

*The Glass Ceiling Delusion:
the real reasons more women don't reach senior positions*

Mike Buchanan's *The Glass Ceiling Delusion* attacks head-on the militant feminist myth that men and women have the same interests and capabilities. Reviewing a wide range of evidence, he shows that the under-representation of women in senior positions in business has nothing to do with discrimination and 'glass ceilings', and that attempts to impose quotas are therefore fundamentally flawed. A polemical book with an important message.

Peter Saunders, Emeritus Professor of Sociology, Sussex University

The Glass Ceiling Delusion is an important and brave book, the best book on social economics and society in general published for decades. It's irresistibly compelling, cogently argued and superbly put together. It should be in all school and college libraries. It should be compulsory reading for social science, economics and politics students. It should be force-fed to male and female politicians. This is definitely a five-star book. Brilliant. Brilliant. Brilliant. Brilliant. Brilliant.

Dr Vernon Coleman bestselling English author

*David and Goliath:
David Cameron – Heir to Harman?*

Mike Buchanan has courageously taken on the radical feminists. For too long this group has dominated the public policy agenda. Pay equality, gender balance in the boardroom, all women shortlists have been given far too much prominence in public life. We needed the other side to be put, and in his book Mike Buchanan does just this. His description of the Prime Minister having a ‘female-pattern brain’ is an interesting aspect of David Cameron. Without being insulting, it explains some of the current direction of Conservative policy.

The book calls for a fight back against the radical feminists. It deserves to succeed. Women had a long hard justifiable fight to obtain the vote in our democracy (see my book *Our Fight for Democracy*), but now they have it the radical feminists want special treatment. This is not acceptable, each person’s vote should have an equal value regardless of gender. Manipulating parliamentary candidate short lists to give preference to women is a distortion of democracy, and anyone who believes in democracy should oppose it.

John Strafford Chairman of the Campaign for Conservative Democracy

FEMINISM

By Mike Buchanan

For LPS publishing (Lpspublishing.co.uk)

Citizen Carrington: The Sage of Bedford, Paul Carrington Aged 61¾
(scheduled for publication in 2012)

Feminism: The Ugly Truth

The Glass Ceiling Delusion:

the real reasons more women don't reach senior positions

David and Goliath: David Cameron – heir to Harman?

The Joy of Self-Publishing

Buchanan's Dictionary of Quotations for right-minded people

Buchanan's Dictionary of Quotations for right-minded Americans

The Fraud of the Rings

The Marriage Delusion: the fraud of the rings?

Two Men in a Car (a businessman, a chauffeur, and their holidays in France)

Guitar Gods in Beds. (Bedfordshire: a heavenly county)

For Kogan Page (Koganpage.com)

*Profitable Buying Strategies: How to Cut Procurement Costs
and Buy Your Way to Higher Profits*

FEMINISM
The Ugly Truth

mike buchanan

lps publishing

publisher's note

every possible effort has been made to ensure that the information contained in this book is accurate, and the publisher and author cannot accept responsibility for any errors or omissions, however caused. no responsibility for loss or damage occasioned to any person acting, or refraining from action, as a result of the material in this publication, can be accepted by the publisher or the author

this paperback edition first published in 2012 by lps publishing

apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the copyright, designs and patents act 1988, this publication may only be reproduced, stored or transmitted, in any form or by any means, with the prior permission in writing of the publisher, or in the case of reprographic reproduction in accordance with the terms and licences issued by the cla. enquiries concerning reproduction outside these terms should be emailed to mikebuchanan@hotmail.co.uk

lpspublishing.co.uk

copyright © mike buchanan 2012

the right of mike buchanan to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted by him in accordance with the copyright, designs and patents act 2008

isbn 9780956641694

british library cataloguing-in-publication data
a cip record for this book is available from the british library

this paperback edition is distributed by lightning source inc

The sleep of reason breeds monsters.

Francisco de Goya 1746-1828 Spanish artist

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

Foreword by Erin Pizzey

	Introduction	1
1	The world must be changed, apparently	6
2	Are you a misogynist if you only hate feminists?	7
3	What <i>is</i> feminism in the modern era?	8
4	Misandry (the hatred of men)	10
5	How feminists view the world: welcome to the grim world of dualism	19
6	Why men have nipples, and my sex change story	22
7	Are feminists less intelligent than normal women?	26
8	Why are fat women fat?	27
9	Are feminists less attractive than normal women?	31
10	Do feminists suffer from PPS (Permanent Premenstrual Syndrome)?	36
11	Feminism: the triumph of emotion over reason?	38
12	The different natures of men and women	39
13	The denial of the different natures of men and women	63
14	Femininity	66
15	Feminist theory: building castles in the air	67
16	Feminist academics and manginas	76
17	Tom Martin	84
18	Big fat feminist myths and lies: female solidarity and feminist representations of women	86
19	Are feminists delusional? Is the pope a Catholic? Do bears crap in woods?	96
20	The evolution of nagging	103
21	Women have a right to complain, but do feminists abuse the privilege?	106
22	Are feminists depressed as well as depressing?	108
23	Politics and feminism: an explosive mixture	116
24	Why do Lefties never learn?	118

25	Should we treat feminists as we treat other difficult people?	120
26	Why is France almost a feminist-free country?	121
27	The Ladies Fawcett	124
28	Are some feminists (e.g. Tracey Emin) a pain in the arts?	127
29	Does Harriet Harman suffer from Mad Cow Disease?	129
30	Caution: women at work	133
31	How feminists are killing men and women	158
32	The feminisation of the United Kingdom	179
33	The feminist assault on men	182
34	The feminist assault on women	193
35	The lesbian feminist assault on heterosexuality	200
36	The feminist assault on marriage	204
37	The feminist assault on the nuclear family	207
38	The feminist assault on capitalism	221
39	The feminist assault on democracy	227
40	The feminist assault on the English language	238
41	Equality, happiness, physical and mental health	239
42	Men's deference towards women	248
43	Were the suffragettes silly?	250
44	Would patriarchal hegemony be such a bad thing?	256
45	The dreaded 'c' word	257
46	The dreaded 's' word	262
47	The dreaded 'f' word	263
48	The vilification of men	266
49	The self-glorification of women and the troop numbers problem	267
50	Do feminists suffer from penis envy?	271
51	Why aren't men revolting?	276
52	The dire state of modern journalism	283
53	The dire state of modern publishing	284
54	Politicians are important impotent	291
55	Ladies, what do you want: happiness or power?	293
56	Women can halt this madness	294
57	Are you a feminist or a post-feminist? A guide	300
58	The ten conclusions	302

APPENDICES

1	Quotations	306
2	The letter to The Rt Hon Theresa May MP	335
3	If the Battle of Trafalgar had been fought in a politically correct age...	338
4	The letter to The Rt Hon David Miliband MP	342
5	Fax to the Fawcett Society	344
6	A template for a letter to a Member of Parliament	345
	<i>Bibliography and further reading</i>	346
	<i>Index of cited publications</i>	349
	<i>Index</i>	351
	How to order books by Mike Buchanan and other authors published by LPS publishing	357
	A sample chapter from <i>Two Men in a Car</i> – ‘Would you like to have sex with my wife?’	358
	Reviews of a number of Mike Buchanan’s books	376

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My first acknowledgements – as distinct from thanks – must go to the militant feminists who've driven me to write three books to date about their dire influence. One of the most dismal examples is the Labour MP Harriet Harman. If men were not so deferential towards women – and successive governments were not institutionally pro-feminist – she'd have been locked up years ago for the harm she and her kind inflicted upon British society over the term of the last Labour administration, 1997-2010. The Conservative / Liberal Democrat coalition currently in power continues to pursue feminist agendas with some enthusiasm.

My thanks to all the writers whose books I cite in this one. Particular thanks must go to the writers of three highly insightful books which I draw upon at length in places: Esther Vilar's *The Manipulated Man* (1971), Steve Moxon's *The Woman Racket* (2008), and Swayne O'Pie's *Why Britain Hates Men: Exposing Feminism* (2011). Esther Vilar received death threats from feminists after the publication of *The Manipulated Man*, and the author of *Why Britain Hates Men* uses a pseudonym due to fears over death threats. What times we live in.

My thanks to Erin Pizzey, a fearless exposé of the manipulation carried out by feminists in relation to the women's refuge movement, for her campaigning over many years, and for penning the Foreword. She, too, received death threats from feminists, in this case protesting (ironically) at Pizzey revealing that women were as responsible for as much domestic violence as men.

My thanks to the psychology professors and writers about psychology whose books form much of the bedrock upon which my own theses are built: Louann Brizendine (*The Female*

Brain), Simon Baron-Cohen (*The Essential Difference*), Oliver James (*Britain on the Couch, How Not To F*** Them Up*), Steven Pinker (*The Blank Slate*) and his sister Susan Pinker (*The Sexual Paradox*).

My thanks to Professor Keith Hawton of the Centre for Suicide Research in Oxford for his contribution to the chapter on the link between unemployment and suicide rates, and to Professor Stefan Priebe and Dr Alfonso Ceccherini-Nelli for their illuminating paper on the subject.

My final thanks to you, for buying this book. I hope it at least meets your expectations. I should be interested to read your opinions in relation to any of the topics covered in it. I invite you to contact me at Mikebuchanan@hotmail.co.uk. and to leave comments on my blog <http://fightingfeminism.wordpress.com>.

FOREWORD

This book details many radical feminist myths and barefaced lies, and explores the damage radical feminism has wrought on relationships and the family in our Western world. It often does this with some humour, but its message is very serious.

Like so many women of my age I became involved in the very early days of the newly emerging women's movement and I would have called myself an 'equity' feminist. I was interested in making sure that men and women could compete with each other on a level playing field. Radical feminists are now – as they were then – different from the majority of feminists, and they're highly unrepresentative of women in general. They hate men and they want equality of gender outcomes at any cost, regardless of what men and women choose to do in their personal and working lives.

I was rapidly disillusioned when I recognised that the women's movement was *never* meant to be a movement for most women. It was an attempt by militant women in the Marxist movement to wrest power from men and to create a movement of their own. They simply moved the political goalposts and instead of capitalism being the enemy it was now patriarchy i.e. all men. It didn't take them long to hijack the entire domestic violence debate and use the money to fill their coffers and state that 'all women are victims of male violence.'

Mike Buchanan is a very brave man. I've known other men who've tried to draw the public's attention to the damage done by the radical feminist movement. Many lost their jobs and none of them were able to find publishers for their books. Men have been thrown out of their own houses and unjustly accused of domestic violence towards their partners, and some

of sexually abusing their children. The legitimate interests of men in Western society have been systematically assaulted by radical feminists, as this book explains.

Men are starting to campaign more effectively for their interests, though they still have a long way to go before they halt the tide of feminist influence, let alone start to reverse it.

Feminists can expect more challenges from another quarter. With every year that passes, more women are becoming aware of the damage that men-hating and family-hating feminists have wrought (and continue to wreak) on society in general, and on women's interests in particular. An increasing number of women are summoning up the courage to openly criticise feminists. This shouldn't surprise us, given that the vast majority of women don't share the feminists' political ideology.

How much more damage will radical feminists be allowed to wreak before they're more widely recognised as the evil women they are?

Erin Pizzey

London, 23 January 2012

Erinpizzey.com

INTRODUCTION

The fact that an opinion has been widely held is no evidence whatever that it is not utterly absurd; indeed in view of the silliness of the majority of mankind, a widespread belief is more likely to be foolish than sensible.

Bertrand Russell 1872-1970 British philosopher, historian, logician, mathematician, free trade champion, pacifist and social critic

On the evening of 15 September 2011 two women were being interviewed by Gavin Esler on the BBC's flagship television news programme *Newsnight*. One was the dour feminist Labour politician Angela Eagle (née Eaglet). She'd obviously chewed on a thick slice of lemon before the interview, to set her customary expression. The other was Charlotte Vere, a businesswoman and former prospective Parliamentary candidate for the Conservative party for Brighton Pavilion at the 2010 general election. The seat was unfortunately won by a green MP, Caroline Lucas, presumably green for the reason outlined in a chapter of this book, 'Why are fat women fat?'

I cheered Ms Vere upon hearing her state the following in a piece recorded to camera before the interview:

'I think feminism is a toxic, battle-hardened and arrogant philosophy which has been manipulated by those at the extremes of politics. Feminism has had its day. We need women to stand up and shout, 'Feminism? Not in my name!'

At last, I thought, at long last... *people are starting to get it!*

A warm welcome to *Feminism: The Ugly Truth*. I should start with a few words about terminology. In her book *Who Stole Feminism? How Women Have Betrayed Women* (1994) Christina Hoff Sommers made a useful distinction between 'equity' feminists who campaign for equality of opportunities, and

‘gender’ feminists who seek special treatment for women with a view to gaining advantage over men. She herself is in the former camp.

In a sense, aren’t we *all* equity feminists now? Women have worked hard and achieved so much in the workplace and elsewhere that very few people in developed countries in the modern era wouldn’t support equality of opportunity. But I don’t know a single person (other than through email correspondence) who advocates equality of outcomes – in senior executive positions, say – *regardless of the relative numbers of men and women able and willing to undertake those positions*. Yet equality of outcomes remains a key feminist objective, and feminists are making relentless progress towards that goal.

This isn’t about gender equality, it’s about relentless special treatment for women. Feminists aren’t troubled when women enjoy *superiority* of outcomes, as they now do in a growing number of fields. How do a small number of feminists, in a modern democracy, manage to exert so much influence over legislative and public policy agendas? This book seeks to answer that question, along with many others.

For the avoidance of doubt the focus of this book is on gender feminism, often termed militant feminism or radical feminism. From this point onwards I shall use the word ‘feminism’ for the ideology, and the word ‘feminists’ for its adherents. It’s these feminists – who constitute a small but highly influential proportion of feminists – who are having such a dire impact in so many areas. Where I’m making a point about *equity* feminism I’ll make it clear I’m doing so.

Feminism has at its core five elements: misandry (hatred of men), fantasies, lies, delusions and myths. I believe the female mind is more naturally inclined to love than to hate, one of the many reasons women tend to be a civilising force in society.

But when the female mind is persuaded to adopt hatred as a core value – a requirement of feminism – then the results can be ugly.

Feminism attracts little serious opposition in the developed world, which is extraordinary given that it's systematically and progressively assaulting men, women, marriage, the family, government, the legal system, the media, academia, capitalism and much else. It's killing men in large numbers through depriving them of employment. It's killing women, albeit in lesser numbers, by forcing them to go against their natural instincts and rely on the world of work for their economic survival. It's a leading cause of misery and mental health problems in both men and women, but mostly in women. It's arguably the most dangerous 'ism' in the developed world today, following the widespread defeat of fascism and communism in the 20th century.

I'll be using the term 'Leftie' as both a noun and an adjective. In the United Kingdom it's become a term denoting 'left-of-centre' politically. The equivalent term in North America and elsewhere might be 'Liberal' but in the United Kingdom that word means something more nuanced, albeit still left-of-centre on most issues. The UK, in common with many countries in Europe, has had numerous Leftie administrations since the Second World War, but few as incompetent as the one in power over 1997-2010, led in its final three years by the ill-fated Gordon Brown, a man whose photograph I featured on the cover of *Buchanan's Dictionary of Quotations for right-minded people*. For any non-British reader wishing to gain insights into Gordon Brown I recommend Vernon Coleman's *Gordon is a Moron*. Brown was a firm supporter and personal friend of Harriet Harman, the militant feminist Labour MP.

What's new in the United Kingdom, and highly unwelcome to Righties such as myself, is that David Cameron, the leader of the traditionally right-of-centre Conservative party for which I once worked – and currently the leader of a coalition government with the Liberal Democrats – is a Leftie. In the United States he'd be regarded as having political persuasions well to the left of those held by most Democrats.

Perhaps Cameron's most shameful act in his first year of office, which started in May 2010, was the enactment of The Equality Bill just two months after taking office. The Bill was the brainchild of Harriet Harman, a militant feminist politician from the preceding Labour administration, and it was surely the crowning glory of a dismal career dedicated to a feminist agenda, none of which was to be found in her party's election manifestos. In 2008 she passed legislation enabling political parties to force all-women prospective Parliamentary candidate ('PPC') shortlists onto their constituency parties *for the ensuing 25 years*. Cameron used that legislation some six months before the 2010 general election, and I resigned my party membership as a result. I was informed by a senior official in the party that I wasn't alone in having done so.

In *David and Goliath: David Cameron – heir to Harman?* I argue that Cameron's support for feminist agendas stems partly from his having a female-pattern brain. One of his most eminent predecessors as Conservative party leader was Margaret Thatcher. To many traditional Conservatives (including myself) she was the most impressive peacetime prime minister (of any party) in the 20th century, and clearly had a male-pattern brain. The chapter, 'The different natures of men and women' in this book covers the topic of gender-patterned brains. *David and Goliath* is being withdrawn from sale and its content is contained in my later book *The Glass Ceiling Delusion*.

To people who ask why I chose the image of a female vampire for the cover of this book, I say that the image reflects two defining characteristics of feminism: anger and ugliness. Feminists' anger is founded upon and fuelled by their misandry (hatred of men) and the book has a good deal to say on that topic. And to my mind any ideology based upon hatred of half the world's population is emphatically ugly.

There is of course another meaning of the word 'ugly', that relating to physical appearance. It would be dishonest to deny the evidence before us – that feminists *are* generally less attractive than normal women – and the link between female attractiveness and feminism is covered in this book.

To the charge that my book makes feminists look ridiculous I happily plead guilty, but in my defence I point out that the group which has most successfully made feminists look ridiculous has been feminists themselves.

There are encouraging signs of growing consciousness among men – and women, for that matter – of the damage being wrought by feminists, and a backlash against the ideology is surely approaching. The question is not whether this backlash will take place, but rather what forms it will take.

I thought the reader might welcome some light relief after reading a lengthy book on the topic of feminism, and so it is that I end this book with a sample chapter from my travelogue *Two Men in a Car*. The book is set in a country – France – where feminism has only recently started to rear its ugly head.

Until the next time.

mike buchanan
bedford, old england
1 february 2012

3 | WHAT IS FEMINISM IN THE MODERN ERA?

I listen to feminists and all these radical gals – most of them are failures. They've blown it. Some of them have been married, but they married some Casper Milquetoast who asked permission to go to the bathroom. These women just need a man in the house. That's all they need. Most of the feminists need a man to tell them what time of day it is and to lead them home. And they blew it and they're mad at all men. Feminists hate men. They're sexist. They hate men – that's their problem.

Jerry Falwell 1933-2007 American Baptist cleric, televangelist and conservative commentator

Countless words have been written – almost all of them by women – about the meaning of the words 'feminism' and 'feminist'. I read a number of books about feminism and concluded there are as many definitions of the words as there are writers on the topic. And when words have many meanings, they arguably have *no* useful meaning. We return to a useful distinction used by Christina Hoff Sommers, the author of *Who Stole Feminism?* (1994).

Ms Sommers is an American former professor of philosophy, and a self-described 'equity feminist'. Wikipedia has some interesting material on Ms Sommers including the following:

'Sommers uses the terms 'equity feminism' and 'gender feminism' to differentiate what she sees as acceptable and non-acceptable forms of feminism. She describes equity feminism as the struggle for equal legal and civil rights and many of the original goals of the early feminists, as in the first wave of the women's movement. She describes gender feminism as the action of accenting the differences of genders for the purposes of what she believes is creating privilege for women in academia, government, industry, or advancing personal agendas.'

Throughout this book (unless stated otherwise) I shall use the terms ‘feminism’ and ‘feminist’ in the same sense that Ms Sommers refers to ‘gender feminism’ and ‘gender feminist’. After all, we’re all equity feminists now, aren’t we? Ever since Margaret Thatcher did such a tremendous job as prime minister of the United Kingdom over the country’s golden years of 1979-90, anyway...

The great irony in the modern era is that feminist thinking is coming under unprecedented levels of criticism, not least from women themselves; yet the power this small band of determined women exerts has never been greater. We shall see that feminists prefer to wield power by operating in the shadows, not emerging into the light where their arguments would be exposed as reflecting extreme left-wing ideologies.

9 | ARE FEMINISTS LESS ATTRACTIVE THAN NORMAL WOMEN?

Feminism is just a way for ugly women to get into the mainstream of America.

Rush Limbaugh 1951- American radio host and conservative political commentator

Rush, thank you. A good point, well made.

Many years ago, as a young man, I went to a nightclub late one evening and made an observation which mystified me at the time, but which suddenly made sense when I came to write this chapter. There were perhaps 20 to 30 young women in the club, many of them inebriated in the British manner which tends to shock those of the American persuasion. The behaviour of the young ladies ranged from attention-seeking on the dance floor to being slumped moodily in the darker corners of the room. If I'd lined up the ladies in a line reflecting their apparent levels of confidence – an action to which they might have objected, to be fair – the line would have accurately displayed a spectrum of attractiveness, ranging from the least attractive woman in the room to the most attractive. There was clearly some sort of hierarchy based on attractiveness, in a way that was far less true of the young *men* in the room (if true for them at all). Why might this be? We'll return to the question shortly.

Are feminists less attractive than normal women? In general, yes. Oh, come on. A number of feminists contacted me after the publication of *The Glass Ceiling Delusion* to complain that the woman on the cover pandered to the stereotype of feminists being unattractive. Ironically, they themselves were reinforcing the stereotype. It hadn't occurred to me that anyone might think the woman was a feminist. The image had simply been

one of more than 7,000 photographs on the internet photograph library Bigstockphoto.com which appeared after I'd employed the keywords 'angry woman'. From memory it was the only photograph which showed an angry woman looking upwards into the viewer's eyes, thereby intimating that she was looking *through* the glass ceiling at the viewer. The responses I received from a number of the feminists to this explanation might best be described as unladylike.

The fact that *some* feminists are physically attractive doesn't alter the fact that most aren't. There often seems to be a link between the degree of a feminist's unattractiveness and her commitment to feminist ideology. The late Andrea Dworkin comes inevitably to mind. Until and unless we accept the link between unattractiveness and feminism we can't begin to understand one of the prime reasons feminists are so angry, unless there's some truth in an alternative explanation I outline in the next chapter, that feminists might suffer from PPS (Permanent Premenstrual Syndrome).

British author Steve Moxon in his book *The Woman Racket* (2008) describes the male dominance hierarchy ('DH'). In the pre-industrial world a man's position in the DH was largely dictated by physical prowess or access to men and arms, while in the modern developed world it's largely dictated by actual or potential financial resources. Women seek partners as high up the hierarchy as possible and have their own dominance hierarchy, as Moxon explains:

'So how does a female DH form if it does not involve physical contest? Mostly it's simply by inheritance – including in primates and human societies. The physical attributes of females that are attractive to males in signalling fertility of youth and beauty are predominantly genetically based, so are well conserved from one generation to the next. Attractive women will tend to have attractive daughters. The key

attribute of youth is an even more pronounced 'given', in that older age cohorts are simply not 'in the game'.

In traditional societies a woman's position in the DH is largely a product of nature, as youth and beauty are the main factors. However the existence in modern societies of multi-billion dollar cosmetics, fashion and plastic surgery industries shows that beauty can be enhanced and the ravages of age can at least be postponed. The rocketing sales of celebrity and beauty magazines show that women are indeed keen to rank themselves according to a uniquely female DH; but the great difficulty involved in attempting to overcome the limitations of nature has manifested itself in the form of modern female epidemics such as anorexia nervosa and bulimia, slimming disorders being rare in males.

Perhaps the sheer difficulty of the task of climbing the female DH (males simply have to work harder or take extra risks) explains the fascination of Victoria Beckham to a female audience – her strange elfish features and cyborg-style cartoon body are more frequently found on the front covers of women's magazines than anyone else. If such an odd-looking creature is attractive to an über-alpha male like her husband David, then women are understandably eager to re-assess their *own* DH ranking in the light of this.

Females *also* tend to compete by doing down other females in terms of sexual propriety – hence the common playground 'ho' and 'slag' derogations. This alerts men to a woman's propensity to indulge in extra-pair sex, and consequently might well put them off considering her as a long-term partner.'

While women bemoan societal pressures to be attractive and slim, for example by exposure to advertising for cosmetics and skincare products, you have to ask why they respond to those pressures so much more readily than men would. The use of such products as 'manscara' and skin products for men appear limited to fashionable metropolitan males, 'metrosexuals'. The answer is clear. Women receive special treatment in proportion to their degree of attractiveness – mainly, but not solely, special treatment from men. There's a high financial and emotional

return on attractiveness for women, a great deal higher than the returns enjoyed by attractive men.

The higher up the female dominance hierarchy a woman can manage to climb, the better her chances of attaining and retaining a high status male. The 'attaining' element typically results in marriage, and given the crippling financial implications of divorce to men, women have little incentive to remain slim and attractive after they marry; which perhaps goes some way to explaining the near-universal phenomenon of women putting on weight in the months and years after they marry. While their husbands remain in fine physical condition throughout their lives, obviously...

But what of the women towards the bottom of the female dominance hierarchy, the *least* attractive women? For many of them, even a superhuman effort won't move them far up the hierarchy, so they inevitably feel a resentment towards not only the men who pay them less attention than they pay more attractive women, but also towards the women able to exploit their attractiveness. It shouldn't come as a surprise that such women will tend to have a bitter outlook on the world, and seminars on 'Celebrating and Experiencing Fatness' (which we'll be coming to later in this book) make sense in this light.

There's an intriguing irony here. The women who come the closest to attaining equality with men are the *least* attractive women, because they share men's challenge to improve their lives through the medium of work rather than relying on their attractiveness to exploit the earning power of a partner. It's little wonder unattractive women are unhappy so much of the time, or that they make up such a large proportion of the feminist sisterhood.

A final thought. I've long been puzzled at the lack of serious criticism of feminists from the vast majority of women who are

not themselves feminists, and whose interests are – I would argue – harmed by them. What might account for this? On the one hand there is, I think, a sense of group solidarity. But I suspect also that attractive women are conscious that unattractive women aren't enjoying the special treatment that they themselves enjoy, and feel some guilt about that reality. Also, I suspect, many women simply find some feminists *terrifying*. As do many men, to be fair.

15 | FEMINIST THEORY: BUILDING CASTLES IN THE AIR

I, on the other hand, have a degree from the University of Life, a diploma from the School of Hard Knocks, and three gold stars from the Kindergarten of Getting the Shit Kicked Out of Me.

Captain Edmund Blackadder (**Rowan Atkinson**): *Blackadder Goes Forth* (1989)

Feminist academics have been busy building castles in the air, and they have little option but to work hard to stop us noticing how ludicrous those constructions are, mainly by inventing mind-numbingly long treatises which no normal person with a life would be prepared to read. You and I, dear reader, along with the other long-suffering taxpayers in the developed world, are financing those constructions. Most of the building work is undertaken by the feminists – generally but not invariably women – who design and teach Women’s Studies and Gender Studies courses, about which I shall have more to say. Let me just say at this point something which may not surprise you. Feminist ‘academics’ have minimal intellectual curiosity; they focus on developing and disseminating propaganda for the feminist movement.

In 1978 I was awarded a Bachelor’s degree in Chemistry by one of the three most prestigious universities in the United Kingdom: Oxford, Cambridge or Reading. Exactly which one, need not detain us. I vividly recall the first lecture on the first day of the course, given by one of the four departmental professors. In those balmy far-off days (summers *were* warmer) professors were usually of advanced years, unlike the twenty-something professors of the modern era. The professor started his talk with something along the following lines:

'Because you will be studying chemistry, a physical science, one that has a long and noble history, you probably believe that all you will learn over the next three years will be held to be equally valid in 30, 40, even 50 years' time. This is a delusion commonly held by science undergraduates. Many of the theories I myself learned as an undergraduate have been discarded or refined, and this is how science progresses. I've been responsible myself for some of that discarding and refinement, I'm not too modest to say.

Political theory, however, does *not* progress in this way. This may explain why a depressingly high percentage of you are Lefties. With luck, most of you will in the fullness of time grow out of that dismal philosophy. My sole purpose in telling you this is to recommend that you be wary of believing theories asserted as facts by academics, including scientists, and to assume that anything uttered by a political theorist is the product of a deeply disturbed mind.

What's the difference between an academic and a village idiot? The academic will calculate the speed at which an elephant needs to flap its ears in order to fly like a bird, and he will – as surely as night follows day – find support for his theory from some of his colleagues. The village idiot, meanwhile, knows elephants have never flown, they don't now, and he will hazard a wild guess that they never will.'

Feminist theories will reflect the realities of the world we live in, and the realities of human nature, the day we have flocks of elephants soaring high above us. That's just a personal opinion, however, so on your behalf I thought I'd research what's currently taught on Women's Studies and Gender Studies courses at universities in the United Kingdom.

I emailed five (female) leaders of Women's Studies and Gender Studies departments in the UK, asking for details of course prospectuses and associated reading lists. I mentioned that my book *The Glass Ceiling Delusion* had recently been published, so I wasn't trying to hide the perspective I have on feminist matters. Only one academic responded, and that was

to refuse to supply the materials, ‘in the light of the probably anti-feminist nature of your next book.’

I then wrote letters to the five women, and still had no response. I emailed them again, invoking the Freedom of Information Act, requiring the materials to be supplied within 28 days. I had two responses. The first was polite, from a lady writing on behalf of Professor Stevi Jackson of York University, who we shall come to shortly.

The second was from Professor Marysia Zalewski, Director of the Centre for Gender Studies in the School of Social Science, University of Aberdeen. We had the following email exchange. Ms Zalewski isn’t one to exchange pleasantries with people like me, clearly. No ‘Best wishes’, no ‘Mr Buchanan’, nothing like that. The following email exchange is shown in chronological order:

From: mikebuchanan@hotmail.co.uk
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2011, 11:40 AM
To: m.zalewski@abdn.ac.uk
Subject: Women’s Studies / Gender Studies

Ms Zalewski, I hope this finds you well. Following the publication of my latest book *The Glass Ceiling Delusion*, which focused on men and women in the world of work, I am embarking on a wider critique of feminist thinking and campaigning in the modern era. I wish to give the book’s readers a real sense of what is currently taught in Women’s Studies / Gender Studies courses. Would it be possible to mail or email me (before the end of September, i.e. nine weeks off) details of your courses in these areas, and associated reading lists for people undertaking them? Also, could you please inform me of the gender balance among the people undertaking the courses in the last academic year? Thank you.

Best wishes,
Mike Buchanan

[Author's note: in the absence of a response a month later – to be fair, the good lady might just have been on holiday over the period – I tried again.]

From: mikebuchanan@hotmail.co.uk
Sent: Saturday, August 27, 2011, 4:27 PM
To: m.zalewski@abdn.ac.uk
Subject: FW: Women's Studies / Gender Studies

Dr Zalewski, good afternoon. I emailed you on 28 July (see above) and wrote to you on 11 August (see attached). Having not even received acknowledgement of these items, I am forced to conclude that you are simply unwilling to provide the information requested. I've taken legal advice on this matter and am therefore requesting this information through invoking the Freedom of Information Act 2000. I understand that this leaves you a maximum of 28 days so I look forward to the information by Friday 23 September latest. Thank you.

Best wishes,

Mike Buchanan

From: mikebuchanan@hotmail.co.uk
Sent: Saturday, August 27, 2011, 6:36 PM
To: m.zalewski@abdn.ac.uk
Subject: FW: Women's Studies / Gender Studies

Dr Zalewski, would you please be so good as to acknowledge receipt of the email I sent earlier today (above)? Thanks.

Best wishes,

Mike Buchanan

From: m.zalewski@abdn.ac.uk
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 5:29 PM
To: mikebuchanan@hotmail.co.uk
Subject: FW: Women's Studies / Gender Studies

No information is available as these courses are currently unavailable.

[Author's note: I then returned to the University website and spotted a course which, it seemed to me, was very much of the type I was enquiring into. So I emailed again.]

From: mikebuchanan@hotmail.co.uk
Sent: 30 August 2011 17:37
To: Zalewski, Marysia
Subject: Re: Women's Studies / Gender Studies

Thank you. Is the following course being run over 2011/2?

Abdn.ac.uk/prospectus/pgrad/study/taught.php?code=sex_gender_violence

Best wishes,

Mike Buchanan

From: m.zalewski@abdn.ac.uk
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 5:38 PM
To: mikebuchanan@hotmail.co.uk
Subject: RE: Women's Studies / Gender Studies

This is not a gender studies course.

From: mikebuchanan@hotmail.co.uk
Sent:
To: m.zalewski@abdn.ac.uk
Fw: Women's Studies / Gender Studies

Thank you, but that wasn't what I asked. I asked if the course was being run.

Best wishes,

Mike Buchanan

Writing these words in late January 2012, four months after the nine week deadline I originally offered, I have yet to receive a response to that last email, and I have no idea if the requested materials will ever be forthcoming, despite my having invoked

the Freedom of Information Act. In case the reason for the non-supply of information was my failure to satisfy some obscure protocol that a citizen would struggle to discover, I think it not unreasonable that Professor Zalewski might have informed me of the fact.

The leader of another Gender Studies course passed my request on to the office responsible for handling such matters. The lady in charge of that office supplied the requested materials but said they were subject to copyright restrictions and I would have to apply for permission to use them, as the academics running the Gender Studies course were concerned I might use them in a ‘misleading’ manner. I would have to present them with the material I sought to duplicate, as well as any commentary concerning it. I wasn’t even permitted to divulge the book titles on the recommended reading lists without prior written permission: copyright was claimed on these lists. But I could, she added generously, state the *number* of books on those lists. You couldn’t make it up.

Onto the Centre for Women’s Studies at the University of York. On 14 September 2011 I received a letter from Professor Stevi Jackson which started by apologising for the lateness of the response, and continued in a polite and informative manner. I rapidly concluded she’d attended a superior charm school to the one attended by Professor Zalewski.

The letter included the following table showing the headcount for all full and part-time students on Women’s studies courses over the academic years 2005/6 to 2010/11:

Academic year	Female	Male
2005/6	35	0
2006/7	30	0
2007/8	30	0
2008/9	30	0
2009/10	40	0
2010/11	40	0

Assuming the courses were completed within single academic years, that works out at 205 females: 0 males. A strong contender to win a coveted Harriet Harman Award for Gender Balance in Further Education.

What of the course prospectuses, which were mostly for MA courses? Taking a random sampling approach, I opened the ‘Handbook for MA Women’s Studies and MA Women’s Studies (Humanities) 2010 – 2011’ at page 22, which is the first page concerning an optional module, ‘Gender and Diasporic Identities (5080006)’. The course description:

‘The module centres on the ways in which diasporic identities in their intersection with gender are constructed in contemporary cultural production, in particular in film, performance, and fiction. It explores the impact of (dis)locations on perceptions of self and other in the context of diaspora as a continual negotiation between past and present, movement and stability, visibility and invisibility, tradition and transformation. It asks about the changing and diverse experiences of diaspora across generations, how diasporic experience shape gendered identities at local levels and in global contexts, and what socio-cultural issues emerge from the cultural construction of diaspora.

Following on from a session on conceptualising diaspora where we shall compare the personal experience of gendered diasporic identities and their theorisations, we shall analyse the ways in which contemporary cultural production engages with the diverse manifestations of diasporic identity to

explore issues such as micro-migration, dreams and realities of ‘motherlands’, ‘first-generation’ migrants, ‘lost generations’, reverse migrations, nomadic identities in the global world, fragmenting and integrating identities, women’s roles in global diasporic economies.’

Little to argue with there, I think you’ll agree.

On the positive side I noticed on one of the course reading lists some papers produced by Dr Catherine Hakim, a sociologist formerly working at the London School of Economics (now with the think-tank The Centre for Policy Studies) whose work is mentioned favourably in *The Glass Ceiling Delusion*. There’s also a session on women who commit violence so maybe – just maybe – such courses (or at least those at the University of York) aren’t quite as woefully imbalanced as I’d anticipated. I should really investigate the matter further but I find that if I spend more than a brief period reading feminist literature I lose the will to live. The absence of male students on the courses suggests I’m not alone.

What is the reality of Women’s Studies and Gender Studies courses beyond what we might deduce from materials such as prospectuses and recommended reading lists? I’m not aware of any books which provide an ‘insider’s guide’ to such courses in the United Kingdom, but there’s a remarkable book which lifts the lid on courses in the United States: Daphne Patai’s and Noretta Koertge’s *Professing Feminism: Education and Indoctrination in Women’s Studies* (second edition, 2003). It’s an excellent but also disturbing read, partly because it depicts a world of men-hating women determined to denigrate men at every opportunity and to isolate women from men as far as possible.

The world these women dream of creating would be a depressing one for the vast majority of men and women. I

came to the regrettable conclusion that I couldn't do justice to the book without using a substantial number of very lengthy extracts, so I leave you with the suggestion that you read it for yourself. Americans might be well advised to have a stiff drink to hand, to help calm their nerves when they realise the true nature of the programmes their taxes have been funding for many years.

57 | ARE YOU A FEMINIST OR A POST-FEMINIST? A GUIDE

Parameter	Feminist
Political views	Extreme left-wing
Customary demeanour	Miserable
Optimist or pessimist?	Pessimist
Emotional maturity	Low
Intelligence	Below average
Predominantly emotional or rational?	Emotional
Attractive physically?	Rarely ¹
Attractive personality?	No
Tone of voice	Whiny ²
Inclination to wear black clothes	High
Weight	Likely to be overweight and to blame her hormones
Understanding of business	Nil
Work ethic	Non-existent
Employed in which sector?	Probably public sector
Opinion of men	They're all bastards
Opinion of women	They're all wonderful and to be celebrated
Opinion of Margaret Thatcher	She was a disaster for the country in general, and for women in particular
Opinion of Harriet Harman MP	She's <i>amazing</i> and has strongly promoted women's interests whilst trampling on men's interests – great!

Notes

¹ Although Harriet Harman MP in her younger days was a hottie, it has to be said – by feminist standards, anyway.

² For example, Angela Eagle MP.

Parameter	Post-Feminist
Political views	Variable, but not extreme left-wing
Customary demeanour	Cheerful
Optimist or pessimist?	Optimist
Emotional maturity	High
Intelligence	Above average
Predominantly emotional or rational?	Rational, but also emotional on occasion (in a good way)
Attractive physically?	Probably
Attractive personality?	Probably
Tone of voice	Pleasant
Inclination to wear black clothes	Low
Weight	Variable
Understanding of business	Variable
Work ethic	Strong
Employed in which sector?	Probably private sector
Opinion of men	Variable, depends on the man in question
Opinion of women	Variable, depends on the woman in question
Opinion of Margaret Thatcher	She was the finest peacetime prime minister of the 20 th century, and remains the ultimate role model for women
Opinion of Harriet Harman MP	She's <i>awful</i> and has harmed the interests of the majority of women, and all men

APPENDIX 1 | QUOTATIONS

Women like silent men. They think they're listening.

Marcel Achard 1899-1974 French playwright and screenwriter

Politics, as a practice, has always been the systematic organization of hatreds.

Henry Adams 1850-1906 American farmer, public official and politician: *The Education of Henry Adams* (1907)

More than any other time in history, mankind faces a crossroads. One path leads to despair and utter hopelessness, the other to total extinction. Let us pray we have the wisdom to choose correctly.

My wife was an immature woman . . . I would be home in the bathroom, taking a bath, and she would walk in whenever she felt like it and sink my boats.

Woody Allen 1935- American screenwriter, film director, actor, comedian, writer, musician and playwright

Woman is the salvation or the destruction of the family. She carries its destiny in the folds of her mantle.

Henri-Frédéric Amiel 1821-81 Swiss philosopher, poet and critic

If you can't annoy somebody with what you write, I think there's little point in writing.

Sir Kingsley Amis 1922-95 English novelist, poet and critic: *Radio Times* 1 May 1971

The sadness of the women's movement is that they don't allow the necessity of love. See, I don't personally trust any revolution where love is not allowed.

in *California Living* 14 May 1975

We allow our ignorance to prevail upon us and make us think we can survive alone, alone in patches, alone in groups, alone in races, alone even in genders.

If you don't like something, change it. If you can't change it, change your attitude. Don't complain.

Maya Angelou 1928- American authoress and poet

Resolved, that the women of this nation in 1876, have greater cause for discontent, rebellion and revolution than the men of 1776.

Susan B Anthony 1820-1906 American civil rights leader

Quotations

A man's looks are measured by the depth of his pockets.

Elizabeth Aston *Mr Darcy's Daughters* (2003)

My vigor, vitality, and cheek repel me. I am the kind of woman I would run from.

Nancy Astor 1879-1964 first woman to sit in the British House of Commons as a Member of Parliament

Evil is unspectacular and always human,
And shares our bed and eats at our own table.

WH Auden 1907-1973 Anglo-American poet

A woman should never be trusted with money.

The Watsons (unfinished novel started in 1803)

Where so many hours have been spent in convincing myself that I am right, is there not some reason to fear I may be wrong?

Jane Austen 1775-1817 British novelist

I mean, damn it all, one minute you're having a perfectly good time and the next, you suddenly see them there like – some old sports jacket or something – literally beginning to come apart at the seams.

of women

Alan Ayckbourn 1939- English dramatist: *Absurd Person Singular* (1971)

Going to war without France is like going deer hunting without an accordion. You just leave a lot of useless, noisy baggage behind.

Jed Babbin a born diplomat, former United States Deputy Under Secretary of Defence, author, political commentator, contributing editor to *The American Spectator* and talk radio host

No man has ever yet discovered the way to give friendly advice to any woman, not even to his own wife.

Petite misères de la vie conjugales (1846)

Equality may perhaps be a right, but no power on earth can ever turn it into a fact.

[Author's note: true, but try telling that to Harriet Harman...]

No man should marry before he has studied anatomy and dissected the body of a woman.

Honoré de Balzac 1799-1850 French novelist and playwright

© Mike Buchanan (2012)