

# A Frontiersman Review: Feminism 1995

---

## January

### Frankly My Dear . . .

by Sam Aurelius Milam III

News Source:  
The San Jose Mercury News,  
Wednesday, December 14, 1994

The astonishing hypocrisy of the feminist movement is nowhere better illustrated than in the fracas at Texas Women's University (TWU), in Denton, Texas. After decades of strident females forcing their way into every conceivable male institution, we now have these bitches at TWU lamenting because men have been admitted into their female undergraduate programs. Here are some of their excuses, as reported, for their current bout of moaning and sniveling:

"Female students say the school provides a nurturing environment for women. Students at protests have said that not having to compete with or be distracted by men improves their chances of a good education."

—San Jose Mercury News, Wednesday, December 14, 1994

Feminists have never given a tinker's damn if an all male school provides a nurturing environment for men. Now they demand a nurturing environment for women in an all female school. Feminists have never had any sympathy whatsoever for men who didn't want to compete with coeds, or to be distracted by their disruptive presence. Now they don't want to compete with men or study in the presence of men. It was feminists who demanded that the sexes are equal. It's a stupid idea, but I don't recall that they have ever cared what men thought about it.

Such inconsistent demands are the hallmark of the feminists. They never stop nagging 'til they coerce their way into a man's institution. Then they drive everybody crazy complaining about the way the men behave. What did they

expect in a male institution? Female behavior? Then when a man succeeds in getting into a woman's institution, they lack even the modicum of decency to recognize that they're the ones who insisted on equality and that equality cuts both ways. If they don't like being equal then they should stop demanding it. After all, it was their stupid idea.

In fact, feminists have never sought equality. They seek to control men. With equality as a cover, the movement promotes control. The program so far has been arrogant and coercive, and has resulted largely in repressed hostility toward women and hidden resentment of their unwelcome trespass into the male arena. Such warped equality as the feminists have achieved hasn't solved women's problems, but has only transformed them. It has also transformed the women, to the tragic detriment of us all. Women should probably go back to making babies and raising families. That is, after all, their traditional role in nearly every culture on Earth. As for the feminists, they'll get no help that I can deny them. If I never have to work around another arrogant feminazi or go to school with another strutting coed, that'll still be way too soon for me. ♂

### Buck Hunter shoots off His Mouth

Dear Buck

When's the best time to tell my girlfriend that I've had a vasectomy?  
—Don't Know For Sure

Dear Don't Know For Sure

After she sues you for child support.

## February

### Dear Frontiersman

This is a tardy response to your Dec. & Jan. articles, and I do not expect you to print my remarks. First of all, how many of your readers are women? You dwell on feminism quite a bit in 1994, and behold the whole December issue is a re-run on a very tedious subject. You are surely going to turn them off. I agree completely that women have been sold a bill of goods, and all the points you make about inequality are well taken. But for Pete's sake (and mine!) don't run the subject into the ground. All the "minorities" are doing the same thing. It's boring, it's dishonest. Save it for the media.  
—Shirley; Urbana, Illinois

### Dear Shirley

Thank you for the letter. I'm happy to print your remarks and respond to them. First, about 15% of my subscribers are female.

As for dwelling on feminism, running the subject into the ground, or "turning-off" my female readers, I expect that I'm

as tired of the feminists as my female subscribers are of reading my opinions about feminism. The advantage of my subscribers is that they have the ability to stop reading my opinions if they wish. Men, however, have no way to escape from the feminists, who're aggressive, intrusive, and persistent. The policies and legislation they demand treat each man as if all men are the enemy. The effect is that men (as a group) are being attacked by women (as a group). As long as the feminists refuse to relent, I intend to "dwell on feminism".

The feminists have demanded equality at any cost. However, they want to be the only ones who decide what's equal and what isn't, and who gets it and who doesn't. This is unacceptable. Equality cuts both ways. If they're equal, then we can have anything they can have. For example, if they can require us to be good men by their definition, then we can require them to be good women by our definition. Quid pro quo. ♂

# A Frontiersman Review: Feminism 1995

---

April

## Penultimate Straw

by Sam Aurelius Milam III

The feminist movement has a fundamentally different goal than other "equality" movements. However misguided those other movements may be, they do pursue equality. Although feminists claim to pursue equality, they actually want something very different.

The latest proof is the "all girl" high school math classes. That's right, the cutting edge in public education today is freshman algebra for girls only (Presque Isle, Maine; Ventura, California; and elsewhere). The reason? Girls aren't learning math as well as boys. The report<sup>1</sup> suggests that they never have, but God forbid that anybody should admit some inherent difference in aptitude. The excuse advanced by "educators" is that girls are distracted from learning math when there are boys in the class. The girls are too bashful to ask questions. They're concerned about their appearance. They're afraid the boys will laugh at them. Consequently, these daughters of the sexual equality mandate are getting their own sexually segregated math classes.

Meanwhile, at North Salinas High School in Salinas, California (and presumably elsewhere), girls have forced their way into the boys wrestling class.<sup>2</sup> They claim they have a "right" to be there. If the boys are bothered by grappling on the floor with their nubile young female classmates, the boys will just have to deal with it. The girls don't care if teenage boys might have difficulty learning wrestling when there are girls in the class. Being careful not to grab anything sexual will just be a normal part of learning their holds and throws. Did the girls all agree in advance that they won't accuse the boys of fondling? Don't be ridiculous.

If girls can have their own math classes to avoid being distracted by boys, then why can't boys have their own wrestling classes to avoid being distracted by girls? This kind of arrogant hypocrisy is typical of the feminist movement. Some of them demand equality when they want a "right", then the others whine about their special needs when they want an extra privilege. Men, of course, are trapped in the middle. The lessons being taught here have little to do with math and wrestling and a lot to do with female supremacy and the subordination of men. These lessons won't be lost on the kids. The hand that rules the cradle rocks the world.

<sup>1</sup> MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour; Tuesday, March 7, 1995

<sup>2</sup> KSBW ; Salinas, California; early 1995, exact date unknown

---

## Word Abuse

observed by  
Sam Aurelius Milam III

On Wednesday, February 1, 1995, the MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour presented a segment on the artist Jacob Lawrence. In this segment, while referring to some people who had exhibited notable courage, Charlayne Hunter-Gault used the words

In recent years, women in the U.S.A. have equaled or surpassed men as aggressive advocates of bearing arms. One such woman, speaking of her concealed handgun,<sup>3</sup> said, "I think it's a great equalizer between a 110 pound woman and a 220 pound man." It turns out that a handgun is a great equalizer for a 110 pound person of either sex. However, groups like Safety for Women and Responsible Motherhood (SWARM)<sup>4</sup> aren't advocating armed citizens. They're advocating armed women.

In Sao Paulo, Brazil, there's a police station that, as a matter of official policy, is staffed exclusively by female cops. Their only agenda is to neutralize men who are accused (by women) of mistreating women.<sup>5</sup> Such a uniformed force of armed women on an anti-male crusade is a pretty good definition of *feminazis*. Women can also have special protection under the law closer to home. Clinton recently opened within the U.S. Department of Justice a new office dedicated entirely to the prosecution of so-called crimes against women. The U.S. government is also providing \$26 million in grants to the states for the same purpose.<sup>6</sup>

These are all straws blowing before the storm. Feminists, and particularly feminazis, have been accumulating power over men for decades now. As I watch the news, I see that around the world they're intent upon a coercive and increasingly militant policy of domination, justified all the while by their hypocritical rhetoric of sexual equality. While they loudly whine about their plight, they gradually ease into control of the means of control.

Today, the feminists have moved so politically far from men that they have become, in effect, a distinct ethnic group. Today, there are ethnic conflicts raging throughout the world, some of them driven by grievances of no greater consequence than those presently being provided by the feminists. Men can be pushed only so far; we've taken up arms before in lesser causes than this. Nobody can infallibly predict the future, but I expect the conflict will escalate. My best guess is that, in the not too distant future, the battle of the sexes will become very real. ♂

<sup>3</sup> NBC Nightly News with Tom Brokaw; Monday, March 20, 1995

<sup>4</sup> How cute: locusts, lemmings, and now women.

<sup>5</sup> ITN World News; Wednesday, March 8, 1995

<sup>6</sup> MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour; Tuesday, March 21, 1995

"heros and sheros". This is typical feminist lunacy about masculine pronouns, but the *he* in *hero* isn't even a pronoun. Besides that, there's already a feminine form of the word: heroine.

Oh well, we're lucky she didn't say *personroes*. ♂

# A Frontiersman Review: Feminism 1995

## May

**Victim Factory** Today there are at least 700 women's advocacy groups making hay from allegations of violence against women. Many of them claim that as many as 4,000,000 women per year are "battered" by their husbands or boyfriends.<sup>1</sup> However, the definition of such battering often includes minor things like "a push or a shove", greatly inflating the statistics.<sup>2</sup> Some advocates even go so far as to include "emotional or psychological battering" in their data.<sup>3</sup>

Feminists continue to advocate sexual equality. If that's what they really want, then they must behave

<sup>1</sup> ABC World News Sunday with Carol Simpson, KNTV, San Jose, CA, April 9, 1995, *The Nation*, Lisa Stark reporting

<sup>2</sup> *ibid*, Doug Besharov, American Enterprise Institute

<sup>3</sup> *ibid*, Rita Smith, Coalition Against Domestic Violence

according to the same criteria that they force upon men. In that case, the same fantastic understanding of battering that is being used by women's advocacy groups can be used by men as well. Men can then point to the bitching, nagging, whining, and complaining to which they are customarily subjected by their female companions and claim, as credibly as do the women, to be the victims of "emotional or psychological battering". The alternative, of course, is that different rules apply to women who therefore aren't equal to men.

In fact, sexual equality is a stupid idea. Men and women aren't equal. Requiring by law that they are makes exactly as much sense as requiring by law that  $\pi = 3.00$ .

Who knows? Maybe feminists believe that, too. ♂

## June

### Personals

(for our amusement by Dante DeAmicis)

SWM, 35, Into self defense, target shooting, hunting, home security. Looking for overeducated liberal who will marry me for my house then constantly berate me for being a "gun nut". Help me keep my bad attitude.

SWM, 26, Techie Type. Would like to merge files with serious woman hacker (either of them). Must be able to talk for hours comparing and critiquing all major commercial software programs. Respond to my on-line address, leave your on-line address.

SWM, 32, Professional. Want to meet emotionally unstable woman who wants to do nothing except have kids and get fat watching soap operas while I bust my ass 60 hours per week. Then after taking me to the cleaners in a divorce, force me to subsidize her anti-daddy thought control to my kids. April fool, I'm getting a "mail order" bride.

SBM, 20, Body builder. I want a widowed white woman whose husband saved lots of money while working himself into an early grave. Now its time to party party party.

DWF, 29, (more or less) Interested in travel, dining out, and the finer things in life. Call if you're financially secure professional, ambitious, successful, generous, and so on, and want commitment and kids. The rest of you losers don't bother.

### Buck Hunter Shoots Off His Mouth

Dear Buck

My girlfriend is so sexually demanding that I can't keep up with her. What can I do to reduce her interest a little?

—Worn Out

Dear Worn Out  
Marry her.

## July

### Buck Hunter Shoots Off His Mouth

Dear Buck

No matter where I go, men just keep asking me for dates. How can I get them to stop?

—Traveling Saleswoman

Dear Traveling Saleswoman

Go to a theatre costume shop, get yourself a big handlebar mustache, and wear it.

## August

MEN!  
Beware of  
the REAL  
sexual  
predators.



Age  
doesn't  
matter  
anymore.  
Today,  
they can all  
be jail-bait.

### No Such Thing As A Free....

by Sam Aurelius Milam III

Whenever a woman you see

Alluring to any degree

Remember this verse

And hold on to your purse

'Cause nothing she offers is free.

# *A Frontiersman Review: Feminism 1995*

---

## *August (continued)*

### Affirmative Distraction

by Sam Aurelius Milam III

A typical demand of the feminists has been that job applicants ought to be judged **only** on the basis of ability, and without any objection to the gender of the applicant. This suggests a regrettable naivety on the part of the feminists. Ability isn't the only relevant consideration. A job applicant should also be judged on the basis of her likely effect. That is, it isn't enough to know that a woman can do the job. So can a man. A hiring manager should also consider whether or not the presence of a woman in the group will be disruptive.

Most men recognize instantly that women in their department will be disruptive. Women pretend that it isn't so. Predictably, when they force their way into a male environment the first thing women do is distract the men. This doesn't improve productivity. To their great surprise, the women are then dissatisfied with the behavior and attitudes of the men. This, of course, is a surprise only to the women. They immediately begin to complain, further disrupting the situation.

Today, U.S. businesses are spending millions of dollars as a direct consequence of women's complaints. They wouldn't have to spend this money at all, were it not for the women. For example, mandated sensitivity and diversity "training" (brainwashing) is entirely a consequence of sexual integration of the workplace, and was never necessary before the women arrived on the scene. Sexual humor and pin-ups in the workplace were not an issue until women began to complain about them. Sexual harassment law suits were unknown before the females defined

themselves as attractive targets. In financial terms, the sexual integration of the workplace has been, and will remain, a net loss. This is because, in general, a woman won't do the job **better** than a man. Therefore, she won't provide any additional **benefit** as a consequence of her gender to offset the additional **costs** that accrue as a consequence of her gender.

I'm not saying that sexually integrated workplaces ought to be prohibited by law, although they're a stupid idea. However, neither should they be required by law. I'm not saying that women should be prevented from seeking jobs. Neither should I be required to work with a woman if I don't want to.<sup>1</sup> The agenda that has dictated universal sexual integration is, at least, a repudiation of the diversity that feminists allegedly pursue. Instead, they must stop dictating employment policies for everyone else and acknowledge that each company should follow the hiring practices that are best suited to its particular circumstances. Some companies can then hire men only. Some can hire women only. Some can hire both. Then each of us can apply for work in the kind of environment he prefers. If, as the feminists never tire of proclaiming, a woman can do twice the work of a man for half the cost, then the marketplace will do its thing and plenty of employers will hire these highly cost-effective women. Those companies will then prevail. Of course, the feminists might be wrong. If the male companies win out, then the ladies can always go back to the kitchen and the bedroom, where I'm sure they'll be welcomed with open arms. ♂

<sup>1</sup> And I'm as entitled to my attitude as any woman is to hers.

## *September*

### Please Hurt Me

by Steve Strayer

I have a female friend who delights in sniping at males. Some time ago, while I was troubleshooting a problem in her car's electrical system to save her from having to pay for the service, she entertained me with the following story.

A talk show host was interviewing two people, one of each variety, who had undergone sex change operations. The ex-male commented that the most painful part of becoming a woman was having the penis amputated. The ex-female responded that the worst part of becoming a man was having half of the brain removed.

My friend, of course, got quite a haw-haw out of her story and my reaction to it. A few minutes later, as I

confirmed proper multimeter readings at various points in her car's electrical system, she asked how men seem to know about such things intuitively. I explained that it's because we don't have all those brains in the way.

After I finished gloating over my timely come-back and her momentary loss for words, I asked myself why so many of us men are so eager to provide freebie help to women, frequently with nothing in return except individual or collective abuse. Is it due to our feeble intelligence or do we simply enjoy being abused? ∞

### **Feminist advocates Family Values**

Next, on  
**Unsolved Mysteries!**

# A Frontiersman Review: Feminism 1995

## September (Continued)

### Give Them an Inch and They Become Rulers

by Sam Aurelius Milam III

The *Bicycle Trader* is a subscription newspaper consisting largely of classified ads. One regular section is called "Women Specific". It advertises events for women only. In the May 1995 issue, the following ad appeared in "Women Specific":

"Women-Only Tour on the North Rim of the Grand Canyon, Aug. 15-19, 1995. Women mountain bike riders of all abilities will enjoy this tour for the amazing singletrack riding through alpine forests and meadows, the intimate group size, and unexpected luxuries along the way. This tour is fully supported and accompanied by three professional female guides...."

The paper doesn't publish a "Men Specific" section.

Meanwhile, Shannon Faulkner forced her admission to the Citadel, a (previously) all-male military academy in Charleston, South Carolina. She could have obtained training elsewhere. Choosing the Citadel enabled her to challenge an all-male institution. Her failure to succeed after admission is delightful, but in no way detracts from the outrage of her unwelcome intrusion.

There are thus two opposite strategies pursued simultaneously by different groups of women. The combination of preserving exclusively female activities while destroying exclusively male activities reduces men to a state of servitude and raises women to a state of supremacy.

The manipulation of men has long been a way for women to seek security. Within the home and family it was O.K. Today, however, manipulation of men for the benefit of women has become a matter of public policy, enforced by feminist courts and legislation. This really shouldn't be a surprise. Over 2000 years ago, Aristotle said, "What difference does it make whether women rule, or the rulers are ruled by women? The result is the same." In 2000 years, they haven't changed. Give them political authority and in a few decades you're living in a maternalistic welfare state. Twenty years ago, I supported feminism. Today, after twenty additional years of dealing with women, I'm convinced that letting them vote was one of the biggest mistakes ever made in the United States. Since women have reaffirmed their old compulsion to control men, I won't rest until feminism is a thing of the past, women are no longer political masters, and men are no longer the political pawns of women ♂

**Female Taxonomy** — I'm sometimes accused of putting all women in the same group. Actually, there are probably four groups.

- Women like the ones in the bicycle tour ad are doing everything possible to promote exclusive rights for women.
- Women like Shannon Faulkner are doing everything possible to deprive men any exclusive rights at all.
- Members of the third group claim that they don't like the feminists, yet they're entirely happy to benefit from feminist "gains". They voluntarily attend classes at schools which are required by feminist legislation to accept female students, and which otherwise would not do so. They voluntarily invoke legislation established by the feminists to oppose so-called sexual harassment. They expect to reap the fruit of feminist ideals in their marriages. They don't actively promote feminist doctrine, but their eagerness to benefit from it constitutes a tacit and hypocritical approval of the feminists.
- I'm not sure the fourth group exists. However, I can think of a few women who don't seem to fit the other groups. I'm not sure, but maybe there's a group of women who really do oppose the feminists, and who try not to benefit from feminist "gains". If the group exists, it's quite small and not politically effective.

—Sam

### Sesame Suite

Bernie: Hey, Burt!  
 Burt: Yah, what!  
 Bernie: Did you hear that the feminists are gonna start their own space program?

Burt: Why?  
 Bernie: They wanna be the first to land a woman on the sun!  
 Burt: But Bernie, what are they gonna do about all that heat?

Bernie: No problem, Burt! They're gonna land her at night!  
 Burt: Aaaaaaaahh, Bernieeee!  
*Sesame Suite has been brought to you by the National Association of Sexual Agitators (NASA), by the letter F, and by the number 0.*

## October

**Animal Facts:** Man is the only animal species whose females don't automatically know their proper place and function.

### Sesame Suite

Beg Bird: Hi there, Mr Looper!  
 Mr. Whooper: It's Whooper, Beg Bird, not Looper! Whooper!  
 Beg Bird: Sorry. Hey, Mr. Whooper! Did you really catch a feminist trying to steal pickles?  
 Mr. Whooper: Sure did. She was tryin' to take 'em out of the bottle right here at the counter,


while my back was turned.  
 Beg Bird: How did you catch her?  
 Mr. Whooper: She got her head stuck in the jar.

*Sesame Suite has been brought to you by the flavor sour, and by the National Institute of Pickle Producers for Legislative Enactment of Safeguards (NIPPLES).*



Nation in Distress

*A Frontiersman Review:  
 Feminism 1995*



*December*

Woperson's Rights

by Sam Aurelius Milam III

During some recent research, I discovered that the foreman of the Santa Clara County grand jury is a woman. However, a clerk at the courthouse informed me emphatically that this woman isn't a foreman, but a foreperson. You'll never guess the lady's name: Nancy Freeman. That's right. Not Freeperson. Freeman. Yet the syllable *man* in a name has just as much gender significance (that is to say, none) as it has in a title. She didn't change her gender designation from woman to woperson, did she? Alright then. She should either change her name to Freeperson and her gender designation to woperson or quit yapping about nonsense and try instead to be a good foreman. I can't help but wonder if there's a "stupidity" requirement for being a woman's rights advocate. ♂

Unauthorized Opinion

by Sam Aurelius Milam III

I mentioned to a woman over the telephone recently that I manage to keep my expenses low because I don't have to pay for either a woman or a car. Those two expenses, I commented, are a man's biggest ones. She replied that I would feel differently if I had a working wife. Having had two of them, I told her that even a working wife is a net loss because she will spend more than she earns. Well, the woman replied, you just picked the wrong women. Such a response is no surprise. Rather than try to refute my position with facts (which might be possible) she tried to impugn my credibility with an accusation. Her assumption is that my experience is valid **only** if it leads me to a favorable conclusion about women. Any other conclusion is forbidden and is therefore viewed as proof that my observations are flawed. Worse yet, there is no discredit to those "wrong" women for having something wrong with them. That's entirely acceptable. The problem is mine for picking the wrong women.

Since this woman was reinforcing my unfavorable opinion about women, I decided that she might possibly be one of those "wrong" ones that she had accused me of picking. I didn't want to lower her opinion of me by talking to the wrong kind of woman, so I got off the phone as quickly as courtesy would allow. ♂

Sesame Suite

*We take you now to Hermit the Frog, with another fast breaking news story on Sesame Suite News!*

Hermit: This is Hermit the Frog, with Sesame Suite News, and today I'm in Washington DC., where, a spokesman for the feminist organization SWEETIES has just announced —  
 Miss Priggy: Oooh, Heeerrrrmm-miie...  
 Hermit: (sotto voce)  
 Not now, Priggy. I'm trying to do the news.  
 Miss Priggy: But Hermie, I just have

to tell you about Mr. Whooper's new secretary.  
 Priggy: Hermie, she's a feminist!  
 Hermit: What — oh, what the hay? Come on, Priggy, get in front of the camera. Now, how can you tell she's a feminist.  
 Miss Priggy: By the correction fluid on the computer monitor.  
 Hermit: Ah. Well, that's all the time we have today. Be sure to tune in next time, for Sesame Suite News!  
 Are we off the air now?

Good. Priggy, you've got to stop interrupting, and listen, not all fem-

*Sesame Suite has been brought to you by the flavor sweet, by the color opaque, and by Strident Women Evangelists for Empowerment by Trickery, Intimidation, Extortion, and Seduction (SWEETIES).*

Buck Hunter Shoots Off His Mouth

Dear Buck  
 Nothing we've tried so far has worked. What can we do to end sexual harassment in our office? —Frustrated Manager  
 Dear Frustrated Manager  
 Don't hire women.