

The first core text of the first week's main introductory course (GI400), entitled *The Uses and Abuses of the Sex/Gender Distinction in European Feminist Practices*, is a typical example of the cumulatively one-sided discrimination I am complaining of. I will now take you through items I have numbered as marked by me on the corresponding text, with key phrases underlined, and will discuss briefly what is going on, in keeping with the terms of my overall complaint. You will see from this one reading alone, a familiar pattern beginning to emerge:

1. You can see from the first three pages, all the references to women highlighted in pink, and to men highlighted in blue – so *this* selected author's idea of what feminism is all about, is disproportionately all about women. What about all the men in feminism fighting for equal rights for both sexes? And there, at the bottom of page 287, the author spells it out – to her, 'gender research' is all about women, both personally, interpersonally, and politically. What a biased first text to make us read! By selecting this text and positioning it as the first we have to read, the course designers are actively discouraging an equal focus on men. Is there any other core text which says we should focus equally on men and women's issues, or that we should disproportionately focus on men's issues? No. Are there any course teachings by the lecturers to do likewise? No – only a historiography by LSE lecturer 1 in class, tacking on 'masculinities' to the gender project – which can be shown, are through a 'critical studies on men' patriarchy theory adherent lens.
2. She says it all again, 'Most importantly, gender research aims at improving the status of women in society' – so gender research should on the whole ignore men apparently - fairly blatant.
3. Here, the author ties women's/gender studies to politics, which contradicts LSE lecturer 2's desperate claim that the main focus of this course is not political in her attempt to validate the exclusion of men's social issues from the curriculum. Such overt political instructions happen very frequently, throughout many core texts. It is a given, which LSE lecturer 2 is denying. LSE lecturer 1 taught us in class 'Gender studies is political' – it is vital LSE lecturer 2 deny that gender studies at LSE is political, in order to justify the exclusion of men's political issues. LSE lecturer 2 would be doing well to find a single core text which does not promote a social movement – and one which focusses on women especially.
4. Here, the author discusses male on female violence, with absolutely no mention of female on male violence, despite over 240 scientific studies worldwide**** showing women and men use roughly equal amounts of interpersonal violence, and many studies showing women initiate 70% of DV. Here, it is talked of as if men are 100% of the perpetrators. The author does not criticize such one-sided hate ideology, merely goes along with it. Ignoring women's violence against men, but focussing on men's violence against women is commonplace throughout the core texts – happening frequently. How does this bias promote equality? How does it promote a reduction in domestic violence? All it does is promote a negative stereotype on men.
5. Here, as throughout this text, is a reference to research on women only, as if this is the norm for feminism. It is the norm for one-sided and sexist feminism, not mature egalitarian feminism.

Linking feminism to women-only issues happens very frequently throughout the core texts. But if someone criticizes feminism, the orthodoxy can say 'What, aren't you interested in equality?' - when the criticism of feminism may be that if it excludes men, then the criticism is that feminism is not egalitarian. The academy broadly introduces feminism as to be understood as an equality project (refs on request), so it is then a deliberate semantic trap for anyone seeking to criticise feminism, when it is entirely legitimate under a gender equality framework to criticise the types of feminism

which ignore men.

6. Same again.
7. Women-only conferences.
8. Nothing on men and equality, only women and equality.
9. Historic tropes of feminism valued here (which is a recurring theme – and a historiography of feminism's roots by Lecturer 1 in a class excluded men's issues-driven movements, including only 'masculinities' as an afterthought – but in context, the 'patriarchy' theory-adherent, apologetic, non-complaining type of 'masculinities'. I signed up for a science degree, not a history of polemic degree.
10. Women's only movements referred to again.
11. The 'women are different, but equal' double standard mentioned here, but not criticized as such, nor its negative effects on men's equality progress for instance (or women's).
12. Women's lives have tensions, nothing on men.
13. 'Patriarchy' talked of in relation to women's oppression only, and the theory is presented uncontested. Lecturer 2's internal report to my complaint claims this never happens.
14. Given the female-focussed kind of feminism this author approves of, it now becomes un-egalitarian and discriminatory for her to talk of how it might be gotten into curricula (without referencing men's issues discourse too).
15. Women's studies only here – no men's studies mentioned, despite men's studies often feminist credentials.
16. Emancipation of women only talked of. What of the men's liberation movement for instance? Or the emancipation of men from 'wage slavery' etc.?
17. 'The New Women's Studies' ties 'gender' which is sex-neutral, to 'activities of women' – and this tactic is very typical throughout the texts also. Under pressure, Women's Studies practitioners will claim that Women's Studies is egalitarian – but it's not the egalitarian type of Women's Studies being imagined by the author in this core text.
18. Presents 'patriarchal' attitudes as being particularly strong among young Russian men – so blaming them only in effect, and this is in Russia, with the largest gender life-expectancy gap in the world, where (at the time this author wrote) Russian men lived to 59 and the women lived to 72 – 'patriarchal'? Let me think about that for a minute. Women's role in 'patriarchy' systematically underplayed or not mentioned throughout texts, so 'patriarchy' can be read as 'blame men -iarchy'.
19. More women-only feminist movements.
20. Oh, and women-only fighters mentioned here for women's votes. Men were involved in that struggle too – but not according to this approved author.
21. Situation of women considered here, not men.

22. More 'patriarchy' linked to 'repressive attitudes to women', so suggesting men by omission - another very popular tactic of the victim-female orthodoxy in discrimination against men.
23. Oh, but what is this, doubt poured on the author's own theory. We should examine 'actual operations' – it looks like we're getting to it now...
24. More on the position of women... and a description of Russian women who may or may not be able to make choices about work-life balance, but then concluding the paragraph with... 'she also seems to be assuming that men had the privilege to make free choices during the Soviet era and have it today'. Yes! A mention of how men might be being screwed by the system as well – but not by women apparently. It's the system what did it. No mention of how though - I would like this to be explained over a few hundred words at least, but no – that is our lot. We will have to work out ourselves how men might be lacking in choices. Men's issues when mentioned throughout the core texts, are not unpacked, merely tacked on at the end of stuff. Too little too late, so not fair or balanced at all – and demonstrating a will to pay the briefest of lip service, but no advocacy on legitimacy of men's issues discussions – a quick mention – then back to ignoring men.
25. More about feminism as a women-only pursuit.
26. A suggestion feminism might be aligned with 'patriarchal' intransigences, but then topped off with some more rubbish about men asserting their superiority over women (contrary to the body of evidence on female/male power relations), so the quoted author angling a justificatory hint for women and feminists to assert their superiority over men perhaps.
27. She goes on to focus on believing in women (not men too?) and suggests female enslavement but not men's (although might be being deliberately vague). She then claims men have 'demonstrated their possibilities' – not in the home surely, or in all the female-dominated spheres of life? or on all the quality of life measures where men do not currently enjoy equality. It's quickly returning to be all about women.
28. Only women have hidden strengths apparently.
29. More on gender as relating to women only, and a women's 'Centre' – no men's anything as usual.
30. And more on the political nature of gender studies discourse, which LSE Lecturer 2's report does attempt to downplay due to the lack of men's political discourse in the curriculum.
31. More on women's position and need of liberation – nothing on men.
32. More unchallenged patriarchy theory – oh, and as oppressive to women only.
33. A link made here to gender theory and a usefulness for activism, flying in the face of LSE lecturer "s report, claiming her course is not concerned with social movements - as she seeks to exclude discussions of misandry (as it's part of the *men's* movement and mature feminist debates).
34. But here, in the last paragraph before the big conclusion, we are finally offered the idea that men are being excluded from something (other than this text on the whole), and that equating men with power and women with oppression is problematic, and... and well that's it. No further

discussion required. No examples of how the opposite might be true in some circumstances – and no mention of the other sex's part in any of it all either. No examples of personal and structural obstacles to men's equality. How very chivalrous. It's ladies first in this core text, with not enough time to go into the male stuff in any detail – and this text is more candid than most in addressing men's issues. This is about as good and clear as it gets for men in the first six weeks of core texts that we all had to read, although there were literally, a few other token mentions – but similarly mild and unpacked, usually tacked on at the end.

35. Women and country mentioned here. Hooray!
36. Women's studies community mentioned with nothing on men's studies communities within feminism or without. One text actively discourages students from considering men's studies.
37. Women's studies teachers mentioned – nothing on Men's.
38. More commitment to feminist history affirmed, which can be read as women-focussed, as demonstrated by this author's sense of gender balance in this article.
39. A feminist intellectual class being called for (presumably hyper-focussing on women then).
40. Cultural differences among women mentioned, but not among men.
41. More on signifiers and differences around women only – aligning it with 'feminism' on the whole (in context, the female-focussed type), as is standard throughout this text.
42. Talk of feminist theory here being aligned with 'the movement' – contradicting LSE lecturer 2's claims that the course does not prioritize movements. Find me a supportive mention in the core texts of any gender movement other than feminism. LSE Lecturer 2 is only kidding herself.
43. Third wave feminism aligned with women only, and talk of lesbianism without mention of gay men, and post-colonial discourse too is linked with a female only-focuss in this paragraph. Aligning women-only struggles with other academic concepts and theory happens frequently throughout the core texts – so everything is encouraged to be thought as to be focussing on women. The evidence is very clear.
44. Talk of 'we' the feminists (and presumably female ones, as that is this author's focus) – not very welcoming to men then.
45. More on women's studies only and differences among women. Nothing on men as usual.
46. - European feminism too.
47. Sexism and racism discussed in this one-sided paragraph, so presumably the author wants us to focus on women here too – no mention of men after all. Aligning women's issues with race, class and sexuality issues happens very frequently throughout the core texts too – another way of encouraging us to think that all other factors are pertaining to women primarily.
48. A hint of people other than women, but no mention of who those groups might be. A classic example of refusing to be explicit about men. Trying not to scare the horses, like gender studies students are horses or something. Poor Gender Studies curricula have long been

criticized for refusing to name others. It's discrimination by omission.

49. More on women's studies – nothing on men's.

50. And again.

51. Support for Women's studies (not men's?) crucial at a European Community level. More sexism then.

52. A claim that political recognition counts as scientific recognition for (in context) women-focussed studies. This non-science and will to political corruption of science-findings flies in the face of the advertised nature of the Masters of *Science* degree I thought I'd signed up to, and in the face of LSE Lectrer 2's claim in her report, that this course was not prioritizing the political. The message I took, whilst on the receiving end of this kind of bias, is 'it will take more than arguing the facts to get men's issues discourse treated properly at the Gender Institute' as confirmed by my interactions with LSE Lectrer 1, who sought to mitigate government lies about the extent of 'sex trafficking' for instance, rather than proportionately acknowledge the enormity of the lies.

53. A suggestion here that women's studies is inclusive, although ignoring the main absence from women's studies - men - as usual from the equation. It's a bit like The BNP saying they are not racist because officially they let others in – as long as they comply with the racist attitudes.

54. More on *tradition* within Women's Studies, rather than on future perspectives and research in keeping with the 'science' bit as advertised. Another blurb I read for the gender courses described them as 'empirical' which to me means experiment-driven, with observation of such rational approaches - when it soon becomes clear the main thrust at the Gender Institute is ideology in the face of the evidence – as made clear with this opening text.

55. And a framework around women from Eastern Europe and elsewhere is called for, with no mention of men, despite the fact that Eastern European men suffer from a huge life-expectancy gap. Next, one line on the need for research on new gender methodologies – but not mentioning men's issues as the elephant in the room, in need of inclusion.

So there is Core Reading number 1 – I would say this reading is fairly typical, and a good place to start, in considering whether the Gender Institute has breached its own guidelines on not including 'learning materials' which are discriminatory, and whether it misrepresented its course's nature in the prospectus description, which is gender-neutral – when these learning materials are clearly not gender-neutral.

Is this kind of core text equally welcoming to men as to women, in keeping with the Equality and Human Rights Commission's advice to me (since redacted), and in keeping with the university's own regulations ruling out discriminatory learning materials? No.

Is it conducive with a teaching environment which does not discriminate on the grounds of sex, by any detriment to men? Directly, or indirectly? No. Does it stereotype men negatively? Yes. Does this will to ignore men encourage harassment of men either directly or indirectly? Yes. Against a context of men's relative lack of equality in Eastern Europe, is it an indignity to men to blame them thus? - and when their problems have not been explored? - and when their inequality of opportunity has not been explored properly, nor their inequality of outcome? Yes, yes, yes and yes.

Does the text inadvertently discriminate against men, or, given the gender expertise of the academics, does it show a will to deliberately discriminate against men (by among other things, omission)? It shows a deliberate will. - And I can show that these patterns are repeated again and again throughout all core texts in the opening six weeks.

Imagine we reversed the roles, and hardly mentioned women at all, and suggested gender studies should be all about men, and we should get that political project into Europe so it will masquerade as scientific – but oh, we mustn't forget women, but nah, let's just focus on the men. Would that be okay? No, it would be sexist. But who needs more focus, men or women? Well, men do less well than women across most areas of life, but what about in the public sphere? - where contrary to popular belief, women earn more per hour worked than men (Hollander, 2008) - and where 95% of people killed on the job are men, and where men report less job satisfaction, and where men do most of the extreme overtime, and face unequal retirement ages, and hiring and promotion policies which may encourage the selection of women. Or where men in service industries earn less tips. And where men get much less parental leave, and pay, and where men pay more tax, but receive less back in pensions. And where (disproportionately) men have their wages garnished to pay for ex-spouse support, or for children who are not even biologically theirs. And where men typically do not have the equal option to work flexi part-time. And where men are expected to take on unpaid bodyguard responsibilities to protect female employees in emergency. And where (disproportionately) men have to use their wages to support economically inactive spouses/children. And where men predominate in the seriously injurious and/or unregulated economic migrant black market jobs – and where men predominate in the unskilled, due to lack of uni degrees (in part due to Critical Studies on Men orthodoxies) or where men only can still be forced to do a job of kill or be killed. I would say advocacy for either sex should be precisely equally appropriate, and in 'public sphere' debates too, given men's and women's current rights/privileges, and choices there, and their average performance ratings, and health indications – but the core text's author seems to think and demonstrate our focus should be about 95% on women, and 5% on men – and this in the very first core text!

The public, as well as other spheres, can be sexist to men too – but this is not properly investigated in this or any other core text.

“Welcome to the Gender Institute!”

- yeah right.