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Since Andrea Dworkin's view of the social relations between females and males is no closer to reality than is Osama Bin Laden's geopolitics, it is unsurprising that her recent diatribe on the subject of lap-dancing should have prompted objections from several readers. However, it is surprising - shocking even - that her concluding sentence should have escaped censure. It is a stark indictment of the state of sexual politics in Scotland that the readership of its foremost newspaper appears so browbeaten by feminist ideology that either it is no longer capable of recognising that the words "the big, brave men who want lap-dancing could use some lap-slicing in its place" explicitly exhort the genital mutilation of males, or else is so anaesthetised to violence against males that it is now indifferent to the forcible removal of a male's penis or testicles. Contrary to your introduction of her, Dworkin is not a "feminist thinker". Indeed, were her writings held to set the standard, that phrase would be an oxymoron. Her obsessive conception of a world in which men "objectify" women in pursuit of their sexual desires and fantasies is the objectification of a morbid and sexist paranoia that is all too-evident in her recent calls for the vigilante killing of paedophiles and the assassination of a feminist opponent. Ideologues of her ilk are the antithesis of genuine thinkers. Her conception of social reality is supported not by the experimental method of hypothesis and research, but by anecdote and rhetoric. To appreciate the significance of her intervention, it is necessary to imagine a country in which male "thinkers" can openly advocate the cutting out of women's tongues (for they nag), or the ripping out of women's breasts and genitals (for they cuckold their husbands). What barbarism! But cease to imagine and look again at Dworkin's article. With insignificant modification, Scotland is such a country. The misandry that is Dworkin's raison d'être pervades Scotland's political and civic institutions. To give but one topical example, it is manifest in Gil Paterson's patently sexist "Cross-party committee on male violence against women and children" (Letters, August 6). There is no problem of violence against women in Scotland. Here, as elsewhere, to be female is to be protected against violence. Nor is there a problem of male violence against children. A child is just as likely to be physically assaulted (or killed), by a female - and in particular by its mother - as it is by a male.
against violence. Nor is there a problem of male violence against children. A child is just as
likely to be physically assaulted (or killed), by a female - and in particular by its mother - as it
is by a male. One wonders as to the motivation of self-hating males like Paterson. Many
males would see the attraction of a committee on which females form the vast majority. But
aren't there easier ways of getting the attention of the ladies? (My views on sexual politics
should not be taken to be those the University of Glasgow or its philosophy department.) Dr
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It is a stark indictment of the state of sexual politics in Scotland that the readership of its
foremost newspaper appears so browbeaten by feminist ideology that either it is no longer
capable of recognising that the words "the big, brave men who want lap-dancing could use
some lap-slicing in its place" explicitly exhort the genital mutilation of males, or else is so
anaesthetised to violence against males that it is now indifferent to the forcible removal of a
male's penis or testicles.

Contrary to your introduction of her, Dworkin is not a "feminist thinker". Indeed, were her
writings held to set the standard, that phrase would be an oxymoron. Her obsessive
conception of a world in which men "objectify" women in pursuit of their sexual desires and
fantasies is the objectification of a morbid and sexist paranoia that is all too-evident in her
recent calls for the vigilante killing of paedophiles and the assassination of a feminist
opponent.

Ideologues of her ilk are the antithesis of genuine thinkers. Her conception of social reality is
supported not by the experimental method of hypothesis and research, but by anecdote and
rhetoric.

To appreciate the significance of her intervention, it is necessary to imagine a country in
which male "thinkers" can openly advocate the cutting out of women's tongues (for they nag),
or the ripping out of women's breasts and genitals (for they cuckold their husbands). What
barbarism! But cease to imagine and look again at Dworkin's article. With insignificant
modification, Scotland is such a country.

The misandry that is Dworkin's raison d'être pervades Scotland's political and civic
institutions. To give but one topical example, it is manifest in Gil Paterson's patently sexist
"Cross-party committee on male violence against women and children" (Letters, August 6).

There is no problem of violence against women in Scotland. Here, as elsewhere, to be female
is to be protected against violence. Nor is there a problem of male violence against children. A
child is just as likely to be physically assaulted (or killed), by a female - and in particular by
its mother - as it is by a male.

One wonders as to the motivation of self-hating males like Paterson. Many males would see
the attraction of a committee on which females form the vast majority. But aren't there easier
ways of getting the attention of the ladies? (My views on sexual politics should not be taken to
be those the University of Glasgow or its philosophy department.)