

Radical Feminism

Anthony Shell April 2021

CONTENTS

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page N°</u>
Contents [this page]	1
Report	2
End	7

[*Note:* Original sources are listed as footnotes at the bottom of each page. Endnotes are not used. URL references are not hyper-linked in this report. Photos and image scans (including that of documents, *et cetera*) are included solely in the context of (and as appropriate to) the research content of this report, for illustrative and substantiation purposes only.]

Report

It was at around the time of the incident described in my 'testimony' report (i.e. in *circa* 1970) that I first heard of the 'SCUM Manifesto'.¹ However I cannot now remember from whom, or exactly why, that reference was made. My rather vague recollection is that it was, indeed, specifically in connection with that particular sexual assault – a cruel assault by a female student against a young (adult, but very naïve) male student. It was therefore presented as some sort of explanation (and supposedly 'justification') in part.

Therefore it was not a matter I had any special interest in, at that time.

The 'SCUM Manifesto' was an extreme hate-filled, anti-men diatribe, created (and first distributed by hand) by the US-based radical feminist Valerie SOLANAS. However my only recollection, in this regard (as a student in 1968), was of seeing news reports that a young feminist (SOLANAS) had attempted to shoot dead Andy WARHOLE, along with two of his business partners. However, at the time, I knew nothing of her utterly repugnant manifesto (which had, in fact, been self-published by her, earlier that same year).

It is very difficult to underestimate the sheer nastiness of 'SCUM'. It could, perhaps, be best described as a neo-fascist, supremacist 'manifesto' for an extreme, gender-based, hate-mongering ideology – agitating (again) for the mass elimination of a biological 'other', based on a fabricated narrative of historical grievances. It is noted Valerie SOLANAS had a particular interest in applied psychology – and she displayed a consummate skill in the ability to use language to adversely manipulate people's emotional state.² SOLANAS clearly knew how to agitate others (primarily young women) into feelings of utmost hatred toward some 'other' (in her case, an extreme, vituperative hatred of men).

However the particular interest here is not in the SCUM manifesto or its author, but in the manner and degree to which it (SCUM) and she (SOLANAS) have become icons for the radical feminist movement.

At the time (the 1970s and 1980s) the radical feminist narrative was then being generated within North America, Australia, France and the UK.³ This narrative was coming mostly from those within (or closely connected to) the professional, global academic establishment.⁴ And there was (and is) very considerable political psycho-sociological pressure imposed upon young people, within the UK, to concur and to conform (or, at least, to acquiesce) to that hatemongering doctrine – hence the *circa* 1970 assault.

¹See: www.darklake-synectics.co.uk/docs/testimony.pdf

² Valerie Solanas showed an early interest in psychology through her work within the psychology department of the University of Maryland, and her subsequent enrollment in a master's psychology program at the University of Minnesota (which she dropped out of after one year).

³ The US-based Women's Liberation Movement (WLM), and (in particular) the Chicago Women's Liberation Union (CWLU) formed in 1969 by: Heather Booth; Vivien Rothstein; Ruth Sural; and Naomi Wesstein.

⁴ In 1970 anti-men 'The Female Eunuch' by the Australian author and neo-feminist Germaine Greer was published in the UK as a piece of revolutionary 'scholarship'. Strenuous efforts were made to install that especially unpleasant narrative throughout the UK – and with very considerable success. 'The Female Eunuch', by Germaine Greer, first published by MacGibbon and Key Ltd., in 1970. [Researcher's copy: 4th edition, published by Harper Collins in 2012].

So then, what of more recent/contemporary times? Have things got worse, or better?

In 2010 Tina ROSENBERG provided an introductory article (published by John Hopkins University) – under the byline “*Every man knows, deep down, that he is a worthless piece of shit*” – seemingly on the notion that activists within the radical feminist movement should be fascinated by, and thrilled by (and, I would assume, inspired to act by) Valerie SOLANAS’s hate-filled, anti-men, SCUM manifesto.⁵

In 2014 the influential ‘Feral Feminism Organization’ published an article titled ‘Writing Violence: The Feeling Politics of Valerie Solanas’ which included the observation: “... *whereas Solanas’ utopian visions for a purely female society are based on the concept of gender as a physical attribute*”, the argument apparently being presented is that of giving consideration as to the extent Valerie SOLANAS could (and should) be viewed as an exemplary *avant garde* revolutionary ‘thinker’ – and extended to the notion of giving license to anyone, assuming any gender identity, to hate masculine (biological) men.⁶

In 2017 an article was published by the Feminist Encounters journal (and presented at the University of Helsinki, by the Swedish School of Social Science) titled: ‘*Perceiving shit as shit: on the grammar of patriarchy in Valerie Solanas SCUM Manifesto*’.⁷ Of course, within this context, language is everything.

In 2018 the establishment journalist Julie BINDEL, writing for the Feminist Current organization, gushed over Valerie SOLANAS and The SCUM Manifesto, describing the Manifesto in the following terms: “*What to take on holiday to read? I don’t like anything too serious or weighty when I am lying on a sunbed, but a relaxing time off is a perfect time to reread favourites or catch up on classics. That is why I am taking SCUM Manifesto, by Valerie Solanas, on holiday this year.*” Ms. Bindel went on to say: “*What I love about this book is how it promotes straightforward man-hating. Blaming men for the ills of the world is underrated. Women have been under siege for centuries, and resistance feels exhilarating, whether in the form of waving placards, or reading radical statements about feminist fight-back.*”⁸

So, where in the world have women been “*under siege for centuries*”?

It most certainly has not been so, within The British Isles – despite the lying, hatemongering rhetoric from some of the most senior members of the US (Washington DC) political class. Lying that was regurgitated, for example, by Presidential Candidate ‘Joe’ BIDEN in 2019, in a piece of anti-Englishmen nonsense.⁹

Joe (now US President) BIDEN told his (mostly female) audience the following: “*You all know what the phrase ‘rule of thumb’ means? You all know this expression? You know what the derivation of that is? It goes back ... to England. In the 1300s ... late 1300 hundreds ... There was a thing called English*

⁵ ‘Still Angry after All These Years, or Valerie Solanas under Your Skin’, Tina Rosenberg, John Hopkins University Press, Vol 62, N° 4, December 2010, pp 529-534

⁶ ‘Writing Violence: The Feeling Politics of Valerie Solanas’, Marit Bugge, Feral Feminisms Publishing, Toronto, Canada, 2014

⁷ ‘Perceiving shit as shit: on the grammar of patriarchy in Valerie Solanas SCUM Manifesto’, Salla Peltonen, Mio Lindman, Sara Nyman, Swedish School of Social Science, University of Helsinki, 2017; and also published in Feminist Encounters: A Journal of Critical Studies in Culture and Politics, 1(1), 09, 30th October 2017

⁸ “‘Scum Manifesto’ is your perfect summer vacay read”, by Julie Bindel, Feminist Current, 29th July 2018.

⁹ Source: transcription from video copy of a campaign speech, by Joe BIDEN, in 2019. Source: lotuseaters.com, Youtube.com

Common Law. ... In the late 1390s so many women were dying at the hands of their husbands – literally, this is fact – dying at the hands of their husbands. Because a woman is considered – and in many cases still is – a chattel, just like the horse, the pig, the farm ... Not a joke! OK, England. Not Zambesia [sic], Zambia – England. Now, so many women were dying by being beaten to death by their husbands that they passed a law in the Common Law Courts of England saying that you could not beat your wife with a rod thicker than the circumference of your thumb. We inherited a cultural depravity.”

That especially nasty (and racist) narrative was completely debunked many decades ago.^{10 11} The future United States President was promulgating proven lies – lies that would, in all likelihood, foment extreme hate against English men, and against English cultural history. As was presumably intended.

In this regard (to historical precedence) a reference to the origins of an extreme, radical feminist political movement is especially important. The core nature of that origin (within the USA) is outlined as follows.

The US-based writer Betty FRIEDAN is usually credited with being the founder of the post-WW2 radical feminist movement (referred to in this context of ‘second wave feminism’). This was at the beginning of the 1960s, with the publication of her work ‘The Feminine Mystique’.^{12 13} A grotesque passage within her book, and seen as of special significance (in both a historical and contemporary context), is this: *“In a sense that is not as far fetched as it sounds, the women who ‘adjust’ as housewives, who grow up wanting to be ‘just a housewife’, are in as much danger as the millions who walked to their own death in the concentration camps – and the millions more who refused to believe that the concentration camps existed.”*

Betty FRIEDAN concludes her three-page exposition with a half-hearted admission that her opening remark was a crude, nonsensical analogy: *“The suburban house is not a German concentration camp, nor are American housewives on their way to the gas chamber. But they are in a trap, and to escape they must, like the dancer, finally exercise their human freedom, and recapture their sense of self.”*¹⁴

Much of that particular FRIEDAN thesis was built upon the work of the eminent US academic Bruno BETTELHEIM – including a verbatim reproduction of BETTELHEIM’s extraordinary (and most horrifying) story of the killing of a resisting, young female dancer, at a Nazi death camp, during WW2.^{15 16} It is the story of a very courageous young woman who – on being cruelly tormented by her SS prison guards whilst being led to her execution – grabbed the leading tormentor’s gun and shot him dead. Inevitably, she was, in turn, immediately shot dead by the other SS guards.

¹⁰ See, for example: ‘Where does “rule of thumb” come from?’, Christina Hoff Sommers, Factual Feminist, S1.E7, American Enterprise Institute, Youtube.com, 2nd June 2014

¹¹ For example, the radical feminists’ ‘rule of thumb’ narrative was thoroughly debunked some two decades ago – in an investigation by The Baltimore Sun, April 1998

¹² First published in the USA in 1963

¹³ Notably, all of this was just 4 years before Valerie SOLANAS (also a scholar of applied psychology) wrote and distributed her utterly nasty SCUM Manifesto.

¹⁴ ‘The Feminine Mystique’, by Betty Friedan, Penguin Books, London, 2010 – pages 247 to 249. [Researcher’s copy]

¹⁵ As cited from: ‘The Informed Heart – Autonomy in a Mass Age’, by Bruno Bettelheim, The Free Press of Glencoe, Illinois, 1960

¹⁶ This appears to be in reference to the brutal killing of Franciszka MANNOVA, at Auschwitz-Birkenau on the 23rd October 1943. Source: ‘Dancers Under Duress: The Forgotten Resistance of Fireflies’, Laura Guilbert, Dance Today, Issue N° 36, September 2019 – as reproduced in www.israeldance-diaries.co.il

Of course, such acts of ultimate defiance in the face of one's own cruel death (by means of an evil, brutal, totalitarian order) should inspire everyone, everywhere (and both men and women, alike).

Both Betty FRIEDAN and Bruno BETTELHEIM were in the USA at the outbreak, and throughout, WW2. So, the question that begs to be asked is this: were FRIEDAN and BETTELHEIM actually, actively involved in the fight against fascism and Nazism in Europe, at that time (i.e. from 1939, and onwards) – and, especially, did they give actual, effective support to the people of the British Isles who, by 1940, were providing the only real obstacle to Hitler's ambitions to rule unchallenged across all Europe?

Betty FRIEDAN's thesis appears to reveal a 'coping mechanism' for extreme trauma – to 'cope' with the perception that most of the inmates of the Nazi concentration camps became totally submissive to the vicious camp régime, and to their fate. And those that survived through such passivity such as Bruno BETTELHEIM (pre-WW2, when he was relatively quickly released and allowed to emigrate to the safety of the USA) would desperately need to find a way to endure that reality.^{17 18}

That 'coping' mechanism may become psychological 'projection' – i.e. to portray post-WW2 housewives as concentration camp inmates who need to 'kill their SS guards' (men, metaphorically speaking) to achieve true liberation. And Betty FRIEDAN was there to help them to do it (again, metaphorically speaking).

There is something very disturbing in the way that the terrible events up to, and during, WW2 have been exploited to advance and enforce (yet more) forms of grievance-mongering hate. This is an insult to the memory of the many millions of people (men, women and children) who lost their lives at that time.

So, how has that 'projection' evolved and animated itself within society, in regard to radical feminism?

Unfortunately, it was from such beginnings that – and most perversely – something disgustingly malign has managed to emerge and become politically dominant, over the following sixty years. The reason for this can be found in the old adage that an extreme, radical movement can become the very thing that it purports to oppose (such as the 'anti fascists' becoming totalitarian, globalist fascists)

Radical feminism now engenders extreme hate. It is an ideology based on identifying the loathed 'other', based on that 'other's' immutable characteristics of biology, and perceived cultural inheritance. The 'other' is presented to the 'in group' as the primary and original source of the 'in group's' supposed historical and contemporary problems – therefore requiring that that particular 'other' be effectively eliminated by means of a State imposed (politically/culturally/technology-based) final solution.

The existence of any alternative proposition to that totalitarian new orthodoxy (from the radical feminists' viewpoint) simply could not – and cannot – be allowed any consideration whatsoever.

¹⁷ 'Bruno Bettelheim and the Concentration Camp', by Christian Fleck and Albert Mller, *Journal of the History of the Behavioural Sciences*, Vol. 33(1), 1-37, Winter 1997

¹⁸ Following Bruno Bettelheim's suicide in 1990, evidence was presented by his academic colleagues, students, and by journalists, to show he had been a long-time fraud, fantasist, and fabricator. See, for example: 'Getting Bruno on the ropes', Kurt Jacobsen, *Irish Times*, 21st September 1996; and 'Bruno Bettelheim: Hustling out of the Holocaust', Chris Taylor, 1st December 2019, www.viewsrebooks.info

Radical feminism is an ideology that embodies much the same form of political philosophy as Nazism.

An intense psychopathic arrogance emanates from the radical feminist movement, in regard to the movement's assumption that every bit of its anti-men rhetoric is justifiable – and that, therefore, it's indulgence in fomenting hate cannot, ever, be challenged.¹⁹ Potential challengers are viciously attacked. Therefore we see (especially within the USA) the mass rallies of black-masked radical feminists – with the synchronized clenched-fist salutes, and the hatemongering placards and obscene slogan chanting.

This begs the question to those who import US-based radical feminism to the UK – what possible relevance does it have to the circumstances of the native women, and the native men of this country (especially of England) from either an historical or a contemporary context? In particular, why is it that despite the claimed rationale of the radical feminist movement, it has gone down the path of adopting a 1930s-style of fascist and (especially, regarding hatred of the 'other') Nazi-type of political philosophy?

Given Mr. BIDEN's stupid, nasty, and very ignorant (and deliberately provocative) remarks regarding English men, English women, and English cultural tradition, I shall relate some personal observations from some sixty years ago. My experience of childhood and as a teenager, in England in the 1950s and 1960s, therefore provides some context to the matters described within this report.

Firstly, there my clear recollection that whilst us boys would regularly engage in 'rough and tumble' play – and have the occasional playground fights or wrestling matches – such physical displays of ritualized aggression were never directed against any of the girls. And this was not because we were told not to do such things – it was because it was contrary to our core nature, and socio-cultural environment.

Notwithstanding the physical, rumbustious side, the young girls could be just as assertive (if not more so) as us boys. They were not averse to telling the boys what to do – and (most especially) what not to do. And, of course, it was not all 'sweetness and light'. I clearly recall occasions when the girls would persuade the boys to exercise physical retribution (a 'roughing up') against boys who had repeatedly given verbal offence to the girls – effectively, of the procurement of 'punishment through proxy'.

Whilst there were no 'facts of life' lessons for the boys (at school), the girls were given separate lessons on the details of human reproduction as a special part of biology classes. However, and contrary to absurd contemporary claims, this was clearly not a traumatic episode for the girls.²⁰ Indeed, the girls could be just as lascivious in their 'earthy' humour and banter as us boys – and often, much more so.²¹

The girls (and young women) were never the fragile, timid, weak, terrified and oppressed creatures so routinely presented by contemporary radical feminists (as a supposedly 'historical truth' that must not be

¹⁹ 'Why can't we hate men?' by Suzanne Danuta Walters, The Washington Post, 9th June 2018.

²⁰ A commonly repeated, false trope (false in, at least, in England) is that just-pubescent girls and boys were given sex-education together, in the same class – and that the boys would react by terrifying the girls with aggressively simulated 'rape games'.

²¹ Most certainly the girls could be just as bawdy. When I was just 11-years-old a same-aged girl, living next door to me, taught me her own improvised version of 'On the Good Ship Venus'. Such things were, even in those seemingly very innocent of times, a not unusual part of our growing up.

challenged). At least, this was not the case within the UK – they were strong-willed, with effective agency.

At co-educational secondary school, both us teenage boys and the girls were taught in the same classes of: English (language and literature); mathematics; physics; chemistry; geography; history; religious studies; classical music and art. And, as such, we were all given exactly the same opportunities to progress to higher education (the sixth form, colleges of higher education, or maybe onto university).

The general expectation was that boys would become family wage earners, whilst girls would be family homemakers (as the bearers, and nurturers of the next generation). The boys' basic education would be supplemented by lessons in carpentry, metal work, and technical drawing – whilst the girls' basic education would be supplemented by lessons in domestic science and home economics. There was nothing seen as demeaning in this specialization of learning skills – not by the pupils, the teachers, nor the parents. It was widely seen as being a very good social/cultural/economic arrangement (for everyone).

The school staff would also organize extra-curriculum dances, theatre, and parties, as an early introduction for the pupils into courtship customs and rituals. This was a traditional part of a civilizing process. Up until at least the latter half of the 1960s dances were occasions where boys (young men) and girls (young women) could come into close intimate contact with each other – and to learn the skills necessary do so with mutual sensitivity, trust and respect. It was a magical, romantic process of social learning.

However, it is now seen (and especially in hindsight) that, in the final years of the 1960s, extreme and fundamental changes were being imposed upon our society by a foreign (and extremely antipathetic) ideology – the divisive, hatemongering politics originating primarily from within the USA.

It was the beginning of an engineered 'counter-culture revolution' to force (and enforce) destructive social change. This included the import of a vicious radical feminist ideology. English women were being indoctrinated to believe that it was justifiable, mandatory (and morally good) to hate English men – and act so as to avenge for their own 'oppression'.

The evilness of radical feminism (and of other such ideologies) is not that it is fundamentally deceitful and full of obfuscation (which it is) – it is that it presents itself (and persuades people of it being) the epitome of goodness, whilst corrupting the vulnerable hearts of good, trusting people. Radical Feminism can (and often does) destroy the lives of good men – such that those destroyed men may involuntarily break the hearts of good women. This is all 'grist to the mill' to the radical feminist movement. It is by such methods that the truly evil nature of the radical feminist movement proliferates so effectively.

END