suggest the far-reaching implications for American education of this new activity by academic women.... What strikes me as especially important is the anger... Feminists have always been angry, and rightly so... They are inventing new classroom procedures...where authoritarian methods—the teacher lecturing, the students passively taking notes—are often seen as an ugly parody of the male-female, dominant-submissive situation in our society...." (Elaine Hedges, Guest Editor, *College English* 34.1, October 1972: 3-4, 2)

"By 1979, Ford had granted more than \$30 million to 'advocacy, research and curriculum projects' in Women's Studies... *Who's Who and Where in Women's Studies*...listed some 3,000 feminist teachers and 5,000 courses in over 2,000 colleges and enabled the troops in this war on curriculum to coordinate their efforts... Under the current plan, Women's Studies will no longer simply be localized in separate departments on campus like other disciplines. Now it will be integrated and mainstreamed into every nook and cranny of the university, transforming the entire curriculum of higher education...[though admittedly] some contemporary women—in women's studies and beyond—cling fiercely to an exaggerated, dogmatic description of women's oppression. They are coconspirators in the growth of their own weakness." (Catherine R. Stimpson, Head, MacArthur Foundation, former President, MLA, "What Lies Beyond 'The Woman as Victim' Construct: New Directions for Women's Studies," *Ms./Campus Times*, October 1984)

"In order to give the curriculum transformation project a solid institutional base, it had to be tied to an already established program or department [usually English]...to encourage individual departments to address the issue of course transformation...and to offer more special-topics courses focusing on women and gender." (Evelyn T. Beck, Sandra C. Greer, Diana R. Jackson and Betty Schmitz, "The Feminist Transformation of a University: A Case Study," *Women's Studies Quarterly* 1 & 2, 1990: 176-77) "More than three hundred curriculum transformation projects since the late 1970s have been launched to persuade faculty teaching in traditional disciplines to incorporate the scholarship of diversity [Feminism] into their courses... Incentives...had to be provided to overcome faculty members' reluctance [office space, course assignments, promotion, tenure, salary increases, etc.]." (Deborah S. Ross, "Definitive Issues: Women's Studies, Multicultural Education, and Curriculum Transformation in Policy and Practice in the United States," *Women's Studies Quarterly* 3 & 4, 1994: 35)

“Today, Women’s Studies programs abound on college and university campuses... Some aspect of women, gender, or feminist theory are steadily displacing traditional topics.” (Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, *Feminism without Illusions*, 1991: 4) “Feminism has provided a kind of blueprint for special interests that wish to appropriate the curriculum to achieve political goals.... Efforts to dismantle the traditional curriculum and institutionalize radical feminism, to ban politically unacceptable speech.... Directives encouraging these and other radical developments now typically issue from the dean’s office or Faculty Senate, not from students marching in the streets.” (Roger Kimball, *Tenured Radicals: How Politics Has Corrupted Our Higher Education* 1990: 19,167) “Advertisements for academic posts listed in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* now often specify a feminist political orientation for instructors.” (Mona Charen, national columnist, “Some Professors Standing Up for Rights,” *The Oregonian*, 9 December 1990)

“What are they advocating? (1) Serious revision in (or abolition of) the canon of literary texts that are taught to American university students... The second and even more problematic call here is for the full-scale politicization of the liberal arts program to the tenets of the cultural left.” (Andrew Wachtel, Review of *The Politics of Liberal Education*, eds. Darryl J. Gless & Barbara Herrnstein Smith, 1992) “In the current *Ms. Magazine* (October 1984)...a sample gender-balanced curriculum for 19th-century American fiction replaces Washington Irving, Edgar Allan Poe, Stephen Crane...and Mary Wilkins Freeman with Harriet Wilson, Susan Warner, Elizabeth Stuart Phelps and others, based on political rather than literary criteria. Susan Warner, for example, wrote didactic melodramas for young girls.” (Michael Hollister, Letter, *The Oregonian*, 18 October 1984)

“Students are not taught that there is such a thing as literary excellence... [We] are throwing out the notion of good and bad, or ignoring it’; the canon was the invention of ‘white, male Northeasterners’ as part of a plot to oppress minorities and women.” (English Department faculty, Duke University, known as “the richest Marxists in the country”) quoted by columnist David Brooks, *Wall Street Journal*, 2 February 1988) “The world changes more deeply, widely, thrillingly than at any moment since 1917...and the American academic left keeps fretting about how phallogocentricity is inscribed in Dickens’ portrayal of Little Nell.... The canon, we’re told, is a list of books by dead Europeans... You know, *them*, the pale, patriarchal penis people.” (Robert Hughes, “The Fraying of America,” *Time*, 3 February 1992)

“Jane Tompkins is married to Stanley Fish, her department chairman...a specialist in American literature... Tompkins argues that Hawthorne’s fame comes not from his literary genius but from ‘the influence of his friends and associates’... ‘I’ve built up a huge storehouse of hatred and resentment against people in authority over me (mostly males)’.” (“Jane Tompkins, Duke University,” *Heterodoxy*, May 1992) “The hypocrisy that disgraces the canon debate now raging in the United States... The curricular carnage taking place in literature departments from coast to coast...is adamantly denied here by...the Modern Language Association, the largest and perhaps the most influential learned society in the nation.” (Norman Fruman, Professor of English, U of Minnesota, “Women Oust Classics in Academe’s War of Words,” *The New York Times Book Review*, 4 October 1994)

“The younger critics seem shipwrecked in feminist rage and deconstructive hostility to dead white European males... Every author is guilty until proven innocent, every book reflects the ideological currents of its moment, the distributions of power... The end of the Cold War has exposed the hollow rhetoric of ersatz academic radicals.” (Morris Dickstein, Director, Center for the Humanities, CUNY Graduate School, “Correcting PC,” *Our Country, Our Culture: The Politics of Political Correctness*, Edith Kurzweil and William Phillips, eds., *Partisan Review* 1994: 48, 42)

WOMEN’S STUDIES

“All men are rapists.” (Susan Brownmiller, *Against Our Will*, 1975)

“The institution of sexual intercourse is anti-feminist.” (Ti-Grace Atkinson)

“All feminists can and should be lesbians.” (Revolutionary Feminists, *Love Your Enemy?*, 1981)

“I feel that ‘man hating’ is an honorable and viable political act.” (Robin Morgan, *Ms.* editor)

“To call a man an animal is to flatter him; he’s a machine, a walking dildo.” (Valerie Salanas)

“Men who are unjustly accused of rape can sometimes gain from the experience.” (Catherine Comin, Assistant Dean, Vassar College)

“All sex, even consensual sex between a married couple, is an act of violence perpetrated against a woman.” (Catherine MacKinnon)

Feminists have made higher education hostile to heterosexuals. Males are demonized. On their websites, Feminist academics express contempt toward any male colleague who tries to be complimentary or friendly or to treat them as equals. Half of all universities and colleges are expected to go bankrupt within the next ten years due to declining enrollments.

“Women’s Studies is institutionalized sexism...a comfy, chummy morass of unchallenged groupthink. It is, with rare exceptions, totally unscholarly. Academic feminists have silenced men and dissenting women. Our best women students are being force-fed an appalling diet of cant, drivel, and malarkey.” (Camille Paglia, *Heterodoxy*, September 1992)

“Long before the term ‘political correctness’ gained currency in its present conservative/ironic sense, ideological policing was a common feature of Women’s Studies programs. Women appraised one another; and, too frequently, found reason to judge other deficient... Where dissenters saw feminist ideology distorting scholarship, advocates praised the virtues of research guided by political commitments.... Today, separatism in Women’s Studies is readily and graphically illustrated by the widespread exclusion of male authors from course syllabi, assigned reading lists, and citations in scholarly papers... A systematic refusal to read or respond to male authors harms feminist scholarship in many ways.

What we see in Women’s Studies is an intellectual and personal preoccupation with the tasks once assigned to Victorian women: to keep the language pure, to act as guardians of morality (feminist morality now), and to spread tales about those who do not measure up to the prevailing norms (whether it be questions of etiquette or political correctness). From this point of view, Women’s Studies as theory reflects the traditional location of women in domestic arrangements, while Women’s Studies as practice derives from the sort of tribal/consensus/shaming strategies that work best in family-sized groups. At every juncture at which feminist bias emerged, it was justified by reference to the prior bias of men--as if emulation of the thing being rejected had, unconsciously, become the feminist agenda.” (Daphne Patai & Noretta Koertge, *Professing Feminism: Cautionary Tales from the Strange World of Women’s Studies*, 1994: 2-10, 4)

“Women’s studies courses have mechanisms structured into them to ensure that resentment against men remains high.... Curricular transformation seeks to recast knowledge itself in a ‘female-centered’ mode. Its main targets are...logic, mathematical reasoning, and scientific research... Despite its aversion to analytical thinking, the curricular transformation movement promotes a host of wacky typologies... The nascent push for ‘national standards’ of high-school achievement doesn’t stand a chance against the gender-feminist celebration of the lowest common denominator... Gender feminism is antithetical to academic excellence, it is a disaster for women.” (Heather MacDonald, *Partisan Review*, 1994: 145-54)

“The passionate hatred of men, the utopian demands for an elimination of all gender differences, the (totally inconsistent) demands for a uniquely female perspective, and the belief in widespread gender discrimination are the core of the new gender studies curriculum.... A dorm-based discussion on feminism culminated in an attack by one of the RFs on women who chose more traditional roles as mothers and did not pursue careers. She had not done so, and could not imagine why other women might.” (David O. Sacks & Peter A. Thiel, *The Diversity Myth: ‘Multiculturalism’ and the Politics of Intolerance at Stanford*, 1995: 72, 97)

WOMEN WRITERS OPPOSE “WOMEN’S STUDIES”

Women’s Studies is the only academic field ever to be rejected by its subject matter.

“It is fatal for any one who writes to think of their sex... It is fatal for a woman to lay the least stress on any grievance; to plead even with justice any cause; in any way to speak consciously as a woman. And fatal is no figure of speech; for anything written with that conscious bias is doomed to death. It ceases to be fertilized.... Some marriage of opposites has to be consummated....” (Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own*, 1929) “Miss [Doris] Lessing has been outspoken for some years about her wish to dissociate herself from...the women's movement... And lately, I've noticed, many other distinguished writers of the female sex have been protesting that they too are not 'women writers,' or 'women's writers' (apparently worse), but *writers only*, less concerned with 'female subjects' or 'women's lot' than with the human predicament ...Joan Didion...Susan Sontag...Margaret Drabble...Nadine Gordimer...Mary McCarthy... How can we know whether the term 'women's writing' has any...validity without serious study?” (Elaine Showalter, *NYTBR* 1984) “The heart sinks to see one's work discussed in a chapter titled 'Women's Literature'.” (Joyce Carol Oates, quoted by Showalter, above)

“Biology is not to be the governing motif of a woman's (or a man's) value or activity, whether as writer or as anything else. That whole careers of whole legions of scholars now focus on precisely the opposite of this principle—and in the name of feminism—is the most famous absurdity of the age.” (Cynthia Ozick, *NYTBR*, 1985) “Elizabeth Bishop explained in a letter to a friend why she resisted inclusion in women's anthologies.... 'Art is art and to separate writings, paintings, musical compositions, etc., into two sexes is to emphasize values in them that are *not art*'... It is this pervasive tone, turning everything into a feminist interpretation, this leveling of artists and their art, this forcing the individual female talent to lie on the Procrustean fainting-couch of a 'dis-eased' tradition, that disappoints me as a lover and practitioner of literature. And as a woman.” (Gail Godwin, Review of *The Norton Anthology of Literature by Women*, *NYTBR*, April 1985) “That I am not alone in my belief that gender should not define individual expression has been evidenced by the letters I have received from readers of my review. With the permission of the writer, Virginia Dunwell, I quote a sentence from a fairly representative letter; 'As a student who has taken my share of women-in-literature classes (*without* the anthology), as a fledgling writer of fiction who hopes if she is ever published she will be published as herself and not as representative of a 'group,' and...as you say...as a *woman*, may I extend a sustained 'bravo!'" (Godwin, *NYTBR* May 1985)

“Why might a woman writer prefer not to be a Woman Writer? Perhaps for the same reason a frog dislikes to be used as a demonstration of the nervous system. It's afraid that might be all there is to life. A tension, a potential conflict, exists between women writers who sometimes do not want to be thought of as Women Writers or, indeed, even as women, and feminist literary critics who need them to be their material.... Who could imagine refusing to be included in *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*? Who, on the other hand, could take seriously a *Norton Anthology of Literature by Men*?... The more feminist the writers, the more comfortable the editors seem to feel about including them....a seventies-style political sentimentality... The book [*The Norton Anthology of Literature by Women*] is too political for a good anthology of literature....Truly great writers get little more representation than the merely interesting Intended as a textbook for courses in women's literature, it is likely to be widely used.... As an anthology of literature, this one weighs on the spirit like a two-pound balloon.” (Phyllis Rose, Review of *The Norton Anthology of Literature by Women*, *The Atlantic*, August 1985)

“This self-conscious separatism leads to rubbish like...‘women's studies’.” (Irish Murdoch, *NYTBR* December 1985) “How depressing it was to find Edith Wharton termed a 'female regionalist' in Susan Gubar's review of Peter Conn's 'Literature in America' (8 October). To reduce one of America's greatest writers—not, dreaded phrase, 'women writers'—to so limited a role is an ironic pursuit for a feminist scholar.... Are we now to refer to Faulkner as a 'male regionalist?'” (Jessica Hornik, Letter, *Time* 1982)

FEMINISTS AND SCIENCE

“Dr. Matt Taylor...is the forty-something British-born astrophysicist who is project scientist for the European Space Agency's Rosetta Mission.... After guiding Rosetta on a journey of some four *billion* miles, they were in (virtual) sight of their holy grail, comet 67P/Churyumov-Gerasimenko. The comet—at 2.8 miles long, a veritable speck in the real estate of outer space—was hurtling through space at some 41,000 miles per hour. It was 311 million miles from Earth. Nevertheless, Taylor and his team managed to detach Philae from its mother ship, remotely guide it towards Mr. 67PC-G, and *land the probe on the*

speeding comet. This was the first time in history, as the British politician Boris Johnson put it, that a representative of humanity had paid a visit to the surface of a comet....

A few days after this stupendous feat of engineering and scientific bravado, Dr. Taylor went on television to say a few words about the mission. He was clearly overcome by emotion. But it soon became evident that he was stirred not by feelings of relief and triumph but of mortification. Choking back tears, he leaned forward towards the microphone and—apologized. Apologized. Why? Because *The Atlantic*'s tech writer Rose Evelev and an angry horde of feminists didn't like what he was wearing when he first broke the news of the landing. Yes, that's right: they didn't like his shirt, so they mounted a social media attack on the hapless scientist....The commentator Glenn Reynolds got to the nub of the matter when, writing in *USA Today*, he noted that 'some feminists took one of the great achievements of human history...and made it all about the clothes.' It was, Reynolds continued, 'one small shirt for a man, one giant leap backward for womankind'....

You can easily find pictures of Dr. Taylor in his shirt on the internet. It's a brightly colored Hawaiian-style number festooned with cartoon-like drawings of scantily clad, gun-toting women, made for him by a close female friend (whose business, we are happy to report, has boomed). Its straight out of a 1950s Sci-Fi adventure story....They're not lewd. Merely, well, nerdy....Why is it acceptable for celebrities or other certified feminist icons to prance around in pornographic splendor when men are expected to behave with Mrs. Grundyesque rectitude?...The goal...is a testosterone-free society in which everything that is not mandatory is prohibited....

Dr. Taylor's humiliation, as [Boris] Johnson noted, 'was like something from the show trials of Stalin, or from the sobbing testimony of the enemies of Kim Il-sung, before they were taken away and shot. It was like a scene from Mao's cultural revolution when weeping intellectuals were forced to confess their crimes against the people. Why was he forced into this humiliation? Because he was subjected to an unrelenting tweetstorm of abuse. He was bombarded across the internet with a hurtling dust-cloud of hate, orchestrated by lobby groups and politically correct media organizations.' (*The New Criterion* 33.4 (Dec. 2014: 1-3)

FEMINIST EDITORS

Feminist editors are sexist, racist, and anti-literary according to Diane Ravitch (a Democrat) in *The Language Police* (2003): "The guidelines...guarantee the exclusion of imaginative literature from our textbooks....They actively prohibit the transmission of our national culture.... The National Council of Teachers of English...opposes any list of recommended readings....Today's textbooks strain to obscure any sense of literary tradition; they pretend that there is no such tradition. Nor do they attempt to teach students how to make judgments among literary works.... They are reducing the curriculum in the schools to bland pabulum....There was no literature or history that anyone was expected to know.... Most classic literature is unacceptable...The classics of the culture just simply were not 'fair'...The student is more likely to encounter folktales from Japan, China, Africa, or India than to read one from the American past....There are no standards for teaching the English language or for teaching literature."

SURVEY OF FEMINIST CRITICISM

"Feminist criticism's relationship to feminism stands out as a major though not often acknowledged embarrassment....The woman-as-victim approach not only failed to elevate the image of women but degraded it.... Some among them...continue to insist on feminine illogic, thereby promoting another negative stereotype of women.... Coercion requires not only closing ranks to protect admittedly faulty theory like images-of-women criticism, but also passing muster as a feminist....

Once loyalty and orthodoxy replace the ordinary norms of intellectual discourse, those who enforce the most Draconian standards tend to prevail.... The introduction of second-rate writing by women into the literary canon as an act of 'affirmative action' [created] an impression of women's inferiority once again.... Radical politics fixes their status altogether beneath the level of literature.... Women's writing, according to radical critics, programmatically neglects grammar, syntax, logic, and narrative organization.... Feminist critics elevate a deficit into a principle when, observing breaches of objectivity in others, they adopt the

same failing in the service of their cause.... In feminist criticism...women have come to be defined almost exclusively by their putative limitations.

Feminist criticism has had and will continue to have the effect of excluding women from literature... surrenders to men the characteristics and habits of mind by which the progress of civilization has always been driven. The world's scientific and cultural progress to date is in effect attributed to men and mankind's future prospects assigned to their exclusive care.... Feminist critics...would in the name of liberation circumscribe women's participation in literature in exactly the fashion that they imagine women to have been circumscribed by society...fostering an image of women at least as insulting as any that they set out to protest." (Peter Shaw, "Feminist Literary Criticism," *The War against the Intellect*, 1989: 67-88)

SUBJECTIVE CRITICAL THEORY

"The final test must be the subjective response of the female reader....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; and (5)...consciousness raising." (Cheri Register, "American Feminist Literary Criticism," *Feminist Literary Criticism*, 1971) [No literary classic meets these standards]

"Ideological dogmatism is the norm, not the exception, in the 'studies' programs, especially Women's Studies. Intimidation of nonfeminists in the classroom is routine." (Thomas Short, Professor of Philosophy, Kenyon College, quoted by D'Souza, *Illiberal Education*, 1991) "[Willa Cather] must be approached as a lesbian writer...to validate and politically support lesbian and gay readers." (Frances Kaye, *Isolation and Masquerade: Willa Cather's Women*, 1993) "One is either part of the group of those who have found their authentic voices as women or one is a 'male-identified' dupe of the patriarchy." (Jean Elshtain, "Race and Racism," quoted by Joan Acocella, *Willa Cather and the Politics of Criticism*, 2000)

"The literary critic...selects and defines an idea, or interpretive model, and then uses it to seek and extend meanings for the words of the text as they relate to the [Feminist] model... *The critic actually creates the meaning of a text*.... Once applied then, the critic's idea, or model, determines all word associations and connotations used to interpret the text; and ultimately, the 'meaning' so created exists as a kind of critical 'fact'....The feminist critic chooses to apply ideas that fit the feminist model for truth about woman." (Dorin Schumacher, *Feminist Literary Criticism*, 1975: 30,32. Italics added.)

"Feminist literary criticism has yet to teach us how to read the fiction of the past with pleasure...The danger of stereotype-hunting is that, like biological classification, it soon becomes an end in itself, that it leads to a habit of mind that does not so much discover fixed patterns as impose them." (Ruth Yeazell, "Fictional Heroines and Feminist Critics," *Novel*, Fall 1974: 29-30) "Professional feminists are driven by their suppositions toward ever more radical conceptualizations. At the end of their road stands the formulation of a distinctive *feminist standpoint*, which in essence is nothing less than an imperialism of feminist sentiments." (Brigitte Berger, "Academic Feminism and the 'Left'," *Academic Questions* 1.2 Spring 1988: 13) Elaine Showalter, for example, is a leading imperialist: She scorns the canon, prefers mediocre writers to great ones, wants to "kill" Virginia Woolf, pronounced Gertrude Stein "unreadable" and is blind to the figurative language of literature. Like the Taliban in Afghanistan, radical Feminists such as Showalter want to destroy art that expresses beliefs different from their own.

"Feminist historians did not invent women's history; they do not even practice it." (Nicholas Davidson, *The Failure of Feminism*, Prometheus 1988) "The media is being led by the nose by a group of radical feminists with a bigoted agenda... The penis is at fault for everything." (Rene Denfield, author of *The New Victorians*, PDXS, September-October 1992)

MARXISM

"Feminist criticism got under way after turning to Marxism to learn how to mobilize an oppositional discourse. It has applied what it learnt so well that it is regarded by Marxists as an exemplary instance of revolutionary intervention." (K. K. Ruthven, *Feminist Literary Studies: An Introduction*, 1984) English

Department faculty at Duke University are known as “the richest Marxists in the country.” (Quoted by David Brooks, national columnist, *Wall Street Journal*, 2 February 1988)

POLARIZATION

Feminist polarization against men was “based upon the self-other dichotomy, discussed in Simone de Beauvoir’s feminist criticism in *The Second Sex* (1953). It is based upon the assumption that one sex is normative, or *self*, and the other deviant, or *other*. To the masculinist critic applying this model, male would be self and female other; to the feminist critic applying this model, female would be self and male other.” This model is based upon “assumption.” It posits a crude dichotomy. Feminist criticism was based upon and inspired by this dichotomy, but there was no such thing as a “masculinist critic.” In the article quoted here, there are no examples of any. The bibliography lists nothing by a male critic. That is because *literary* criticism, as opposed to the *political* criticism practiced by Feminists, has never reduced people to “self” and “deviant.” This is an example of why “Feminist critics may find themselves charged with the inability to be analytical, to be objective, or to think critically.”

DEHUMANIZATION

Imagine a mother relating to her son as a “deviant.” Or a man saying to a woman, “I love you, deviant.” Feminists perverted literary criticism into propaganda “to change the academic establishment and its thinking, especially with regard to sex roles.” Their subjective model allowed them to dehumanize their enemy by reducing him to a “deviant.” This was their model for Political Correctness, the total conformity they were able to enforce after they took over the academic establishment. This was also the model for the Communists and the Nazis. Simone de Beauvoir praised Communism: “No woman should be authorized to stay at home to raise her children. Society should be totally different. Women should not have that choice, precisely because if there is such a choice, too many women will make that one.”

To reduce people to “self” and “deviant” expresses characteristics of Postmodernists: (1) total self-centeredness; (2) solipsism; (3) narcissism; (4) alienation; (5) dehumanization of “others”; (6) totalitarian politics. It displays psychological isolation, an inability to love, and lack of empathy or even sympathy. No wonder such Feminists were unable to appreciate literature. As Robert Scholes has said, “Reading—as a submission to the intentions of another—is the first step in all thought and all communication.” Feminists were in no mood to submit to anything. Their dissociation from others was also expressed in their slogan “the personal is political.” That is, in personal relationships, do not expect love or compromise or anything but selfishness from a Feminist. (Quotations from Dorin Schumacher, “Subjectivities: A Theory of the Critical Process,” *Feminist Literary Criticism*, 1975: 29-37)

NEGATIVITY

“Feminist criticism may be seen as a mode of ‘negative thinking’... I am unclear whether our negations will lead to the promised synthetic end... As feminist critics, our sensitivities must be negative... Radical feminists and lesbians have been in the forefront of the women’s movement in seeking the patterns that identify women as a separate cultural group.” [Josephine Donovan, Editor, *Feminist Literary Criticism* (U Kentucky, 1975: 77, 76, 75) “Hemingway’s work must be distrusted from the outset.” [Marcia Holly, “Toward a Feminist Aesthetic,” *Feminist Literary Criticism* (1975) 43] “Do you concur that men are chauvinist pigs?” “No more than that women are chauvinist sows.” (Mary Welch Hemingway, *The Way It Was*, Knopf, 1976: 536)

POLITICAL STANDARDS

The principle objective of feminist criticism has always been political.” (Toril Moi, *Sexual/Textual Politics: Feminist Literary Theory*, 1985) “[The motive is] resistance in the interest of social transformation through interpretation.” (Elizabeth Meese, *Crossing the Double-Cross: The Practice of Feminist Criticism*, 1986) “[Feminists advocate] a shift in focus from canonized texts to methods of contextual interpretation... meaning is contextual... [Scholarship] should become a means of political activism.” (Betty Jean Craige, *Reconnection: Dualism to Holism in Literary Study*, U Georgia 1988: 1, 122, 76, 86)

CENSORSHIP

Any criticism of Feminism or Women's Studies is forbidden because it has "a disparate impact on women faculty and chills the intellectual climate for academic women." (*Report on the Status of Women in the Academic Profession*, American Association of University Professors, *Academe*, July-August 1989: 38) "John Baker, Editor-in-Chief of *Publishers Weekly*, points to a peculiar bias that hangs over many an editorial desk. 'A lot of editors in publishing are women,' he says, 'and there are certain authors they regard as anti-woman or misogynist. They will not accept work from these authors regardless of their actual status. They simply will not take them on.'... Don't these editors have a greater responsibility to readers than to censor because of personal distaste?... 'Bookbanning certainly comes into play with political things from the sex point of view'." (William Noble, *Bookbanning in America*, 1990: 174-75)

"In universities at least...feminists do exercise power in the form of moral censorship, determining limits to what is and is not sayable.... Feminist moral authority acts as a censoring super-ego." (Zoe Sofia, "Feminism and Position Envy," *Arena Magazine* 4, April/May 1993) "Any counterargument will be seen as oppressive. It is already considered 'antifeminist harassment' for male students to pick at flaws in feminist arguments. The door is closed to further debate, the new orthodoxy cannot be questioned." (Jerry L. Martin, former Assistant Chair, National Endowment for the Humanities, "The Postmodern Argument Considered," *Our Country, Our Culture*, 1994: 178) "Some of the words and phrases that the AAUW [American Association of University Women] has identified as 'dangerous' are as follows: *back to basics in education, media elite, excellence in education, decency, choice in education, pro-family, school choice, moral rebirth, traditional family values, and parental control.*" (*Heterodoxy*, May-June 1994)

Christina Hoff Sommers was invited by *The Atlantic Monthly* in 1991 "to write an article on women's studies.... When the radical feminists heard about her assignment...they launched a nasty campaign against her with the magazine's editors. *The Atlantic Monthly* never ran the piece." (Alyson Todd, *Heterodoxy*, May-June 1994) "When I suggested to the features editor of one of the more literate women's magazines, that it would be interesting to write a piece from the other side—from the point of view of a woman inside the right-to-life movement—I was told that the magazine had a policy of not acknowledging such views." (Daphne Merkin, critic for *New Yorker*, "Notes of a Lonely White Woman," *Partisan Review*, 1994: 182) "In Canada feminists, wielding the legal theories of Catherine McKinnon, rejoiced when the Canadian Supreme Court in *Regina v. Butler* (1992) affirmed the power of the state to ban literary or visual expression that 'degrades' and 'dehumanizes' women. But the main consequence has been the seizure by the Canadian Customs of books ordered by feminist and lesbian bookstores." (Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., "Multiculturalism and the Bill of Rights," *Partisan Review*, 1994: 225)

"At Occidental College, feminist thought police demanded that the college administration suspend the Alpha Tau Omega fraternity and take their house away. The crime: privately circulating a bawdy limerick. The college administration caved in to the feminists' demands and announced their intention to discipline the culprits." "ARE YOU BEING HARASSED BY RADICAL FEMINISTS, GAY ACTIVISTS OR OTHER MEMBERS OF THE CAMPUS THOUGHT POLICE FOR EXERCISING YOUR FREE SPEECH RIGHTS?" (Flyer, *The Individual Rights Foundation*, 1993) "Today, separatism in Women's Studies is readily and graphically illustrated by the widespread exclusion of male authors from course syllabi, assigned reading lists, and citations in scholarly papers... A systematic refusal to read or respond to male authors harms feminist scholarship in many ways." (Daphne Patai and Noretta Koertge, *Professing Feminism: Cautionary Tales from the Strange World of Women's Studies*, 1994: 2-10)

THOUGHT CRIMES

"New Criticism [objective literary analysis]...arose in a suspiciously short period and at a time when American and English businessmen were arming Hitler... Brooks, Warren, Ransom and Tate all came from ultra-conservative Vanderbilt University via elite Oxford.... By the 1950's New Criticism had reached its zenith with the rise of Senator McCarthy..." (Fraya Katz-Stoker, Communist, "Feminism vs. Formalism," *Images of Women in Fiction*, 1972)

“Have we forgotten already that in 1984 it was a ‘thought crime’ to believe that two plus two is four if the Party ruled otherwise? This is no trivial verbal quibble, but a matter...of the integrity of inquiry and, politically, of freedom of thought. Needlessly sacrificing these ideals would not help women; it would hurt humanity.” (Susan Haack, “Knowledge and Propaganda: Reflections of an Old Feminist,” *Partisan Review*, 1994) “In [Christian Hoff] Sommers’ view, the gender feminists virtually rule the academy, where they effectively squelch all dissent.” (Barbara Ehrenreich, Review of *Who Stole Feminism?*, by Sommers, *Time*, August 1994) “Reading and writing are merely technologies of control.” (Houston Baker, President, MLA, Conference in October 1989) “A vision of political correctness cum intellectual terrorism.” (Review of *Oleanna* by David Mamet, *Time*, 1992)

EXAMPLES OF FEMINIST CRITICISM

“In *The Four Gated City* [by Doris Lessing], we are presented with a woman we are encouraged to perceive as insane throughout more than half the book... No matter how much her husband desires her, no matter how long he waits faithfully for her to be ‘cured’ so she can enjoy his embrace she can’t stand to have him touch her. The fact that there has already been a child of this marriage *would lead us to suspect* that the ‘insane’ character has had some unwilling and unpleasant sexual experience with her husband which we can be sure she did not initiate [how can we be sure?] And yet despite this evidence [what evidence?] of *marital rape* her husband is portrayed throughout the book as a touching sympathetic person.” [“Sympathetic” contradicts the allegation that he is a rapist; why would he *wait* “faithfully” if he is a rapist? Accusing a man of rape based on suspicion and conjecture is typical of Feminists in real life.] (Susan Koppelman Cornillon, *Images of Women in Fiction* 1973)

“If women writers or characters are too successful, whether materially or morally, they cannot speak for women still oppressed. But if they are failures in achieving independence, they can hardly serve as models for other women.” (Carol Iannone, Harvard Ph.D. diss., 1981) “Showalter has since moved to correct the impression of tolerating humanism by identifying the common ‘enemies’ of all ‘feminist, black, and poststructuralist critics, both male and female’--namely these who urge a return to the ‘basics’ and the ‘classics.’” (*The New Feminist Criticism*, 1985) “[Feminist studies] foment reorderings in the pre-feminist canon (the demotion of Hemingway, for instance).” (Lawrence Buell, “Literary History Without Sexism? Feminist Studies and Canonical Reconceptation,” *American Literature* 59, 1987:114) “Reading--as a submission to the intentions of another--is the first step in all thought and all communication.” (Robert Scholes, *Textual Power: Literary Theory and the Teaching of English*, Yale 1985: 40)

“I do not think that Scholes and Fetterley read Hemingway as they do because they are human and therefore err; I think their feminist approach leads them to ‘see’ what is not there. It is very hard to submit oneself to the intentions of another. If one is fully committed to an ideological position, it may be impossible.... Let us hope that Showalter’s goal—‘a complete revolution in the understanding of our literary heritage’--is not achieved by misreading as well as demoting writers such as Hemingway. Even more important, though, because it is central to the *theory* of feminist criticism, is the feminist questioning of our criteria of aesthetic value. This questioning is at the heart of the feminist project. It is also its most dangerous procedure... [As] more radical feminists demand an end to aestheticism as the informing principle of our literary histories...our most cherished notions about the aesthetic value of texts are obviously under siege.

The real thrust of Davidson’s work--and that of most feminist critics--is to protest the use of aesthetic standards to judge some works better than others.... [Jane Tompkins] takes her relativism so far as to argue that a canon based on aesthetic standards is impossible... As critics why must we pursue ‘ideological codes’ instead of aesthetic excellence, as Kolodny says the feminist critic wishes to do?... The question is whether it is the best approach for a truly *literary* history of American writing.... Aesthetic standards may be elitist and they are certainly relative. But they do allow us to assess the writer’s success in embodying his or her intentions, didactic or otherwise. And this, for many of us, will remain the primary, if by no means the only, goal of literary history.” (Robert Merrill, “Demoting Hemingway: Feminist Criticism and the Canon,” *American Literature* 60.2, May 1988: 255-68) On the English Department faculty at Duke University: “Students are not taught that there is such a thing as literary excellence... [We] are throwing out the notion

of good and bad, or ignoring it.' The canon was the invention of 'white, male Northeasterners' as part of a plot to oppress minorities and women." (quoted by David Brooks, *Wall Street Journal*, February 2, 1988)

"According to Robert J. Nelson, in his 1988 book *Willa Cather and France*, Cather was torn between the 'phallogocentric hegemony' and a 'virginocentric' one. (Hence her 'phallic' women. Thea Kronborg, standing 'in erectile sublimity' on a peak in Panther Canyon 'is, symbolically...the linear and upright form of the male phallus.'... In a 1989 essay Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, pioneer of 'queer theory,' writes, that *The Professor's House* might seem, on the surface, 'heterosexist,' but that its underlying rebellion against heterosexism can be discovered by deconstructing the last sentence of the book—specifically, one word in that sentence, 'Berengaria,' the name of the ship on which the professor's wife and daughter are sailing...[which] supposedly reveals the maelstrom of lesbian energies churning beneath the surface of *The Professor's House*.... She apparently does not know that it was the name of a real ship...on which Cather had returned from Europe immediately before starting work on *The Professor's House*...

Most of these new political critics agree that Cather's books are about instinctual processes. No tree can grow, no river flow, in Cather's landscapes without this being a penis or a menstrual period...They have since taken us on a long crawl through the female reproductive anatomy.... Most of Cather's main characters are shown to be 'masked' homosexuals.... Will it be useful if we argue that while men and heterosexuals can write about anything they want, women can only write about gender, homosexuals only about sexuality?... [Cather] broke out of jail, and now they are putting her—and all other women writers—back in.... [Judith] Butler's chapter on Cather [in *Bodies That Matter* 1993] is not a chapter on Cather; it is an essay on politics, in which Cather's text lies bound and gagged." (Joan Acocella, *Willa Cather & the Politics of Criticism*, U Nebraska 2000: 55-57, 61, 63, 72)

FEMINISTS HARASS FEMINIST

"The movement for political correctness has not—not yet—turned murderous, but such telltale markers characterize it as surely as they characterized the totalitarian movements of the twentieth century.... Cynthia Woolf, a noted scholar of American literature and a tenured professor at MIT's School of Humanities, has filed suit against her employer... Professor Woolf is seeking damages for MIT's 'acquiescence in and perpetuation of a persistent and continuing pattern of professional, political and sexual harassment.'... What makes this case more than business as usual in the PC haven of the academy is Professor Woolf's own impeccable credentials as a feminist scholar. A specialist in the works of Emily Dickinson and Edith Wharton, she has long been an advocate of Women's Studies, Cultural Studies, and other up-to-date items on the academic multicultural menu....

The New York Times...conceded, Professor Woolf 'still believed in applying traditional scholarly standards in her academic work.' And this retrograde belief, at least for some of her colleagues at MIT, was enough to brand her as that unspeakable thing, a 'neo-conservative.'... According to the complaint, her votes against granting tenure to various politically correct candidates have won her the lasting enmity of certain powerful colleagues who have embarked upon, as the complaint charges, 'an unrelenting campaign of verbal abuse and isolation,' refusing to allow Professor Woolf to teach in the Women Studies Program, denying her release time, spreading groundless rumors to impugn her integrity, and bad-mouthing her to junior colleagues as 'poison.'

Professor Woolf, along with Irene Taylor, a colleague in the Literature Section, has also had the temerity to object to allowing hiring decisions to degenerate into a kind of pimping service for the faculty. As her complaint reports, 'twice, in two different years, Professor David Halperin, an outspoken advocate of gay and lesbian views, demanded that the [Literature] Section interview a specific candidate because he said he was "in love" with the candidate. When Professors Woolf and Taylor expressed opposition to this rationale for hiring, Professor Halperin verbally attacked them for expressing "homophobic" attitudes.' According to *The New York Times*, Professor Halperin admitted making this comment but insisted that he did so 'in the interest of full disclosure' and did not mean that MIT 'should hire [the candidate] because I was in love with him.' Be that as it may, it is worth noting that at least one assistant professor—a male—has repeatedly complained of being sexually harassed by Professor Halperin, and has confided to Professor Woolf that he was worried his complaints might compromise his opportunities for advancement.... When

an independent committee was set up to investigate the case, it found that the tenure decision of the person in question had unfolded in a 'context of malice and destructive behavior.'

In short, MIT has provided the public with a new and unusually grisly chapter in the continuing saga of sexual intimidation and political correctness on campus.... As her complaint states, Professor Woolf found herself in a situation in which 'all aspects of the personnel process—hiring, reappointment, and tenure decisions—had become so egregious and vicious that responsible professional behavior had become impossible,' a situation in which the faculty had fallen 'into a chaotic state in which the sheer exercise of power governed the behavior of many of its members, and all forms of process and procedure had been abandoned.'" ("Sexual Politics at MIT," *The New Criterion*, June 1992)

FASCISM AND PERSECUTION

"Pete Schaub looked like everything the instructors and guest speakers raged against in the Introduction to Women's Studies class at the University of Washington. That's what Shirley Hamblin, another student in the class [says]. 'They're so good at stereotyping,' Hamblin says, 'they have him figured as a white Aryan, this body-builder. He looks like everything they hate.'

A 22-year-old senior, Schaub wandered unaware into an introductory class on women's studies taught by two graduate students, Donna Langston and Dana Michele. He couldn't believe what he heard.... Pete Schaub did the unthinkable, according to his supporters. He asked questions. He challenged speakers and vague statistics that cast all men as wife beaters and child molesters. He struggled with the class' emphasis on lesbianism. He didn't back away in the face of hostility from instructors and the 20 hyperactive teacher's aides—or 'facilitators'—in the class. 'They pick a lamb to sacrifice every quarter,' Schaub says. This lamb didn't submit quietly to the knife.... He was banned from the class after three weeks as a 'disruptive influence.' He was accused of threatening the instructors. He was forced to deliver a voice-print to the police when the Women Studies office received a bomb threat....

'Pete wasn't the problem,' says Hamblin, a 31-year-old feminist who was stunned by what happened in Women Studies 200. 'The class is the problem. Pete just brought it to our attention.... Hamblin argues that Women Studies 200 isn't a class, but a club. 'They all get together and hate together.'... 'Everything was so negative,' says Kristin Engerson Dohn, who attended the class with Schaub... 'All the problems—racism, sexism, classism—everyone points the finger at the white male.'" (Steve Duin column, *Northwest Magazine*, 1 May 1988)

"One young female radical in the English department fatuously charged that opponents of the new curriculum were 'academic death squads'... What he [English Professor Alan Gribben, traditional scholar of Mark Twain at the U of Texas] was facing had to do not with a seismic shift in the entire discipline of literary studies but also with the growing power of a new set of cliches about Western thought.... Fellow English professor James Duban says that what happened to Gribben can only be called a 'smear'... Posters attacking Gribben appeared all over the Austin campus. He got wake-up calls in the middle of the night...and hate mail ('You are a Nazi and a racist')... Not long afterward, he discovered that [a] woman was charging him with 'sexual harassment'...[In] 1991 he decided to give up his tenured position at UT and take an untenured one...at Auburn University." (Peter Collier, "Incorrect English," *Heterodoxy*, May 1992) "There was a concerted persecution of him [Alan Gribben] by a strong contingent in the department, a group of fanatics who know that the majority of academics hate confrontation and will lie low and let this sort of thing happen... It was that special sort of cruelty of which only literature professors are capable." (Maxine Hairston, writing instructor, University of Texas, quoted in "The Case of Alan Gribben," *Heterodoxy*, May 1992)

"The class [Women's Studies, U of Washington] recalls the brainwashing episode in 'The Manchurian Candidate'... When [the male student] decides to question the feminist dogma during class discussion, he is yelled at and eventually expelled from the class. He decides to fight his expulsion and returns. The instructors call campus security guards to keep him out." (Laurence Jarvik, Review of *Campus Culture Wars: Five Stories about PC*, Michael Pack, Director, PBS stations, 24 September-3 October 1993)

“These trends are so firmly established in the academy that they will not fade, as other fads and fashions have faded, but will remain dominant for a ruinously long time... Fundamental dissent is ignored or dismissed; sometimes, and quite disgracefully, it is banned in classrooms... As for feminist critics, it seems that the single-issue approach has become so dictatorial that feminist professors can require their students to make a formal declaration of unquestioning adherence to the cause before admitting them to a class in which dissent is forbidden; a male professor can be charged with harassment merely for presuming to criticize feminist colleagues; and the Modern Language Association of America might well endorse such actions.” (Frank Kermode, “The Academy vs. the Humanities,” Review of *Literature Lost* by John M. Ellis, *The Atlantic Monthly*, August 1997)

“A second trial has begun in the case of Jared Sakren, a distinguished theater professor at Arizona State University who sued the school claiming he was unfairly ousted by radical feminists who disagreed with his teaching of Shakespeare and other classical dramatic works [1997]. His first trial, which drew national attention, ended in a hung jury. This time, the former Yale University and Julliard Theater Center drama teacher—whose pupils have included Hollywood actors Annette Bening, Val Kilmer, and Kelly McGillis—hopes to convince an 11-member Phoenix jury that departmental politics and feminist agendas overshadowed his academic rights... In one interview with CBS News, J. Robert Wills, dean of ASU’s College of Fine Arts, suggested that Mr. Sakren was guilty of sexual harassment because of the classical curriculum he was teaching. In a performance review, Mr. Sakren was accused of contributing to a climate of sexism by refusing to teach works from the ‘postmodern feminist/ethnic canon’....

‘ASU hired an international superstar teacher, promised him academic freedom, and then expected him to follow the politically correct orthodoxy of radical feminism and watered-down academic standards... When Sakren refused to cheat his students out of a good education, they fired him’....‘Equally disturbing...is the silence of the faculty in the Sakren case’...They fear the same fate—professional destruction... ‘They’ve had to silence him—even destroy him professionally—in order to maintain their comfortable positions as professional victims. This is just one more example of a concerted effort to prevent any critics from arising from within the academic camp.’ He has been forced to switch careers.” (Andrea Billups, *The Washington Times*, 30 October-5 November 2000)

FEMINIST RELIGION

“I am a trained philosopher, concerned with the rules of evidence and getting the facts right... It just looked to me as if there were a lot of shoddy arguments...The women in the audience had clearly never been criticized before. They reacted hysterically. There were women weeping, calling names...There were four-letter words, in short they had a temper tantrum. At that moment I realized that this was not your run-of-the-mill academic debate but that I was facing basically a religious movement.... Feminists...say you misstate their positions merely by quoting them... I kept waiting for the adults to arrive. I was astonished that no one was blowing the whistle on the horrible outbreaks of intolerance, the violations of academic freedom, and the miseducation of a whole generation of young women.” (Christina Hoff Sommers, on reception of her scholarly paper criticizing Women’s Studies at conference of American Philosophical Association quoted by Alyson Todd, *Heterodoxy* May/June 1994)

“LOOKISM”

“The Smith College administration handed out to all incoming students...‘Specific Manifestations of Oppression,’ warn[ing] the entire Smith community against a wide range of unacceptable prejudices, including the prejudice of ‘lookism,’ i.e., the reactionary belief that some people are more attractive than others....an accurate measure of the thought-control mechanisms that had already become commonplace in our colleges and universities by the end of the 1989.” (Notes, *The New Criterion*, February 1992)

DATE RAPE

“With the moral degeneration of the 1960s, we have had an explosion of deviancy in family life, criminal behavior, and public displays of psychosis. And we have dealt with it in the only way possible: by redefining deviancy down so as to explain away and make ‘normal’ what a more civilized, ordered and

healthy society long ago would have labeled...deviant.... As part of the vast social project of moral leveling, it is not enough for the deviant to be normalized. The normal must be found to be deviant.... Once innocent behavior now stands condemned as deviant.... As part of this project of moral leveling, entirely new areas of deviancy—such as date rape and politically incorrect speech—have been discovered.... The moral deconstruction of middle-class normality is a vast project....

We start with a real offense; rape. It used to be understood as involving the use of or threat of force. No longer. It has now been expanded by the concept of date rape to encompass an enormous continent of behavior that had long been viewed as either normal or ill-mannered, but certainly not criminal.... How does one explain the vast discrepancy—1 in 2 differs from 1 in 1,000 by a factor of 500—between the real numbers and the fantastic numbers [claimed by Feminists]...? Easy. Deviancy has been redefined—up. Rape has been expanded by [Mary] Koss and other researchers to include behavior that you and I would not recognize as rape. And not just you and I—the supposed victims themselves do not recognize it as rape. In the Koss study, seventy-three percent of the women she labeled as rape victims did not consider themselves to have been raped. Fully forty-two percent had further sexual relations with the so-called rapist.... With rape so radically defined up—to include offering a drink or being verbally insistent—it is no surprise that the result is an epidemic of sexual deviancy.

Of course, behind these numbers is an underlying ideology about the inherent deviancy of all heterosexual relations. As Andrea Dworkin once said, 'Romance...is rape embellished with meaningful looks.' The date rape epidemic is just empirical dressing for a larger theory which holds that because relations between men and women are inherently unequal, sex can never be truly consensual. It is always coercive.... Or, as Susan Estrich puts it, 'Many feminists would argue that so long as women are powerless relative to men, viewing 'yes' as a sign of true consent is misguided.' But if 'yes' is not a sign of true consent, then what is? A notarized contract? And if there is no such thing as real consent, then the radical feminist ideal is realized: all intercourse is rape.... Date rape is only the most extreme example of deviancy redefined broadly enough to catch in its net a huge chunk of normal, everyday behavior.... As Allan Bloom wrote, 'What used to be understood as modes of courtship are now seen as modes of male intimidation.'...

The project now is to identify prejudiced thinking, instincts, anecdotes, attitudes.... Insensitive speech [has] achieved official status as a thought crime.... Under the new dispensation it is not insanity but insensitivity that is the true sign of deviant thinking, requiring thought control and re-education.... The deviant is declared normal. And the normal is unmasked as deviant. This, of course, makes us all that much more morally equal.... And the perfect vehicle for exposing the rottenness of bourgeois life is defining deviancy up.... Helpless in the face of the explosion of real criminality...we satisfy our crime-fighting needs with a crusade against date rape.... The guilt-ridden bourgeoisie, the vulnerable college student, is a far easier object of social control than the hardened criminal or the raving lunatic.... Having given up fighting the real thing, we can't give up the fight. So we fight the new deviant with satisfying vigor. That it is largely a phantom and a phony seems not to matter at all." (Charles Krauthammer, "Defining Deviancy Up," *Our Country, Our Culture* 1994: 77-78,80-85)

SEXUAL HARASSMENT

"American colleges are in the grip of the loony left... The kind of rigid, ideological nonsense that is being forced upon college students by these wide-eyed zealots of academia would be funny if it weren't so scary. At the University of Minnesota, the entire department of Scandinavian Studies, including one woman, was charged with sexual harassment." (Mona Charen, national columnist, "Thought Police Control Campus," *The Oregonian*, 9 December 1990)

"In January 1993, we set out our concerns in...*Sexual Harassment and Academic Freedom*. We noted that 'sexual harassment' was often defined in a mischievously vague, open-ended manner that extended far beyond conduct, and aggressively intruded into the realm of ideas and classroom discourse. A new and impossibly subjective standard—the 'hostile environment'—became the driving force behind an avalanche of complaints, usually having no obvious connection to sexual impropriety. Thus—believe it or not—'callous insensitivity to the experience of women' or arguing that distinct social roles between men and women resulted more from nature than nurture were standard issue in the ever-expanding lexicon of

apparent thought offenses that now constituted ‘harassment.’ A local cadre of enforcers in the faculty and administration were commonly the most aggressive movers and shakers: drafting their school’s code, monitoring faculty members and students, ‘planting’ student observers in ideologically suspect courses, encouraging complaints, and staffing the administrative bodies charged with adjudicating them....

4 April 2011...the US Education Department’s Office for Civil Rights (OCR) published mandatory new ‘guidelines’ for the adjudication of sexual harassment complaints at all colleges and universities receiving federal funding (which is to say, just about every college and university in the country)... From now on, all schools falling under its jurisdiction *must* apply the ‘preponderance of evidence’ standard, or they will be determined as ‘not in compliance,’ with the possible loss of federal funding.... That is to say, if the relevant judicial body thinks it’s probable that the accused is guilty, then that’s all they need: guilty!... It really isn’t necessary to ‘prove’ that a defendant is guilty, certainly not by the more exacting standards heretofore used. Just *suspecting* that he is may indeed be good enough.... And... Even with no new evidence or witnesses, the *complainant* must routinely have the right to appeal an acquittal, with potential re-prosecution of the accused!...

In other words, if you think it’s quite a stretch to construe ‘callous insensitivity to the experience of women’ as sexual harassment, you’d better continue to watch what you say and where you say it.... OCR’s most recent letter...makes no mention of free speech at all, much less stipulate that harassment codes must comport with First Amendment rights. Bite your tongue.... If you’re wondering what kind of ‘verbal conduct’ might now be construed as harassment, you’ll apparently have to wait until someone accuses you....Nearly everything we value as academics is now seriously threatened, and we intend to fight for it. At the very least, some serious Congressional inquiry is in order.” (Glenn M. Ricketts, “OCR’s New Sexual Harassment Guidelines Threaten Academic Freedom, Due Process,” *The Newsletter of the National Association of Scholars* 19.1, 2011: 1, 4-6)

ADOLESCENT GROUP THINK

“Your reputation as a pig precedes [*sic*] you, not only among student feminists, but in your own department as well... I thought this would be a good place to exert [*sic*] the fact that I am not an idiot. Am I convincing you, or am I convincing me? Maybe a bit of both. I am going to receive an F in this class, so I might as well speak my mind... Like most men, you believe that what you have to say is *more* important than what others have to say... I have attended class 79% of the time, I have read each of the books, so why can’t I answer the questions you pose to me on this final?” (student note to Prof. Michael Hollister, Portland State University, December 1989)

“A male student volunteered to provide ‘a feminist reading of Ernest Hemingway.’ Loud chuckles. [Professor] Jardine offered a friendly jibe at ‘Ernest.’ The students weighed in, everybody commenting on ‘Ernest’ and his famous misogyny.... One female offered ribald one-liners about a man who lost his penis, penises that were cut off, accidents in which every part of the victim was recovered—except the penis. These brought loud and unembarrassed laughter from the professor and other students.” (Women’s Studies class, Harvard, 22 November 1989, observed by Dinesh D’Souza, *Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus* 1991: 209)

“Because I have cited and skeptically described some of the panels at the MLA devoted to homosexual themes, I will doubtless be accused of being ‘homophobic.’ But then it is precisely on the subjects that are most difficult to debate in public—like race or homosexuality—that the demand for political correctness exercises its greatest tyranny: There is one politically correct position and then there is everything else. In any event, it is important to stress that the issue raised by these panels has nothing to do with ‘homophobia.’ It has to do first of all with the kinds of things that are appropriate subjects for a public scholarly discussion of literature....Which brings us to ‘Lesbianism, Heterosexuality, and Feminist Theory,’ an extremely popular session presided over by Biddy Martin from Cornell University. The papers presented in this session, especially the second—‘The Lesbian Phallus: Or, Does Heterosexuality Exist?’—were criticized and ridiculed as soon as the program began....

I submit that neither 'The Sodomitical Tourist' nor 'The Lesbian Phallus' is appropriate. This is not because I suffer from 'homophobia' but because I believe that the chief attraction of such topics is prurient. Panels devoted to homosexual themes often have the air of rallies for the initiate; 'sexual orientation'—like race, ethnic origin, and so on in other contexts—is deliberately politicized and hailed as another mark of cultural 'difference' that renders 'universality' or 'transcendence' impossible.'... The more general issue, however, concerns the glorified place that has been allotted to sexuality and questions of 'sexual orientation' in the humanities. Why should the details of one's sexual interests—hetero-, homo-, or otherwise—be featured in panels and classes supposedly devoted to the study of literature." (Roger Kimball, "The MLA in Chicago," *The New Criterion*, February 1991: 11,13)

"Following my lecture at Brown, I was screamed at by soft, inexperienced, but seethingly neurotic middle-class white girls, whose feminist party-line views on rape I have rejected in my writings. Rational discourse is not possible in an atmosphere of such mob derangement." (Camille Paglia, "The Nursery-School Campus: The Corrupting of the Humanities in the U.S.," *Times Literary Supplement*, London, 1992) "Imagine my surprise to find the adolescent diatribe of a 'tenured female Harvard graduate' suggesting that you should 'put your tiny penises back in your pants' and that Camille Paglia's greatest wish was to 'dry hump Madonna.' I don't understand what penis size has to do with the feminist agenda. This must be something that is taught only at Harvard." (Donald Otto, Letter to *Heterodoxy*, November 1992)

REGRESSION TO INFANTILISM

"If the pen is a metaphorical penis, from what organ can females generate texts?" [Sandra M. Gilbert & Susan Gubar] The reply--that it must be the female genitalia--appears evident enough and has been widely accepted. (Helene Cixous, it is true, employs an alternate 'Kleinian analysis of the mother's nipple as a pre-Oedipal penis image,' but she has been faulted for a superficial willingness to 'happily integrate both penis and nipple.') Still, once the female genitalia are agreed upon, just which part should be 'privileged'? At this point in the argument, the escalation of terms continues in a most baroque fashion. For on the hermetic battleground of the female genitalia, too, are to be found a political Left and Right...

Luce Irigaray champions the vulva. In her theoretical system the unique experience of pleasure derived from the labia, 'two lips which embrace each other continuously,' is the basis of the self-indulgent, illogical thinking and writing—'*jouissance*'--that should and will become characteristic of women.... An American, Naomi Schor, holds that Irigaray tends 'to valorize the vagina' at the expense of the clitoris--an evidently more weighty objection. Schor seems to be suggesting that such 'valorization' falls into the patriarchal habit of delegitimizing the clitoris--something radical feminists have taxed other feminists with in the past. Schor calls on feminist critics to correct the shortcomings of Irigaray's approach by developing a 'clitoral hermeneutics.'

But here radical politics proves to be at odds with itself. For even before such a project can be completed, a political objection has already been raised by other feminists--namely that *jouissance*, whether it be clitorally or labially derived, excludes Third World women who have undergone clitoridectomies. Irigaray's vaginal criticism, in any case, like other feminist theories before it, has been dismissed as 'completely under the influence of patriarchal ideology.' To be sure, some feminist critics have not failed to remark on the paradox of confirming the very stereotype of women as weak-willed and weak-minded that the movement began by denouncing." (Feminist critics of the 1980s quoted by Peter Shaw, "Feminist Literary Criticism," *The American Scholar*, August 1988, reprinted in *The War against the Intellect: Episodes in the Decline of Discourse*, U Iowa, 1989: 83-4)

"A contemporary feminist might see in its fertile and 'gorgeous luxuriance of fancy' an emblem of the female sexual organ itself, a perverse revision of seventeenth-century sexual-textual optics." (Shari Benstock, "A Feminist Critic at Work": "*The Scarlet Letter* (a)doree, or the Female Body Embroidered," *The Scarlet Letter*, ed. Ross C. Murfin, 1991)

FEMINIST DECLINE

“When someone pointed out to one woman that her views were ‘feminist,’ she wept in the arms of her R.A. because the label was so horrible.” (Marcus Mabry, Stanford student, “My Life as a Member of the PC Patrol,” *Newsweek*, 24 December 1990: 55) “Many young women simply consider feminism outmoded—a relic of former times that no longer constructively affects their lives.” (Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, *Feminism without Illusions*, 199: 1) “The feminism typical of campus women’s studies has little credibility among the general public.” (John M. Ellis, *Literature Lost: Social Agenda and the Corruption of the Humanities*, Yale 1997)

“There are chapters on feminism’s hostility to the family and children, on its fixation with abortion rights, on its hostility to femininity and fashion, on its preoccupation with the problems of up-scale career women and its failure to help or to sympathize with poor women... Fox-Genovese shows that modern feminism itself is responsible for the fix it is in. For one thing, as she points out, women simply ‘do not see men as The Enemy’.... Fox-Genovese finds the matronizing attitudes of hard-line feminists fatal to feminism: ‘It takes a breathtaking elitism...to charge that the mass of American women have let themselves be brainwashed—a charge that in effect reduces most women to “bimbos”.’

Though feminism’s demonization of men and hostility to beauty and romance help to explain its current unpopularity, it is the movement’s negative attitude toward children that Fox-Genovese finds most alienating for many women....Today...the problem that has no name is women trying to raise their children in a hostile world...They are learning not to expect practical solutions from the feminist movement, which is less concerned with helping them than with punishing their husbands and lovers... This inflexible feminist theory, a theory which is at war with nature, rejects women’s actual preferences and so harms women and the children they love.” (Christina Hoff Sommers, Professor of Philosophy, Clark U, Review of *Feminism is Not the Story of My Life*, 1996, by Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, *Heterodoxy*, May/June 1996)

WRITERS CRITICIZE FEMINISTS

Most notable American novels criticizing white Feminists: *The Blithedale Romance* (1852), Hawthorne; *The Bostonians* (1886), James; *The Awakening* (1899), Chopin; *One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest* (1962), Kesey; *The Crying of Lot 49* (1966), Pynchon; *When She Was Good* (1967), Roth; *The World According to Garp* (1978), Irving; *Tar Baby* (1981), Morrison; *The Witches of Eastwick* (1985), Updike; *White Noise* (1985), DeLillo; *The Garden of Eden* (1985), Hemingway; *The Road* (2006), McCarthy. *Oleanna* (1992) by David Mamet is a powerful drama portraying Feminist fascism in higher education. More examples are given on the document "Feminism in American Literature: Four Modes."

Michael Hollister (2018)