

The patriarchal suppression of women has even taken on a more sinister form:

*Although there are many areas for sexual arousal, there is only one area for sexual climax; that area is the clitoris. All orgasms are extensions of sensation from this area. Since the clitoris is not necessarily stimulated sufficiently in the conventional sexual positions, we are left 'frigid' . . . . Men have orgasms essentially by friction with the vagina, not the clitoral area, which is external and not able to cause friction the way penetration does. Women have been defined sexually in terms of what pleases men; our own biology has not been properly analysed. Instead, we are fed the myth of the liberated woman and her vaginal orgasm--an orgasm that in fact does not exist.*

If these radicals are practising lesbianism and separatism, how would they know?

And now for what is commonly referred to as "male-bashing." Two examples will suffice in illustrating this. Example one:

*Throughout [a feminist course on "French Literary Criticism"] one female student offered ribald one-liners about a man who lost his penis, penises that were cut off, accidents in which every part of the body was recovered--except the penis. These brought loud and unembarrassed laughter from the professor and other students.*

Example two: Tracy Smith in her letter to the editor said, "Historically men made all the decisions for both men and women, so if male policy making has brought about global warming I guess [sic]. You'll [Mr. Editor] have ti [sic] live with the guilt." Why should Mr. Large, did he have anything to do with this global warming? Is he to feel guilty just because he is a man? Is this the new "biological determinism," Ms. Smith?

It is quite obvious that these radical feminist scholars feel terribly suppressed by patriarchal society. And just how hard is it for these radical feminists to get their jobs in order to express their woe? The following numbers about the hiring practices of female professors shows the "true extent" of this oppression (percentage hired vs. percentage in hiring pool):

*. . . at the Associate rank, the percentage hired is 16.4, whereas the hiring pool was only 9.3; at the Assistant rank, 29.3 vs. 20.5; and at the Lecturers,*

*45.0 against 24.0. That was in 1986-87 . . .*

1986-87, before many affirmative action programs were put in place--including the proposed program for U.P.E.I. This gives the impression that if as many women/womyn were applying to become professors as men, men would be vastly outnumbered on university faculties.

But, as stated earlier, this article is not a blanket attack on feminism. As Morrison and Whelon point out, feminism has some very idealistic, if not naive, visions of Utopia. This article, however, is a critique of radical feminism. This critique may be summarised in the following statement: "Radical feminism uses an "utopian" end to justify immoral means." Dawn Ambler, our resident womyn, dealt only with the ends of radical feminism. I now put out the challenge for these radical feminists to justify their means.

Meanwhile, hopefully those among us who are still "sane" will realise the truth in MISTER Editor's editorial.

HAPPY  
NEW  
YEAR



**Back  
Alley  
Discs**

Buy, Sell, and Trade  
C.D's, Tapes and Albums  
100 1/2 Kent Street Tel: 566-DISC  
**ACROSS FROM CITY HALL**  
12:00-5:00 TUES.-SAT.