PS1 for 8/4/88#AN EXPOSE OF FEMINIST FOLLIES

If one of our POW/MIAs had suddenly returned from captivity last week and been confronted with the news that a United States Navy plane had gone down, plunging its crew into the South China Sea, whereupon it was discovered that the copilot pulled out of the ocean was pregnant, the returning POW would probably conclude that our military had gone insane. Indeed, Lt. j.g. Elizabeth Steinnecker, who copiloted the CT-39E twin-engine jet that crash-landed in the south Pacific, is pregnant.

No, the military establishment is not insane; it is simply infected with the social disease called feminism. Not only is the military constantly shoving women more and more into men's roles, but it is concealing the great gap of performance between men and women and the embarrassingly high rate of pregnancies among servicepersons on active duty.

A new book by philosophy professor Michael Levin called (BF)Feminism and Freedom(end BF) (Transaction Books) provides a long-needed dissection of feminism and its foolishness. Levin wrestles with the feminist intelligentsia on their own terms and proves their ideology to be barren, self-contradictory, and ultimately destructive of a free, democratic society.

Levin says that the current military policy is ""the first indiscriminate mixing of the sexes in military units'' in the history of the world. He warns that the potentially devastating consequences cannot be fully predicted short of wartime combat.

The physical requirements have had to be dramatically reduced in order to keep women in the armed forces and maintain the pretense that they are performing equally. A West Point male applicant must do at least six chinups, while a female applicant is only required to do one ""flexed arm hang.''

Levin cites the 1979 federal case of (BF)Beckman v. New York City Fire Department(end BF). The court ruled that the physical-standards test used in selecting new firefighters was discriminatory because substantially fewer women passed than men.

The NYFD is now required to spend large sums of money trying to train women to do tasks that men are by nature better equipped to do. Where was the discrimination? What type of logic is it that allows federal courts to force local governments and individuals to perform actions that don't make sense, economically or otherwise?

""If males and females have equal predispositions for aggression and nuturance,'' wonders Levin, ""why have not half of all human societies encouraged women to be aggressive and men to be nuturant.'' None of them has because our biological nature determines otherwise.

Levin's conclusion is that the ""socialization that helps produce observed sex differences'' is actually following ""grooves etched by pre-existent dispositions.'' Anyone who gives any credence to accepted scientific standards of investigation will have a hard time denying this premise.

But in areas such as Affirmative Action, Comparable Worth, and the Family, feminist ideology refuses to accept the way we are and insists on trying to force its vision upon us by government edict.

Levin dismisses the oft-heard distinction between radical and moderate feminism. All feminism is radical, he says, because contrary to the overwhelming findings of the natural and social sciences, feminists refuse to believe that there are inherent differences between men and women which should be manifested in the basic organization of society.

If slavery and Nazism were totalitarian because each denied the natural equality of human beings, Levin argues, feminism is no less so because it denies the natural differences between men and women. Not

only does feminism deny them, but feminists rely on the brute force of government to impose their ideology on the rest of us.

That is why Professor Levin comes to the conclusion that "feminism is an antidemocratic, if not totalitarian, ideology.'' Feminism is not compatible with freedom because free men and women will not voluntarily submit to social engineering to restructure society according to an ideology that runs counter to common sense and all historical experience.

One of the delights of Dr. Levin's book is the way he illustrates through analogy. Feminists are fond of saying that it is not that they dislike women (BF)per se(end BF, but only that they dislike women who have been raised up under patriarchy. Levin says, that's like saying that you really enjoy baseball but are bored by baseball as it has actually been played since the time of Abner Doubleday. Who's fooling whom?

Michael Levin, a distinguished professor of philosophy at the City College of New York, has written a conscientious and sorely needed book that ought to be required reading in all university women's studies courses. It is also excellent for anyone who wants to understand the contorted dynamics behind the feminists' political and social agenda.