

## Issues Download #5 – Misandry: “Male Bashing”

Male bashing, driven by misandry (hatred/contempt toward men), is common and is just as commonly overlooked. Even authors whose books may flatter women at men’s expense can be a bit taken aback by the magnitude of women’s anger toward men. “For example, Dan Kiley, author of *The Peter Pan Syndrome* and *Wendy’s Dilemma*, startled himself when, to an audience of several hundred Midwestern women, he was explaining research showing that men who are excessively self-involved are six times more likely to die of coronary heart disease than men who are not, *and four hundred women erupted into applause and cheers.*”<sup>xi</sup> [Emphasis in the original]

Almost from the very beginning feminism has systematically, willfully and deliberately set about defaming the character of Man. In a book called *Who Stole Feminism?* (which Camille Paglia describes as using “ingenious detective work to unmask the shocking fraud and propagan-da of establishment feminism”<sup>xii</sup>), Christina Hoff Sommers debunks all-manner of spurious feminist claims.

Consider, for example, the extraordinary assertion that 150,000 women *die* from anorexia each year, an assertion that prompted Naomi Wolf to compare anorexia to the “Holocaust.”

In *Revolution from Within*, Gloria Steinem informs her readers that “in this country alone . . . about 150,000 females die of anorexia each year.” That is more than three times the annual number of fatalities from car accidents for the total population. Steinem refers readers to another feminist best-seller, Naomi Wolf’s *The Beauty Myth*. And in Ms. Wolf’s book one again finds the statistic, along with the author’s outrage. “How,” she asks, “would America react to the mass self-immolation by hunger of its favorite sons?” Although “nothing justifies comparison with the Holocaust,” she cannot refrain from making it anyway. “When confronted with a vast number of emaciated bodies starved not by nature but by men, one must notice a certain resemblance.”<sup>xiii</sup>

Let’s be clear about this. In asserting that men are inflicting a “Holo-caust” upon women, Ms. Wolf is drawing a direct comparison between maleness and the evils of “Nazism.”

It turns out that Wolf got her figures from *Fasting Girls: The Emergence of Anorexia Nervosa as a Modern Disease* by Joan Brumberg, former director of women’s studies at Cornell University. Brumberg, who claims the American Anorexia and Bulimia Association as her source, “points out that the women who study eating problems ‘seek to demonstrate that these disorders are an inevitable consequence of a misogynistic society that demeans women . . . by objectifying their bodies.’”<sup>xiv</sup> Owing to biases underlying its ideological agenda, in every gender reality, feminism *always* finds the Male-Power/Female Victimization that it seeks.

Sommers spoke with Dr. Diane Mickley, president of the American Anorexia and Bulimia Association:

“We were misquoted,” she said. In a 1985 newsletter the association had referred to 150,000 to 200,000 *sufferers* (not fatalities) of anorexia nervosa. What is the correct mortality rate? Most experts are reluctant to give exact figures. Reasonable estimates range from 100 to as many as 400 deaths per year. . . . such numbers are hardly evidence of a “holocaust.” Yet now the false figure, supporting the view that our “sexist society” demeans women by objectifying their bodies, is widely accepted as true. . . . By now, the 150,000 figure has made it into college textbooks. A recent women’s studies text, aptly titled *The Knowledge Explosion*, contains the erroneous figure in its preface.<sup>v</sup>

It seems clear to me that the most “anorexic” models appear in women’s fashion magazines while the models who pose for men’s magazines are better described as buxom, not anorexic. Studies show that when men and women are asked to draw the “ideal” female form, or choose the “ideal” female form from a set of drawings, the female figures women draw and choose are, on average, far thinner than the figures men draw and choose.

According to a survey published in *Cosmopolitan*,<sup>vi</sup> when men were asked “What’s your favorite female body type?” 61.6 percent of them checked the box marked “Curvy with an average rack.” Only 11.6 percent checked the box marked “model-thin and small-chested.” The comment chosen as most representative for this question read: “Bones aren’t sexy, flesh is.”

“It is not for men that we starve ourselves,” says Nancy Friday, “but for the approving eyes of other women, who respond admiringly to the success of she who has managed to turn the lovely roundness of her body into sharp angles.”<sup>vii</sup> Other women agree. “Men don’t mind a big behind,” says writer Holy Millea, “Women do—both their own and every other large rump that goes by. And when we’re not complaining, ‘My ass is huge,’ or pointing, ‘Now *that’s* a big ass,’ we’re thinking it so loudly we can hear each other.”<sup>viii</sup> “Dressing for women means you need to have a figure that looks good in clothes—meaning thin;” says writer Nigella Lawson, “whereas men, thank God, prefer women who look good naked, which translates into women who have curves.”<sup>ix</sup>

Perhaps the pressure Woman experiences to be without an ounce of fat is largely self-imposed? Is blaming men an example of the All-Fault-Is-Male rule? Could it be that feminist-fabricated statistics, the anti-male rhetoric that accompanies them, and the instant acceptance they receive are an inevitable consequence of a *misandric* society that demeans men by blaming and defaming them?

Even as we extend empathy toward women for feeling the obligation to live up to the impossible standards of a supermodel, empathy toward men for feeling the same obligation to live up to the *even more* impossible standards of a superhero remains pretty much nil. If anorexic women think they look fat when they’re actually thin, “Men with muscle dysmorphia think that they look small and weak, even if they are actually large and muscular.”<sup>x</sup> If Barbie dolls and other cultural imagery instill an unrealistic expectation for thinness in girls and women, G.I. Joe dolls and other cultural imagery instill in males an expectation for bulk muscle that is *unachievable* without steroids. Accordingly, about one in ten adolescent males has taken some kind of “body enhancing” drug or supplement.<sup>xi</sup> Potential side effects, some-times permanent, include addiction, hyper-aggression, liver damage, breast and prostate enlargement, prostate cancer, shrunken testicles, infertility, loss of sex drive, and impotence.

Female and male issues like anorexia on the one hand and steroid abuse on the other, mirror each other all down the line. Logically, the issues are parallel, the consequences equivalent. Sentiment *alone* causes us to raise only female concerns to the level of major societal concerns—only female pain elicits sufficient societal empathy.

Consider the claim that: “Domestic violence (vs. pregnant women) is now responsible for more birth defects than all other causes combined.”<sup>xii</sup> Once again, Sommers did the fact checking that no one else did. She called Sarah Buel, a founder of the domestic violence advocacy project at Harvard Law School and the first to spread this Ms-information. Buel cited Caroline Whitehead, a maternal nurse and childcare specialist as her source. So Sommers talked with Ms. Whitehead.

“It blows my mind. *It is not true,*” she said. The whole mixup began, she explained, when she introduced Sarah Buel as a speaker at a 1989 conference for nurses and social workers. In presenting her, Ms. Whitehead mentioned that according to some March of Dimes research she had seen, more women are screened for birth defects than are ever screened for domestic battery. . . . Ms. Whitehead had said nothing at all about battery *causing* birth defects.<sup>xiii</sup> [Emphasis in the original]

Nonetheless, the erroneous statistic proliferated unchecked throughout the media. The *Boston Globe* (09/02/91), *Time* magazine (01/18/93), *Dallas Morning News* (02/07/93), *Arizona Republic* (03/21/93), *Chicago Tribune* (04/18/93) among others all published this male-denigrating “fact.”<sup>xiv</sup> Here again, FemalePower is revealed in the way that allegations of FemaleVictimization cause journalists to suddenly forgo the skepticism so fundamental to their trade.

Battery responsible for more birth defects than all other causes combined? More than genetic disorders such as spina bifida, Down syndrome, Tay-Sachs, sickle-cell anemia? More than congenital heart disorders? More than alcohol, crack, or AIDS—more than all these things combined? Where were the fact-checkers, the editors, the skeptical journalists? Unfortunately, the anorexia statistic and the March of Dimes ‘study’ are typical of the quality of information we are getting on many women’s issues from feminist researchers, women’s advocates, and journalists.<sup>xv</sup>

Dr. Richard T. Hise: “According to Jennifer Roback Morse, the press treats feminists with kid gloves, not asking them the tough questions leveled at other special interest groups like the tobacco industry or the

National Rifle Association.”<sup>xvi</sup> But then, the NRA and the tobacco industry are nowhere *near* as powerful as feminism.

Richard Hise quotes dissident feminist reporter Robyn Blumner of the *St. Petersburg Times* and a syndicated columnist for Tribune Media Services: “so many of the shibboleths about men being bad and women being good, women being victims and men being oppressors, are inaccurate. Even so, popular culture is full of such images, as in the television show, *Men Behaving Badly*.”<sup>xvii</sup>

Media-driven discussions and depictions of “men behaving badly” go far beyond ridicule. When the media tells us that men beating on pregnant women account for more birth defects than *all other causes combined*, the media is telling us that men are *absolute scum*. This is defamation of character extreme enough to be a form of *violence*, a systematic, well organized, and well funded violence perpetrated by Woman upon Man. One consequence is *heterophobia*. Says Ms. Sommers, “Many foundations and government agencies are involved in making it financially possible for a lot of resentful and angry women to spread their divisive philosophy and influence.”<sup>xviii</sup> Yet, despite enormous political power, feminism is devoid of political accountability.

Countless anti-male falsehoods have become common knowledge. Take for example the myth of a 40 percent increase in violence toward women on “Super Bowl Sunday.” When NBC prefaced the 1993 Super Bowl with “special pleas to men to stay calm,” they accused men of being so worthless as to go about beating up women for no other impetus than a ballgame. Feminists called for “emergency preparations.” “They also used the occasion to drive home the message that maleness and violence against women are synonymous. Nancy Isaac, a Harvard School of Public Health research associate who specializes in domestic violence, told the *Boston Globe*: ‘It’s a day for men to revel in their maleness and, unfortunately, for a lot of men that includes being violent toward women if they want to be.’”<sup>xix</sup> Unfortunately, too many women believe that.

Upon investigation, *Washington Post* reporter Ken Ringle found the story was without basis in fact—not that it made any difference. All other journalists gullibly accepted the 40 percent figure and did their part in spreading the myth nationwide. “Millions of American women who heard about it are completely unaware that it is not true,” laments Sommers. “What they do ‘know’ is that American males, especially the sports fans among them, are a dangerous and violent species.”<sup>xx</sup> What they know is feminist-induced heterophobia—an indoctrinated fear and hatred of men.

Little wonder then if women today are tending to avoid men and marriage. “But as women advance and men continue their downward slide,” adds journalist and author Guy Garcia, “it’s also true that more and more women are simply unable to find a man that they think is worth marrying.”<sup>xxi</sup>

Feminism’s false, anti-male aspersions comprise a devastatingly effective attack upon the masculine. In his book *The Decline of Men*, Guy Garcia catalogues the many signs and portents of Man’s downward spiral. He quotes census statistics showing that the percentage of men reaching middle age (ages 40 to 44) without ever marrying has tripled in the last 25 years (from 6 to 18 percent). Not coincidentally, over the same period, the number of non-college-educated single men (ages 35 to 39) has nearly tripled (from 8 to 22 percent).<sup>xxii</sup>

Garcia goes on to make the connection between the increasing number of men without college degrees and men’s decline in all other realms. “Experts agree,” says Garcia, “that at least part of the reason is that men without college degrees have more difficulty finding women who will marry them.”

This trend of fewer male college graduates and the resulting decline in the number of married men is creating a vast pool of undereducated, lower-income bachelors for whom the economic, social, and emotional benefits of a stable family environment are permanently out of reach.

Even grimmer are the prospects for a generation of young men who will grow up without the example, support, and guidance of a loving father. . . . There is, in fact, a creeping sense that men are in some way an endangered species. From young boys who are slacking off and dropping out of school in record numbers, to grown guys who fritter away their time on video games and Internet porn.<sup>xxiii</sup>

Google-search “men obsolete” and see for yourself the *astounding* outpouring of articles asking “Are Men Obsolete?” or proclaiming men already “obsolete.”

Up to a point, the more devalued men are, the more fiercely competitive and driven they become in their need to compensate. Adversity, low intrinsic value, and low intrinsic power have always tempered men and driven men to perform their way to extrinsic value/power. Historically, these extra pressures have resulted in *both* a male elite at the tip of the “success” pyramid *and* vast throngs of “disposable” males occupying the pyramid’s base.

In the past, Man coped with being relatively disposable by taking refuge in the one thing he could always count on. Man could always find meaning in being needed by Woman whom he adores and worships. Man could always draw vital emotional sustenance from gaining entrance to Woman’s world of love, intimacy, home, family, and parenting. Of late, however, feminist-induced disadvantages in education and employment have been accompanied by Woman’s increasing withdrawal of need, desire, and emotional support. The double whammy of increasing disadvantage together with female rejection has proved more demoralizing than motivating and has resulted in what Garcia describes as the current male malaise.

Even so, if there’s one point upon which Garcia is adamant, it is this: “to blame the no-longer ‘second’ sex for the current male malaise is missing the point entirely. After all, what could possibly be less manly than seeking a scapegoat for our troubles?”<sup>xxiv</sup> In his choice of the word “blame,” Garcia forces our agreement. As we know, *blame* is indeed a fool’s game. But what of *accountability*? Seeking a “scape-goat” is foolish, but what of Man taking a proactive stand to hold responsible cultural forces that do, *in fact*, seek to undermine him?

“The only thing that could possibly make things worse for men is if they made the mistake of blaming women for their predicament. The causes of the current male malaise are myriad,” says Garcia declining to be more specific, “but one thing is clear: the solution certainly doesn’t lie in shifting responsibility to the opposite sex. It would not just be wrong and false; it would be, well, unmanly.”<sup>xxv</sup> Hmm, there’s that word again. Could it be that holding Woman accountable would be neither wrong nor false; it would *only* be “unmanly”?

What *would* be “manly,” of course, is for Man to take Full Re-sponsibility. But, however much he may be inclined to do so, Man *cannot* take Full Responsibility.<sup>1</sup> Garcia’s entire book is a compendium of cultural indicators of political power shifting from Man to Woman, yet the idea of shifting responsibility accordingly is anathema. Don’t power and responsibility go hand in hand?

Clearly, “unmanly” is synonymous with un-chivalrous. What we have here is a standard case of chivalry protecting women/feminism not just from the judgments of “blame” but also from adult *accountability*. The primal impulse is to maintain the status quo whereby the gift of compassion is directed exclusively to Woman and the gift of accountability is directed exclusively to Man.

But we’ve been all through this and we know that, as power and responsibility go hand in hand, so accountability and compassion must go hand in hand. Accountability without compassion is ruthless. It’s what tradition would have us direct at men. It is respecting men but not loving men enough to allow for their human vulnerability. This ruthless accountability does not allow for “excuses” (i.e., “scapegoats”) but extends further to disallow Man’s vulnerability to powerful cultural forces that are damaging and diminishing him. Compassion without accountability is infantilizing. It’s what tradition would have us direct at women. It is loving women but not respecting women enough to recognize women as powerful adults responsible for their effect upon the world—including their effect upon *men*.

Feminism is a creation of Woman and, being an autonomous adult, Woman must be held responsible for its byproducts—both good *and* bad. And not just card-carrying feminists but women *in general* are implicated in these matters.

In her role as media observer/analyst, Kathleen Parker notes: “men are variously portrayed as dolts, bullies, brutes, deadbeats, rapists, sexual predators, and wife beaters. Even otherwise easygoing family

---

<sup>1</sup> A distinction: on the personal level, we are, as individuals well served to take full responsibility for our own lives. On the political level, however, when Man takes Full Responsibility he is being grandiose to his own detriment. The world does not generally distinguish between responsibility and blame. When Man takes Full Responsibility, he draws Full Blame and suffers the Full Judgment and Full Hostility that go with it.

men in sitcoms are invariably cast as, at best, bumbling, dim-witted fools.”<sup>xxvi</sup> What lies behind this free-for-all of male bashing?

“If you follow the money and household spending, you find that women do most of the buying,” says Parker, “including 59 percent of all automotive purchases. Women also watch TV more than men do. Apparently, women—who constitute four out of five sitcom viewers—are attracted to shows and ads that depict men as buffoons.” Women’s force of influence, includes inordinate control over TV, the most powerful ideological force on earth. In creating a demand for male-bashing imagery—a demand the media fulfills in response to FemalePower—what is the impact on men and masculinity? “What do these depictions telegraph to the children who also watch these shows?”<sup>xxvii</sup>

Man would gladly enable Woman’s flight from accountability and keep all the adult status for himself. That is indeed the “manly” thing to do, but it is false. Man has only half the power and can legitimately claim only *half* the responsibility. Woman owns the other half of the responsibility—whether she is *held* responsible or not.

We have already seen how feminist falsehoods together with strident feminist advocacy have resulted in over-allocating cultural attentions, efforts, and funding toward women/away from men in the crucial realms of health and education. We have seen that advocacy result also in a *reverse* pay gap. What more direct correlation between feminist influence and male decline could there be?

Up next we’ll look at feminism’s deleterious effect upon fathers’ rights and follow that with a look at what effect the “Sexual Harassment Industry” is having on men in the workplace. But we are *now* examining feminist-induced and inspired heterophobia, misandry, and defa-mation of male character, everywhere apparent in both the political and the personal realms. In the political realm, misandry inspires anti-male laws and policies and media depictions that further male decline. In the personal realm, male decline is having the same result worldwide.

For example, in the Béarn region of France:

Although the land no longer produced the impressive income it once had, the men felt obligated to tend it. Meanwhile, modern women shunned farm life, lured away by jobs and adventure in the city. They occasionally returned for the traditional balls, but the men who awaited them had lost their prestige and become unmarriageable.<sup>xxviii</sup>

We *all* agree that a woman can’t possibly be expected to marry some jobless man still living with his parents. That would be ridiculous . . . right? But wait—marrying someone without a job still living at home—hey, isn’t that what men have been doing for millennia? In fact, at the very *sight* of her, haven’t starry-eyed men felt a deep *need* to “go out and make something of themselves” so as to become *worthy* of such a woman? Haven’t men gone into debt and gone down on their knees to present a diamond symbolizing their earnest intention to devote their lives to protect and provide for that jobless woman still living with her parents?

If “women are simply unable to find a man that they think is worth marrying,” we can react with tacit agreement that men of lower prestige are “unmarriageable” and righteously shunned, *or*, we can hold women accountable for *their* sexist views that grant men such low intrinsic value in the first place.

In 1987 Marion L. Kranichfeld of Pennsylvania State University wrote: “Women occupy positions at the very center of the family, affectively and structurally, in contrast to men who seem to be becoming increasingly isolated from the family, and have virtually no substitute for this essential primary group form.”<sup>xxix</sup> What is the effect of this increasing isolation from family—already evident in 1987 and overwhelming more than 20 years later? Shut out from this essential source of emotional sustenance, what damage is done men?

In my role as mentor to high school boys, I can *see* the damage misandry is doing. The boys I’ve worked with have “I’m of the sex that’s bad, ugly, inadequate, at fault and to blame” written all over their faces. It’s in their posture. It’s in their listless attitude.

Out of their own *personal* experience, boys who’ve grown up fatherless *know* themselves to be parentally nonessential!

According to Katherine Hanson, director of the Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA) Publishing Center, "Every year nearly four million women are beaten to death" and "Violence is the leading cause of death among women."<sup>xxx</sup> Who are the perpetrators of this annual "gendercide"? Who else but the scum of the earth, the heinous male.

"Hanson, [Nan] Stein, and other 'gender-fair' activists regularly whip themselves into an anti-male frenzy with their false statistics," says Christina Hoff Sommers.<sup>xxx</sup> How false? Per annum, in the U.S., the total number of women dying from *all causes combined* is about *one million*.<sup>xxxii</sup> In 1996, according to the FBI, 3,631 women died by violence—at the hands of both men *and women*. To put that figure into perspective, approximately 6,000 women died by suicide. Meanwhile, in that same year, approximately 27,000 men (4.4 times as many) died by suicide.<sup>xxxiii</sup> Might some of the vastly greater number of male suicides rightly be considered casualties in feminism's war against men and masculinity? Author Howard Schwartz:

I have no doubt that, someday, the distortion of the truth by the radical feminists of our time will be seen to have been the greatest intellectual crime of the second half of the twentieth century. At the present time, however, we still live under the aegis of that crime, and calling attention to it is an act of great moral courage. Of those who have stood up and told the story, none has done so more elegantly and effectively than Christina Hoff Sommers.<sup>xxxiv</sup>

Given that "History is written by the victors," I'm not so confident that feminism will *ever* be revealed. Too much of what Sommers calls "Ms-information" has already been unquestioningly accepted as fact, taught in schools, and circulated widely enough to become famous. The damage done gender relations along with male self-esteem, efficacy, and credibility, is incalculable.

I will leave it to other men to shield and shelter feminism from accountability. I for one see no sense in further protecting an already overprotected movement whose high ranking members will sink to any level to do me and my kind *every* damage they can inflict.

Little wonder we're getting books these days with titles like *The War Against Boys* (2000) by Christina Hoff Sommers and *The War Against Men* (2004), by Dr. Richard T. Hise:

The radical feminist aims are pushed by a propaganda machine that is second to none and is bolstered by a supportive media which is controlled by women and biased toward their agenda. The amount of information touting the causes of women in general and radical feminism in particular is prodigious. A man can hardly go a day without being bombarded with their propaganda in some form or another—television, radio, magazines, newspapers, web sites, conferences, symposia, etc. and the number of women's organizations boggles the mind. . . . Pages 259-390 of *The Encyclopedia Of Women's Associations Worldwide* lists 1,027 different groups in the United States.<sup>xxxv</sup>

Many of these female-centric organizations receive federal, which is to say taxpayer, which is to say primarily *male* funding.

Men are cowed by guilt and the omnipresent accusation of "male chauvinist pig" and women are cowed by the accusation of "traitor to the cause," leaving only a few "heretics" to play the vital role of skeptic. Men in the U.S. beating women to death at a rate of 4 *million* a year? Feminism has become so self-indulgent in its rhetoric, so corrupt, not because it is the product of women, but because it is a belief system so fiercely *protected* from high-level public critique. That protection *itself* has doomed feminism to ever-escalating hyperbole.

And that protection has also provided safe haven for the most aggressive, hate-filled minds to rise highest. Following a brush-up with such feminists, gender theorist Carol Iannone wrote, "I had glimpsed something of the ruthlessness of ideological commitment, at odds with its purportedly humane objectives. What good is it to insist that they were only the exceptions when 'exceptions' like that had muscled their way into power? Feminism of my type had no defense against aggression like that."<sup>xxxvi</sup> Even if one accepts the dubious notion of an "egalitarian" female-ism, such moderate feminism is marginalized under the thumb of a toxic "radical" feminism. What good is it to insist that the problem is restricted to "radical" feminism when "radical" feminism is the dominant feminism?

All products of the human mind (whether in art or science or ideology) *must* be subject to judgment and critique; it's the only way to promote high standards in quantity and quality of truth. In my judgment, *all* feminism is wrong-headed—moderate feminism is moderate-ly wrong-headed; radical feminism is radically wrong-headed. The sooner we phase out female-ism and transition to equalism the sooner we'll move beyond this destructive era in gender politics with its ma-tronizing attitude toward women and hostile attitude toward men.

We mustn't protect feminism for fear that it is all that stands between Woman's Liberation and some absurd notion of Woman "chained to the kitchen stove." It was technology, not ideology that freed women from biology-as-destiny. So long as reproductive and domestic technology continues to free women up and high tech keeps the workplace safe, suitable and appealing to women, gender roles will remain flexible. Besides, equalism would still address any and all women's issues; it just wouldn't address women's issues *exclusively*.

And what of skepticism toward Ms. Sommers' findings? In deciding whom to believe, one of the more important questions to ask ourselves is: Who stands to gain and who stands to lose? Richard Gelles and Suzanne Steinmetz are two of the *many* domestic violence researchers who conclude that DV is, in truth, a two-way street.

Christina Hoff Sommers:

Richard Gelles claims that whenever male researchers question exag-gerated findings on domestic battery, it is never long before rumors begin circulating that he is himself a batterer. For female skeptics, however, the situation appears to be equally intimidating. When Suzanne K. Steinmetz, a co-investigator in the First National Family Violence Survey, was being considered for promotion, the feminists launched a letter-writing campaign urging that it be denied. She also received calls threatening her and her family, and there was a bomb threat at a conference where she spoke. . . . However, in today's envi-ronment for feminist research, the higher your figures for abuse, the more likely you'll reap rewards, regardless of your methodology.

You'll be mentioned in feminist encyclopedias, dictionaries, "fact sheets," and textbooks. Your research will be widely publicized; Ellen Goodman, Anna Quindlen, and Judy Mann will put you in their col-umns. Fashion magazines will reproduce your charts and graphs. You may be quoted by Pat Schroeder, Joseph Biden, and surgeon generals from both parties. Senator Kennedy's office will call. You should expect to be invited to give expert testimony before Congress. As for would-be critics, they're in for grief.<sup>xxxvii</sup>

Advocates of the MP/FV and the MB/WG paradigms not only enjoy ready acceptance, professional success, and prestige, they also enjoy material rewards as well. Clearly, a pro-female/feminist stance may be motivated by more than a simple desire to speak truth. What motivates those who would denounce pro-female/anti-male bias? Aside from the hate mail, hissing crowds, and death threats, speaking truth would seem to be a men's advocate's only motive.

Those who would challenge feminism, the world's most powerful ideology, have much to lose and little to gain.

Warren Farrell began his career as a feminist. As is typically the case with men who speak on behalf of women, Farrell thrived. His first publication, a feminist book (*The Liberated Man*), was a massive bestseller. He was applauded and flattered with remarks about what tremendous "internal security" he must have to speak from the feminist perspective. "How can we clone you?" feminists would ask.

It wasn't long, however, before Farrell discovered that "It took far more internal security to speak on behalf of men than to speak on behalf of women. Or, more accurately, to speak on behalf of both sexes rather than on behalf of only women."<sup>xxxviii</sup>

"For three years I served on the board of directors of the National Organization for Women in New York City. As I explained women's perspectives to men, I often noticed a woman 'elbow' the man she was with, as if to say, 'see, even an expert says what a jerk you are.' I slowly became good at saying what women wanted to hear. I enjoyed the standing ovations that followed." As Farrell became enlightened to *male* perspectives, he faced a dilemma. "Now when women asked, 'Why are men afraid of commitment?' or feminists said, 'Men have the power,' my answers incorporated both sexes' perspectives. Almost

overnight my standing ovations disintegrated. After each speaking engagement, I was no longer receiving three or four new requests to speak. My financial security was drying up. I would not be honest if I denied that this tempted me to return to being a spokesperson only for women's perspectives."<sup>xxxix</sup>

Consider also the case of Neil Lyndon, a British journalist who in 1992 wrote *No More Sex War: The Failures of Feminism*.<sup>xl</sup> In a *Sun-day Times* retrospective in December 2000, he recounts the wave of personal attacks that descended on him.

Until December 1990, I was among the highest-paid and best-established feature writers in British journalism . . . After "Badmouthing" [the essay that preceded Lyndon's book], however, I became a pariah, a professional and social outcast. My income plummeted from many thousands of pounds a month to hundreds. In the whole year of 1993, I earned less money in total than I had earned each month in 1989. . . . Many of the people who wrote about me had clearly not read the book. Their articles were almost entirely devoted to personal attacks on me. Most reviews declared - on the basis of no evidence - that the book emerged from personal disturbance in my life and was largely about me. Every literary editor gave my book to a feminist to review, which was like giving an anti-Catholic book to a cardinal. . . . The reason why they did not seek out the truth must be, I think, that the imaginary role in which I had been cast - as heretic, as moral derelict, as sexual inadequate, as maniac - was essential to the dismissal of my arguments."<sup>xli</sup>

With what my long and varied studies have taught me about women's issues, I too could become a women's advocate and enjoy a far easier, more lucrative path. Like Warren Farrell and Neil Lyndon, I too have only *one* motive for taking on this arduous and thankless task. Why invite the feminist wrath of women, along with the "shoot-the-messenger" hostility of men, all for speaking on behalf of both sexes rather than speaking on behalf of women only? I do so out of the deep conviction that there is essential truth in what masculism has to offer and *both* sexes need to hear it. The MP/FV belief system is both false and poisonous and *must* be challenged.

Ever doubted and scrutinized, an unscrupulous masculist would be found out in a heartbeat, which is why *The Myth of Male Power* concludes with over fifty pages of documentation in support of its factual and statistical information. The extra effort masculists make toward accuracy doesn't render masculist facts infallible of course, but it does render them more credible than feminist advocacy stats that rarely stand up under scrutiny.

That said, it is worth repeating: when it comes to gender, there are no disinterested parties. Where gender is concerned bias is omni-present. It is, therefore, wise to maintain healthy skepticism toward both feminist and masculist rhetoric. I can't know with certainty the accuracy of every fact and every assertion in this book; but I do know this: to demonstrate that It All Balances Out, masculist rhetoric need not be superior to feminist rhetoric, it need only be as good. And frankly, that's not setting the bar very high.

Sommers quotes feminists who express no regrets for *knowingly* fabricating and spreading false and misleading information, believing apparently that the feminist cause justifies *any* means. Men are slandered by a profusion of false statistics regarding rape, domestic violence, and "violence against women" in general.

It has become the stuff of legend that men are wont to drug women's drinks then rape them. But, "Doctors tested 75 women who claimed their drinks had been spiked by date rape drugs, not one tested positive. Women who claim to be victims of 'date-rape' drugs such as Rohypnol have in fact been rendered helpless by binge-drinking, says a study by doctors." The medical establishment has conducted an extensive investigation into the matter yet, "They found no evidence that any woman seeking help from emergency doctors because their drinks were allegedly spiked had actually been given these drugs."<sup>xlii</sup>

Not only does ubiquitous anti-male slander force the average man to work all that much harder to "prove himself" to the women he socializes with, but also, the more men are falsely depicted as dangerously brutal, the more women live with unnecessary fear. The result is ever escalating *heterophobia*.

Having turned "Men are scum" into something like common knowledge, the culture feels justified in demeaning men. In their book, *Spreading Misandry: The teaching of contempt for men in popular culture*, authors Paul Nathanson and Katherine K. Young analyze a score of films and as many TV shows.



In one category of misogynic filmmaking they find that “The implication of many movies and television shows, for example, is that women do not or should not need men for any significant reason. Men are not necessarily evil, just superfluous. *Indifference* to men, not hostility, is encouraged.”<sup>xliii</sup> [Emphasis in the original] Again, the true opposite of love is not hate; it is *indifference*.

Gloria Steinem’s oft-quoted phrase, “A woman without a man is like a fish without a bicycle,” would not have caught the public imagination so if there weren’t at least some kernel of truth in how it sums up Woman’s feelings (or lack of feelings) toward Man. I believe that there’s truth *enough* in this worldview to lend support to my contention that *both* sexes love women more than men. In fact, as previously stated, I would go so far as to say that a woman doesn’t fall in *love* with a man as much as she falls into a kind of sexualized and romanti-cized *respect* with a man.<sup>2</sup> Humanity’s relative loveless indifference toward men equals humanity’s relative lack of respect toward women, leading to an imperfect but *balanced* system.

A more virulent category of misogynic films is summed up with:

Almost any night of the week, viewers can watch innocent but vulnerable women go through the following cycle: caring diligently for their families and achieving their professional goals; worrying patiently over some danger sign; suffering patiently or screaming defiantly; fighting back with courage and intelligence; and finally, overcoming their evil or psychotic male adversaries.<sup>xliiv</sup>

Clearly, we’ve moved now from indifference to *hatred*.

*The Color Purple* may be considered a trend setter in this regard. “Though not necessarily the first of its kind, this movie can now be seen as a kind of cinematic watershed. It was a sign of the times but also of things to come: what was still unusual in 1985 would become commonplace by 1990. Since then, movies based on this mentality have become pervasive.”<sup>xlv</sup> For once, some men *actually protested!* Why? “In a nutshell, it was that every male character, without exception, is either a hopelessly stupid buffoon, a fiendishly evil tyrant, or both. And every female character, without exception, is a purely innocent victim, a quietly enduring hero, or both.”<sup>xlvi</sup>

ManBad/WomanGood: this film “consists ultimately of a battle between the forces of light represented by women and those of darkness represented by men.” One of the men “eventually repents his evil ways. But the last scene finds him so crushed by guilt that he cannot bring himself even to ask for Celie’s forgiveness. She, meanwhile, has successfully transcended the past and can thus move on into the future. Even in contrition, then, the men are worthless. At their *best*, in other words, they are irrelevant anachronisms”<sup>xlvii</sup>

So, what are women to do about the obsolete male? “It proposes a very simple solution to the problem of hostility between the sexes. Women need to escape from suffering. Their suffering is due primarily or even solely to the evil of men. Ergo, women need to escape from men. Sure enough, four innocent and heroic women escape from four evil and stupid men.”<sup>xlviii</sup> Is there a connection between anti-male propa-ganda and women initiating 70 percent of all divorce actions?

Many have noticed the trend toward degrading men in the media. Dr Jim Macnamara, who works as a media researcher, has recently published his findings in a book, *Media and Male Identity: The Making and Remaking of Men*.

[T]he study involved detailed analysis of over 2,000 media articles and program segments. Dr Macnamara found that, by volume, 69 per cent of mass media reporting and commentary on men was unfavourable, compared with just 12 per cent favourable and 19 per cent neutral or balanced. Some of the recurring themes in media content portrayed men as violent, sexually abusive, unable to be trusted with children, ‘deadbeat dads’, commitment phobic and in need of ‘re-construction’. “Men were predominantly reported or portrayed in mass media as villains, aggressors, perverts and philanderers, with more than 75 per cent of all mass media representations of men and male identity showing men in on one of these four ways,” Dr Macnamara says. Further, in somewhat of a back-handed compliment, when positive portrayals of men as sensitive, emotional or caring were presented, these were described as men’s and boys’ ‘feminine side.’<sup>xlix</sup>

---

2 For further explanation, please visit my website: <http://www.anima-animus.com/wordpress/>

“As feminists are so fond of asking when confronted with what they consider patriarchal cultural productions, What is wrong with this picture? What is left out, and why?”<sup>i</sup> What is left out, of course, is the mirror opposite. We’re not seeing nearly as much of kind, loving men being raked over the coals by cruel, loveless women. Why? Be-cause women don’t want to see that. What too many women *do* want to see are depictions of their own righteousness versus male guilt, stupidity, evil, and inadequacy. Says Cathy Young, “A poll in which 42 percent of women agree that ‘men are basically selfish and self-centered’ is presented as evidence of male rottenness, not female chauvinism. One could hardly imagine the reverse.”<sup>li</sup>

It works like this: A negative said of women is sexism because a negative said of women can only be “false.” A negative said of men is not sexism because a negative said of men can only be “true.” So you see, negative stereotypes of men are not *sexism*, they’re “truth telling.” But then again, only fifty years ago the phrase “Women have no head for business” wasn’t sexism; it was “truth telling.” How long will it be before we realize that we’ve exchanged the old sexism for new?

The great irony is this: “manly,” males absolutely *recoil* at “victim.” In refusing to acknowledge his victimization, Man rejects *protesting* his victimization and, in so doing, he refuses to demand *justice* for himself. Instead, he rolls over, goes to sleep, and snarls at anyone who threatens to awaken him. While asleep, the “manly” man plays the unconscious role of feminist doormat (i.e., *victim*).

Even if grown men, armored knights every one, will deny the damage cultural misandry is doing them, what of all the young men and boys who can’t even remember back to a time when the portrayal of men and masculinity was more generally favorable? Even if men will claim immunity to the pervasive denigration and ridicule, will we be so hardhearted as to deny the vulnerability of boys?

Misandry and male bashing are men’s issues because they currently outweigh misogyny and female bashing. Every male, each in his own way, will internalize the generally male-negative cultural messages and every male, each in his own way, will be damaged by them. On a so-cietal scale, misandry underlies the vastly higher rates of male suicide, incarceration, homelessness, battlefield and work-related death, as well as anti-male bias in social services, charities, courts of law, parenting, and, of course, the media. Just as importantly, misandry underlies our cultural *indifference* to all the above.

---

<sup>i</sup> Kiley, Dan, *Living Together, Feeling Alone: Healing Your Hidden Loneliness*, (Pawcett Book Group, 1991), pp5-6 of the hardcover version. Cited from Farrell, Warren, Ph.D., *Women Can’t Hear What Men Don’t Say: Destroying myths, creating love* (New York: Tarcher/Putnam, 1999) p.183.

<sup>ii</sup> Camille Paglia quoted from the back cover of, *Who Stole Feminism?*

<sup>iii</sup> Sommers, Christina Hoff, *Who Stole Feminism?: How Women Have Betrayed Women* (New York: A Touchstone Book/Simon & Schuster, 1994) p.11, quoting Wolf, Naomi, *The Beauty Myth*, p.207.

<sup>iv</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.11-12.

<sup>v</sup> *Ibid.*, p.12.

<sup>vi</sup> *Cosmopolitan*, August 2004, p.111.

<sup>vii</sup> Friday, Nancy, *The Power Of Beauty: A Cultural Memoir of Beauty and Desire* (New York: HarperCollins, 1996) p.198.

<sup>viii</sup> *Elle* magazine, June 2002, p.112.

<sup>ix</sup> Lawson, Nigella, *Harper’s Bazaar*, August 2004, p.92.

<sup>x</sup> Garcia, Guy, *The Decline of Men: How the American Male Is Getting Axed, Giving up, and Flipping Off His Future* (New York: Harper Perennial, 2009) p.161.

<sup>xi</sup> *Ibid.*, p.160.

<sup>xii</sup> Sommers, Christina Hoff, *Who Stole Feminism?: How Women Have Betrayed Women* (New York: A Touchstone Book/Simon & Schuster, 1994) p.13.

<sup>xiii</sup> *Ibid.*, p.14.

<sup>xiv</sup> *Ibid.*, p.13.

<sup>xv</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.14-15.

<sup>xvi</sup> Hise, Dr. Richard T., *The War Against Men: Why Women are Winning and What Men Must Do If America Is to Survive* (Oakland, Oregon: Red Anvil Press, 2004) p.171.

<sup>xvii</sup> *Ibid.*, p.171.

<sup>xviii</sup> Sommers, Christina Hoff, *Who Stole Feminism?: How Women Have Betrayed Women* (New York: A Touchstone Book/Simon & Schuster, 1994) p.33.

<sup>xix</sup> *Ibid.*, p.15.

- 
- xx Ibid., p.15.
- xxi Garcia, Guy, *The Decline of Men: How the American Male Is Getting Axed, Giving up, and Flipping Off His Future* (New York: Harper Perennial, 2009) p.xv.
- xxii Ibid., pp.xv.
- xxiii Ibid., pp.xv-xvi.
- xxiv Ibid., p.xvii.
- xxv Ibid., pp.51-52.
- xxvi Parker, Kathleen, *Save the Males: Why Men Matter, Why Women Should Care* (New York: Random House, 2008) p.viii.
- xxvii Ibid., p.17.
- xxviii Rosin, Hanna, July/August 2010, *Atlantic Magazine*, "The End of Men"  
<http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2010/07/the-end-of-men/8135/>. Source: sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, *The Bachelors' Ball*, published in 2007.
- xxix Kranichfeld, Marion L., "Rethinking Family Power," *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 8 no. 1, March 1987, pp.42-56 ©1987 Sage Publications, Inc.
- xxx Sommers, Christina Hoff, *The War Against Boys: How Misguided Feminism Is Harming Our Young Men* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000) p.48.
- xxxi Ibid., p.49.
- xxxii Ibid., p.49.
- xxxiii Ibid., p.49.
- xxxiv Schwartz, Howard S., *The Revolt of the Primitive: An Inquiry into the Roots of Political Correctness* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2003) p.15.
- xxxv Hise, Dr. Richard T., *The War Against Men: Why Women are Winning and What Men Must Do If America Is to Survive* (Oakland, OR: RedAnvil Press, 2004) pp.167-9.
- xxxvi Bunzel, John H. (editor), *Political Passages: Journeys of Change Through Two Decades, 1968-1988* (New York: The Free Press: A Division of Macmillan, Inc., 1988). Quoted from Carol Iannone's essay, "The Wide and Crooked Path," p.318.
- xxxvii Sommers, Christina Hoff, *Who Stole Feminism?: How Women Have Betrayed Women* (New York: A Touchstone Book/Simon & Schuster, 1994) p.201.
- xxxviii Farrell, Warren, Ph.D., *The Myth of Male Power: Why Men Are the Disposable Sex* (New York: Berkley Books, 1993) p.15.
- xxxix Ibid, pp.14-15.
- xl Lyndon, Neil, *No More Sex War: The Failures of Feminism* (London, UK: Sinclair-Stevenson, 1992).
- xli Lyndon, Neil, "Return of the Heretic," *The Sunday Times News Review*, (London, UK), December 17, 2000.
- xlii Hope, Jenny, "Drug rape myth exposed as study reveals binge drinking is to blame,"  
<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-436592/Drug-rape-myth-exposed-study-reveals-binge-drinking-blame.html>, 02/16/07.  
See *Emergency Medicine Journal*, 2007;24:89-91 doi:10.1136/emj.2006.040360
- xliiii Nathanson, Paul and Young, Katherine, *Spreading Misandry: The Teaching of Contempt for Men in Popular Culture* (Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001) p.78.
- xliiv Nathanson, Paul and Young, Katherine, *Spreading Misandry: The Teaching of Contempt for Men in Popular Culture* (Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001) p.141.
- xliv Ibid., p.13.
- xlvi Ibid.
- xlvii Ibid., p.14.
- xlviii Ibid., p.16.
- xlix CommunityNet, <http://www.cnet.ngo.net.au/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=20729>, November 29, 2006.
- <sup>1</sup> Nathanson, Paul and Young, Katherine, *Spreading Misandry: The Teaching of Contempt for Men in Popular Culture* (Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001) p.15.
- li Young, Cathy, *Ceasefire!: Why Women and Men Must Join Forces to Achieve True Equality* (New York: The Free Press, 1999) p.5.