**Men have to acknowledge their system of unearned privileges especially in the classroom in order to advance any form of communication.**

(SPF)

**Schacht** (steven, self-identified radical feminist queer who is an associate professor of sociology and women's studies teaching associate at Plattsburgh State , “Teaching About Being An Oppressor: Some Personal and Political Considerations” http://www.nostatusquo.com/Schacht/teaching.html)

Isn't it Amazing the Things One Might Ascertain?

**We live in a society where ignorance** truly **is bliss**, especially **for those with unearned male privilege** and status, **which** in turn often pr**ovides men with an excuse to deny the existence of the** very real and **harmful sexist hierarchical realities that surround us and the active role men must play in their maintenance.** While some men are willing to admit that women are disadvantaged in our society, very **few men are willing to acknowledge that they are over-privileged** (McIntosh 2000). After all, **to actually do so would mean that men would not only have to admit the unearned and unjust basis of their advantage but perhaps even personally change and give-up some of their privilege. In the highly competitive world we live in giving up any advantages--**earned or unearned--**one might have in the game of life would seem foolish at best to the vast majority men.¶** And yet, as a partner, a mother, a sister, a daughter or just a friend, most men have significant women in their lives that they deeply care about, love, and sometimes even view as equals. I believe herein lies the true promise of the feminist pedagogy that I bring to my classes. **Instead of abstractly talking about male dominance and women's subordination, I attempt to put a face on oppression. I offer my own experiences of doing unearned male privilege, and recognize the harm it inflicted on others--both female and male. Often courageous male students will also offer their experiences of doing male dominance. In all classroom discussions female students freely and frequently offer their experiences of being oppressed by men. Combined with constant reminders by me that the "who's" and "what's" we are talking about are our partners, parents, siblings, children, friends, and each of us, emerges lived images of the oppressor and oppressed**. **These "faces" of sort demonstrate how all too common oppression is, how harmful it is for so many, and why each of us--women and men--should join together to bring about its end.¶ By making men aware of the unearned advantages that society confers upon them, coupled with** the knowledge **of how this is oppressive** to the significant women in their lives, many men are left in an ideological bind: how can they personally express concern and respect for the welfare of these women all the while supporting realities that cause women's oppression in larger societal settings? While I realistically have no meaningful way to measure the answer to this question, I have witnessed many men (although admittedly not all) in my classes very much loosen the otherwise firm grip they have on justifying and living the male privilege that society so unjustly confers upon them. A world without unearned male privilege would be a significant step in the pursuit of a non-oppressive, egalitarian future.

#### Their focus on queerness assumes a neutral political subject robbing women-identified-women of material agency. Queerness becomes only about performance and emphasis on style ignores the fact that Maddie and I are ALWAYS ALREADY performing

**Goodloe, 94** (amy, “Lesbian-feminism and queer theory: another “battle of the sexes””, <http://amygoodloe.com/papers/lesbian-feminism-and-queer-theory-another-battle-of-the-sexes/>)

Perhaps the most scathing critique comes from Sheila Jeffreys, whose work is not always received well by non lesbian feminist scholars because of her tendency to claim to speak for all lesbian feminists, when in fact she only speaks for a particularly radical group. In her most recent article, “The Queer Disappearance of Lesbians: Sexuality in the Academy” (1994), Jeffreys states simply, “The appearance of queer theory and queer studies threatens to mean the disappearance of lesbians” (459). Jeffreys’ concern, like that of so many lesbian feminists, is that queer theory threatens to offset the advances made by feminism by failing altogether to recognize its impact in shaping contemporary understanding of sexuality and gender; queer theory, she argues, is “feminism free” (459). Despite its supposedly counter-normative associations, Jeffreys believes the word “queer” has come to signify white gay male, which renders any project associated with this signifier simply “more of the same,” while masquerading as “new and uniquely liberating” (469). Thus, unlike Stein, whose critique of queer theory is relatively mild in comparison, Jeffreys accuses this new theoretical discourse of deliberately reinscribing the very oppression(s) that feminists and lesbian feminists have been fighting against for years, in order to privilege (homo)sexuality and gay male culture as the epitome of the “anti-discourse” made so much of by postmodern theory. Central to Jeffreys’ critique is that queer theory privileges and indeed naturalizes the masculine in a way that runs counter to the aims and goals of most forms of feminism. The notion of “camp” or “drag,” which Jeffreys sees as one of the key concepts of queer theory, is built on gay male notions of performative femininity, which not only excludes biological women but enshrines the dominant construction of masculine as the binary opposite of feminine; a drag queen’s enactment of femininity for the pleasure of other men, rather than calling into question the performative nature of all gender roles, instead fixes perceived sexual difference at the core of desire, a claim early lesbian feminists were most anxious to refute. According to Jeffreys, then, while queer theory may claim to expand the limits of gender by “playing” with the terms that constitute it — by supposedly separating femininity from the female body in the persona of a drag queen, for example — it in fact fails to account for the sexism inherent in the terms as they are constituted by the dominant culture. A man “playing at” being a coy, submissive woman, for the benefit of other men, is hardly a vision of sophisticated gender analysis to most lesbian feminists — which is not to criticize drag queens in and of themselves, so much as to point out the inadequacy of drag as core theoretical concept. Jeffreys also criticizes the tendency of queer politics to “[accept] and [celebrate] the minority status of homosexuality.” This, she believes, is a politics “which is in contradiction to lesbian feminism” (469) because of its insistence on a stable, coherent albeit counter-normative identity. She continues: Lesbian feminists do not see themselves as being part of a transhistorical minority of 1 in 10 or 1 in 20, but as the model of free womanhood. Rather than wanting acceptance as a minority which is defined in opposition to an accepted and inevitable heterosexual majority, lesbian feminist theorists seek to dismantle heterosexuality, and one strategy is the promotion of lesbianism as a choice for women. (469) One of the supposedly progressive things about the word “queer” — its open and defiant stance against heteronormativity — is, to critics like Jeffreys, precisely its greatest weakness, since it presupposes the naturalness of that which it is supposed to be in opposition against, and lesbian feminism has long insisted that no system of sexuality is natural. Failing to see this fundamental insight of lesbian feminism, queer theorists are unable to account the total hegemony institutionalized heterosexuality has over all human interactions, ranging from the regulation of marriage and reproduction to a whole host of seemingly unrelated restrictions which prevent the self-identified queer from being free.

**There is inherent power in being a male– only the acknowledgement of that power allows for us to deconstruct other forms of oppression.**

Lee, 81 **(**Anna, Black seepratist**,** From For Lesbians Only, edited by Sarah Lucia Hoagland and Julia Penelope (Onlywomen Press, 1988) http://www.feminist-reprise.org/docs/leeblacksep.htm)To state all this is to begin to raise necessary considerations concerning ethical stances. For example, I still feel alienated from the black male nationalist community because I am a lesbian, and yet I understand that our struggles are intimately intertwined. At the same time, I often feel alienated by the white feminist community which has the privilege to ignore and to minimize racism. White feminists can demand my support, presence and energy without seeing what it is they are asking of me. They can refuse to acknowledge the price I pay: the losing of my protection as limited and limiting as it is. My blackness is visible and the first line of attack on me. I am also a womon and choose to continue my struggle within the wimmin's community. I have stopped struggling with my brothers around their homophobia and sexism. As I have indicated, merging my seemingly separate identities is not easy, but all of them exist within me. It is very important to me to recognize that racism hurts both my brothers and me. While it may manifest itself differently for each of us, it is the blackness that defines the conditions we live under. **I am very clear that my brothers hold the power of the penis. They are not confronted with being women** in this world and I am. **It is true that any male** **regardless of class, income, or race** **holds power in the world**. For sure, some males have more control in the world than others. Each has if nothing else a womon or womon-substitute as his slave - wife, mother, girlfriend, etc. This is not true for me. I do know white wimmin who are active in anti-racist struggles and willing to address this issue. Unfortunately, I know of no males of color who are or have been willing to deal with their own sexism or homophobia. My analysis of power, who has power, and who gets what resources allows me to make the distinction between power and revokable privilege. White wimmin have revokable privilege. During slavery white wimmin tortured black wimmin slaves and today act as if privilege is, in fact, power. The reality is that revokable privilege is just that. **If the group exercising the privilege decides to use their 'powers' in a way objectionable to those who actually hold power, their privilege is immediately revoked**. Too few white feminists realized **their privilege was given by white males and can as easily be taken back if not exercised in the interest of white males**. Or, perhaps, they do realize this; and making the connection, white wimmin wish to delude sisters regarding this reality. No matter. The result is that **the hegemony of white males remains unchallenged by white wimmin who are not willing to acknowledge or to address the ways privilege is used to divide black and white wimmin**. Separatism gave me the analytical tools and, yes, the guts to say out loud that males are the enemy. **Do you think I will be struck down by god (good ole white boy that he is)?** **Not only will I say it out loud but I will also operate as much as possible from a womon-identified context.** **Becoming a separatist encouraged me to realize that the world can be interpreted through my lesbian eyes.** My sexuality gives me fire and peace**. It is a way of living that is the basis for reaching out, understanding, and bonding with other wimmin**. **Separatism is not withdrawing from the world** **or denying that what happens in the world affects me. I cannot simply ignore the heterosexist, racist, misogyny of the world. White male hatred of me controls my economic reality. I cannot operate out of wimmin- only space and pretend that I am living independently of boys.** I hope wimmin who function or claim to do so at that level are doing so without pretense, and therefore responsibly. I do think it **is important that wimmin own and live on land, but the claim that they are totally separate from boys evades the interdependency of the world**. **For example, electricity can be given up, but the payment of taxes cannot be. Beyond that, what I have heard and read about wimmin claiming to be independent of boys is so incredibly class unconscious** that I am furious. For **the privilege** necessary to maintain the pretense **is** very transparent and **NOT AVAILABLE TO SISTERS**. Each time I hear how it is being done, I also see the womon's ability to re-join patriarchal, capitalist society, even if she denies her ability to do so. Do white wimmin expect us to be so dumb as to accept what they say as the final truth? Any sister who survives has taken'a crash course on white lies and learned to perceive the reality, not what whites would have us believe to be true. White wimmin's privilege is not mine!I have no white father, no connection who will grease my re-entry. I have already, in fact, been chosen to provide the back on which capitalism can build and prosper.

## Perm

#### Public policy discussions on nuclear policy have systematically ignored the everyday experiences of women who have entered into the public sphere seeking acknowledgement. Nuclear energy production has polluted their water and air, devastated their homes and their communities. But because their experiences are do not meet a preconceived objective standard for valid evidence, they are cast off and regulated back to a silent existence in the private sphere. At the intersection of class, race and gender, these anti-toxic waste activists challenge phallic logics of rationality and desirability by repositioning our knowledge in a gynocentric eco-logic that remains open to difference and embraces multiplicity

**Glazebrook in 2k5** (Trish, Associate Professor of Philosophy at Dalhousie University in Nova Scotia, *Ethics & the Environment* 10.2 (2005) 75-99, Gynocentric Eco-logics)

These logics are not confined to women. As women can work in the phallic order of science and technology, so men can practice gynocentric eco-logics. John Caputo, for example, argues in his "radical hermeneutics" for the "suppleness" of thinking, "a more reasonable notion of reason" (Caputo 1987, 213)[10](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.mnl.umkc.edu/journals/ethics_and_the_environment/v010/10.2glazebrook.html#FOOT10) than that of scientific objectivity, that leads "not to a conclusion which gives comfort but to a thunderstorm, not to a closure but to a dis-closure, an openness toward what cannot be encompassed, where we lose our breath and are stopped in our tracks, at least momentarily, for it always belongs to our condition to remain on the way" (214). His argument against scientific methodology is replete with reference to mystery and respect, and comes out of his reading of Heidegger on truth, which I have described above as inherently gynocentric. To say that Caputo is thus engaged in gynocentric eco-logics is not to threaten his gender identity, but to hear Ravindra's claim that we are all both male and female, and to suggest that Caputo is counter-balancing phallic logic with his post-metaphysical rationality. Notice that he does [End Page 88] this by analogizing knowledge to the experience of a natural phenomenon, a thunderstorm. His epistemological basis is an event in nature itself. Likewise for Hélène Cixous, l' écriture feminine is mysterious, an overflowing of white ink that cannot be exhaustively theorized because "it will always exceed the discourse governing the phallocentric system; it takes place and will take place somewhere other than in the territories subordinated to philosophical-theoretical domination . . . never subjugated by any authority" (Cixous and Clément 1986, 92). Resisting the Selfsame of patriarchal authority, Cixous writes the possibility of love in relation to the other, rather than in objective indifference. Hers is a feminine practice of writing, but an example she cites is Jean Genêt (Cixous 1999, 82).[11](http://muse.jhu.edu.ezproxy.mnl.umkc.edu/journals/ethics_and_the_environment/v010/10.2glazebrook.html#FOOT11) "There are some men (all too few) who aren't afraid of femininity" (Cixous 1999, 79). Cixous' Medusa does not turn men to stone—she laughs. She does not threaten, but "nourishes life—a love that has no commerce with the apprehensive desire that provides against the lack and stultifies the strange; a love that rejoices in the exchange that multiplies" (84), a gynocentric, pregnant love that reve(a)ls in diversity. This pregnancy comes not from subjugation and rape, but is a welcome exchange—an economy beyond economy (etymology: oikos–home; nomos–law), a law of the home that cannot be reckoned in objective mathematization. For love exceeds calculation in its mutual sharing of body that nurtures life. Accordingly, gynocentric eco-logics do not need to kill the (eternal) father in order to love the (mortal) mother, to destroy phallic logic and take its place. Such a move would simply replace a phallic logic of domination by equally fascistic and domineering eco-logics. Rather, the task is to chorus logics of inclusion and reciprocity that welcome and encompass differences. Following Carol Bigwood, I am "not blindly privileging traditional feminine characteristics and experience and denouncing those of the traditional male" (Bigwood 1993, 76) but calling for balance. There is a place for the logic of science and technology in our world, but it must share the space with other ways of thinking, and other practices of human engagement with, and as part of, nature. What distinguishes gynocentric eco-logics from phallic logic is precisely their toleration, in fact, welcoming of differences. They involve rather than distance themselves from nature. Logics that embrace diversity do not articulate themselves in eternal, unchanging truth. They are eco-logical in that they take nature as [End Page 89] their model—they are on the way, evolving, open to revision, in a word, organic.