

Issues Download #2 – Education

Schools all over the western world are adopting “zero tolerance” policies. Michael Crowley of *Reader’s Digest* tells the tale:

On a chilly December morning in Houston, Eddie Evans’s 12-year-old son hurried out the door in shirt sleeves on his way to the bus stop. Feeling the cold, he ducked back into his house to quickly grab a jacket. It wasn’t until he’d gotten inside the school building that he remembered his three-inch pocketknife was still in his coat. Why would a sixth-grader carry a knife? Because he was a Boy Scout and he’d brought it to his last Scout meeting. After asking a friend what he should do, the boy decided to keep quiet and hide the knife in his locker until the end of the day.

But his friend mentioned the knife to a teacher, and school officials called the police. That afternoon, cops arrested the Evans child and took him to a juvenile detention center. “From that point on, my family’s life was flipped on its head,” the boy’s father says. The boy was suspended from school for 45 days and enrolled in an alternative school for juvenile offenders. Evans says the place was like a boot camp, where his son—a good student, a youth leader in his church and a First Class Boy Scout—was so miserable he talked about suicide.ⁱ

Does “zero tolerance” apply equally to both genders, or does it, by its very nature, specifically target boys more than girls? Is the zero-tolerance-toward-boys rule an extension of the zero-empathy-toward-men rule? As seen from the politicized male perspective, we now turn our attention to the evidence suggesting that our current educational system is gynocentric, which is to say, biased in favor of female students and against male students.

In her book, *The Trouble with Boys* (2008), Peg Tyre describes recent dramatic shifts in preschool curricula—from an emphasis on building blocks and free play, to greater emphasis on reading and writing. As a result, a little boy “may encounter expectations that are so at odds with his natural development that they leave him bewildered and angry.” Add to that all the hostility aimed his way for “refusing” to “keep still” and, “Instead of fostering a love of learning, his days in preschool may shake his confidence to the core.”ⁱⁱ

Scholastically sabotaged from the start, far too many boys are sent on an academic downward spiral from which they may *never* recover. Author and gender scientist Anne Moir:

According to Dianne McGuinness, education is almost a conspiracy against the aptitudes and inclinations of the schoolboy: “In the early school years, children concentrate on reading and writing, skills that largely favor girls. As a result, boys fill remedial reading classes, don’t learn to spell, and are classified as dyslexic or learning-disabled four times as often as girls. Had these punitive categories existed earlier they would have included Faraday, Edison and Einstein.” Over 95 per-cent of children diagnosed as hyperactive are boys. . . . Given what we now know about the male brain and the female bias in education, the statistic of frustration is not surprising. Dr. Dianne McGuinness maintains that for too long this has been the guilty secret of educationalists: “Hiding the knowledge concerning sex-specific aptitudes in learning has done far more harm than good . . . it has caused a great deal of suffering in many boys who *normally* are slower to acquire reading skills when compared to girls. Even more pernicious is the spectacle of young boys on medication for a ‘disease’ that has no valid diagnosis.”ⁱⁱⁱ

Newsweek columnist, George F. Will: “Consider the supposed epidemic of attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) that by 1996 had U.S. youngsters consuming 90 percent of the world’s Ritalin.”^{iv} Does this “epidemic” represent a change in *boys* or a change in our *attitude* toward boys? If “Jack Armstrong: The Aaaaaall-American Boy” (title of a popular radio adventure series, 1933-1951) was enrolled in the *current* American school system, would his boyish exuberance now be subdued with mega-doses of Ritalin?

Christina Hoff Sommers:

Celeste Fremon, a Southern California writer and mother of boys, was stunned when she was informed that one of her sons had been punished for running during recess. On another occasion, he was almost suspended because he jumped over a bench. The principal told her, “He knows that jumping over benches is against the

rules, so this constitutes defiance.” Sad to say, normal youthful male exuberance is becoming unacceptable in more and more schools. . . . Recess—the one time during the school day when boys can legitimately engage in rowdy play—is now under siege and may soon be a thing of the past. . . . The move to eliminate recess has aroused little notice and even less opposition. . . . school officials today would never act in a manner equally dismissive of girls’ characteristic desires and needs, for they know they would immediately face a storm of justified protests from women advocates. Boys have no such protectors.^v

Actually, *males* have no such protectors. Women and girls have both men *and* women primed to be their heroes. While I quote many exceptions in this book, in general, there is little reason to believe that either men or women possess a similarly chivalrous and/or protective impulse toward males.

Society remains largely focused on the girl “crisis.” One of the leading proponents of the notion that American girls are in crisis, Carol Gilligan, author of *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women’s Development* (1982) and professor of gender studies at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, has made quite a name for herself on the theory that girls “lose their voice” in adolescence. “Gilligan is the theorist who,” says Sommers, “almost single-handedly, initiated the fashion of thinking about American girls as victimized, silenced Ophelias.”^{vi} “Ophelia” refers to Hamlet’s shrinking violet girlfriend, hence the book *Reviving Ophelia: Saving the Selves of Adolescent Girls* (2005) by Mary Pipher and Ruth Ross—required reading in any number of Women’s Studies courses.

Gilligan’s funding and power to dictate educational trends are clearly enormous, but is the validity of her theories and assumptions equal to her influence? Susan Harter, a psychologist at the University of Denver, set about trying to measure this “loss of voice.”

Using the common notion of voice as “having a say,” “speaking one’s mind,” and “feeling listened to” and applying relatively objective measures, she and her colleagues recently tested the claims that adolescent girls have a lower “level of voice” than boys and that girls’ level of voice drops sometime between the ages of eleven and seventeen. . . . Harter concludes, “Findings revealed no gender differences nor any evidence that voice declines in female adolescents.” In a second study . . . [t]heir conclusion is that “there is no evidence in our data for a loss of voice among female adolescents as a group.” They could not even find a trend in that direction.^{vii}

Researchers have, however, found a trend in the *opposite* direction.

In a 1990 U.S. Department of Education study of several thousand tenth-graders, 72 percent of girls “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the statement “Teachers listen to what I have to say”; for boys the figure was 68 percent. Nor did Gilligan’s portrait of adolescent girls “losing their voice” agree with the findings of the AAUW self-esteem research that she herself helped to design. In that survey of children aged nine to fifteen, 57 percent said teachers call on girls more and 59 percent said that teachers pay more attention to girls. . . . Louis Harris Associates asked students to respond to the statement “I feel that teachers do not listen to what I have to say.” Thirty-one percent of boys but only 19 percent of girls said the statement was “mostly true.”^{viii}

In other words, at the very point in time at which girls had clearly and decisively pulled ahead of boys in virtually every measure of academic performance and self-confidence, Mary Pipher “calls American society a ‘girl-poisoning’ and ‘girl-destroying culture.’”^{ix}

Again, if Woman truly desires respect, authentic well-earned respect, feminism’s strategies seem like rather poor strategies for getting it. In an environment as girl-friendly and boy-hostile as the American school system, feminists sink mighty low to support their claims of MP/FV. That boys are about *nine* times more likely to be yelled at, reprimanded, and punished^x has been used as evidence that teachers pay more attention to boys! I have seen girls’ greater rate of *attempted* suicide presented as proof of a girl crisis while the fact that adolescent boys are *six* times as likely to *actually kill themselves*, was *literally* buried in a footnote! I don’t know. Perhaps, on balance, feminists would rather women were *feared* than respected.

Statistical facts, and the negative picture for the performance and wellbeing of boys relative to girls that they paint, are growing ever harder to deny. So, after years of ignoring them, Gilligan finally turned her attentions to boys. But the approval, acceptance, empathy, and admiration shown girls are nowhere apparent in her outlook on boys.

Boys, Gilligan tells us, need saving from the malady that is masculinity. "Given Gilligan's extraordinary influence on American education, the doubts about her work become ever more pressing," says Sommers. "Do American boys need to be saved? And are thinkers like Gilligan and her followers equipped by knowledge and temperament to save them?"^{xi} When they came to the conclusion that the school system "short changes" girls, Gilligan and her followers endeavored to make schools more girl-friendly. Having now concluded that "patriarchy" (but not *matrisensus*) is crushing boys as well as girls, Gilligan and her followers endeavor to save boys from their own masculinity. But such efforts only make schools even more hostile toward boys and their naturally masculine energy.

Does Gilligan really understand boys? She finds boys lacking in empathy, but does *she* empathize with *them*? Is she free of the tiresome misandry that infects so many gender theorists who never stop blaming the "male culture" for all social and psychological ills? Nothing we have seen or heard offers the slightest reassurance that Gilligan and her colleagues are wise enough or objective enough to be trusted to lead the field in devising new ways of socializing boys.^{xii}

Socializing boys, that is, to behave more like girls.

Girls far outnumber boys in advanced placement classes and, with the exception of competitive sports; girls also dominate extracurricular activities including school newspapers, yearbook committees, student councils, and performing arts.^{xiii} Meanwhile, according to one test, boys comprised four out of every five children with reading disorders such as dyslexia.^{xiv} Boys, having *always* been perceived as essentially inferior to girls in terms of beauty, grace, goodness; home, family, and parenting, must *now* suffer a school experience in which they are clearly inferior to girls in virtually *every* parameter. Is it any wonder more boys than girls currently opt *out* of the school environment?

Ms. Sommers has also taken an in-depth look at how feminists have transformed textbooks. As a result of feminist rewrites, more high school students know of Harriet Tubman than either Winston Churchill or Joseph Stalin and know more about what Tubman did than they know, for example, of Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation or that the U.S. Constitution divides powers between the states and the federal government.^{xv} This "padding" of women in history is something Sommers calls "filler feminism."

Once Charles Lindbergh was a great role model for American boys; today, a textbook will make a point of informing students about Lindbergh's World War II isolationism. In the same text, Anne Morrow Lindbergh's very considerable achievements will be raised, but there will be no mention of her dalliance with fascism. . . . Filler feminism pads history with its own "facts" designed to drive home the lessons feminists wish to impart. . . . [I]n some cases, feminist pressures determine what is excluded even more than they determine what is to be included. In an extensive survey of the new textbooks written under feminist guidelines, New York University psychologist Paul Vitz could find no positive portrayal of romance, marriage, or motherhood.^{xvi}

"The problem of 'filler feminism' will get worse," warns Sommers. "Transformationists are well organized and their influence is growing apace. Because of transformationist pressures, the law in some states now actually mandates 'gender-fair' history."^{xvii} Steven E. Rhoads, author of *Taking Sex Differences Seriously*, explains:

In California the state education code demands that wherever reading presents achievements in science, history or other fields, "the achievements of women and men should be represented in approximately equal numbers." As a result, one widely used history text gives more attention to Maria Mitchell, a nineteenth-century astronomer who discovered a comet, than to Albert Einstein; another has three pictures of Civil War nurses but none of General Sherman or General Grant.

During the 1980s, the most popular American history texts increase the representation of women important to the feminist movement on average from fewer than 10 to 35. . . . The same deficits occur as well in textbooks that teach students to read.^{xviii}

Feminism influences not only textbooks,^{xix} but curricula as well. "While there is a vigorous national program to equalize male and female rates of success in science and math," says author/educator Lionel Tiger, "there is not a shred of equivalent

attention to the far more central practical impact of the sharp deficit males face in reading and writing."^{xxx} What effect has all this had on male students?

Columnist Melana Zyla Vickers:

American colleges from Brown to Berkeley face a man shortage, and there's no end in sight. Yet few alarm bells are ringing. In the early 1970s, when the college demographics were roughly reversed [from what they are today] at 43 percent female and 57 percent male, federal education laws were reformed with the enactment in 1972 of Title IX, a provision that requires numerical parity for women in various areas of federally funded schooling. . . . The problem was structural, feminists never tired of repeating: A system built by men, for men, was blocking women's way. Today's shortage of men, by contrast, is largely ignored, denied, or covered up. Talk to university administrators, and few will admit that the imbalance is a problem, let alone that they're addressing it.

Consider the view of Stephen Farmer, director of undergraduate admissions at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, where this year's enrollment is only 41.6 percent male. "We really have made no attempt to balance the class. We are gender blind in applications, very scrupulously so." Why the blind devotion to gender-blindness? Because affirmative action for men is politically incorrect. And at universities receiving federal funding like UNC, it's also illegal. "My understanding of Title IX is that an admissions process that advantages men would be very difficult to defend," Farmer says.^{xxi}

Like all feminist byproducts, Title IX serves females and females *only*.

In the opinion of many, the American university has become a sanctuary and stronghold for radical feminism and the misandry that goes with it. "At my university as at countless others," says Lionel Tiger, "one of the very first official greetings to students is a rape seminar predicated on the intrinsic danger which males carry with them."^{xxii}

Emotions peak during ritual "Take Back the Night" rallies and marches. "At the end of the march, the victims are shuffled onto a stage and handed microphones and they're told that not only does their testimony have personal and therapeutic value for the listeners, but it has political value as well," explains Ruth Shalit, a reporter for *The New Republic* magazine. "By coming forward, they're helping to raise consciousness about male oppression."^{xxiii}

According to Shalit, the women getting up to speak "were encouraged by the campus Women's Center activists who ran the march to say, 'This happened to me, and it shows why all male-female interaction is just another structure of oppression.'^{xxiv} Would it be surprising if hyped-up emotion, matrisensus solidarity to the cause, and competition for the coveted title of Most Victimized caused some of the student's stories of being raped to be embellished or even outright fabricated? Ms. Shalit reports on a case in point occurring at her alma mater, Princeton University. A woman got up to speak:

She described a crime that was almost gothically brutal. She said that this guy dragged her to his room and tied her up. While raping her, he screamed things like, "My father buys me cheap girls like you to use up and throw away," and "public school bitch." He banged her head against the headboard until she was unconscious, and then dumped her at the entry to her dorm. . . . She said that after he raped her, she filed a complaint with the dean of students office, and the student agreed to withdraw for a year, but that he was now back on campus. She said he belonged to her eating club, so she saw him every day, and it was terribly disempowering for her to see this student and to know that no real action was taken against him.^{xxv}

Thus far her story was much like the others and would have been accorded the same presumption of truth, but then . . .

She got so caught up in her story that she submitted a written version to *The Daily Princetonian*, the student paper. The dean of students saw it and said, "Hey, wait a minute. This woman is maligning the dean of students office; she's saying that we failed to respond adequately to her complaint. I don't want women who are raped to be afraid to come and talk to us." So he wrote a letter explaining that if this had really happened, the male student would have been disciplined very severely. He would not have been allowed to remain in the community.^{xxvi}

When her story went from the general to the specific, it became vulnerable to fact checking and was discredited. But “rather than retract her story, she escalated it.” Ms. Shalit continues:

We can never know what was going through her head, but apparently her peers approached her and said, “Hey, what’s going on? Dean Lowe said you never filed a complaint.” She went on to name a particular student, spreading his name around campus. She had to escalate it into this huge conspiracy theory, and a web of deceit leading all the way up to the university president’s office. Later, she admitted she had never even met or spoken to the guy she accused. . . . Even after her retraction, she was supported by the Women’s Center activists who said, “Listen, we cannot hope to find truth in all these stories. The goal is to reveal these women as ‘lenses of oppression’ through which the crimes of the patriarchy can be exposed.”^{xxxvii}

But how can the “oppressed” and the massively indulged be one and the same? How can the “oppressed” be the ones who have *carte blanche* to defame the character of their “oppressors”? And how can the supposedly “oppressed” be beyond accountability for truth?

“Her defense was, ‘I was overcome by emotion.’”^{xxxviii} Of course she was. “Take Back the Night” events are *designed* to ramp passions into overdrive. Aren’t *all* participants overcome by emotion? And is this an excuse for outright lies that can destroy a man’s life?

Author Kate O’Beirne tells us that at Vassar College:

The female dean thought that men can benefit from being falsely accused. “They have a lot of pain, but it is not a pain that I would necessarily have spared them. I think it ideally initiates a process of self-exploration. ‘How do I see women?’ ‘If I didn’t violate her, could I have?’ ‘Do I have the potential to do to her what they say I did?’ Those are good questions.” I have a good question. How have we allowed women who think that falsely accusing our sons of rape is a helpful exercise in consciousness-raising to wield authority on our campuses?^{xxxix}

Avowed feminist Judith Grossman heartily approved of all things feminism; that is, until recent feminist “reforms” subjected her own son to a “nightmarish college tribunal”:

On today’s college campuses, neither “beyond a reasonable doubt,” nor even the lesser “by clear and convincing evidence” standard of proof is required to establish guilt of sexual misconduct. These safeguards of due process have, by order of the federal government, been replaced by what is known as “a preponderance of the evidence.” What this means is that all my son’s accuser needed to establish before a campus tribunal is that the allegations were “more likely than not” to have occurred by a margin of proof that can be as slim as 50.1% to 49.9%.^{xxx}

Though well indicated, there was “no consideration,” says Grossman “that jealousy or revenge might be motivating a spurned young ex-lover to lash out.” Women *do* lash out sometimes:

Women taking a class in feminist art at the University of Maryland publicly labeled male students whose names they picked from a campus phone book as “potential rapists” . . . on hundreds of posters put up around campus. . . . said every identifiable male name in the student directory was put on the list . . . Women involved in the project asked to remain anonymous fearing harassment.^{xxxi}

Who are the harassers and who are the harassed? Who are the oppressors and who are the ones running and ducking for cover? Wouldn’t labeling every female student a “potential whore” be equally true—and equally inappropriate?

“William S. Pollack, a clinical psychologist at Harvard Medical School who heads the Center for Men and Young Men, calls schools ‘some of the most boy-unfriendly places on Earth.’”^{xxxii} Not surprisingly, “[t]he number of boys who said they didn’t like school rose 71 percent between 1980 and 2001”^{xxxiii} All of which leads to the high dropout rate, which in turn, leaves fewer boys to apply for college. And does the American public understand what young men who make it to college may be facing? Author Nancy Friday asks:

Have you spent time at a college lately? Are you aware of the matriarchal rule on these campuses where your sons as well as your daughters are being fed female-victim rhetoric that gains its fuel from the assumption

that sleeping men will continue to back off from women's rage? Wake up, men! It baffles me why men continue to cave in at the slightest murmur of victimization of women.^{xxxiv}

Indeed, men often seem *terrified* of offending women. In my experience the same does *not* hold true in reverse.

And, adds Friday, "there is another predicament a sexually unsure young man must face, which is how to respond to the new lesbian chic on college campuses. Today, The Power Bosom, clothed in the Won-derbra, is not flashed at him but at other girls."^{xxxv} Says Daphne Patai, "So much abuse is heaped on males that it becomes difficult for self-respecting women who consider themselves feminists to associate with them. This is epitomized in such expressions as 'sleeping with the enemy' and in the labeling of 'heterosexual feminist' as a 'paradoxical identity.'"^{xxxvi} Sometimes, within the feminist realms of colleges and universities, efforts are made to reverse heterosexual women's sexual preferences and those who remain stubbornly hetero are said to be specially targeted for harassment.^{xxxvii}

Apparently, highschool and college women who make a statement of turning away from men are common enough to have spawned the acronym, LUG (Lesbian Until Graduation).^{xxxviii} So, males only become of interest *after* graduation (when a "wallet" will be needed)? That's some message these "LUGs" are sending. Given this level of hostility toward all things male it would be surprising if the percentage of men on campuses were *not* decreasing.

And it's not just male *students* who feel the wrath. Daphne Patai: "Tell a man such as Leroy Young, who lost his university position because of a barely investigated charge of sexual harassment, that feminists do not possess power."^{xxxix} Even before they become teachers, applicants are often required to present their "feminist credentials" as a prerequisite to getting hired.

The feminist legislation called Title IX dictates that female sports programs must equal male sports programs in size and funding. The problem? *If there are 1,000 men but only 500 women within sports programs of equal size and funding, the individual male athlete will experience twice the competition to gain access to the program's resources and sports teams. Moreover, if universities can't interest female athletes in numbers that reasonably justify expanding their female athletic departments, then existing men's athletic departments must be downsized or cut entirely.* Claire Yan writing in 2004 states that: "Since 2000, a total of 435 men's teams across America's college campuses have been eliminated."^{xl}

Yet Title IX has never successfully been employed to balance women's studies (often disguised as Gender Studies) with equal-opposite men's studies. Even worse, what "men's studies" there are only teach feminism to male students!^{xi}

This book and others like it prove that a real men's studies class, a masculist men's studies class, would have plenty to teach young men. (Though what we really need are equalist classes that teach both perspectives hand in hand and the "click" experience is the revelation that, in the big picture, It All Balances Out.) This book also makes clear that, contrary to feminist assertions, a history class is nothing like what a real men's studies class would be. Note that masculist perspectives are nowhere to be found within history books.

"Should it concern us that most teachers of women's studies think of knowledge as a 'patriarchal construction'?", asks Christina Hoff Sommers. *"It should, because twenty years ago the nation's academies offered fewer than twenty courses in women's studies; today such courses number in the tens of thousands. Such rapid growth, which even now shows little signs of abating, is unprecedented in the annals of higher education."*^{xii} Warren Farrell: "Nationwide, between a quarter and a third of universities now require women's studies courses for graduation. A study of college courses at fifty-five major universities found that every Ivy League school, with the exception of Princeton, 'now offers more courses in women's studies than economics, even though economics majors outnumber women's studies

¹ Robert Connell is *the* authority, *the* architect of men's studies curricula, worldwide. Is this man who would teach young men gender politics empathic toward men and masculinity? In my opinion all there is to know about this man's attitude toward masculinity (and the current academic environment that would embrace and canonize him) is contained in the fact that he recently had himself castrated on the way to becoming a woman.

majors by roughly 10 to 1^{xliii} [Emphasis in the original] In other words, astounding numbers of young women from all across the nation are being indoctrinated into victimhood and self-righteous contempt of men.

It doesn't take any great stretch of the imagination to see a connection between feminist-dominated anti-male bias at all levels of academia and the decline of male academic performance, attendance, and graduation. "Thirty years ago it was girls, not boys, who were lagging," writes Peg Tyre for *Newsweek*:

The 1972 federal law Title IX forced schools to provide equal opportunities for girls in the classroom and on the playing field. Over the next two decades, billions of dollars were funneled into finding new ways to help girls achieve. . . . Boys, meanwhile, whose rates of achievement had begun to falter, were ignored and their problems allowed to fester.^{xliv}

Now, when it is boys who are falling behind, the issue generates little empathy and less action. Yet the issue generates deeper *anxieties*. "This widening achievement gap, says Margaret Spellings, U.S. secretary of Education, 'has profound implications for the economy, society, families and democracy.'^{xlv} The situation was not so "profound" when it was girls suffering an achievement gap. What's the difference?

The difference is found within a politically incorrect yet *core* truth—a truth *shunned* by the media. The difference is this: low-achieving *females* still tend to be desired, cherished, loved, married, protected and provided for. Low-achieving *males* tend to be looked down upon, devalued, rejected, discarded and divorced.

Women—whether high-achieving or low-achieving—enjoy a kind of societally sanctioned "ownership" of beauty, grace, goodness; home, family, and parenting. In the past, high-achieving men "owned" intellect, competence, prestige; toughness, strength, and courage, but then as now low-achieving men are "bums," "losers," and "failures." When women fail to achieve they retain intrinsic value as lovers, nurturers, spouses, and mothers—through which they gain access to the earnings of men. When men fail to achieve they are granted far less *intrinsic* value (a theme I'll develop at length in the chapters to come).

It's a matter of degree, of course, but in general, women have far greater access to men's money than men have to women's money. I invite any man who doubts that to present himself as a potential "househusband" to every woman he meets so he can see for himself how little *intrinsic* value he is accorded. It's not so easy for men to gain access to the earnings of women, and those who do, will struggle to retain access over the long run (more on this later).

In an article with the title "Are Men Obsolete?" feminist author Jodie Allen catalogues all the ways in which women rising/men sinking is creating an ever-growing population of disenfranchised, jobless, family-less, and homeless men. She concludes: "All of which prompts the question: What shall we do with all the men?"^{xlvi} Indeed, we can't put them *all* in prison.

This is why *female* low achievement may pull heartstrings and demand action, but *male* low achievement has aware observers *worried*.

Education is a men's issue because men are experiencing ever diminishing levels of participation and success in all aspects of academia—a stronghold for feminism's anti-male bias. And education is a men's issue because men's declining academic performance leads to declining performance in every measure of economic status and success. This decline in male performance is particularly disturbing because *males* who fail to perform, achieve, and succeed are particularly vulnerable to becoming evermore societally, matrimonially, and parentally superfluous (even "obsolete").

ⁱ Crowley, Michael, "No Mercy, Kid!: In the name of 'zero tolerance,' our schools are treating innocent children (i.e. boys) like criminals," *Reader's Digest*, 05/2007, <http://www.rd.com/content/printContent.do?contentId=37236>

ⁱⁱ Tyre, Peg, *The Trouble with Boys: A Surprising Report Card on Our Sons, Their Problems at School, and What Parents and Educators Must Do* (New York: Three Rivers Press, 2008) p.55.

-
- iii Moir, Anne and Jessel, David, *Brain Sex: The Real Difference Between Men and Women* (New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991) p.65.
- iv Will, George, JewishWorldReview.com, December 03, 1999. See also, <http://www.mapinc.org/drugnews/v99.n1323.a07.html>
- v Sommers, Christina Hoff, *The War Against Boys: How Misguided Feminism Is Harming Our Young Men* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000) pp.94-9.
- vi Ibid., p.99.
- vii Sommers, Christina Hoff, *The War Against Boys: How Misguided Feminism Is Harming Our Young Men* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000) p.120.
- viii Ibid., p.121.
- ix Ibid., p.19.
- x Kipnis, Aaron, *Angry Young Men: How Parents, Teachers, and Counselors Can Help "Bad Boys" Become Good Men* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1999) p.40.
- xi Sommers, Christina Hoff, *The War Against Boys: How Misguided Feminism Is Harming Our Young Men* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000) p.123.
- xii Ibid., p.134.
- xiii Tyre, Peg, *The Trouble with Boys: A Surprising Report Card on Our Sons, Their Problems at School, and What Parents and Educators Must Do* (New York: Three Rivers Press, 2008) pp.30-31.
- xiv Moir, Anne and Jessel, David, *Brain Sex: The Real Difference Between Men and Women* (New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991) p.62.
- xv Sommers, Christina Hoff, *Who Stole Feminism?: How Women Have Betrayed Women* (New York: A Touchstone Book/Simon & Schuster, 1994) p.61.
- xvi Ibid., pp.59-61.
- xvii Ibid.. p.62.
- xviii Rhoads, Steven E., *Taking Sex Differences Seriously* (San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2004) p.40.
- xix For a detailed look at feminism's influence over textbooks, see Ravitch, Diane, *The Language Police: How Pressure Groups Restrict What Students Learn* (New York: Vintage Books/A Division of Random House, Inc., 2004). The book reveals the exhaustive and restrictive P.C. guidelines current school texts must adhere to. Not only do these restrictions foster dull texts void of vitality, conflict, or gritty reality; predictably, they also foster anti-male bias. For example, it is "appropriate to show women as strong and brave and men as weepy and emotional. Fairness might allow an equal distribution of these emotions, but the guidelines imply that women must not be shown as weepy and emotional and men must not be shown as brave and strong . . . The guidelines regulate what writers are permitted to say about specific groups in society, including women, the elderly, people with disabilities, and members of racial and ethnic minorities . . . All of these groups must be presented only in a positive light." Since only able bodied white men are unprotected, that leaves only white men to portray all human inadequacy. Feminism's hostility toward traditional family is also apparent: "men should not be portrayed as breadwinners; women should not be portrayed as wives and mothers." pp.26 & 34 & 27.
- xx Tiger, Lionel, *You've Got Male!*, Rutgers University, December 17, 2005, p.A10. *The Wall Street Journal*, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB113477972844425239.html>.
- xxi Vickers, Melana Zyla, "Where The Boys Aren't: The gender gap on college campuses," *The Weekly Standard*, weeklystandard.com, 01/02/06, Vol. 011, Issue 16.
- xxii Tiger, Lionel, *You've Got Male!*, Rutgers University, December 17, 2005, p.A10. See the *Wall Street Journal* on line, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB113477972844425239.html>.
- xxiii Kammer, Jack, *Good Will Toward Men: Women Talk Candidly About the Balance of Power Between the Sexes* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994) p. 111.
- xxiv Ibid., p.111.
- xxv Ibid., p.112.
- xxvi Ibid., pp.112-3.
- xxvii Ibid., p.113.
- xxviii Ibid., p.113.
- xxix O'Beirne, Kate, *Women Who Make the World Worse: and How Their Radical Feminist Assault Is Ruining Our Families, Military, Schools, and Sports* (New York: Sentinel, 2006) pp. 62-3.
- xxx Grossman, Judith, "A Mother, a Feminist, a Ghost: Unsubstantiated accusations against my son by a former girlfriend landed him before a nightmarish college tribu-nal." *The Wall Street Journal*, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324600704578405280211043510.html#articleTabs%3Darticle>, April 16, 2013.
- xxxi *The Seattle Times*, "Feminist Art Students List All Males At University By Name As 'Potential Rapists'", <http://community.seattletimes.nwsourc.com/archive/?date=19930508&slug=1700105>, May 8, 1993. "The posters bore the heading 'Notice: These Men Are Potential Rapists.'"

-
- ^{xxxii} Hodges, Michael H., "Where are the boys? Women outnumber men on campuses," *The Detroit News*, detnews.com, December 4th, 2005.
- ^{xxxiii} University of Michigan study cited by Tyre, Peg, *Newsweek*, January 30, 2006, p.46.
- ^{xxxiv} Friday, Nancy, *The Power Of Beauty: A Cultural Memoir of Beauty and Desire* (New York: HarperCollins, 1996) pp.156-7.
- ^{xxxv} *Ibid.*, p.278.
- ^{xxxvi} Patai, Daphne, *Heterophobia: Sexual Harassment and the Future of Feminism* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1998) p.146.
- ^{xxxvii} See: Patai, Daphne & Koertge, Noretta, *Professing Feminism: Education and Indoctrination in Women's Studies* (New and Expanded Edition) (Maryland: Lexington Books, 2003) p18. The authors tell, for example, of two students in a Women's Studies class who were "treated unfairly because they were heterosexual women. They and the other heterosexuals had been asked to identify themselves at the beginning, with the suggestion that by the end of the term, if the course were successful, there would be no heterosexuals left. One of them had been asked to do extra papers. I actually went to the ombudsman about this, because a married woman with kids was being asked to do extra work as a kind of punishment, because she'd been stubborn about her sexual orientation."
- ^{xxxviii} See Wikipedia: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lesbian_until_graduation. "The slang terms lesbian until graduation (LUG), gay until graduation (GUG), or bisexual until graduation (BUG), are terms used to describe women primarily of high-school or college age, who are assumed to be experimenting with or adopting a temporary lesbian or bisexual identity."
- ^{xxxix} Patai, Daphne, *Heterophobia: Sexual Harassment and the Future of Feminism* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1998) p.158.
- ^{xl} Yan, Xiaochin Claire, "News & Comments on Women's Issues," *The Contrarian*, Vol. 8, No. 15, December 09, 2004.
- ^{xli} Elam, Paul, April 22, 2010, "Men's Studies Foremost Authority Opts for Castration, Literally," <http://mensnewsdaily.com/2010/04/22/mens-studies-foremost-authority-opts-for-castration-literally/>
- Robert W. Connell is the premier authority in the world on masculinities. A native of Australia, his books have been ranked first, fourth, fifth and sixth of the top ten books considered to have a profound impact on sociological theory in that country. Connell's influence has reached global proportions, making his work required reading in men's studies programs internationally, earning him iconic status and widespread esteem. He is to men's studies what Darwin was to the study of evolution. And now, he is a she. . . . Robert Connell showed up at a 2008 Wake Forrest College meeting of the American Men's Studies Association (AMSA) as Raewyn Connell, a legally recognized female incarnation of the formerly male scholar. It was a startling change that must have stunned those attending, but not a word about it was formally spoken. One might think that the remarkable silence was a reflection of an enlightened collection of men and women, blind to the supposedly limiting constructs of gender, and practicing an acceptance so espoused by the causes they promote. But it is more likely that there was a different sort of silence in the audience that day; one of solemn concern about the implications of a masculinities expert who, in his sixth decade of life, had the masculinity cut from his body like a malignant tumor.
- ^{xlii} Sommers, Christina Hoff, *Who Stole Feminism?: How Women Have Betrayed Women* (New York: A Touchstone Book/Simon & Schuster, 1994) p.50.
- ^{xliii} Farrell, Warren, Ph.D., *Women Can't Hear What Men Don't Say: Destroying Myths, Creating Love* (New York: Tarcher/Putnam, 1999) p.244.
- ^{xliv} Tyre, Peg, *Newsweek*, January 30, 2006, p.47.
- ^{xlv} *Ibid.*, p.46.
- ^{xlvi} Allen, Jodie, "Are Men Obsolete?," *U.S. News and World Report*, June 23, 2003, p.33.