

Just a few choice quotes from feminists

Last Update: 20/10/13

Hilary Clinton, First Lady of the United States, 1993 to 2001, U.S. Senator from 2001 to 2009, and 67th United States Secretary of State from 2009 to 2013, arguably the most powerful woman in the world at that time - and a feminist.

"Women can do anything men can. And do it better. And do it with one hand tied behind their backs". The point here is that no male politician could possibly say this with the gender roles reversed. Suppose a male member of the current UK cabinet were to say, "Men can do anything women can. And do it better. And do it with one hand tied behind their backs". David Cameron would have their resignation before they went to bed that same night. He would be obliged to distance himself immediately and as emphatically as possible or his own job would be in jeopardy. Equality? What equality?

"Women have always been the primary victims of war. Women lose their husbands, their fathers, their sons in combat". This is a lovely one in that it betrays the mindset of the feminist. Note firstly that what Clinton is asserting is that men are not the primary victims of their own death!!! Feminists will *never* allow men to be victims - not even when they are killed. Clinton's view, very clearly expressed, is that a man's death is less important than a woman being inconvenienced. That's male disposability, right there.

Harriet Harman: currently Deputy Leader of the Labour Party, she was the first ever UK Minister for Women under Tony Blair. One of her contributions to gender relations includes,

"It cannot be assumed that men are bound to be an asset to family life, or that the presence of fathers in a family is necessary to social cohesion". Here is a woman in an extremely powerful position - as a Minister in the government, with particular responsibility for gender issues, promulgating the full-on feminist, anti-male, anti-marriage message: men are not necessary. So, next time you hear someone saying that young peoples' delinquency is due to absent fathers, by all means agree. But do remind the speaker that it is feminists that have seen fit to boot men out of the family, not men themselves. We need a Minister for Men, not women.

Lady Justice Brenda Hale (a UK High Court judge) speaking about how women are treated in the judicial system (and note that the formal guidance to judges in the UK includes this quote, thus making it official policy),

"It is now well recognised that a misplaced conception of equality has resulted in some very unequal treatment for the women and girls who appear before the criminal justice system. Simply put, a male-ordered world has applied to them its perceptions of the appropriate treatment for male offenders.... The criminal justice system could ... ask itself whether it is indeed unjust to women". In other words, we must not treat women like we treat men because that would not be equality(!) It is essential to realise that women are more equal than men. See? Do you understand now? If this worries you, don't be too upset. It's not too important. It's only about sticking people in prison. Ever wondered why there are 20 times more men in prison than women? Oh, because they commit more crimes? Well, probably they do. But there are only 3 times as many men as women sentenced each year, not 20 times....?

Catherine Comins, Vassar College Assistant Dean of Student Life. She helped draft the US Violence Against Women Act. Here quoted in Time magazine, June 3, 1991,

"Men who are unjustly accused (of rape) can sometimes gain from the experience. They have a lot of pain, but it is not a pain that I would necessarily have spared them. I think it ideally initiates a process of self-exploration. 'How do I see women?' 'If I didn't violate her, could I have?' 'Do I have the potential to do to her what they say I did?' Those are good questions". No, they are staggeringly stupid questions. If you are falsely accused of burglary you gain nothing from the experience. Asking yourself "could I have committed burglary?" is bonkers. The question does not arise in the mind of an innocent non-burglar. Why in God's name should it be different for rape? It isn't. What we have here is the feminist narrative that all men are rapists really (see the quotes below). What this nasty woman is actually saying is, I don't care if this man happens to be innocent, he's a man and he should learn to grovel abjectly to women at all times. This theme, that men should be grateful for the experience of being dragged through the courts to defend themselves against a malicious false rape charge, continues, as illustrated here...

Deborah Orr, journalist, writing in The Guardian, 13 September 2013, following Michael Le Vell's acquittal on a charge of child rape.

"I'd like to hear just one person, exonerated after a sexual offences trial, declare that despite their personal suffering, they are proud to live in a society that takes people seriously when they say they have been sexually abused, and that if occasionally people have to undergo ordeals like theirs, in order to ensure that others who have committed such crimes are less likely to get away with them, then so be it. All those worries about women making spurious allegations of rape to wreak vengeance on men?.....Start seeing people vindicated after trials involving sexual offences as people who have made their own unpleasant, unfortunate, yet heroic sacrifice to a cause much bigger than them – the fight for justice for victims". Ah, I get it. The cause which is much bigger than justice for men is justice for women. I'm beginning to understand. Seriously, this again illustrates the pernicious feminist mindset. It is simply this: that men's feelings do not matter as much as women's. A man should be proud to be bludgeoned by society if it means sparing some woman (some purely notional *other* woman) some pain. The actual criminal, the woman who has made this false accusation knowing full well that she might destroy a man's life, is not even mentioned. I particularly like Deborah's use of the phrase "heroic sacrifice". If only she were better informed about the reality of historic gender relations (as contrasted with feminist patriarchy theory) she might have avoided this phrase, redolent as it is of the true relationship of men towards women. It is precisely this default, white knight, heroic sacrifice behaviour of men that has got us into this position of disadvantage. The learning point for men is just this: that heroic sacrifice in favour of woman must stop. Do you get it, Deborah? We've had a belly full of heroic sacrifice, thanks. Men need to concentrate on protecting men against the boundless self interest of women.

Barbara Jordan (1936 – 1996) former US Senator.

"I believe that women have a capacity for understanding and compassion which man structurally does not have, he does not have it because he cannot have it, he is just incapable of it". Nice. And on what evidence is this extraordinary claim based? None. You see, women can say anything they like about men, however ridiculous and however vile. Barbara is saying here that men are biologically incapable of understanding or compassion. She is denying that men are actually human. Hmm, well men did a pretty good job of inventing about 99% of all science and technology for an organism with no "understanding". Ah, but that's not what she meant. It was the compassion thing she was really drawing attention to. Yes, indeed, men have none of that at all. The vast majority of the world's art, poetry, literature and music was created by men by merely *simulating* having feelings. Wow! that's some feat, isn't it? This theme that men are emotionally stunted is very popular with feminists. It's rather convenient for them, you see. Because, if men don't really feel very much, then it's OK for women to beat them up as much as they want. This is the sentiment that you see repeated endlessly in all those Guardian articles about the feminisation of the workplace, etc, and how the world will benefit from women's empathy, fairness and cooperation (which, by omission, we are to understand that men lack). Forgive me if I am less than impressed by women's empathy and fairness.

Marilyn French (1929 – 2009) American feminist author.

"The media treats male assaults on women like rape, beating and murder of wives or female lovers, and male incest with children, as individual aberrations, obscuring the fact that all male violence towards women is part of a concerted campaign". This is a clear statement of what men have long been made to feel: that we should all share in the guilt of any man who has committed an act of abuse against women or children. But why? I do not feel guilty if another man commits a burglary or steals a car. I don't quite know the answer, but I suspect it is because this collective guilt is the response with which women have burdened us. But, of course, the idea that men are secretly conspiring to abuse women and children as some sort of deliberate act of oppression is ridiculous. One of the things we have learnt from the last 40 years is that women are very good at concerted campaigns but men are very bad at it. Women hunt in packs. Men act as individuals. It is our strength and our weakness. Do women really believe this nonsense, or are they just attempting to justify their innate hatred of men? Carrying the same message the lovely Marilyn also said: *"As long as some men use physical force to subjugate females, all men need not. The knowledge that some men do suffices to threaten all women. He can beat or kill the woman he claims to love, he can rape women, he can sexually molest his daughters. The vast majority of men in the world do one or more of the above"*. No they don't. That's just a nasty, stupid lie. What the vast majority of men in the world are actually guilty of is allowing women to get away with this gender hate for so long.

Robin Morgan is an American author and radical feminist, author of the anthology "Sisterhood Is Powerful" and the editor of Ms. Magazine. A few of her gems are,

[1] *I feel that man-hating is an honourable and viable political act and that the oppressed have a right to class-hatred of the class that is oppressing them.*

[2] *Lets put one lie to rest for all time: the lie that men are oppressed too by sexism, the lie that there can be such a thing as men's liberation groups.*

[3] *We can't destroy the inequalities between men and women until we destroy marriage.*

[4] *I claim that rape exists any time that sexual intercourse occurs when it has not been **initiated** by the woman out of affection and desire.*

On [1] I would demure. The trap that the Men's Rights Movement must **not** fall into is just that - that oppression justifies hate. To replace a system based on the politics of hate with another based on the politics of hate would not be progress. Mindless class-hatred is wrong, people.

[2] illustrates the intellectually closed mind of feminists. It simply does not matter how much evidence of male oppression is piled up in front of them, they just don't see it. This is one of the strengths of feminists: they are unencumbered by any sense of justice towards men. But it will also be their downfall as they under-estimate the overwhelming outrage that must ultimately crash onto their heads.

[3] is another reiteration that feminists are anti-marriage, if there could be any doubt. The epidemic of single parent families is feminists' doing. The social disadvantage that the children of single parents face is therefore also feminists' doing.

[4] is hilarious. Just how is this woman supposed to have affection for the object of hatred, as made clear in [1]? The logical corollary of [1]+[4] is that all sexual intercourse is rape. Ah well, for once the feminist view is consistent. Haven't we always been told that all men are rapists?

Andrea Dworkin (1946 – 2005) influential American radical feminist writer,

I want to see a man beaten to a bloody pulp with a high heel shoved in his mouth like an apple in the mouth of a pig.

Under patriarchy, every woman's son is her potential betrayer and also the inevitable rapist or exploiter of another woman. (from "Our Blood", 1976).

Marriage as an institution developed from rape as practiced.

Heterosexual intercourse is the pure formalised expression of contempt for women's bodies.

No gender hatred there then. Note that it is inevitable that a boy will become a rapist / exploiter.

Susan Brownmiller: American feminist journalist and author of "Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape" whose message is simply this,

"Rape is nothing more or less than a conscious process of intimidation by which all men keep all women in a state of fear". I can state categorically that this is untrue. Since "all men" includes me, and I am certainly *not* conscious of any such process of intimidation, it is definitely a false statement. It is a reiteration of all men being guilty of some men's crimes - how very convenient for the feminists. Bollocks.

Sheila Cronin: leader of the feminist organization NOW

Since marriage constitutes slavery for women, it is clear that the women's movement must concentrate on attacking this institution. Freedom for women cannot be won without the abolition of marriage.

Sheila Jeffreys: Australian feminist and political activist, known for her analysis of the history and politics of sexuality in Britain.

When a woman reaches orgasm with a man she is only collaborating with the patriarchal system, eroticizing her own oppression.

Catherine MacKinnon (Prominent feminist and lawyer, University of Michigan, & Yale)

"All sex, even consensual sex between a married couple, is an act of violence perpetrated against a woman". The human race has always been propagated exclusively by rape, then.

"You grow up with your father holding you down and covering your mouth so another man can make a horrible searing pain between your legs". Do you think that perhaps feminists are just in need of psychological help?

"In a patriarchal society, all heterosexual intercourse is rape because women, as a group, are not strong enough to give meaningful consent". This is one of my favourites because it manages to be staggeringly misandric *and* misogynistic at the same time in just one short sentence. There's nothing weak about women. But this does illustrate how feminists are happy to argue both ways according to circumstance. Women are strong, noble and fearless - or weak and defenseless victims, as the fancy takes them.

Jilly Cooper: English author of romantic novels. Not a feminist as far as I am aware. This quote is an example of what I'd call every-day sexism. It is perhaps more indicative of the majority female view of men.

The male is a domestic animal which, if treated with firmness...can be trained to do most things. Except cleaning, of course. We're just too dirty.

Valerie Solanas (1936 - 1988) Authoress of the SCUM Manifesto (Society for Cutting-Up Men). We are told that we should not quote Solanas because the poor woman was insane. But that does not stop the feminists themselves treating her with reverence, so I regard her as fair game. The SCUM Manifesto calls for the complete annihilation of males amongst other nutty things. It has been reprinted at least 10 times and translated into 13 languages. Clearly a work of great scholarship. Here are some excerpts,

"To call a man an animal is to flatter him; he's a machine, a walking dildo".

"The male is a biological accident. The Y gene is an incomplete female X gene. That is, it has an incomplete set of chromosomes. In other words the male is an incomplete female, a walking abortion, aborted at the gene stage. To be male is to be deficient and emotionally limited. Maleness is a deficiency disease and males are emotional cripples". I'm sure this is all scientifically impeccable, but Valerie's credibility is done no good by confusing genes with chromosomes and vice-versa.

Professor Joyce Trebilcot (1933 - 2009) formerly of Washington university, founder of women's studies there. Here we see a frank admission of how the feminist message has been evangelised within the educational system.

"If the classroom situation is very hetero-patriarchal, a large beginning class of 50-60 students with few feminists, I am likely to define my task as largely one of recruitment, of persuading students that women are oppressed". Yes, I guess if any women students were silly enough not to realise they were oppressed when they joined your classes, Joyce, they jolly well knew they were by the time you'd finished brainwashing them.

Sharon Stone: Actress. Not noted for her intellect I include her offering because as a "celeb" her words get a greater audience than most people's.

"The more famous and powerful I get the more power I have to hurt men". That's absolutely clear, Sharon, thanks.

Sally Miller Gearhart: American teacher, feminist, science fiction writer, and political activist, she helped establish one of the first gender study programs in the US.

"The proportion of men must be reduced and maintained at approximately 10% of the human race". You're probably getting accustomed to this stuff now - but don't. They're serious. How in God's name are these vile women getting away with this institutionalised gender hate? And getting paid for it by universities as if they were proper academics rather than intellectually bankrupt Nazis?

Professor Mary Daly (1928 – 2010) was an American radical feminist and theologian. She taught at Boston College, a Jesuit-run institution, for 33 years. Daly refused to admit male students to her classes. She argued that their presence inhibited class discussion. You can see why below - the women might have been a little shy of talking about the extermination of men while they were actually present.

"If life is to survive on this planet there must be a decontamination of the Earth. I think this will be accompanied by an evolutionary process which will result in a drastic reduction of the population of males". I don't know how she squared this with her Christian doctrine of love. Look on the bright side - she's dead.

Former University of Michigan Administrator: *All men are good for is fucking and running over with a truck.* Probably quite a popular view amongst women, I suspect.

The State of Michigan opposes joint custody of children after divorce. The reasons officially quoted are: *"It is unworkable for uncooperative parents; It is dangerous for women and their children who are trying to leave, or have left, a violent husband and father; It ignores the diverse complicated needs of divorced families; and it is likely to have serious unintended consequences on **child support**".* Ah, the last bit is the give away. The State of Michigan does not want any blurring of the issue as regards who is going to have to pay. Note that there is actually no reason given here to cover the majority of cases, when either there is no domestic violence issue at all (most cases) or when the women is the violent partner. This is state sponsored sexism - just like the UK.

Amanda Marcotte: American feminism and author of "It's a Jungle Out There".

"Men's Rights Activists deny that domestic violence is common and when they will admit it is common they claim that woman do it just as much. The evidence that women are just as bad comes from the theory that if a guy bruises his knuckles on your face then you've both sustained domestic violence". This is representative of the quality of research which underpins all feminist assertions - none. I am not a professional writer nor a professional on gender matters. Yet in a couple of weeks I could write the 73 page review of partner violence in England & Wales, which you can find on this site, complete with humongous amounts of hard data and quotes from official sources. The only reason why anyone reads drivel like Marcotte's books is because they want their prejudices to be reinforced. They do not want the truth and she does not bother them with it.

Marcotte is infamous for writing the following on her blog: *"I had to listen to how the poor dear lacrosse players at Duke are being persecuted just because they held someone down and fucked her against her will - not rape, of course, because the charges have been thrown out. Can't a few white boys sexually assault a black woman anymore without people getting all wound up about it? So unfair".* She is referring to a famous false rape accusation case. The accuser, Crystal Gail Mangum, was proved to be lying and the accused boys unambiguously cleared. That is not enough for Marcotte. Like all feminists, she believes that if a man is accused of rape then he is guilty of rape, even when proved beyond all doubt that he is innocent. You see, there is no such thing as an innocent man. Mangum, incidentally, was not prosecuted for her malicious false rape accusation. They rarely are. She had a string of criminal offences to her name, before and after the Duke university events. She is currently being held on a murder charge.

For my final offering from the feminists I will depart from quoting only named, influential individuals and quote an anonymous source ("Liberated Woman"), published as a letter in a Melbourne newspaper. I include this because I think it is rather typical of the mainstream feminist view:-

"Who cares about how men feel or what they do or whether they suffer. They've had over 2000 years to dominate and made a complete hash of it. Now it's our turn. My only comment to men is, if you don't like it, bad luck. And if you get in my way, I'll run you down."

My parting query is this: just why do women hate men so much? I mean, the hatred is really extreme, isn't it? I know they keep wailing about rape, but this doesn't ring true as a reason, does it? How many of the women quoted above had been raped? I suspect this hatred of men is not due to anything that men do. Our mere existence seems to be enough. There's something psychologically pathological going on with women. It might help if someone diagnosed it.