

WHITE MEN AS THE NEW VICTIMS: REVERSE DISCRIMINATION CASES AND THE MEN'S RIGHTS MOVEMENT¹

Bethany M. Coston* & Michael Kimmel**

Roy Den Hollander doesn't exactly look like a revolutionary. He's a reasonably good-looking guy—nattily dressed, sort of preppy-corporate, Ivy-League educated, former New York corporate lawyer. He should be comfortable in his late middle age, approaching retirement at the top end of the Top One Percent. And yet Den Hollander is “incensed,” furious at the ways that men like him—upper-class white men—are the victims of a massive amount of discrimination . . . as white men. In this self-styled revolutionary, the legions of oppressed men have found their champion.²

Men's oppression is not an accident, Den Hollander says. It's the result of a concerted campaign against men by furious feminists and their allies, a sort of crazed feminist version of “Girls Gone Wild”—more like “Feminazis Gone Furious.” And they're winning. Roy Den Hollander casts himself as one of the few who is standing up to them, or at least trying to. He suffers, he says, from PMS: “persecuted male syndrome.”³ As he told a reporter, “the Feminazis have infiltrated institutions, and there's been a transfer of rights from guys to girls.”⁴

A corporate attorney by training, Den Hollander has refashioned himself a civil rights champion, fighting in court for the rights of men that are being trampled by the feminist juggernaut. (And this rebranding has brought him lots of fame—he's been profiled in heaps of media, including a very funny and self-mocking takedown on the Colbert Report⁵—even if he's had no legal success at all.)

Over the past decade, Den Hollander has filed three different lawsuits, each of which has had multiple iterations as appeals. Taken together, they form a trinity of issues raised by the angry middle-class white guys who march under the banner for Men's Rights.⁶ In his own words,

¹ Some of this material is taken from a chapter about the men's rights movement in Kimmel's forthcoming book, *ANGRY WHITE MEN* (forthcoming, New York: Nation Books, 2013).

* Sociology Department, SUNY at Stony Brook University.

** Distinguished Professor, Sociology Department, SUNY at Stony Brook University.

² E-mail from Roy Den Hollander, Men's Rights Activist to Michael Kimmel, Professor of Sociology, Stony Brook University (Sept. 6, 2011) (on file with author).

³ *The Colbert Report: Difference Makers—Roy Den Hollander* (Comedy Central television broadcast Mar. 31, 2011), available at <http://www.colbertnation.com/the-colbert-report-videos/379605/march-31-2011/difference-makers—roy-den-hollander>.

⁴ Lauren Collins, *On the Docket: Hey, La-a-a-dies!*, *NEW YORKER*, Aug. 6, 2007, at 22.

⁵ *The Colbert Report: Difference Makers—Roy Den Hollander*, *supra* note 3.

⁶ *Id.*

This trilogy of lawsuits for men's rights makes clear that there are now two classes of people in America: one of princesses—females, and the other of servants—males. Governments, from local to state to federal, treat men as second class citizens whose rights can be violated with impunity when it benefits females. Need I say the courts are prejudiced, need I say they are useless, need I say it's time for men to take the law into their hands?⁷

(We'll return to these legal cases below.)

I. WHAT IS "MEN'S RIGHTS" AND WHERE DID IT COME FROM?

Given Roy Den Hollander's characterization of feminism as vicious man-hating ideology—a sentiment shared by many in the Men's Rights movement—it might come as a bit of surprise to know that the seeds of the contemporary Men's Rights movement were initially planted in the same soil from which feminism sprouted. When what became known as the "second wave" of feminism began to emerge in the 1960s, two distinct streams of political outrage fed it.⁸ First were those women who were mobilized initially by Betty Friedan's scathing critique of domestic life in *The Feminine Mystique*,⁹ a furious wake-up call from the somnambulant 1950s that had suppressed the ambitions of a generation of post-war women, swathing them in a mid-century cult of domesticity. These disappointed women were met by a second, younger group, some their daughters, who had already been politically mobilized into the Civil Rights and anti-war movements and whose experiences there were the political equivalent of the unhappy housewives—not taken seriously by men, being asked to suppress their ambitions in order to further the cause (and serve the men who ran the movements). Both groups agreed with an emerging critique of traditional notions of femininity; understanding those ideas submerged women's abilities and drowned their ambitions.

That critique of what became known as the "female sex role," the traditional ideology of femininity, resonated for some men, who took the feminist call for women's liberation as an opportunity to do some liberating of their own. As such, "men's liberation" was born in a parallel critique of the male sex role. If women were imprisoned in the home, all housework and domestic drudgery, then men were exiled *from* the home, turned into soulless robotic workers, in harness to a masculine mystique, so that their only capacity for nurturing was through their wallets. Their main argument? The separation of spheres sucked for men too: women were demoted to the realm of feeling; men were relegated to a public persona where their success depended on the suppression of emotion.

Men's liberation posited a set of parallelisms. If men had, as writer Sam Keen would put it, "the feeling of power," then women had, "the power of feeling."¹⁰ These were thought to be equivalent; women and men were equally

⁷ Roy Den Hollander, *Trilogy of Cases*, ROY DEN HOLLANDER, <http://www.roydenhollander.com> (last visited Feb. 17, 2013) [hereinafter Hollander, *Trilogy of Cases*].

⁸ For more about the origins and development of the Men's Rights movement in the 1970s, see MICHAEL S. KIMMEL, *MANHOOD IN AMERICA: A CULTURAL HISTORY* 185 (2d ed. 2006).

⁹ BETTY FRIEDAN, *THE FEMININE MYSTIQUE* (1963).

¹⁰ SAM KEEN, *FIRE IN THE BELLY: ON BEING A MAN* 209 (1991).

oppressed by traditional sex roles. And the early men's liberationists claimed to be inspired by women's emancipatory efforts.¹¹ But then feminists moved from a critique of those sex roles—the abstract ideological constructions—to the actual behaviors of men, who acted in the name of those antiquated roles. That is, women began to critique masculinity—by making rape, sexual harassment, and domestic violence a part of the gender dynamics that were under scrutiny—and the men's libbers departed.

And when they left, the Men's Liberationists stuck with the analysis of roles but shifted their focus to those institutional arenas in which men were, they argued, the victims of a new form of discrimination—gender discrimination against men. Initially, these included the military, where only eighteen-year-old males, and not females, were required to register for military service, an indication that men were considered “expendable.” Traditional notions of masculinity were as toxic and outdated to Men's Rights guys as traditional notions of femininity were to feminist women.

For their part, those early feminist women managed to figure out how to be angry about men's behaviors, furious about their own subordinate position, incendiary about institutional discrimination in the workplace, and yet retain their compassion for the not-quite-comparable, if parallel, experience of men. Here's Betty Friedan in 1973, in the epilogue to the 10th anniversary republication of *The Feminine Mystique*:

How could we ever really know or love each other as long as we played those roles that kept us from knowing or being ourselves? Weren't men as well as women still locked in lonely isolation, alienation, no matter how many sexual acrobatics they put their bodies through? Weren't men dying too young, suppressing fears and tears and their own tenderness? It seemed to me that men weren't really the enemy—they were fellow victims, suffering from an outmoded masculine mystique that made them feel unnecessarily inadequate when there were no bears to kill.¹²

But by the 1980s, the dissatisfaction with the “male sex role,” as they called it, had reached a crossroads. Yes, everyone agreed, men were unhappy; their lives impoverished by shallow friendships; fraught relationships with wives, partners, girlfriends, and potential girlfriends; and strained or nonexistent relationships with their children. The question was *why* men were so unhappy. What *caused* the male malaise? The way different groups of men resolved this question provided the origins of the various men's “movements” currently on offer.

There were essentially two answers, though one had two parts.

For a large number of men, there was a sustained critique of traditional notions of masculinity; the John Wayne model, a sort of “male mystique” that paralleled the equally false “happy housewife” heroine, was ill-suited for today's men who wanted emotional sustenance and deeper and more meaningful relationships with their children, their partners, and their friends. And just as countless women had joined the Women's Movement in an effort to expand their lives beyond the feminine mystique, many men trooped off to wilderness retreats, stadium rallies, and woodsy campfires to explore a deeper, more reso-

¹¹ KIMMEL, *supra* note 8, at 185.

¹² FRIEDAN, *supra* note 9, at 521.

nant masculinity. What became known as the mythopoetic men's movement, often attributed to the work of poets like Robert Bly¹³ and Michael Meade¹⁴ and writers like Sam Keen¹⁵ (all of whom enjoyed critical accolades or best sellers in the early 1990s),¹⁶ sought to enable men to search for some "deep" or "essential" masculinity, which, the movement's leaders claimed, had been diluted and polluted both by life in mass consumer society. Through spiritual retreats, group therapies, and encounters with nature, middle-class white men could return to something primal, heroic, and deeply resonant about themselves as men. Mythopoets were largely gender separatists, neither feminist nor anti-feminist in their politics; rather, they said, they were "masculinists"—of men, by men, and for men.¹⁷ And, they claimed, rightly as it turned out, that their efforts to enable men to experience that depth would only redound well to the women in their lives: men would be more nurturing, more emotionally responsive, and more reliable as men.

Another group saw in feminism not only the critique of traditional femininity but also of traditional masculinity. Politically, they agreed with Friedan that men were "fellow victims." Social psychologist Joseph Pleck, for example, offered a scathing empirical critique of the male sex role, revealing its internal contradictions and unrealizable pretensions.¹⁸ To these pro-feminist men, women's demands to enter the labor force meant that men needn't stake their identity solely in the workplace success. Women's efforts to balance work and family life enabled men to reconnect to their children and their partners. Feminist women's insistence on an end to men's violence, battery, sexual assault, and other indicators of men's contempt and rage enabled men to begin to unravel the tightly wound skein of manhood and violence and the ways that perceived threats to such elusive ideas, such as honor or manhood, itself provoked violent responses as compensation. Feminist women sought solidarity with other women in a collective struggle, inspiring men to break down their own barriers that kept them feeling isolated and alone. It turned out that for these "pro-feminist" men, the feminist vision of full equality and gender justice might not be such a bad thing for men—indeed, it might be the very political theory we'd been searching for. Pro-feminist men want to do the right thing; we

¹³ See generally ROBERT BLY, *IRON JOHN: A BOOK ABOUT MEN* (Vintage Books ed. 1992).

¹⁴ See generally MICHAEL MEADE, *MEN AND THE WATER OF LIFE: INITIATION AND THE TEMPERING OF MEN* (1993).

¹⁵ See generally KEEN, *supra* note 10.

¹⁶ See, e.g., Robert Bly, POETRY FOUNDATION, <http://www.poetryfoundation.org/bio/robert-bly> (last visited Feb. 17, 2013); SAM KEEN: AN INQUIRING PHILOSOPHER (May 21, 2011) <http://samkeen.com/products-page/books/>.

¹⁷ Cathy Young, *Man Troubles: Making Sense of the Men's Movement*, REASON (July 1994), <http://reason.com/archives/1994/07/01/man-troubles> ("Masculism (mas'kye liz*'em), n. 1. the belief that equality between the sexes requires the recognition and redress of prejudice and discrimination against men as well as women. 2. the movement organized around this belief.") (emphasis omitted). We use the term differently here than the standard dictionary: "masculinist. noun: an advocate of male superiority or dominance." MERRIAM-WEBSTER, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/masculinist> (last visited Feb. 17, 2013) (emphasis added). We use it to refer to movements and groups that promised to retrieve the "deep masculine"—a sense of male power and resonance that was compatible, proponents believed, with gender equality.

¹⁸ JOSEPH H. PLECK, *THE MYTH OF MASCULINITY* 158–60 (1981).

find ourselves grounded in more solid relationships with our friends, our children, and our partners and wives.

And, finally, there were the men who reveled in the parts of women's liberation that benefited them and blamed women's liberation for the rest. Politically, many of them thought the only good thing about feminism was that it gave women permission to "put out" as a way to express their liberation. The other outcomes of feminism? Damning men in all other aspects of daily life. They blamed women for their given predicaments, whatever they may be, and could not figure out if they were "liberated men" on the hunt for equally liberated women, or more traditional men, looking for a more traditional woman—albeit one who puts out at the drop of a hat.

The Men's Rights movement's departure from the Men's Liberation movement of the 1970s was because of what they observed as the cause of men's problems. Somewhere along the way, the critique of the oppressive male sex role, and the desire to free men from it, morphed into a celebration of all things masculine, and a near-infatuation with the traditional masculine role itself. Men didn't need liberating from traditional masculinity anymore; now they needed liberating from those who would liberate them! Traditional masculinity was no longer the problem; now its restoration was championed as the solution.

The problem was, in a word, women—or, more accurately, women's equality, women's empowerment, and specifically, feminism. Feminism, they argued, was both a political strategy to take power and an individual lifestyle that despised and denigrated men. It wasn't traditional notions of masculinity that made men so miserable, it was women. Feminism was a hateful ideology; feminists were castrating bitches. (To them, the iconic feminist was more Lorena Bobbitt than Gloria Steinem—this despite the fact that neither Bobbitt nor her followers thought of themselves as feminists at all.) But here, also, that contradiction seemed to prevent the movement from ever articulating any coherent policy ideas. Feminism, they argue, has turned normal healthy feminine women into a bunch of gold-digging consumerist harridans:

[Unlike Chinese women, for American women] every dollar earned is an opportunity for her to enjoy herself. The fruit of her labor is squandered on eating out, going to a spa, getting her hair done, working out at a gym, dancing or gambling. She goes into marriage without any sense of responsibility or duty to anyone but herself, and our society, based as it is on consumerism, celebrates and encourages this attitude. It is as though the American economy relies upon the production of lousy daughters and wives, good for nothing but selfish expenditures and entirely unable and unwilling to see any purpose to life beyond self-indulgence.¹⁹

So Men's Rights activists hate those traditional women because they enslave men, gluing them to gold-digger trophy wives, who spend, preen, and otherwise ignore their hardworking husbands. No, wait. Men's Rights activists love traditional women who won't compete outside the home for scarce jobs that should go to men anyway. See the confusion?

And Men's Rights guys are equally perplexed about their position on masculinity. Some want to embrace traditional masculinity; Alan Barron's 2001, A

¹⁹ Welmer, *The White Elephant*, 2 MRM!, JAN. 14, 2010, at 11, available at <http://www.maskedwriter.com/MRissue2.pdf>.

Men's Manifesto, urges men to “vigorously defend the concept that male domination/patriarchy is part of the natural order of things.”²⁰ Others want to reject the old John Wayne image entirely, casting it as a recipe for an emotionless automaton who slashes and burns his way through life like *The Terminator*, competitive and unfeeling, until he dies an early death of some stress-related disease without ever knowing his family—or himself.

The real trouble is that Men's Rights guys don't know if they want to be restored patriarchs or liberated men. That is, they don't know if they would prefer to live in 1950 or 2050. As a result, men's rights websites and pamphlets are clogged with howls of anguish, confusion, and pain. And this anguish, confusion, and pain, we believe, is real, and well grounded. Real, here, is not to be confused with true. These men do feel a lot, but their analysis of the cause of those feelings is decidedly off—especially when we see that the howls of pain have been transformed into rage and the Men's Rights movement has become a movement of re-appropriating power at all costs, no matter who gets in the way.

II. ROY DEN HOLLANDER AND THE CASE(S) FOR REVERSE DISCRIMINATION

So enters Roy Den Hollander, that unlikely revolutionary we mentioned before and his trilogy of men's rights cases. While Den Hollander's lawsuits may not have found sympathetic judicial ears based as they were on the shakiest of legal and empirical foundations, they do provide a triumvirate of issues that capture what has the Men's Rights activists so incensed—the putative institutional arenas of discrimination against men: the “special treatment” of women, the vulnerability and victimization of men, especially around violence and in family life, and the dramatic tilt towards women in education.

First, Den Hollander went after bars in New York City that offered Ladies' Night. You know, those promotional come-ons that offer women reduced or free admission to clubs, or half-price or free alcoholic drinks, but require that men pay admission and full drink prices. Bars and clubs offer ladies nights, of course, to entice men to come to the club; men are more likely to show up, and more likely to buy women drinks, if there are more women there—that is, if the odds tilt in the guys' favor. So the Ladies' Night framing is really a deliberate misnomer—by attracting a lot of ladies, the guys will spend lavishly, in hopes, actually, that it will be *their* night.

Alas, Ladies Nights obviously discriminate against men, Den Hollander argued. They're supposed to; it's good for business. So, in 2007, he filed a federal lawsuit against six New York City bars and clubs (hoping they'd come to constitute a class for a class action suit), claiming they violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.²¹ According to the suit, these bars “allow females in free up to a certain time but charge men for admission

²⁰ Alan J. Barron, *A Men's Manifesto*, THE MEMUCAN INST. OF MEN'S STUD. (MIOMS) (Aug. 14, 2003, 1:34 AM), <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/aum/message/9628>.

²¹ Complaint at 1, *Hollander v. Copacabana Nightclub*, No. 07 CV 5873 (S.D.N.Y. June 12, 2007).

until that same time, or allow ladies in free over a longer time span than men.”²²

Nearly forty years after women successfully sued McSorley’s Old Ale House²³ for the right to drink alongside men (a suit that is cited as some sort of anti-discrimination precedent here), we question, is this what civil rights law has come to—infantile parodies of serious civil rights cases? When asked by a reporter what would happen if he were to win, Den Hollander replies:

What I think will happen . . . is that clubs will reduce the price for guys and increase it for girls. Every guy will have ten or fifteen more dollars in his pocket, which the girls will then manipulate into getting more drinks out of him. If they drink more, they’ll have more fun, and so will us guys. And then when she wakes up in the morning she’ll be able to do what she always does: blame the man.²⁴

Either way, according to Den Hollander, women win. Den Hollander needn’t have worried. He lost—it was a “lady judge” of course (his terminology, not ours).²⁵

The next year, he went after the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA),²⁶ or, as he likes to call it, the “Female Fraud Act.”²⁷ VAWA is a favorite target for the Men’s Rights movement, since they see its specific scrutiny of violence against women as both discriminatory towards men, as well as failing to acknowledge, let alone minister to, the pervasive violence perpetrated by women against men. Den Hollander’s logic is a bit more tortured—and more torturedly personal.

Den Hollander’s “story” is recounted by him in the third person:

The Acting Manager of Kroll Associates’s [sic] Russian operation marries a Russian girl and brings her to the U.S. He discovers she’s a Russian mafia prostitute, former mistress to a Chechen warlord, and that she secretly fed him drugs in order to wheedle him into marriage. He tells the tramp to get lost, but she and her immigration lawyer refuse because they want him to commit perjury by sponsoring her for permanent residency. The guy refuses, so they *apparently* win or are winning her permanent residency by falsely claiming the guy “battered” her and subjected her to “extreme cruelty” or an “overall pattern of violence.”²⁸

To Den Hollander, then, VAWA provides legal cover for scheming, conniving, non-U.S. women to trap native-born American men. If they have been the victims of violence, VAWA “gives alien females who married American guys a fraudulent track to permanent residency and U.S. citizenship.”²⁹ All she has to do is claim her husband battered her, or subjected her to “an overall

²² *Id.* at 2.

²³ See *Seidenberg v. McSorleys’ Old Ale House, Inc.*, 317 F. Supp. 593 (S.D.N.Y. 1970).

²⁴ Collins, *supra* note 4, at 22, 23.

²⁵ Hollander, *Trilogy of Cases*, *supra* note 7.

²⁶ Violence Against Women Act, Pub. L. No. 103-322, §§ 40001–40703, 108 Stat. 1902 (1994).

²⁷ Hollander, *Trilogy of Cases*, *supra* note 7.

²⁸ Roy Den Hollander, *Synopsis VAWA Complaint*, ROY DEN HOLLANDER 1–2, <http://www.roydenhollander.com/vawadc/SynopsisVAWAComplaint.pdf> (last visited Feb. 17, 2013) [hereinafter Hollander, *Synopsis VAWA Complaint*]; see also Roy Den Hollander, *Roy’s Resume*, ROY DEN HOLLANDER, <http://www.roydenhollander.com/royresume.htm> (last visited Feb. 17, 2013).

²⁹ Hollander, *Synopsis VAWA Complaint*, *supra* note 28, at 1.

pattern of violence.” So, he argues, the reason that the Feminist establishment pushed for this law is to “intimidate American men into looking for wives at home,” though it isn’t entirely clear why feminists would promote this.

Again, the judge (a man this time) tossed out the case.³⁰

Most recently, in 2009, Den Hollander brought a suit against Columbia University.³¹ Essentially, this case centers on the fact that Columbia has a Women’s and Gender Studies (WGS) program³²—a pretty good one, for that matter. But it doesn’t have a Men’s Studies Program, so, Den Hollander argues, that’s de facto gender discrimination right there—failing to provide comparable services based on gender. What’s more, the WGS program at Columbia promotes “feminism,” which is, Den Hollander alleges, a religion—“belief system that advocates an accident of nature, born a girl, makes females superior to men in all matters under the sun.”³³ Thus, Columbia University is violating not only the Fourteenth Amendment, but also the First Amendment, guaranteeing the separation of Church and State. So men are doubly injured—by their absence from the Women’s Studies curriculum and by the unfettered spread of Feminism, the religion.

The judge—again, a man—disagreed, and called Den Hollander’s case “absurd.”³⁴ “Feminism is no more a religion than physics,” Judge Lewis Kaplan wrote,³⁵ obviously ignorant of all those creationists and Biblical literalists who believe that physics *is* also a religion. All subsequent appeals were denied, though Den Hollander is convinced that the judge ruled “with an arrogance of power, ignorance of the law, and fear of the feminists.”³⁶

Roy Den Hollander’s men’s rights legal trilogy makes for fascinating reading on his website. While not exactly Tolstoyan in the arc of its emotional compass, it captures both the spirit and the substance of the Men’s Rights movement, a loose but loud collection of Internet blogs sites, policy-oriented organizations, and a legion of middle-class white men who feel badly done by individual women or by policies they believe have cheated them. Men don’t generally do well with expressing pain; it’s more readily channeled into rage. The Men’s Rights movement channels Peter Finch’s impotent outburst in *Network*: They’re mad as hell, and they’re not gonna take it anymore!³⁷

His cases perfectly illustrate their positions that men are the victims of reverse discrimination in every political, economic and social arena; that femi-

³⁰ Hollander v. Chertoff, No. 08-CV-01521-WHP, 2008 WL 5191103, at *1, *4 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 3, 2008).

³¹ First Amended Class Action Complaint at 1, Hollander v. Inst. for Research on Women & Gend. at Columbia Univ., No. 08-CV-7286-LAK-KNF (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 1, 2008).

³² *Id.* at 1–2.

³³ Roy Den Hollander, *Preaching Feminist Religion in Women’s Studies*, ROY DEN HOLLANDER, http://www.roydenhollander.com/articles.htm#Preaching_Feminist_religion_Women%92s_Studies (last visited Feb. 17, 2013).

³⁴ Hollander v. Inst. for Research on Women & Gend. at Columbia Univ., No. 08-CV-7286-LAK, 2009 U.S. Dist. Lexis 131582, at *1, *5 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 23, 2009).

³⁵ *Id.* at *4.

³⁶ Corey Kilgannon, *Court Rejects Men’s Studies Lawsuit*, N.Y. TIMES CITY ROOM BLOG (Apr. 27, 2012, 2:15 PM), <http://cityroom.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/04/27/court-rejects-mens-studies-lawsuit/>.

³⁷ NETWORK (MGM 1976).

nism has been so successful that men are now the second sex; and that men have to stand up for their rights. In doing so, they believe, they strike a blow against the wimpification of American manhood—they get their manhood back by fighting for the rights of men. Who says the personal isn't also political?

But these issues also lay bare several contradictions that lie at the heart of the Men's Rights movement—contradictions so fundamental that it leaves them not just personally confused and perplexed, but politically paralyzed.

The contradictions at the center of the Men's Rights discourse likely stem from the movement's transition from sadness to anger—what came with all of the rage was the need for a target. And starting in the 1990s, the Men's Rights movement got angrier. So angry, in fact, that the Southern Poverty Law Center, which monitors all sorts of “hate groups,” from paramilitary organizations to Klansmen and other neo-Nazi groups, recently started listing Men's Rights groups in its annual survey of hate, citing what one blogger called their “virulent misogyny, spreading of false anti-woman propaganda and applauding and even encouraging acts of domestic terrorism and extreme violence against women and children, up to and including murder.”³⁸

Warren Farrell's 1993 book, *The Myth of Male Power*,³⁹ has become something of a Bible to the Men's Rights followers. While early in his career Farrell seemed to ally with feminism—he convened NOW's Task Force on the Masculine Mystique and was thrice elected to the board of New York's chapter of NOW⁴⁰—and he believed that men could benefit from women's liberation, saying that if she could refuse to be a “sex object” he could just as easily refuse to be a “success object”⁴¹—some of the inversions in his book are worth noting, because they anticipate many of the more hyperbolic claims made by the Men's Rights activists (MRAs) today. According to Farrell, men's power is, well, a myth. Farrell has explained that power is not earning money that someone else can spend and dying earlier so they can get the benefits.⁴²

Indeed, it would seem that while white men were being cast as the oppressors, some malicious, conspiratorial, patriarchal, ruling class, normal, everyday, middle-class white guys didn't feel all that power trickling down to them. When informed by some earnest Gender Studies type of the amount of “privi-

³⁸ Radfem News Service, *Southern Poverty Law Center Names Men's Rights Activists (MRAS) as Hate Group*, RADFEM WORLD NEWS (Mar. 9, 2012), <http://radfemworldnews.wordpress.com/2012/03/09/southern-poverty-law-center-names-mens-rights-activists-mras-as-hate-group/>.

³⁹ See, e.g., WARREN FARRELL, *THE MYTH OF MALE POWER: WHY MEN ARE THE DISPOSABLE SEX* (1993) [hereinafter FARRELL, *MALE POWER*].

⁴⁰ Ilene Barth, *Now It's the Men Who Want Liberation!*, PARADE, Apr. 2, 1972, at 6; see also *Biography of Warren Farrell*, DR. WARREN FARRELL, <http://www.warrenfarrell.org/Links/index.html> (last visited Feb. 18, 2013).

⁴¹ See WARREN FARRELL, *THE LIBERATED MAN* 46–51 (1974); see also Lee Powell, *When Women Fight for Equality, Says Warren Farrell, Fairness to Men May Be One of the Casualties*, PEOPLE, June 15, 1987, at 49.

⁴² FARRELL, *MALE POWER*, *supra* note 39, at 50 (“The location of a man's work disconnected him from the people he loved, thus depriving his life of meaning . . . creating little deaths every day. And if he succeeded in all this, he became a male machine; if he failed, he suffered humiliation. Either way, the more he saved [his wife], the sooner he died compared to her, leaving what he made to her and the children to spend. In these ways, successful men freed women but forgot to free themselves.”).

lege” or power they have, white men look puzzled. “What are you talking about?” they’ll say. “I have no power! My wife bosses me around, my kids boss me around, my boss bosses me around. I’m completely powerless!”

To the MRAs, the *real* victims in American society were men, and so they built organizations around men’s anxieties and anger at feminism: groups like the Coalition for Free Men, The False Rape Society, MensActivism, A Voice for Men, and The Spearhead.

These groups proclaimed their commitment to equality and to ending sexism⁴³—which was why they were compelled to fight against feminism. For while feminism actually gave women *more* freedom than men enjoyed, men were still responsible for initiating sexual relationships, for fighting in wars, and for paying alimony and child support. Feminism, they argued, was the most insidious and vexing form of sexism going today. Feminist women were “would be castrators with a knee-jerk, obsessive aversion to anything male,” wrote Richard Doyle, an administrator of the Men’s Rights Association, in his book *The Rape of the Male*.⁴⁴ Fred Hayward, the founder of MR, Inc., claimed that men were the most common victims of violence, rape, abuse, and battery and that women are “*privileged* because they are more frequently *allowed* to raise children, while men are being *oppressed* by denial of access to children”—and it was women who controlled this situation.⁴⁵ Another advised men who felt powerless in the face of divorce-court proceedings to “fight dirty and win” by exploiting their wives’ vulnerabilities.⁴⁶

They may not currently feel powerful, but they feel *entitled* to feel powerful. It’s this aggrieved entitlement that animates the Men’s Rights movement. They *should* feel powerful. And they don’t.

Politically, this resentment and anger had fueled a new gender gap, the preponderance of middle-class, middle-aged, straight white males who were listening constantly to the Right. Raised to feel “entitled” themselves, they resented any entitlement program that gave anything to anyone else. “If I can’t have what I’m entitled to,” they seemed to say, “then neither can you”—a new twist on the old exclusionary formula employed to retrieve a sense of manhood.

⁴³ EDWARD LEE GAMBILL, *UNEASY MALES: THE AMERICAN MEN’S MOVEMENT 1970–2000* 85 (2005). See *Philosophy*, NATIONAL COALITION FOR MEN, <http://ncfm.org/ncfm-home/philosophy/> (last visited Feb. 18, 2013) (“The main objectives of Free Men are: Promote awareness of how gender based expectations limit men legally, socially and psychologically.”); see also *Father’s/Men’s Rights*, MENSTUFF.ORG, <http://www.menstuff.org/resources/resourcefiles/fathers.html> (last visited Feb. 18, 2013) (“Men’s Rights, Inc. is dedicated to ending sexism in a way that recognizes the social, psychological, physical, legal, and economic problems of men. It seeks to make available to men the wide range of options that are now available to women.”).

⁴⁴ R. F. DOYLE, *THE RAPE OF THE MALE* 118 (1976).

⁴⁵ See Fred Hayward *quoted in* Michael Kimmel, *Has a Man’s World Become a Woman’s Nation?*, in *THE SHRIVER REPORT: A WOMAN’S NATION CHANGES EVERYTHING* 322, 339–40 (Heather Boushey & Ann O’Leary eds., 2009). (citing Marcy Sheiner, *What Do Men Really Want . . . and Why Should We Care?*, EAST BAY EXPRESS, July 10, 1992, at 11); see also ANNA GAVANAS, *FATHERHOOD POLITICS IN THE UNITED STATES: MASCULINITY, SEXUALITY, RACE, AND MARRIAGE* 10–11 (2004); JOCELYN ELISE CROWLEY, *DEFIANT DADS: FATHERS’ RIGHTS ACTIVISTS IN AMERICA* 148 (2008).

⁴⁶ Neal Hirschfeld, *Wimps No Longer, Men Fight for Equality*, CHI. TRIB., Feb. 13, 1985, at C1.

One writer fumed that he “will have none of the nonsense about oppressed and victimized women; no responsibility for the conditions of women, whatever that condition might be; none of the guilt or self-loathing that is traditionally used to keep men functioning in harness.”⁴⁷

Such sentiments about entitlement reveal a curious characteristic of these new legions of angry white men: although they maintain most of the power and control in the world, they still feel like victims. In the bedroom and the boardroom, women’s protests for greater equality led to a flipping of the table, a restacking of the deck—women now have all the power. And apparently this is not only something men are uncomfortable with; it’s a situation that makes them feel utterly powerless.

III. SO WHAT DOES ROY WANT?

Amidst these complaints, and Roy Den Hollander’s formal cases, we’re left to ask ourselves: Is there method to all this madness, some coherent set of policy issues, changes in relationships, and shifts in gender roles that the Men’s Rights movement wants?

The “Good Men Project”—a website that purports to be for such self-described “good men” but shows remarkable sympathy for anti-feminist diatribes—recently conducted a survey of its readers to find out the “Top 10” issues that incite MRA passion.⁴⁸ The top issue was Fathers’ Rights (with twenty percent of the total votes).⁴⁹ This was followed by:

(2) “Feminism”—has “harmed men”;

(3) “Anti-Male Double Standards” like this one—“An adult man has a relationship with a younger teenage girl? He’s a disgusting pedophile. A teenage guy with an adult woman? She’s lauded and called a cougar—it’s considered hot.”

(4) “Removing the Notion that All Men are Potential Rapists/Pedophiles”—reminding the public that rapists are few, and bad, and do not represent the entire male gender;

(5) “Reproductive Rights”—complaints that there is no male pill, or that men have no right to choose. “There are countless options for women, and none for men.”

(6) “Better Treatment of Men Regarding False Accusations”—expanding anonymity for men accused of sexual assault, and insistence that false accusations be prosecuted as a serious crime.

(7) “Making Government Programs Gender-Neutral”—since, MRAs claim, “tremendous amounts of government money goes to women’s aid,” men should have a right to equal amounts.

(8) “Educating Boys”—helping boys improve their achievement and attendance in school.

⁴⁷ Richard Haddad, *Feminism has Little Relevance for Men*, in *TO BE A MAN: IN SEARCH OF THE DEEP MASCULINE* 96, 97 (Keith Thompson ed., 1991).

⁴⁸ Zeta Male, *Top 10 Men’s Rights Issues*, *THE GOOD MEN PROJECT* (Mar. 8, 2011), <http://goodmenproject.com/ethics-values/the-top-10-issues-of-mens-rights/>.

⁴⁹ *Id.*

(9) “Negative Portrayal in the Media”—MRAs are “[t]ired of seeing dumb and deadbeat dads,” “of every man on TV being a sex-obsessed womanizer,” “as incompetent, misogynistic, brutish slobs with few redeeming qualities.”

(10) “The Male Gender Role”—The complaint here is that the traditional male role—honor, chivalry, and the like—“has got to go. No longer should men be expected to be the providers and protectors of society.” Men should be free to express their feelings. “Just because we have penises doesn’t mean we should be forced to abide by additional societal expectations, especially when those lead to an early grave.”⁵⁰

We’ve listed all of their Top 10 because we didn’t want to cherry-pick only the more egregious reversals. Obviously there are several issues with which feminists would agree—negative portrayals of men and women are harmful; sexual predation, especially towards children, is generally a bad thing no matter what gender is doing it; school reforms that pay attention to different learning styles, initially a feminist reform, are obviously good for both girls and boys, to give a few examples.

And several rest on those tired and misplaced reversals—men’s right to choose, the disparate public spending, the problem of false accusations that dissolve when contextualized. Men’s right to choose, of course, needs to be coupled with men’s increased responsibility to caring for children they father and for ensuring that women have access to safe and reliable birth control, for both their sakes.

It’s interesting that discomfort with the “male gender role” came in last, and that it expresses that same contradiction in the Men’s Rights cosmology: men don’t want to be saddled with those traditional expectations of robotic stoicism, but they also are tired of being nice to women, who should be pulling their own weight in the workplace. (When they want to pull their own weight in the workplace, of course, they’re “invading” male territory and they should go back to the home where they belong.)

However, perhaps most revealing is what—or, rather, who—is missing from the Men’s Rights Top 10. Not a word about the especially dismal plight of African American men, or Latino men, or working class men—the types of racial and ethnic discrimination they experience, *as men*, the stereotypes of their masculinity they are forced to endure, all of which deprive them of the “rights” claims by other men.

Nor a word about gay men, and the ways in which they suffer discrimination in employment, housing, or in their ability to marry the person they love, or the terrible violence that gay, bisexual, and transgender men suffer every single day at the hands of *other men* (just who do we think commits virtually every single act of gay bashing? Squirrels?).

Where are the Men’s Rights guys when it comes to “other” men? Men’s Rights is almost entirely a movement of angry, straight, white men. Gay men, Black men, Asian men, Latino men, and other racial and ethnic minority men feel no such sense of entitlement to power that these middle-class white men feel has been unceremoniously and illegitimately snatched from them. That’s

⁵⁰ *Id.*

not to say that in their personal relationships they don't feel entitled to unfettered obedience from their children, subservience from women, and a drive to find their place in the hierarchical pecking order. Many do. They just don't make a federal case out of their sense of entitlement. They don't take it to court or demand legislation. It's personal, not political.

The Men's Rights movement may sound, at times, progressive in their critique of traditional notions of masculinity, but it's actually quite regressive. They seek to return to an era where the playing field was so decidedly tilted in their favor that they felt they got what they were entitled to. But they seek to do so in ways that allow them to express more of their feelings.

What the Men's Rights Movement really wants, then, is a return to men's unchallenged, unquestioned dominance—but more than that, a dominance that each individual man feels he shares. Are there some arenas in which men are disadvantaged—in which it's actually “better” to be a woman? Sure. It's here that the familiar litany of the MRAs makes some sense: men have to register for the draft; women don't.⁵¹ Men are dramatically overrepresented in the most hazardous occupations.⁵² Men are more likely to be denied joint custody, no matter how much time and energy they spend with their children.⁵³

But there is a major difference between being disadvantaged and being discriminated against. The former suggests that there are areas of public policy that still rely on outdated stereotypes; paternalistic policies designed to “protect” helpless, fragile, vulnerable women from the predations of men; and the privations of individual freedom. The latter, being the victim of discrimination, relies on policies implemented to single certain groups out for unequal treatment. For example, men are dramatically overrepresented in all those hazardous occupations—but every single time women have sought entry into those occupations, men have vigorously opposed their entry.⁵⁴ Once again, that contradiction: on the one hand, MRAs believe men shouldn't be “forced” to do all the dangerous jobs; on the other hand, they also believe that women shouldn't (and are probably ill-qualified to) invade men's territory. While it's true that there remain some areas in which being a man is a disadvantage, there is no evidence that white men are the victims of discrimination.

IV. THE REALITY OF REVERSE DISCRIMINATION

At this point, you might be asking just how relevant the movement's arguments are for real men. The short answer is, very. The daily lives of men are fraught with experiences and predicaments that often make them feel powerless. So what exactly are they saying? Most of what constitutes Men's Rights activism is trotting out a series of empirical inversions that usually leave the rational mind reeling. Here's a sample:

⁵¹ FARRELL, *MALE POWER*, *supra* note 39, at 28–29.

⁵² *Id.* at 106–07.

⁵³ See CROWLEY, *supra* note 45, at 148; *but see* Cassandra, *Child Support/Custody Facts & Figures*, Villainous Company (Apr. 18, 2012, 5:09 AM), http://www.villainouscompany.com/vcblog/archives/2012/04/child_supportcu.html.

⁵⁴ Kimmel, *supra* note 45, at 327–29.

Women complaining about sexual harassment? Actually, it's *men* who are the victims of harassment. "The way young women dress in the spring constitutes a sexual assault upon every male within eyesight of them," writes William Muehl, a retired professor at the Yale Divinity School.⁵⁵ Warren Farrell argues that "consensual sex among employees," as he euphemistically called it; it's "courtship" when it works and "harassment" when it doesn't.⁵⁶ If there is a problem with employer-employee sex, Farrell argues, it's because it "undermines the ability of the employer to establish boundaries because the employer often feels needy of the employee."⁵⁷ See, the employee, the beneficiary of the sexual attention, is actually the one with the power.

And it's the same with sexual harassment on campus and even at home. Sexual contact between professor and student may confer on the young woman "potential academic advantages over other students," Farrell writes.⁵⁸ She's the one with the power, not him! And what he calls "workplace incest" is similar to at-home incest, which reverses family authority dynamics, since "parental authority becomes undermined because the child senses it has leverage over the parent."⁵⁹ What a novel theory—incest afforded undue power to the young girl over her father's actions! Does this mean that those altar boys and other children abused by all those Catholic priests were the ones actually with all the power, able to get the priest to do such unchristian things at their, the boys', whim?

How about rape and sexual assault? Rape, Farrell argues, is not, as feminists have argued, simply a crime of violence.⁶⁰ It's about sex. Younger, more attractive women are 8,400% more likely to be raped than older women, we're told.⁶¹ The general point that rape has a sexual component is, of course, not entirely wrong despite the hyperbolic statistics. But to suggest that rape is a crime of sexual frustration implies that if only women would put out a little more often, rape rates would go down. (The reason younger women are more likely to be raped is also because they are more likely to be unmarried, and out in the public sphere unescorted.)

By now, nearly everyone's heard that men are battered and abused by their wives and female partners at least as much—if not much more—than women are by their husbands. It turns out, by the way, that this "gender symmetry" in domestic violence is empirically true—but only if you ask women and men if, during the past year, they *ever* used any one of a set of physically violent "tactics."⁶² But if you ask questions like: How often? How severe? Who initi-

⁵⁵ William Muehl, Letter to the Editor, *The Chaplain's Lament*, N.Y. TIMES, June 12, 1992, at A24.

⁵⁶ FARRELL, MALE POWER, *supra* note 39, at 292–93.

⁵⁷ *Id.* at 298.

⁵⁸ *Id.* at 301.

⁵⁹ *Id.* at 298.

⁶⁰ Warren Farrell, *The Myth of Male Power: Why Men Are the Disposable Sex (Part Two)*, 1 NEW MALE STUD. J. 5, 26 (2012).

⁶¹ *Id.* at 25–26.

⁶² Michael Kimmel has reviewed all the empirical studies that claim to show this "gender symmetry" in his article, Michael S. Kimmel, "Gender Symmetry" in *Domestic Violence: A Substantive and Methodological Research Review*, 8 VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN 1332, 1333 (2002). There is a lot less there than meets the eye.

ated? Did you use violence to protect yourself? Were you protecting your kids? Then the rates of domestic violence come to resemble what we've known all along: that the overwhelming majority of violence is used by men—against both women, and against other men.⁶³

But what if we take such claims on their face? Here's something to explain to MRAs about the claims they make about domestic violence. They claim that women hit men as often as men hit women, *not* that men don't hit women as often as feminist women claim they do. That is, their claim of "gender symmetry" is that women's rates of violence are equal to men's rates. What if we were to assume their claims are true? Then they should be advocating for more shelters for battered men—but not challenging the number of shelters for battered women. That is, domestic violence, by their logic, is not a zero-sum game, and greater funding for the legions of underserved battered men, who would come forward in droves if they had shelter services, shouldn't be accomplished at the cost of fewer shelters for women—which, after all, they acknowledge are well and fully utilized by battered women.⁶⁴ That is to say, if these guys were really interested in serving these legions of battered men, they would *ally themselves* with feminist women in the anti-violence movement and advocate for greater funding for men's shelters in addition to maintaining the funding for women's shelters.

They're actually not interested in those legions of battered men, only in discrediting feminist women's efforts to protect women who have been battered. In 2000, eighteen men sued the State of Minnesota's commissioners of Corrections, Human Services, Public Safety, and Children, Families and Learning to end the granting of state money to shelters for battered women. Their lawsuit, *Booth v. Hvass*, argues that these shelters "publish fanatical, irrational, hysterical, sexist literature which maliciously and falsely defames and seeks to generate social and political hatred against men in general, portraying them as the basic cause of all domestic violence and associated acts of cruelty in American society."⁶⁵

(This is an example of what logicians call the "compositional fallacy": Just because all As are Bs, does not mean that all Bs are As. Classic example: All members of the Mafia are Italian. Not all Italians are members of the Mafia. In this case, virtually all of those who commit acts of violence are men. Therefore, the fallacy holds, virtually all men commit acts of violence. Of course, no sensible person, feminist or not, would make such a claim.)

The U.S. District Court dismissed the case in 2001. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit upheld the dismissal in 2002. The U.S. Supreme Court refused to hear the case.⁶⁶

⁶³ *Id.* at 1347.

⁶⁴ See Joseph Caputo, *Can We Degenderize Domestic Violence?*, GOOD MEN PROJECT (Mar. 11, 2011), <http://goodmenproject.com/featured-content/can-we-degenderize-domestic-violence/>.

⁶⁵ Amended Complaint at 6, *Booth v. Hvass*, No. 00CV1672MJD/JGL, 2001 WL 1640141 (D. Minn. 2001); *Booth v. Hvass*, 302 F.3d 849, 850 (8th Cir. 2002). See also *Transitions*, 22 J. MEN'S PERSP., Nov./Dec. 2002, at 4 (awarding "Excellence In the Advancement of Men's Issues" to the original instigators of *Booth v. Hvass*).

⁶⁶ MOLLY DRAGIEWICZ, EQUALITY WITH A VENGEANCE: MEN'S RIGHTS GROUPS, BATTERED WOMEN, AND ANTIFEMINIST BACKLASH 3 (2011).

MRAs also claim that men are discriminated against in the workplace—and in their efforts to balance work and family life. Women have far more choices than men do. Warren Farrell observes that women have three choices: they can work full time, stay home full time, or balance work and family.⁶⁷ Men, he says, also have three options: they can work full time, work full time, or work full time.⁶⁸ See how oppressed men are?

Rounding out the trilogy of oppression examples, the last venue of men's inequality is in academia itself. And, as satirical as it may seem, today the Men's Rights groups are campaigning against *their* exclusion from a field that was designed solely to remedy previous inequality (for women): Women's Studies.

A. *MRAs ask, "Where's Men's Studies?"*

You might think this a bit ironic; after all, pretty much every course that doesn't have the word "women" in the title is a course in "men's studies." But actually, the Men's Rights campaigners don't want anything to do with "Men's Studies." As far as they're concerned, Men's Studies already exists, and it's an outpost of the enemy.

However, Women's Studies made gender visible, and this meant that we could actually apply the insights of Women's Studies to men's lives: How is masculinity one of the constituent elements of identity for men? How do different groups of men understand the meanings of masculinity? And how do men experience the hierarchies and inequalities based on gender? Just as we might inquire how white people experience racial inequality, Women's Studies began to integrate men and masculinity into their courses and their analysis.

You'd think that men would be thrilled with this—finally, we could study men *as men*, understand how the dynamics of masculinity shape and distort our relationships with women, with other men, with our children, with our own sense of ourselves as men. Today, a dynamic subfield of Gender Studies, Masculinity Studies, is thriving on campuses—there are dozens of books series, scholarly journals, conferences—all the institutional trappings of the successful emergence of an academic subfield. But Angry White Men are anything but happy about this state of affairs. As far as they're concerned, "men's studies"—or, as we like to call it, "Masculinity Studies"—is no friend to men, beholden as it is to feminist perspectives on gender inequality.

Warren Farrell likens men's situation in all of these aspects of life to that of the chauffeur: he's sitting in the driver's seat, knows where he is going (or at least appears to so he can avoid asking for directions), and is wearing the right uniform.⁶⁹ But, from the perspective of the chauffeur, someone else is giving the orders.

Sounds sensible, we suppose, until one asks the obvious next question: What is the gender of the passenger in the chauffeur-driven limousine? It's a man, of course—a wealthy white man to boot. When we ask that question, we

⁶⁷ FARRELL, MALE POWER, *supra* note 39, at 52.

⁶⁸ *Id.*

⁶⁹ See Warren Farrell, Address at the First Int'l Conference on Men in Austin, Tex. (Oct. 1991) (on file with author).

see more clearly that the relationships between *men* may be more decisive in making the Men's Rights guys feel so powerless than do the relationships between women and men. It's other men who have outsourced the jobs, cut wages and benefits, and so corrupted the banking industry that so many men, firm believers in their role as family providers, are losing their homes to foreclosure, sinking underwater on their home values, and struggling to keep their jobs. (In fact, the financial meltdown of 2008 was a dramatically "gendered" crisis, engineered entirely by guys being guys.) And yet, to the MRAs, it's "a black woman stole my job."

In a sense, this is the contradiction at the heart of the Men's Rights movement: women, especially feminist women, must be seen as to blame for every problem men seem to be having. If she wants a career, she's abandoning her traditionally feminine role and is probably overly sexually adventurous as well. If she doesn't, she's some gold-digger layabout who is too passive in bed. It's sort of what Kimmel has come to call the "Goldilocks Dilemma"—like the porridge in the bears' house, contemporary American women are either "too hot" or "too cold" but never "just right." They're too sexually demanding and career driven (i.e., "masculinized") or they are manipulative money-hungry schemers who will rob a guy blind and take him to the cleaners.

V. WHY MEN'S RIGHTS IS WRONG

It might be easy, if facile, to simply demonstrate empirically that they are "wrong" in their claims. We've indulged in a bit of that here. But we think it's important to acknowledge the authenticity of the pain and anguish that propel the misguided empirical analysis. That's real, and important. Many men do not feel very good about their lives. They're casting about for someone to blame, some explanation for their anguish, confusion, malaise. In a sense, we think some of the original Men's Liberation rhetoric hit closer to the mark. Traditional masculinity can be a fool's errand, an effort to live up to standards set by others that leave you feeling empty, friendless, a Willy Loman surrounded by Mitt Romneys—shallow, happy, cartoon characters. They feel themselves to be the "hollow men" in the T.S. Eliot poem.⁷⁰ They're scared their lives are going to amount to little. That malaise is real, and important—and, able to be politically manipulated and mobilized. Failure to hear that pain means that rational assessments of these men's plights will never be heard.

As the country was being founded, Thomas Jefferson envisioned a democracy as a mix of rights and responsibilities—the rights to which we are endowed by our creator are always set against the responsibilities to the community, to the other people's ability to pursue those same rights with the same freedoms. A focus on responsibilities alone dissolves the individual into simply a drone, a worker bee, part of the mass, indistinguishable from the rest. But a focus on rights only, as in Men's Rights rhetoric, aggrandizes into narcissistic solipsism, a competitive *me-firstism* that can only take without giving anything back.

⁷⁰ T.S. ELIOT, POEMS: 1909–1925, at 95–99 (London, Faber & Gwyer Ltd., 1927).

Winter 2013]

WHITE MEN AS THE NEW VICTIMS

385

In 1848, nearly a century after the nation embraced Jefferson's vision, American women realized they'd sort of been left out of the "Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness" equation. They had few rights, and those they had still excluded them from having a public voice or presence. The motto of the Woman Suffrage Movement, proclaimed by Susan B. Anthony in a slogan that formed the banner of the movement's newspaper, *The Revolution*, was simple: "Men, their rights and nothing more: Women, their rights and nothing less."⁷¹ Still seems an apt framing.

⁷¹ Elizabeth Cady Stanton & Susan B. Anthony, *REVOLUTION*, Apr. 23, 1868, at 1.