

# **[Reading] → The WAR AGAINST BOYS: How Misguided Feminism Is Harming Our Young Men By Christina Hoff Sommers – Soccerjerseys-wholesale.co**

Posted on 24 July 2019 By Christina Hoff Sommers

This book was written in 2000 by someone who works at the American Enterprise Institute (AEI), a conservative think tank in Washington, D.C.

As far as I can tell, this was part of a successful campaign by AEI to kill funding for the Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA, 20 USC §§ 72837283g), which among other things authorizes grants to promote gender equity in schools. WEEA received funding in the federal budget from 1976 to 2010, with a high of \$10 million in 1980. The funding dwindled steadily every year and leveled off to about \$2 million per year in the 1990s. In 2003, the Bush Administration stopped funding the WEEA Equity Resource Center, and since 2010 the Department of Education has not funded any WEEA program grants. The President's budgets no longer request funds for WEEA. Thus, the campaign to kill funding for WEEA has been a success. After reading this book, I agree that the way this program was implemented was a waste of taxpayer money. This book contains some good reporting exposing the way that some of the grantfunded programs were not evidencebased.

This book doesn't agree that the educational system needs to do more for girls. In 1992, "How Schools Shortchange Girls"

## NEW POST

[Twenty Boy Summer](#)

[Audrey, Wait!](#)

[Perfect You](#)

[Going Too Far](#)

[The Nature of Jade](#)

[Paper Towns](#)

## RECENT POST

[Just Listen](#)

[The Truth About Forever](#)

[Along for the Ride](#)

[Lock and Key](#)

[This Lullaby](#)

[Keeping the Moon](#)

[North of Beautiful](#)

was published. This was "A Study of Major Findings on Girls and Education" commissioned by the American Association of University Women (AAUW) and researched by what is now called The Wellesley Centers for Women at Wellesley College. This "study" concluded that our educational system was shortchanging girls, and more action was needed to correct the inequity. The author of this book takes issue with the findings of this study as well as its authors.

The book takes aim at The WEEA Equity Resource Center in Newton, Massachusetts, run by Katherine Hanson, which was funded through a contract from the WEEA Program Office at the United States Department of Education's Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. Its 5 year federal contract ended in February 2003.

The author also didn't like Take Our Daughters To Work Day, so I would say this book was part of the impetus to change it in 2003 to Take Our Daughters and Sons to Work Day.

According to this book the materials produced by the WEEA Equity Resource Center with federal grant funds were heavily influenced by the work of Carol Gilligan while she was at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Gilligan wrote the book In a Different Voice, published by Harvard University Press. She got a Heinz Award in the category "human condition." I was convinced by this book that Gilligan's hypothesis that girl's lose their "voice" after Middle School really hasn't been validated by any data.

This book also doesn't agree that boys and girls should be treated the same. She takes issue with the Ms. Foundation and Gloria Steinem who is known for saying "We badly need to raise our boys more like our girls." "Creating SexFair Family Day Care," by Bonnie Raines, was another WEEA Equity Resource Center "equity in education" resource. It encourages boys to play with dolls. The book Real Boys: Rescuing Our Sons From the Myths of Boyhood, by William Pollack (1998) also saw it as problematic to encourage boys to be "masculine." The author thinks it's stupid and contrary to biology to try to raise boys as if they were girls. It certainly

Pride and Prejudice

The Last Song

Megan Meade's Guide to the McGowan Boys

That Boy

Bloom

Starlet's Web

Flipped

Twilight

Something, Maybe

The Time Traveler's Wife

Angus, Thongs and Full-Frontal Snogging

The Notebook

Ice in My Veins

Looking for Alaska

When It Happens

That Wedding

should not be the basis for educational policy.

The arguments that boys and girls should be treated the same also play out in the courts. The Supreme Court case *United States v Virginia* struck down the male-only admission policy of the Virginia Military Institute in 1996. Gloria Allred represented the plaintiff in *Yeaw v Boy Scouts of America*, in which the plaintiff claimed it was illegal for the Boy Scouts not to allow girls. In 1998, the California Supreme Court said girls had no right to be in the Boy Scouts.

The author of this book is in favor of allowing boys to be educated in boys-only environments, and she believes traditional teacher-centered education with firm rules and strict discipline and high academic and code of conduct expectations are better for boys. The movement towards child-centered classrooms where students are taught to express their feelings and opinions and work together hurts boys. In general, the author opposes the educational effort to boost student self-esteem. Rather, she thinks schools should teach character.

The author also takes issue with the sexual harassment education in schools. The publication "Quit It!" is still available on the Wellesley Centers for Women website, so presumably some schools still use it. The author thinks it and other similar educational materials go overboard in the "zero tolerance" policy for boys' touching girls or hitting on them. In the case *Davis v Monroe County Board of Education*, the Supreme Court held that a student can sue under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (under which students must not be denied access to educational benefits and opportunities on the basis of gender) for severe and pervasive student-on-student sexual harassment, where the school is deliberately indifferent and has actual knowledge. The author thinks this case was decided wrong.

Finally, the author thinks schools have become too permissive and don't foster moral education. In the case *Tinker v Des Moines Independent Community School District*, the Supreme Court held that a student had a First Amendment right to wear an armband indicating opposition to the Vietnam War. The

author thinks this was the beginning of the end for discipline and morality in public schools.

I think this book starts out being about how certain "feminists" have been influential in creating educational policies in certain schools that at best are just politically correct hooey, and at worse actually have a negative impact on boys. But then the book lapses into a kind of general attack on the influence of progressive liberalism in the schools. I agree that boys have a lot of issues in schools these days, but I was not at all convinced that this is the fault of "feminists." The feminists in this book are not necessarily representative of feminists in general and are really not all that influential in the big scheme of things. And a lot of the stuff the author opposes I would perhaps characterize as politically correct bullshit, but I wouldn't characterize it as "feminism." Clearly, the Supreme Court is not "feminist."

One thing I agree with in the book is that people who believe that boys need to be more "empathetic" in many cases themselves lack empathy for boys. There is nothing wrong with nonemotional, philosophically based ideas of justice that guide the way men act. Boys should not be told that it is not good enough to do the right thing, because they are feeling the "wrong" emotions. Education should focus on what kids do, not how they feel.

Overall, I thought this was a thoughtprovoking book, although I doubt I share the author's political views. This teacher comments: One of the best nonfiction books I've read all year!

I graduated from Indiana University in 1990 just as the 'girls are fragile' movement was gaining momentum. I was taught the 'facts' that Sommers refers to in numerous inservices (for all of you nonteachers, many teacher inservices are attempts at teacher training in which a speaker comes and entertains or horrifies us with a speech that usually has little or no practical value when I taught in the inner city it was usually the horrifying type: "these kids are all failing and blahblah percent of them will end up dead or in jail and it's all because you didn't teach them how to multiply fractions or diagram a sentence

correctly!").

Anyway, I did buy into some of the stuff about girls being fragile and being overrun in the classroom. I have heard the statistics Sommers skewers so completely and thoroughly and I swallowed many of them hook, line and sinker because it was early in my career and as a young person I foolishly believed that if a Harvard PhD researched the facts they must be right. As a more jaded professional, I appreciate Sommers' meticulously endnoted work.

In *The War Against Boys* she embarrasses the 'fragile girl' theorists by burying their underresearched (and sometimes unresearched) theories in a blizzard of relevant studies and facts from responsible and trusted sources (for example, I've had the '4 million women die from physical abuse from a man' stat thrown at me in a diversity seminar. Yes, verbally thrown at me as if I were the man who personally beat them all to death! Well, if it happens again, I'm armed with the REAL facts from the Centers for Disease Control, thanks to Sommers).

Sommers overwhelmingly makes the point that our 'touchyfeely' self-esteem oriented schools are a great big turnoff to most of the boys. (in my experience as a high school teacher, the girls don't buy into it much either). Schools are not designed for most boys, especially as we take away physical activities and recesses. Male boisterousness is seen as wrong a mental disorder and/or a sign of ADHD. Boys have to be medicated specifically for their built-in attributes that they possess as boys...

Read more at: <http://dwdsreviews.blogspot.com/2011/...> The War Against Paris, Tombs, RobertNotRetrouvez The War Against Paris, et Des Millions De Livres En Stock Sur Achetez Neuf Ou D Occasion Ingraham The War Against Kids YouTube They Re Lying To You When They Say It S Too Dangerous To Reopen Schools FoxNews Ingraham Angle Subscribe To Fox News WatchFox The War Against The Machines Original Timeline Wage War Against Traduction Franais Linguée Program, CARE Canada, Oxfam Or UNICEF, So That One Day We Are Serious And Well Equipped To Wage War Against

Poverty Parlgc Le Seul But Que Nous Poursuivons, C Est De Renforcer Davantage La Crdibilit Des Nations Unies, Les Rendre Encore Plus Fortes, Elles De Mme Que Tous Les Organismes Qui Sont Sous Leur Responsabilit, Que Ce Soit Le Programme Alimentaire Against The War Traduction En Franais Exemples Accommodation Will Be Called For In Order To Obtain A Majority Against The War Pour Cela, Pour Runir Une Majorit Contre La Guerre, Il Faut Tre Capable De Faire Des Compromis Sixty Per Cent Of The US Population Is Against The War Soixante Pour Cent Des Amricains Sont Opposs La Guerre Russia Is Winning The Information War In Afghanistan Although Memories Of The Soviet Afghanistan War Of Continue To Fuel Anti Russian Feelings In Afghanistan, Russia S Infrastructure Investments And Construction Of The War Against The Chtorr Wikipedia When Trying To Figure Out A Way Of Communication With The Worms Via Flashing Lights, The Team Accidentally Sets Off A Chtorran War Where The Worms Battle Each Other In A Massive Slaughter On The Way Home The Flight Crew Realize Too Late That Chtorran Stingbugs Have Created Too Many Holes In The Helium Chambers, Causing A Massive Loss Of Lift Gases Quickly Dumping Cargo, The Ship Heads Back To America S Year War Against Iraq Bring The II Y Ajours At A Time Of Nominal Peace The US Averaged A Bombing Raid A Week On Iraq President George W Bush Continued Washington S Unofficial War Against Iraq, Before Deciding To Use The Attacks As An Excuse To Invade The Country And Oust Hussein Starting In The War Against Al Qaeda Georgetown University Nahed Zehr S The War Against Al Qaeda Brings The Story Of Our Conflict With The Al Qaeda Movement Up To The Minute It Is A Dazzling Work Of Synthesis That Illuminates The Complexities Of The Rhetoric On All Sides Scott Davis, Lewis T Booker Professor Of Religion And Ethics, University Of Richmond International Military Intervention Against ISIL International Military Intervention Against ISIL Part Of The Syrian Civil War, War On Terror, Spillover Of The Syrian Civil War, Iraqi Civil War , Libyan Civil War present , Boko Haram Insurgency, Insurgency In The North Caucasus, Moro Conflict, And Sinai Insurgency Top Two US Air Force F E Strike Eagle Aircraft Flying Over Northern Iraq I'm a woman. As such, I'd like true equality between the sexes. However, I despise most

feminism, at least the more modern variety. Most is militant and entirely illogical in its maniacal desire to bring disadvantage to men as a form of revenge. So while I want women to have the same opportunities as men, I want to see them work for those just as hard as said men. I don't want any favours and gifts. Women should only be allowed to work certain jobs if they are indeed equally qualified (sadly, the reality is that special rules are usually put in place for women and quotas are enforced in many countries even). And I see nothing wrong if a woman wants to be a stayathome mom instead of a career machine if she and her partner can afford it.

I therefore often have a problem with people's assumption that girls have it tougher in school and need special coddling. And yes, I often have been attacked for my belief.

The problem is this: either girls/women are as tough as boys/men or they need special protection. Take your pick. It's either or, not both.

Are there horrible male assholes out there? Absolutely. Are there horrible female assholes out there? Absolutely. Is there sexual violence against girls/women? Unfortunately. Are the numbers of sexual violence against boys/men either as high or almost (and having a much higher dark figure)? You bet.

None of this is to say that there isn't injustice in the world. But what I'm saying and what the statistics presented by this author prove is that many assumptions in the world are blatantly wrong. And the author makes a wonderful argument about the misguidedness and toxicity of today's feminism. It's always been political but nowadays it's even more of a tool. Mengood men are silenced because of their gender alone. If you don't believe me, look at Matt Damon vs Minnie Driver. There are countless such examples out there in the entertainment industry alone. And if you're shocked at how bad it is between adults, you are in for an even nastier surprise when looking at the children.

This book greatly shows how the US (and I can attest to it being the same in other school systems) enforces the image of

girls being held back in school due to the big bad patriarchy. The problem? It's bullshit. Girls can read earlier than boys, grasp concepts faster. Yes, often boys are more competitive, but when has competitiveness become a bad thing??? Without competitiveness, humans wouldn't have become the dominant species on this planet. Leaps in science (often thanks to women by the way) wouldn't have been possible without competitiveness either. And a competitive boy isn't automatically going to grow up into a rapist. There is no such thing as "toxic masculinity". There is toxic indoctrination, yes, but that's different. This is some of the worst sociopolitical propaganda out there.

This book shows many research papers that have been published. Some names will sound familiar, others won't. In the end, it hardly matters. What matters is that data has often been manipulated (for example by willfully hiding sources) so as to show what the respective person wanted it to show (like the teenage suicide rates).

Here's the truth every normal thinking person knows: every kid needs guidance. And yes, boys and girls are indeed slightly different from biological differences to responding better or worse to certain teaching techniques. Is any of that bad? Of course not!

We need to stop categorizing genders as if they were different races and thus promote true equality. Because what we are seeing at the moment is people teaching boys that they are bad and bound to become rapists and that they should therefore not only not be heard but not even have an opinion in the first place. Can you imagine what that does to a child (to adults, too, of course, but children are even more vulnerable)?

And while we're at it: doing "boyish" things like climbing trees or competing physically against others is also nothing bad. It's not all about empathy and cooperation, sometimes we need that little boost ahead of the crowd. If you don't believe me, check history books and/or books about human evolution. Boys are not the root of all that is going wrong in the world.

I'm glad I coincidentally found out about this author. Her writing



is crisp and clear and on point and the fact that I'm not the only woman looking in horror and disgust at what is happening to innocent male children does indeed give me hope that we can come away from this nonsense again. Moreover, her statistics did hold up to scrutiny which is much more than I can say for many others (some of which are talked about in this book). This has definitely not been the last book I've read of hers. Dr. Sommers has some valid and important points in this book, but she falls prey to some of the same weaknesses she accuses those terribleawfulhorrible feminists of. As another reviewer pointed out, she calls for an end to crismongering in a book called *The War against Boys*. Hmmm...crismonger much? And she frequently lambastes feminists for painting with a broad brush and assuming all boys or girls are (fillintheblank) while doing some fairly thorough stereotyping and "broadbrushing" of her own of boys, girls, feminists, and others.

Now, being the mother of three boys (ages 9, almost6, and almost3), I am enormously concerned about their education. In fact, just this morning, with more than a little trepidation, I sent two of them off on the school bus to start 4th grade and kindergarten. But I think the problem is more a wholesale failure of the public education system to see children as individuals, rather than a targeted "war" against either sex. Yes, the average male child has better spatial relations, is more aggressive and less "in touch with his feelings" than the average female child, but the average child is a composite that simply doesn't exist. For example, Ms. Sommers states that boys do better in a competitive classroom environment and decries the shift away from competition to make classrooms more "girlfriendly." Well, competition is actually the worst possible educational technique to use with my nineyearold son. It's a crushing demotivator for him. But when I was in school, I thrived on competition and loved coming out "on top of the heap." Please, oh please, oh please, look at children as individuals, not as a perfect "average" specimen of their sex.

I appreciate the neat holes Dr. Sommers punches in the "studies" that have been used to bolster the false idea that girls are uniquely susceptible to the trials of adolescence. I have absolutely no patience for intellectual dishonesty or politics

masquerading as science, but that's certainly not limited to this area of politics or science.

Some of Dr. Sommers's proposals are spoton. I'd love a move back to more classical education, for example. And of course, all children need to be held accountable for following clear, unequivocal, moral rules. I just wish that she could have toned down the inflammatory language, the snippy digs at feminists, and the overgeneralizing by gender so that the essential information in her book could have shown through better. Still, an important read, especially for parents and educators of boys.

For more book reviews, come visit my blog, [Build Enough Bookshelves](#). It was clear to me from several years of volunteering in my son's elementary school that girls and boys are simply and clearly different. Yet the director of the literacy program at the Redwood City Library insisted to me—expressing a belief that too many people have—that boys and girls are identical in every way, and any perceived differences are strictly the result of biased socialization by adults. WRONG. Boys are not "defective girls" and treating them as if they were will only harm them.

I was impressed by the research Sommers did and by her bravery in rebutting things that "everyone knows," especially ideas promoted by organizations with an agenda (like NOW) and a shallow media that just wants a quick, provocative headline.

I recommend this book to anyone with children. It will make you reconsider assumptions you might have about boys, girls, education, society, fairness, and appreciating differences. Is it really a 5 star book, maybe not but I found it refreshing to read a book that didn't feel so extreme, from either a conservative or liberal point of view on feminism. Though I imagine there would be some disagreement about that.

This book reminds me that maybe we are failing boys when I'm surprised at finding a polite one or when a young man holds the door for me, or when a little boy is well behaved at a restaurant. Why should these things be out of the ordinary?

When did it become a bad thing to instill these values.

I personally think it's pretty obvious that girls are outdoing boys in the academic world, yes, yes, maybe not in the STEM disciplines but far surpassing boys in most of the others. Absolutely, I think it's important to educate girls in the choices they have, that a career in science or getting into a trade would be a great idea, that they pay more, that they offer opportunity and variation and interest. Though from a personal perspective, I can't say as I'd be thrilled to go find a job working out in the rain and the mud or one where I had to work 80 hours a week (that being said, I do work in a very male dominated field, because this was where my interests lay, and I'm thrilled that I'm able to do that in this day and age.) But I think it's also imperative that we train young men for the future as well, we need them to be as interested in higher education as girls because we're going to need that for even basic jobs. Even working as McDonald's isn't as simple as it used to be; the menu is large, the speed has increased and you have to know how to use a computer. I think it's important that we focus on the entire population and not leave anyone out. If that means we have to come up with a better solution, then we better do that, because technology is only getting more pervasive and all of us need to keep up. This well researched and enlightening book is an important book for debunking the myths and bad science surrounding the notion that we need to raise boys more like girls. The author clearly points out the importance of the reality of gender differences and respect to biological fundamental truths vs. a need to merely presume that in order to be progressive, we must alter the way we raise boys. I love the evidence based writing that this book adheres to! It's always an eyeopener when a really good look at statistics shows some glaring errors in widely held assumptions. It's even more of an eye opener to realize that some of your own carefully held assumptions are wrong.

This book, published in 2001, seems kind of political and reactionary, but that is only the fault of the title. The contents are much more revealing.

Feminism is political. This should not be surprising. We see it

everywhere. Some a\*\*\*holes take it way too far. What we have in America's school systems (and probably quite a few other places as well) is a climate where we are told that girls are being held back by the patriarchy, that their voices are not being heard, and that all boys should be more like girls.

No joke. I was in the school system when this was really getting started. I bought into it, myself. Even thought of myself as a feminist. Yes. I'm a white male feminist. Or, at least, I thought I should have been. I kept trying to be more feeling and thoughtful and in touch with my feelings. I valued cooperation over competition. I felt bad because I was a boy. Boys are violent. Boys are rapists. Boys the embodiment of the patriarchy that has done so much to transparently ruin women.

I was indoctrinated. And I bought it, hook, line, and sinker.

So what do I learn here? I went through college and got a degree in Psychology and English Literature in the mid 90's and learned a lot about education. The big keys were inclusion and tolerance and above all, making sure that women have all the benefits that had been taken from them in the past. I thought I approved of this.

I also found myself not being heard. I, as a male, surrounded by hundreds of academic studies revolving around a certain Carol Gilligan, then a superstar of feminist studies and the leader of the movement to change all our schools into this bright feminist ideal, was quoted everywhere. I didn't bat an eyelash. I studied more feminists and wanted to see more equality between the sexes. I got upset with every revelation of rape, abuse, and wage differential.

So, after all this time, thinking that it's only individual bad apples who like to say things like "murder all men", I held to my beliefs anyway.

So what do I believe after realizing that Carol Gilligan had fudged research data, hid sources, and used a very limited several thousand student sample in her study? Remember, she was the foundation of hundreds of similar papers and

books that became the forefront of a full politicized movement. A movement that transformed almost every school in the nation based on faulty data.

A later study using a hundred thousand samples show a very different picture, and yet the weight of the political movement could not be stopped.

What did it report?

Little things like girls are twice as likely to be heard in class. That boys are much more likely to give up and not take tests like the SAT or the ACT, leaving only the very confident to take the tests, whereas girls almost always take them. That girls are more confident and self-reported happy in schools than boys.

And it didn't stop there. I went to many many inschool campaigns brought up in this book. Campaigns with a clear agenda where I was told about date rape, bullying (that was always bent toward unwanted sexual advances to girls), talking about my feelings, being inclusive, and never, ever, ever violent.

Remember, this is 2001 when the book came out. We were already seeing a whole generation of boys be told to be just like girls. That we should all be ashamed of what and who we are regardless of what we may or may not have ever done. I knew a lot of them that took it to heart like I did. Who bought the indoctrination.

Of course, after about 12 years of this, we get a complete eroding of value systems and a complete blindfolding of the educational system as to what BOYS ARE. They respond very differently to teaching techniques as compared to girls. It's NOT all learned. They're rambunctious. They do need strict limits and precise indoctrination into values. They respond to active play much stronger than girls, learn from scuffles and a lot of competition AND form very strong and beneficial ties with other boys through it. This is real. And yet the system is devoted to wiping out all the things that most boys are, naturally.

I'm speaking in general terms and ignoring outliers.

And it's getting worse. It's an ideology that ignores basic reality.

You know what opened my eyes back in the day? Fight Club. For how amazingly F\*\*\*ed up it was, it absolutely spoke to me on many other levels. It was the repudiation of all the indoctrination I had gone through.

I still don't want to hurt anyone. I still believe in equality. But by the actual numbers and the harmful teaching practices and the direction all this is taking us, I now fully agree with the conclusion.

Boys (and of course, men) are well on the way to becoming the "second sex". Just look at some of the stats in this book already and you'll see. College grads make more money, but 38% of men go in while 51% of women do. That margin has probably increased in the near 20 years since this book was published.

I'd love to see how many men are severely depressed or have gone through long periods of depression, listlessness, and despair after going through the school system. I know I did. I also improved a TON after getting into college. I was surrounded by a much healthier atmosphere.

I bought into the lies. I didn't realize I was being downgraded just because I was male. I wonder if a lot of this is the direct cause of some men's backlash. Anger, turned to violence, after having so many of their natural play and learning impulses quashed, being told that they were all rapists in training, that most of our natural desires were not to be channeled into appropriate directions, but told that they were simply and baldly BAD.

Of course, I'm not saying that we're all unaccountable to our own actions. Of course we are. But I'll admit that I am rather angry that I have not had any positive male role models.

I was brought up to be a girl. I love women. I thought that was

okay.

It's just a shame... this dog was taught to use the kitty litter box and meow for affection. "We must put an end to all the crisis mongering," writes Christina Hoff Sommers in a book titled *THE WAR AGAINST BOYS*. I'll pause for a moment to contemplate the irony.

I picked up this book after I learned from my then kindergarten daughter that the children at her school were told not to run on the playground during recess and that a male schoolmate was informed he would be sent to the principal's office if he continued to form his finger into a gun and say, "Pow, pow, pow." (I used to think these sorts of school stories were ridiculously rare exceptions, until they started coming home to me.)

Sommers occasionally treats extreme examples as normative and allows some assumptions and logical fallacies to slip into an otherwise convincing argument. She clearly has an axe to grind with one particular feminist (she dedicates a good chunk of the book to tearing down the woman's work), but many of her basic points are sound.

Sommers argues that there is a "war against boys" in the American education system, that is to say, in less polemical terms, that (1) girls receive more academic attention and focus, attend college in greater numbers, and earn higher grades than boys, even while feminists claim girls are being shortchanged, (2) stereotypically masculine characteristics and behaviors (such as competitiveness, physical courage, and war play) are discouraged while boys are encouraged to exhibit more stereotypically feminine characteristics (the "feminization" of boys), and (3) the pedagogical methods employed and materials used favor girls over boys. As a solution to this problem, Sommers proposes that boys be taught in an allmale classical school environment, with an emphasis on drilling, high standards, strict discipline, competition, moral/character education, and more boycentric reading materials.

I agree with her basic points, and I think her proposed solution has potential, although I am ambivalent about the

gendersegregation component, because I think gendersegregation has many benefits as well as many disadvantages. (Personally, I'm glad my education was coed.)

Despite my general agreement with her arguments, I was bothered by the way she seemed to make everything into an attack on boys. For example, she notes that there is a gender literacy gap between boys and girls: girls are typically a year or more ahead in reading level, and girls read more often for pleasure than boys. This, she suggests, is because of the evil feminist attempt to "feminize" our boys. Yet, when it comes to the math/science gap between girls and boys, she simply puts that down to gender differences. She doesn't understand why feminists get so worked up trying to close this gap, trying to make girls, on average, equal boys in math/science performance. Even though she admits that research shows women excel more than men in verbal areas, she doesn't seem to consider that this, and not a "war on boys", may possibly account for much of the literacy gap. Boys are shown to improve their literacy greatly in an allmale classical school environment with strict standards. But I imagine girls would too. Schools are short changing our kids, yes, but it isn't just our boys. Give them both classical educations, and they'd both probably pull ahead in many subjects, but would the gender gaps in literacy and in math/science close dramatically? Probably not.

Even assigning Jane Eyre as required reading is part of the "war on boys," because wouldn't it be better if they assigned works of more interest to boys? Well, yes, boys will more likely read works of more interest to them, but the girls in my school suffered through Mutiny on the Bounty, so why can't the boys suffer through Jane Eyre? A liberal education does not consist of being exposed ONLY to what interests you.

I get the impression that Sommers wants me to be worked up over a boy who is expelled from a private school (a \*private\* school, no doubt with a strict code of conduct that the student signed) for saying sexually crude things and making crude gestures to a girl. Sorry. I don't see that as part of the "war on boys." I see it as a rare insistence on the complete



unacceptability of crude behavior. Unfortunately, many conservatives of today say, “Boys will be boys” where conservatives of yesteryear probably would have said, “Where is his sense of honor?!”

Further evidence of the “war on boys”: girls earn higher grades and go to college in greater numbers. Now, there are all sorts of reasons boys may be academically underperforming girls that have nothing whatsoever to do with feminist efforts to feminize boys. But Sommers does not seriously explore or convincingly refute these alternative explanations. Nor does she ask whether boys are, in the longterm, truly shortchanged, compared to girls, by this academic underperformance. Are women now earning more income, on average, over a lifetime, than men? Are they making more revolutionary innovations in medicine, business, and technology than men? Do they hold more political offices? She does not address such questions, to which, I’m pretty sure, the answer is no. Indeed, she acts very like the feminists she chastises, decrying a sexist war on boys the same way they decry a sexist war on girls, without adequate consideration of the myriad reasons why people do not always excel. As an example of her assumptionbased logic, she mentions that (A) girls are called on in class much more often than boys, and that (B) boys are much less educationally interested and focused than girls. She assumes that (A) causes (B), but isn’t it just as likely that (B) causes (A)?

While I am not in favor of “feminizing” boys, I am in favor of “civilizing” children, boys among them. Feminization seeks to suppresses male nature; civilization, much less ambitiously, merely seeks to channel it. But civilizing boys requires lauding and grooming stereotypically masculine virtues, such as honor, chivalry, and courage. It also requires girls to exert pressures on boys by practicing stereotypically feminine virtues such as chastity and modesty. And gender stereotypes are never popular with feminists. Thus we insist that gender differences are social constructs and try to “remake” masculinity. The result of this experiment, Sommers argues, has not been beneficial for boys. I’d argue that it hasn’t been beneficial for girls either.

“Provocative and controversial . . . Sommers’ voice is impassioned and articulate.”  
—Marilyn Gardner, *The Christian Science Monitor*

# The War Against BOYS

[ HOW MISGUIDED  
FEMINISM IS HARMING  
OUR YOUNG MEN ]

**Christina Hoff Sommers**  
*Author of ~~Who Stole Feminism?~~*