

Letters To the Editor...

Dear Editor,

Knowing Peter Hanus, having read his article on radical feminists and having seen his sources, as well as having read Vaughn Jelliffe's response to it, I would like to make a few comments on Prof. Jelliffe's response.

The definition of radical feminism given by Peter Hanus was a direct quote taken from a book by Marlene Mackie (a book used in some courses on the campus). It was not taken out of context. As to being "condescending" to Dawn Ambler, she said that "radical," according to the Oxford dictionary, means to get to the root of the problem. Peter stated this was not completely accurate (it's only a definition of "radical"), he expanded upon it by showing what the "root" of this "problem" (presumably patriarchy) was according to most radical feminists. This "root" was "women's child-bearing function and subsequent dependence on men as the root of female oppression..." This was a direct quote not taken out of context.

As far as a smear campaign, giving direct quotes not taken out of context is not a smear campaign. It is telling the truth. The articles by Anne Koedt ("The Myth of the Vaginal Orgasm"), Charlotte Bunch ("Not for Lesbians Only"), Susan Hawthorne ("In Defence of Separatism"), Susie Orbach ("Fat is a Feminist Issue"), and Joan Cassel ("Externalities of Change") are all relatively well known works among radical feminist scholars - the quotes from them were fair. To say what were given were "taken out of context" was (1) done out of ignorance or (2) a lie. As such, who is conducting the smear campaign? "Taken out of context" is quite an ironic statement coming from one who fits Joan Cassel's description to a "t".

In reference to the "lack of female representation" on university faculties, this does not change the fact that affirmative action is "reverse discrimination," and the number of women hired in relation to their hiring pools tends to show this fact. Are you, Prof. Jelliffe, arguing that equality is a "numbers game" (50% males and 50% females on faculty is equality)? Most people view equality as a matter of every individual, no matter what their sex or race, playing by the same rules. Affirmative action doesn't provide this envi-

ronment. Or should I assume that you believe that equality is the question?

I would also like to respond to one of the dumbest comments I have ever read. You stated "one of the most fundamental beliefs of feminism is that 'the end is the means.'" There is no separate means to an end. I place before you a glass. The "end" that you are to achieve is to break the glass. You can jump on it, take a baseball bat to it, sing a high pitched note, etc. There are several means to achieving this "end," there is to any "end." To deny this is sheer stupidity.

As for using the ends to justify immoral means, two examples were illustrated: (1) Affirmative Action "reverse discrimination" and thus acts as immoral means, and (2) by presenting "women's child-bearing function and subsequent dependence as the root of female oppression... only a biological revolution 'free women'" is trying to present a "value judgement" as "fact." I can find several women who would say this is not so--if you state this is some form of "false consciousness" then you don't understand the problem (it's epistemological).

As well, I have spoken to "feminists" on campus who have both agreed with Peter's article and have stated that radical feminists are making the movement look bad. Some have taken your courses. So much for your statement "Feminists of many different backgrounds and viewpoints value each other..."

In conclusion, your failure to note the immorality of radical feminism displayed in Peter Hanus' article would lead me to conclude either one of two things: (1) you are trying to deny their existence and make Peter Hanus look like a "feminist basher" or (2) your own feminist "belief system" has closed your mind so much that you find nothing immoral, as long as it serves your interests.

Signed, All Men Don't Hold Identical Beliefs Etc.