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Where once there were Reds under the bed, now there is the Fem Menace by every blackboard.

—Laura Flanders

Campus feminists better not count on external affirmation in 1994. In fact, with media models like these, it’s a wonder that there are feminists on campus at all. Perhaps they survive because they’ve never held their breath to be the cover story.

—Laura Flanders

In a world where millions of women have been losing ground before our very eyes—in newly fundamentalist cultures, in the postcommunist countries that have restricted abortion or ceased to fund child care, in the expanding global sex industry and in the increasingly miserly American welfare state—there is no need to exaggerate women’s oppression. And there is no excuse for downplaying it.

—Barbara Ehrenreich

In 1994, the much-touted year of the Woman, seven Republican Congresswomen swept into office. As newly elected Republican Congresswoman Barbara Cubin of Wyoming presented a post-election plaque reading “Rush was Right” to none other than Rush Limbaugh himself, she exclaimed “There’s not a femi-Nazi among us!” At Cubin’s side were a cast of Newt Gingrich’s handmaids, including Helen Chenowith of Idaho, an advocate for the abolition of the IRS; Linda Smith of Washington, who in her campaign referred to the League of Women Voters as the

League of Women Vipers; and Sue Myrick of North Carolina, who favored concentration-style camps for drug dealers while she was mayor of Charlotte, North Carolina (Burkett 15–16). What distinguished these women from other women politicians, contends Elinor Burkett, feminist author of Right Women: A Journey into the Heart of Conservative America, was that they "bragged about their aversion to the very movement [feminism] that had helped blast open the doors of Congress to them" (16).

Also in 1994, hot on the heels of the "political correctness" controversy plaguing academe, a number of "feminists" made headlines by adopting the rhetorical stance of "internal critics" of feminism and women's studies. In 1994, Christina Hoff Sommers, a tenured philosophy professor and self-proclaimed "equity feminist," wrote Who Stole Feminism: How Women Have Betrayed Women. The same year, Daphne Patai and Noretta Koertge, both tenured professors, published Professing Feminism, a critique of what they perceive to be the excesses and anti-intellectualism of women's studies. Jumping on the anti-political correctness bandwagon that was already well underway, Sommers and Patai and Koertge draw on popular media representations and stereotypes of campus feminists to fuel their analyses. Laura Flanders a feminist journalist for the anti-censorship organization Fairness and Accuracy in Media Reporting (FAIR), argues that the story of feminism in the 1990s has not been the international women's movement and the Beijing conference but a caricature of campus feminism that draws on cultural stereotypes of "'New Victorians,' 'politicized' women's studies professors, and 'rape hype' in an era when young women are encouraged to be sexually hot, politically cool and into conspicuous consumption" (105). While bias in mainstream media representations of feminism is hardly new, feminism's self-proclaimed "internal critics" like Sommers and Patai and Koertge have extended and fueled that bias from their positions inside the academy. Sommers, funded by right wing foundations and think-tanks, and Patai and Koertge, have offered scathing critiques of feminism in book-length texts and articles that have reached popular audiences (see also Denfield, Fox-Genovese, Paglia, Roiphe). These thinkers have also had a significant hand in shaping social policy and perceptions of feminist issues. As "the very notion of state protection for the vulnerable is being discussed in Congress, the effective destruction of feminist credibility is key," writes Laura Flanders (151).

In the following, I analyze how Sommers, Patai and Koertge have deployed trash and shock rhetorics to portray conflicts and "problems"
within feminisms and women's studies and have shaped media representations of feminists and feminisms. I also address what a feminist ethics of criticizing other feminists should entail—an ethic that avoids trash and shock rhetorics and offers a productive and ethical style of internal critique. As I analyze two representative texts by internal critics within feminism, I draw on the work of feminist critical media advocates such as Laura Flanders, who argues that popular media representations of feminist scholarship and women's studies curricula have consistently been showcased in a negative light (145). I argue that those of us who teach and research feminist rhetoric need to work across the lines of the academy and critical media studies to close the gap between the representation of the women's movement that makes "headlines" and the one "going on on the ground" (Flanders 105).

**Trash and Shock Rhetorics in Internal Criticism**

As writers and researchers, Sommers and Patai and Koertge interview feminists and non-feminists about their ideas and attitudes toward feminism, make allusions to the historical traditions of feminism, and offer their own anecdotes and insights about feminist politics, practice, and discourse. They write readable prose for educated readers who may not know much about feminist history or politics and who may not care to know much about it other than its "problematic" tendencies. Although Sommers and Patai and Koertge purport to function as "internal" critics within the feminist movement, they direct their claims at audiences external to feminist politics and practice—namely, popular and largely conservative audiences unsympathetic to feminism or openly hostile to it. This stance is clearly articulated in the two rhetorics deployed throughout the books: the rhetoric of trashing and the "shock rhetoric of expose" (Loeffelholz 86).

The rhetoric of trashing "is a dismissal based on minimal argumentation, usually spiced with heavy irony, allusive accusation, and moralistic discourse" (Bal 295). Narrative theorist Mieke Bal argues that trash rhetoric is not merely bad scholarly practice where one colleague dismisses another's work "without doing it justice," but it is a "form of argumentation" that is worth analyzing (295). Trash rhetoric tends to be characterized by the following features:

- It compares "old" versus "new" ideas and "unenlightened" versus "enlightened" ideas; it can be exercised not only by those critiquing others but others critiquing themselves and former sets of critical strategies they once exercised (294).
It produces an excess of affective discourse about the discourse itself or a sort of “discursive specularity” (296).

It is synecdochal, offering “one element of a complex as representative of the whole,” which has the effect of “isolating” and “generalizing.” As Bal puts it, synecdoche has the effect of being “reductive” through two means: first, through “isolation of one element of the object of trashing (which is then reduced to that element)”; second, through generalization, making sweeping claims about a larger body of material without accounting for the nuances of that material (299–300).

It makes use of metaphor in “argument by analogy,” likening one element to another, but doing so without arguing the “motive of the analogy.” If the analogy is not argued, the “analogy alone may suffice to discredit the compared object”—for instance, comparing feminists to Nazis (300).

It is highly narrative, and often relies on stock characterizations: good versus bad, for instance. Narrative in trashing, Bal contends, “replaces argumentation,” and its function is “obfuscation of argumentative transitions” (301).

While trash rhetoric allows one to dismiss or discredit one’s opponents, shock rhetorics allow one to call attention to all that is wrong with one’s opposition in a sensationalist way. Shock rhetoric in the case of the texts I will analyze has two parts: (1) the authors deploy quasi-investigative journalism to expose and document outrages and excesses within feminism and women’s studies, a tactic I refer to later as the “trope of outrage,” and (2) the authors deploy “quasi-anthropological” analyses to represent the “strange worlds” of feminism and women’s studies through a pseudo-ethnographic gaze (Loeffelholz 86).

While trash and shock rhetorics are not staples of introductory argumentation or logic courses—indeed, they make use of logical fallacies such as ad hominem arguments and arguments by analogy—these rhetorics are pervasive in conservative media and tabloid publications. As Bal points out, trashing is a pervasive and particularly influential genre in academic life and popular culture, “too common to ignore—so common that careers, and more importantly, ideas, are not only broken by it but also built upon it” (296). Both trash and shock rhetorics are centerpieces of shock-jockey radio programming (Rush Limbaugh, Dr. Laura Schlessinger), tabloid television programs like Jenny Jones, and factionalized left-right television “news” programs like CNN's featured political talk show Cross-fire, which showcases left and right commen-
tators (usually white and male) "duking it out" over the issues of the day. In addition, shock and trash rhetorics have been adopted as a tried and true means to sell popular media critiques of education and the academy (see D'Souza, Sykes for a sample). Deployed in these venues, trash and shock rhetorics effectively polarize debate and reasoned conversation and curtail critical thinking. In an era when shock-jockey radio, tabloid TV, factionalized left-right TV news programs, and trash and shock critiques of higher education predominate and in an era in which Jerry Fallwell has blamed feminists and other progressives for the September 11 attacks (Harris C3), a measured response to trash and shock rhetorics seems necessary, especially since feminism has become a favored target of conservative pundits and a stand-in for all that is wrong with the academy. As Susan Stanford Friedman contends: "Now, those attacking the academy frequently do so by using women's studies as the epitome of what's wrong with higher education" (6).

The "Strange" World of Internal Criticism

In their 1990 trilogue Conflicts in Feminism, Jane Gallop, Marianne Hirsch, and Nancy K. Miller call for an "ethics of feminist criticism" that does not commit epistemological violence or resort to trashing or generational bashing. As part of the dialogue with Hirsch and Miller, Gallop argues that we need a feminist ethics of criticism that distinguishes "between a criticism that actually attends to something and a criticism that's really dismissive" (368). In collections such as Conflicts in Feminism (Hirsch and Keller), Feminism Beside Itself (Elam and Wiegman), Generations: Academic Feminists in Dialogue (Looser and Kaplan), contributors have struggled to analyze and enact an ethics and politics of internal criticism that honors feminism's multiple conceptual and historical frames. Academic feminists, however, have tended not to "go public" to the mainstream media with critiques of their internal politics for two reasons. First, in an era of attacks on the academy for being "politically correct," "going public" may lead to setbacks in shared feminist agendas. Feminism has been under attack so much by the right that internal academic critics who go "public" with their critiques may risk undermining and potentially compromising the political and economic work of feminism and women's studies. Joan Korenman, in a February 9, 1995 International Women's Studies listserv post, addresses the problem of appropriation of internal criticisms, worrying that books such as Professing Feminism will simply reinforce stereotypes and will ultimately damage the enterprise of women's studies:
By branding the entire field of Women’s Studies guilty of the excesses of a decided minority of programs and faculty, Patai and Koertge have done far more harm than good. They have put in jeopardy my program and the many others that do NOT have the problems they describe. I and other program administrators now have to spend far more time than we have defending our programs to skeptical politicians, journalists, administrators, faculty, students, and even parents who cite PROFESSING FEMINISM (either directly or via the grapevine) as “proof” that Women’s Studies is the academically unsound field they always suspected it was. I for one deeply resent this.

I agree with Patai and Koertge’s argument that there should be room in feminist work for those who hold “unpopular” positions and that there should not be ideological policing or public censoring of those who hold positions “that may be unpopular or potentially misunderstood (xiv-xv); however, I also believe that internal critics, especially those who have the potential to be heard externally by audiences deeply invested in conservative gender ideologies, must address their audiences in a meaningful and ethical way rather than buying into trash and shock rhetorics that sell out feminist colleagues and projects. As Ruth Ginzberg writes in a February 10, 1995 post to the International Women’s Studies listerv, books like Professing Feminism and Who Stole Feminism?

are mega-hits exactly because they are being used by those who would want to DISMANTLE Women’s Studies. . . . They are appealing to those who want to be able to argue “This so-called academic discipline is so riddled with faults, let’s just get rid of the whole thing.” And they are encouraging those who wish to so argue.

Now, I *do* think criticisms ought to be made, and they ought to be considered carefully, ESPECIALLY by those who already have a commitment to ensuring the excellence of Women’s Studies rather than tolerating mediocrity or hoping for its demise. But I think some forums are more appropriate than others for reaching that particular audience. I don’t think the commercial press and the NYT [New York Times] Bestsellers list are the proper forums for reaching academics whom one would like to see becoming convinced to engage in some internal self-examination.

I think there are better forums. Academic forums. It is just like the question of where scientific discoveries should be announced. If they are to be taken seriously by other scientists, they need to appear in scientific journals, not in splashy commercial publications headed for the Bestsellers List.

Similarly, if critiques of academic Women’s Studies are to be taken
seriously by Women's Studies scholars and teachers, they need to be
presented in academic forums, not as tabloid fodder for antifeminists and
media hype.

It is not THAT these critiques are being made, but WHERE they are
being DIRECTED that bothers me. I can't help but wonder if there isn't
an active attempt going on here to engage anti-feminist allies . . . because
I can't think of any other explanation for the way in which they are being
presented. And I do credit all the recent authors of such books with
enough "smarts" to be able to know exactly what they are doing. So it
makes me very uncomfortable, in the WRONG ways, not in the ways that
such critiques SHOULD make all of us uncomfortable (and more inclined
toward self-examination.

I quote Ginzberg's response at length because she foregrounds convinc­
ingly the problem of how "internal criticism" should be made and to
which audiences it should be directed. Unfortunately, Ginzberg's well­
aimed advice has not been heeded. Who Stole Feminism? and Professing
Feminism along with similar texts have become tabloid fodder as they
courage Jerry Springeresque versions of feminism replete with dys­
functional colleagues and students and sensationalist excesses. If one is
to believe these internal critics, feminism is a hopelessly lost cause that
must be saved by its internal critics, its so-called "dysfunction" the
subject of the authors' continued professional exploitation, an industry
unto itself of shocking expose and stylized criticism not unlike the
rhetorics common to the shock-talk show circuit or shock-jockey radio
programming.

Whose Feminism? Reading Who Stole Feminism

As Bal argues, one of the features of trash rhetoric is its tendency to
compare "old" versus "new" ideas and "unenlightened" versus "enlight­
ten" ideas (294). In Who Stole Feminism?, feminism is represented in
an unenlightened versus enlightened dichotomy as "gender feminism"
versus "equity feminism." Sommers argues that the "real feminist"
movement—real in the sense that it addresses mainstream (middle and
working class) women's lives and needs—has been stolen by a group
of radical gender feminists who reside in the academy and in well­
known feminist organizations like NOW, NARAL, and the Fund for
the Feminist Majority:

The leaders and theorists of the women's movement believe that our
society is best described as a patriarchy, a "male hegemony," a "sex/
gender system” in which the dominant gender works to keep women cowering and submissive. The feminists who hold this divisive view of social and political reality believe we are in a gender war, and they are eager to disseminate stories of atrocity that are designed to alert women to their plight. (16)

So-called sex-gender feminists Gloria Steinem, Patricia Ireland, Susan Faludi, Marilyn French, Naomi Wolf, and Catherine McKinnon—lumped together in spite of their significant differences in ideology, generation, and practices—have achieved a virtual monopoly of feminist influence that extends into the liberal and mainstream press, politics, and the academy, claims Sommers (17–18). To combat the insidious influence of gender feminism, Sommers strives to bring back a “more representative” and “less doctrinaire” feminism, what she calls the classically liberal feminism or equity feminism of suffrage leaders like Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony. By seeking to “restore” feminism to its golden age of “equity feminism,” Sommers’ analysis implies a period in feminist history when there was purportedly a monolithic classical equity feminism around which all feminists gathered: “A First Wave, ‘mainstream,’ or ‘equity’ feminist wants for women what she wants for everyone: fair treatment, without discrimination. ‘We ask no better laws than those you have made for yourselves. We need no other protection than that which your present laws secure you,’ said Elizabeth Cady Stanton, perhaps the ablest exponent of equity feminism, addressing the New York State Legislature in 1854” (22). Surprisingly, Sommers must have been absent on the day that history lessons about the suffrage movement were conveyed in the women’s studies classes she critiques. To hearken back to a “golden age” of equity feminism when feminists agreed upon and did not dispute feminist ideals and tenets is to fall into historical inaccuracy. Feminism in the nineteenth century was often fractured by debate over issues such as men’s involvement in suffrage, race, class, divorce law, and religion. In fact, two suffrage organizations, the National Women’s Suffrage Association and the American Women’s Suffrage Association, were formed because two prominent leaders Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucy Stone could not agree on the priorities for a single organization. Stanton wanted the focus to be on “women’s issues—which included suffrage, the divorce questions, help for working women, and censure of the church for its unfeminist perspective”—Stone “wanted to focus on women’s suffrage after the emancipation of slaves had been accomplished” (Sochen 145).
What is wrong with Sommers depiction of nineteenth-century equity feminism is what is wrong her depiction of the twentieth century feminism: her portrayal of feminism does not accurately portray disagreements and dissensus among feminists—dissensus often caused by the generational, racial, sexual, and class-based politics that continue to complicate feminist interactions. Also absent is an understanding of how feminist communities work in multiple and often unpredictable ways, and that coalitions can be formed between different women (feminist or not) to serve particular purposes. The diversity and broad base of the feminist movement is not examined in all its complexity, ambiguity, and contradictoriness, and, as a result, Sommers' book loses sight of where an internal critique should take the reader in salvaging a viable feminist politics that mitigates the problems of the so-called "gender feminist" stance.

In addition to drawing on the trash rhetorical tactics of unenlightened versus enlightened claims and synecdochal representations (lumping disparate feminists together to represent the whole of feminism), Sommers mixes two staples of shock rhetoric: quasi-investigative journalism and quasi-anthropological analysis. Sommers makes heavy use of the trope of outrage, a rhetorical tactic often used in investigative journalism and popular columns and op-ed pieces (for an example of this see conservative pundit Tucker Carlson's column "That's Outrageous" in the monthly edition of Reader's Digest). In the trope of outrage, the writer seeks to expose and ridicule a particular movement by exposing incidents or moments that he or she considers to be excessive, unjust, or unreasonable. By exposing the "outrage," the writer hopes to call attention to what is wrong with a system that makes possible such practices and behaviors. This tactic can be found in early chapters in the book where Sommers documents in quasi-ethnographic fashion her visits to two major conferences: "The Out of the Academy and Into the World with Carolyn Heilbrun" Conference, which took place in October 1992 at CUNY Graduate Center, and the National Women's Studies Association Conference that same year in Austin, Texas. Serving as a pseudo-ethnographer of the "strange rituals" of "gender feminist" practice and pedagogy, Sommers observes, documents, and caricatures moments of encounter group style workshop "excess." Caricaturing the therapeutic language of feminist workshops and mocking aspects of the two conferences she attended, Sommers uses her pseudo-ethnographic observations to synecdochically represent the problems with the whole of feminism. For instance, she recounts an NWSA conference session where attendees and
a facilitator participated in singing a round about women’s oppression
and where one of the panelists “took the mike to tell about ‘ouch
experiences.’ An ‘ouch’ is when you experience racism, sexism, classism,
homophobia, ableism, ageism, or lookism” (30). These moments are used
to indicate Sommers’ overall sense that feminist conferences are not a
place for the exchange of ideas, but that they are overlaid with therapeutic
discourse and are insipid.

Sommers also expresses ironic disgust at the way anger is used as a
trope at the Heilbrun conference, noting that the feminist academics at
this conference who spoke of their feelings of oppression and anger over
the way they have been treated in the academy invite “feminist bonding
in a resentful community.” She asks, “For whom do these ‘engaged and
enraged’ women at the conference speak? Who is their constituency? It
might be said that as academics and intellectuals they speak for no one but
themselves. But that would be to mistake their mission. They see
themselves as the second wave of the feminist movement, as the moral
vanguard fighting a war to save women. But do American women need
to be saved by anyone?” (21). Anger utilized as a trope in feminist
discourse disturbs Sommers who finds it “unwholesome and divisive”
(21). Essentially, she disagrees with the root cause of that anger: the idea
that there is a system of patriarchal oppression that disadvantages women.
Her message is clear: gender feminists are anti-intellectuals who do not
deal in “disciplined scholarship” but in “feminist ideology” (51).

Not only are feminist conferences problematic, women’s studies
courses are worse: “unscholarly, intolerant of dissent,” “full of gimmicks,”
and a “waste of time” (90). Sommers sees “gender feminist” women’s
studies courses as indoctrination camps, a closed system that she likens
to the totalitarianism described in George Orwell’s novel 1984 (97–99).
To further her case, Sommers examines syllabi, visits the course of one
gender studies faculty member (a male faculty member no less), and
recounts popular press controversies that have arisen around women’s
studies courses. She returns to argument by analogy, a feature of trash
rhetoric, to make this point, stacking up incriminating evidence through
her observations and visits to campuses with strong women’s studies
programs. Feminist students who “buy into” gender feminism are like
Brown Shirts: “They have raised a generation of student watchdogs ever
on the lookout for sexist bias in all its insidious manifestations” (113).
Feminist teachers resemble religious zealots who embrace the faithful
and ostracize the heretics. As one College of Wooster interviewee stated,
“It is ‘suicidal’ to criticize campus feminists in any way. ‘They want
people to be scared. Then you keep quiet and they don’t have to deal with you.’ He described the atmosphere as ‘McCarthyist.’” (107). Students enrolled in women’s studies courses who don’t get or don’t like feminism are portrayed as victims: betrayed, dissatisfied, and angry (100–05). Sommers’ stance is clear: feminists are extremists; women’s studies or feminist students are either collaborators or victims.

Sommers devotes the latter half of the book to evaluating and critiquing feminist research studies. Again, in the shock rhetoric tradition of quasi-investigative journalism, Sommers sets out to expose contradictions and inaccuracies in how research on women gets taken up to make feminist arguments in reports such as the American Association of University Women study on the self-esteem of girls and boys, “Short­changing Girls, Shortchanging America”; the “Wellesley Report,” “How Schools Shortchange Girls”; and statistics and studies on eating disorders, rape, domestic violence, and wage differentials. This is by far the most provocative portion of the book in that Sommers raises significant questions in Chapters 7–11 about how data about women get interpreted and taken up within the feminist community and in the popular press. But the problem with this segment of the book is that while she purports to raise questions about the accuracy of particular feminist studies, questions have been raised by critical media advocates about the research that she bases her critiques upon. Anti-Censorship media organizations such as Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting (FAIR) have raised questions about the veracity of her critiques of studies on date rape, domestic violence, and anorexia nervosa and have pointed out problems in her journalistic sources and research (see Flanders 141–44).

One of Sommers’ biggest complaints, however, is that gender feminists are bad sports who can’t take criticism: “As they see it, they are dealing with a massive epidemic of male atrocity and a constituency of benighted women who have yet to comprehend the seriousness of their predicament. Hence, male critics must be ‘sexist’ and ‘reactionary’ and female critics ‘traitors, ‘collaborators,’ or ‘backlashers’” (18). Fear of being called a “backlasher” silences many critics, she argues, but not her. Her interviews with male and female faculty members are often conducted under the condition of anonymity, as many of the critics she interviewed purportedly feared reprisal and threats from feminists on their campus. Like persecuted Christians in Roman times, male and female faculty who doubt “gender feminism’s” tenets must remain underground and murmur their disagreements to Sommers in an interview if she promises to omit their names.
Meanwhile, feminist ideas are gaining currency in the form of funding for curricular transformations and workshops, and Sommers believes this is robbing other "legitimate" and less ideologically driven scholars of opportunities: "Many foundations and government agencies are involved in making it financially possible for a lot of resentful and angry women to spread their divisive philosophy and influence" (33). The funding of "angry feminist research" displaces serious and principled intellectual work, contends Sommers, and in the preface to her book she writes: "It is easy enough to get grants for feminist research aimed at showing how women are being shortchanged and 'silenced' by the male establishment. It is not so easy to receive grants for a study that criticizes the feminist establishment for its errors and excesses" (8). Ironically, Sommers follows up that statement about difficulty in finding funding for projects critical of feminist work with an acknowledgment of the generous support she received from the "Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, the Carthage Foundation, and the John M. Olin Foundation" (8). Sommers received at least $164,000 between 1991 and 1993 from the Olin, Bradley, and Carthage foundations to write her book—on top of a reported "six-figure" advance from Simon & Schuster, according to Laura Flanders, who quotes a May, 17, 1992 Boston Globe article on Sommers (145). It is no coincidence, then, that the Olin foundation, the conservative organization that bankrolled Dinesh D'Souza's backlash critique Illiberal Education, also served as a major grantor to the National Review, which made Sommers' book the cover story in 1994, and the Laughlin Group, which featured Sommers as the main guest on one of their programs that same year (Flanders 145). In addition to the support she received from conservative foundations and think-tanks, she was also granted a two-year leave from Clark University and a "Mellon Faculty Development Grant and a Higgins Research Grant" (Sommers 8). Clearly, funding was not lacking for her critical feminist project in spite of her remonstrations to the opposite.

Sommers' affiliation and support from right wing foundations has not ended with the publication of her book. She is currently W.H. Brady Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, a conservative think-tank, and Rush Limbaugh has proclaimed her book "brave and courageous" along with a host of other pundits and journalists (qtd. in Flanders 144). Moreover, she has written a follow-up book entitled The War Against Boys: How Misguided Feminism is Harming Our Young Men, a book that claims that the feminist focus on girls being shortchanged has actually shortchanged America's boys.
In spite of her mainstream success as a conservative critic of feminism, Sommers has not been happy with the reception of her work by most academic feminists. In a 1995 radio interview on “The Future of Feminism” hosted by Scott London, Sommers contends that she has been censored and viciously attacked by fellow feminists, the most public incident of this being a controversy that broke out over reviews of her book when well-known feminist literary critic Nina Auerbach was asked to review it for the New York Review of Books. Sommers accused Auerbach of lacking objectivity and of exercising extreme bias in the review, alleging “she didn’t read it or read a few pages and hated it” (London 5). Sommers further alleges that the review was a set-up, in that the editor of the New York Review of Books at the time was a former student of Auerbach’s; in addition, Sommers contends that Auerbach wrote a negative review because her fellow feminist scholars and colleagues were portrayed in a critical light (5). John K. Wilson in a 1994 Z magazine review of the book questions and counters Sommers’ claim that Auerbach wrote a biased review:

For writing a negative review, Auerbach was attacked by Sommers and vilified by conservatives across the country even though (as [New York Review of Books editor Rebecca] Sinkler observes) “No one who has charged her with bias has found anything inaccurate in her review.” Yet Jean Elshtain (New Republic), Mary Lefkowitz (National Review), and Elizabeth Fox Genovese (Atlanta Constitution) favorably reviewed the book without anyone criticizing the fact that all three are praised in Who Stole Feminism? as “distinguished figures” (131–32). Why was Nina Auerbach attacked for reviewing a book which didn’t mention her, while four supporters named in the book (including Cathy Young, who reviewed it in Commentary) were not challenged at all for being “biased” reviewers? (5)

Wilson has pointed out the irony of a critic of feminism who opposes “victim feminism” seeing herself as a victim of feminists: “The presentation of Sommers as the victim of gender feminists (another irony for someone who opposes seeing women as victims) has been widely promoted by conservatives and the media, who in some cases resort to pure invention to support it” (5).

The reception of Sommers’ book, interestingly, has mirrored the polarized narrative strategies it relies upon. On the one hand, it has become a text that feminists have dismissed as a trash critique and others have pointed to as a dangerous source of misinformation and partial
claims that must be countered. On the other hand, it has been hailed as truth-telling important book by conservatives, mainstream journalists, and sympathetic feminist dissenters (see Wilson's summary of positive reviews). Whether for good or for ill, Sommers has become one of the foremost "internal" critics of the feminist movement. Thus, Sommers constitutes a new breed of "internal critic": less an "insider" and more a critical "outsider" to feminism, a critic that commands a disproportionate share of media attention and a critic who has made a career out of critiquing feminists, pointing out flaws, and capitalizing (literally) on the notoriety such a critique brings in the marketplace of the mainstream media. Ultimately, the question Sommers asks and answers in her book is not "who stole feminism?" but who should own and represent it? The problem with her question is that feminism does not belong to any one group, and to imply that it does is to offer an ahistorical and unrealistic view that simply perpetuates public biases against feminism rather than alleviating them.

**Professing Feminism**

Of the two sets of "internal" critics I address in this essay, Patai, a literary critic, and Koertge, an historian of science, are certainly closer than Sommers to being members of the feminist academic community in that both have spent a number of years as faculty members associated with women's studies. As a result, their critique has been taken more seriously by fellow faculty members in women's studies, although no less contested than Sommers'. A quick survey of the critical reception of the book reveals a wide variance of opinion on its value and impact, a point I will address in the conclusion when I take up the direction of future "internal critiques" in feminist theorizing and women's studies.

On the surface, *Professing Feminism* looks like a fairly typical academic book. Patai and Koertge employ tactics familiar to social science and humanities researchers: they conduct three-hour interviews with thirty women's studies "exiles" (those who have left women's studies or who are thinking about doing so). What all of these "exiles" have in common, says Patai and Koertge, are "concern, disappointment, and unhappiness," yet they assure the reader that these feminists are not merely disgruntled academics or "enemies of feminism," but "sincere and thoughtful individuals, providing accounts of troubling experiences and disappointed hopes" (xvi-xvii). To supplement the interviews, the coauthors examine "correspondence, memos, and journal entries as well as communications from the International Electronic Forum for Women's
Studies (WMST-List, run by Joan Korenman"). Although their research is not representative of a specific qualitative sample of programs broken out by region or institutional type, the authors claim that “everything we have learned convinces us that the voices heard in this book, and the problems discussed, are characteristic” (xviii).. The problem that is immediately apparent with this study, as is the case with Sommers’ book, is that the thirty interviewees remain unidentified so it is difficult to judge how representative their sample is. Patai and Koertge acknowledge this as a problem because the “desire for anonymity” tends to “stifle open debate” and “implies that “disagreement is viewed as betrayal” (xix).

What is also apparent is that Patai and Koertge are less interested in a reasoned critique and more interested in telling a good story. Like Sommers, they do their best to mix the trash tactic of argument by synecdoche and the shock rhetoric tactic of the trope of outrage to call attention to the excesses and outrageous behavior of feminist students and faculty. In three narratives about the women’s studies classroom, representative anecdotes about “militant” feminist students are utilized to portray the problems as a whole with women’s studies. In the narratives, women’s studies students are represented as either vicious and militant or bewildered, fragile and misled. Patai and Koertge argue that each of them the three representative women’s studies faculty members named in Chapter Two, “Cautionary Tales from Women Who Walked Away” “attributed a large share of the blame for creating an inhospitable atmosphere to militant feminist students” (13). Anna, a prominent social science researcher, describes how her attempts to engage women’s studies students were thwarted by a class “of really tough students—they called themselves ‘dykes,’ actually—who in the first class meeting, launched an all-out assault on me for having men on my reading list” (14). In addition, one of the groups in Anna’s class is further described as engaging in disruptive tactics such as stomping and hooting when ideas were presented that offended their feminist sensibilities. At the end of the semester, these students also stuffed the “evaluation” box, so to speak, with negative evaluations. Some of them filled out extra evaluation forms to underscore their dissatisfaction (14). Another interview subject, Margaret, a professor in the humanities who directed a women’s studies course for years, speaks of a literature class, “in the “early days of Women’s Studies” in which “radical lesbian separatist” students and heterosexual students polarized in a women’s literature class: “The lesbians sat on one side, the straights on the other, and I was constantly terrified that they would attack each other physically, hate each other,
hate me, that the class would completely break down.” According to Margaret’s account, the lesbian students “had no interest in any aesthetic questions or any structural questions,” but were interested in literature as a model for life” (15–16). The heterosexual students felt “intimidated, silenced, and later they would come and cry and tell that they just couldn’t go on this way” (15). Jeanne, a well-known and respected historian with a joint appointment in History and Women’s Studies, laments the dismissive attitudes that women’s studies students display toward significant male thinkers such as Freud (16). In short, in Professing Feminism, students, with only a few exceptions, are portrayed as feminist versions of the “Stepford wives,” ideologically programmed toward intolerance, anti-intellectualism, and negativity toward male thinkers, or as victims damaged by their peers’ or professors’ ideological programming.

Given the narratives of “disruptive” and resistant students, it would seem natural for Patai and Koertge to situate their critical readings of feminist students and classrooms within the scholarship on critical pedagogy and feminist critical pedagogy. Doing so would allow the authors to interrogate the differential power relations and rhetorics in which they, as researchers, solicited pedagogical narratives and in which the interviewed teachers constructed “narratives” of teaching “difficult” or “resistant” students, and to check those narratives against potential cultural stereotypes of students. Questioning the construction of these pedagogical narratives, however, is not part of the critique offered here. The pedagogical narratives Patai and Koertge offer fall into the genre of pedagogical “testimonials,” a form of pedagogical narration “complete with an implied narrator, stock character types, a specific mode of emplotment, and an informal tone” (Helmers 35). The goal of pedagogical testimonies, says Marguerite Helmers, is to identify and correct an evident “lack” in students: “Testimonial plots emphasize change and reclamation of the students to what is proper. Constructing the students as ‘those who lack’ establishes their impotency . . . and reinforces their dependency on the power of the instructor as the one who is able to initiate change” (22). Patai and Koertge rely on the interview subjects’ pedagogical testimonials without offering qualitative comparisons to scholarly discourses on similar topics, and readers and reviewers of the book have rightfully questioned the generalizability of the interview narratives, not only in terms of the “contingent ‘local conditions’” of individual programs but also in relation to the broader interdisciplinary feminist discourses that have led to complex understandings of knowledge-
making, research methods, and programmatic change (Loeffelholz 89).

Another realm the authors focus on in addition to "outrageous students" is the "outrageous" ideology of feminism that they claim permeates women's studies programs. Patai and Koertge characterize problematic "language games" within feminism in terms of a series of acronyms and slogans:

IDPOL or ideological policing is the centerpiece of feminist ideology/language games in women's studies, and it "stands for the attempt by a particular group to gain a political advantage from whatever makes it identifiable as a group" (50).

TOTAL REJ, another feminist language game, is rejecting the Western tradition, the "feminist move of totally rejecting the masculinist, patriarchal, Eurocentric, capitalistic cultural heritage and trying to invent de novo feminist replacements for all that has been discarded" (115-16).

BIODENIAL, the tendency to discredit theory based in biology, which results in women excluding themselves from scientific fields of studies and careers because they should be resisting or rejecting scientific knowledges or other forms of technical information (156-57).

In highlighting these language games, Patai and Koertge once again, emphasize the "outrageous" examples of women's studies students and faculty wielding these ideologies for anti-intellectual and conformist purposes. For instance, they argue that IDPOL is wielded as "an instrument for disadvantaged or oppressed groups to seize their rightful share of power in the world" (50). Using IDPOL, faculty and students one-up each other on the basis of their marginalized status and end up "comparing types and degrees of oppression" (51). Tensions over sexuality also play a role in IDPOL, over political versus born lesbians, over bisexuality, and heterosexuality (58-59). Battles over race and representation are recounted as "ritualistic denunciations and confessions of 'white skin privilege,'" which tend to shut down dialogue or can result in power struggles and guilty silence (67-65).

No doubt these tendencies are present in a number of women's studies programs, and also in ethnic studies programs, but how representative are such "language games" of the whole of women's studies programs? How have women's studies scholars and students found other ways to operate critiques of heterosexism and racism, of the Western tradition, and of scientific discourses that do not fit into these ideological
characterizations? Once again, the problem of representativeness is made manifest through their reading of the problematic tendencies of these ideologies. Loeffelholz argues that *Professing Feminism* levels the differences between programs and, as a result, "renders differences among programs unthinkable and unanalyzable, random rather than meaningfully contingent (and its authors thus consistently refuse to follow up their informants' suggestions that they have had significantly different experiences in different Women's Studies programs)" (90).

Patai and Koertge's position, although they disagree somewhat amongst themselves about the future fate of women's studies, is to argue for a form of mainstreaming women's studies: "It would be far better to introduce courses on women and gender as part of the regular curriculum, insisting on sound scholarship and high professional standards on the part of those who teach and those who learn" (210). Additionally, they favor a liberal education approach: "Feminism in the academy should abandon its simplistic and abused notion of the 'political,' its grandiose claims, its know-it-all strictures, and its radical rhetorical flourishes, and return to professional practices consistent with the principles of liberal education" (211). They argue that activism and political ideology groups should remain outside the academy. However, what is meant by the liberal educational approach, and how does such an approach account for a critique of traditional knowledge-making in the disciplines? How does a liberal education approach address the real issue of hiring feminist faculty members and the material conditions of women's studies programs on many college campuses (both elite and non-elite)? Mary Loeffelholz argues that *Professing Feminism* would have better served its readers if it would have focused on the structural conditions that make interdisciplinary work possible in women's studies instead of calling readers "back to what they regard as the bracing rigors and timeless intellectual liberties of the traditional disciplines in traditional colleges and universities" (92).

Patai and Koertge conclude *Professing Feminism* by saying that they feel a sense of sadness and loss at the present circumstances of women's studies. However, the pervasive ironic tone in the book masks that sadness, loss, and disappointment and instead underscores a critical and ironic tone that appeals to dismissive or reactionary audiences. Although they claim to be "insiders" to feminism, the "shock rhetoric of expose positions its readers as outsiders by definition" (Loeffelholz 86), and draws Patai and Koertge's critique closer to the shock and trash rhetoric critique articulated by Sommers.
**Toward a Productive Internal Criticism**

Internal critics of feminism like Sommers and Patai and Koertge have forced feminists to consider how we want to examine and critique women's studies programs and feminist discourses without compromising their place and influence in the academy. Beyond bemoaning the "unenlightened" nature of such critiques (itself a feature of trash rhetoric), those of us who teach women's studies and write feminist theory/feminist criticism must grapple with the question of how to respond to such critiques. Some academics have argued that we need to do a better job of representing what we do and who we are to various publics and that we must develop effective replies to public critiques that "trash" complex intellectual movements and ideas like feminism. This view is appealing to many of us as the emphasis is on using rational, well-reasoned discourse to counter the less-than-rational claims of conservative critics; however, this view is rhetorical as it does not acknowledge how appeals to shock/trash rhetorics hold sway over popular audiences. As I argue earlier, shock and trash rhetorics are familiar and much-cherished modes that various publics partake in daily through popular journalism, tabloid TV, and Internet chat rooms. In the case of conservative critiques of the academy, it is perhaps a good idea to "fight fire with fire," to paraphrase Naomi Wolf, and to use a mix of rhetorical styles. FAIR is an excellent example of how to undertake such critiques through a combination of investigative journalism, sound academic research, and a mix of rhetorical styles.

In addition, we need to engage in more effective and rigorous self-criticism and reflection and develop counterresponses that we can employ both externally and internally. Within the academy and within feminist criticism, there have been four main responses to these critiques: _local narratives_, texts that tell the story of individual women's studies programs and feminist endeavors; _collective responses_, which consider conflicts within feminism from different perspectives including "generational" ones; _historical responses_, which are seeking to counter critiques through multi-leveled readings of feminist history and practice, and _qualitative studies_, which try to address how women outside academe respond to feminism.

**Local Narratives: Institutional Memoirs**

One way feminists have begun to address and practice internal criticism is to launch narratives of feminist self-exploration and critique that consider problems within feminism from a local perspective. _Can We_
Wear our Pearls and Still be Feminists?: Memoirs of a Campus Struggle, a contemporary account of Joan Mandle’s tenure as Director of Women’s Studies at Colgate University, addresses many of the same themes raised in Patai and Koertge’s Professing Feminism but instead offers a local, contextualized analysis rather than a general analysis. Mandle eschews shock and trash rhetorics and offers an admittedly partial view of the complex material and psychological negotiations that happen in women’s studies communities. Although her narration is singular and framed as an institutional memoir, Mandle is attentive to the minute negotiations of power, authority, personality, and tradition in the women’s studies program she directed. While Mandle tends to make herself into the heroine of her own story, representing institutional battles mostly from her perspective, she at least shows how complicated and multifaceted feminist communities are. In addition, she aptly demonstrates how individual personalities, resources, and physical and historical location affect the outcomes of feminist interactions. If well-written, fair, and careful to offer multiple perspectives (and it is debatable if Mandle’s book, indeed, fits this criteria on every account), local narratives/institutional memoirs may allow for a fuller exploration of the local issues and conflicts that tend to arise in particular women’s studies programs, and such accounts may be instructive for the larger community of feminist scholars and women’s studies students and faculty.

Collective Responses
Feminists seeking to respond to internal critiques have also fostered collective exchanges between and among feminists over issues such as generational differences, a theme that has been prominently featured in panels and regional and national conferences and also in popular and academic publications about the “third wave” of feminism. The mid-1990s saw a surge in interest in the concept of feminist generations, with a host of events taking place between 1993-1996, including an MLA session on feminist generations in 1993 and numerous conferences: the 1995 National Women’s Studies Association Conference on Generations of Feminism, the CUNY Graduate School conference “Gender and Generations: Postmodernism and its Discontents,” the Bowling Green State University Conference on Feminist Generations in February 1996, the Fifth Annual Women’s Studies Conference at Southern Connecticut State University, and the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee’s Conference on “Women and Aging: Bodies, Cultures, and Generations” (Looser
These events have sparked the makings of intra-generational and cross-generational dialogue over feminist differences that can be found in collections such as Devoney Looser and E. Ann Kaplan's *Generations: Academic Feminists in Dialogue*, a cross-generational analysis/dialogue between different generations of feminists over the tensions between feminist generations: "Comprising original essays from academic women at varying professional stages (from established scholar to beginning assistant professor to doctoral student), the book is also an enactment of feminist generations. In the spirit of dialogue, the essays collected here question the categories of old, middle-aged, and young in order to discuss feminisms—'proto,' 'post,' and 'present'" (x; see also Whittier). The goal of feminist scholarship that accounts for generational differences, argues Lynn Worsham, should be to seek a "way of doing feminism that seeks to hold in living memory the specific historical forces that have shaped feminist statements, making certain words necessary for one generation and others words possible for another; a way of doing feminist work that is tough-minded because self-critical, politically courageous because engaged with multiple differences, and generous to prior selves, to different generations of feminists" (351). Seeking a way of doing feminism that is generous to prior selves and to differences between and among generations also has sparked a number of historical reconsiderations of women's studies and feminism in the academy.

**Historical Responses**

*Who Stole Feminism?* and *Professing Feminism* have highlighted the urgent need for the preservationist project of writing the histories of the programs and founders of women's studies, a number of whom are retiring and "passing on." In Florence Howe's rich edited collection, *The Politics of Women's Studies: Testimony from Thirty Founding Mothers*, thirty founding directors of women's studies programs across the country tell the story of how they set up and funded women's studies programs. In assembling this collection, Howe conveys a sense of rhetorical urgency about the preservation of women's studies history in the face of its "detractors," those who "see it as 'wrecking' or 'trivializing' the curriculum," and its "promoters," those who "strive to legitimize women's studies through its admittance as a 'discipline' into departmental status" (xi). Howe and her contemporaries undertook this collection for two reasons. First, they wrote the book to prevent cultural and institutional amnesia: "What shocks all of us, just thirty years after women’s studies
begin, is the amnesia afflicting most of those teaching or studying about women” (xiii). Secondly, they undertook this history to reveal the collective power of the story of the formation of women’s studies (xiii). Reading these histories provides a sense of the struggle feminist scholars underwent to gain ground in women’s studies. Also, the materiality of that struggle is aptly conveyed, a struggle that is largely unacknowledged in internal and external critiques of women’s studies. Many of women’s studies founders began “as part-time instructors or assistant professors,” as graduate students and undergraduates with few resources. Also characteristic here is that most of the institutions represented are state universities, thus reflecting the public dimensions of women’s studies (xiii). Read alongside popular critiques of women’s studies, Howe’s collection exposes the limited perception of women’s studies’ collective history and collective struggle.

Qualitative Studies
An interesting counterbalance to claims that feminists don’t speak for “real women” (a pervasive critique in Sommers’ argument) can be found in research studies that ask so-called “real women” about their responses to feminism and in doing so seek to go to the source instead of speaking “for” so-called real-women. The contradictoriness and ambiguities of women’s relations with each other and with feminism are well represented in The Deep Divide by Sherrye Henry, a qualitative and quantitative analysis of why so few women have made it into American politics as elected representatives. In addition, Elinor Burkett’s The Right Women: A Journey Through the Heart of Conservative America, offers an interview-based analysis of how conservative women view and respond to feminism. Both writers are feminists who wish to understand why the majority of American women do not think they are feminists and why a growing number of women claim feminism doesn’t speak for them. Unlike “internal critics” such as Sommers and Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, the author of Feminism is Not the Story of My Life, Henry and Burkett set out to find out why this is the case by asking for and studying women’s responses, going where the responses take them, not using generalizations to fit an argument that the feminist movement is wrong and unrepresentative. One cannot help but wonder why Henry’s and Burkett’s smart and insightful qualitative analyses of real women’s responses and ambivalence to feminism and the women’s movement did not receive the same public attention as the “internal critiques” of Sommers and Patai and Koertge.
Together these responses (individual, collective, historical, and qualitative) go beyond the limited shock and trash rhetorics of "internal criticisms" and represent a more nuanced, reflective, self-critical approach to problems and debates within women's studies and feminism. What these critiques do not offer, however, is a wide reach beyond the academy, and this returns us to the perennial question of how feminists should address popular audiences and, in general, how academics can make their ideas accessible and understandable to popular audiences.

**Feminist Critical Media Studies/Rhetorical Studies**

In her insightful article on the conservative campaign against liberal higher education (of which anti-feminist critiques have been a significant part), Ellen Messer-Davidow argues that the key to understanding the right's success in launching anti-feminist and anti-liberal higher education media coverage is to understand the campaign of social strategy effected by conservatives. As Messer-Davidow puts it, "the Right has manufactured the attack on liberalized higher education by means of a right-wing apparatus dedicated to making a radical cultural change" (43).

Using foundations and think-tanks, journalistic training schools, and grassroots organizing structures to train their spokespeople (academics, student advocates, print journalists, media commentators), advocates for the right have conveyed their social message to government agencies, politicians, media outlets, and citizens via direct mailings of conservative reports and publications, lobbying efforts, the establishment of political action groups, and the establishment of conservative campus-based organizations (47–49). In particular, conservative groups like the Independent Women’s Forum, bankrolled by conservative foundations and think-tanks, have succeeded in putting conservative anti-feminist journalists and commentators front and center in the media coverage of women’s issues (Flanders 154). The result, as I allude to earlier, is that feminist ideas and experts are discredited and social policy is affected by the lack of representation of such perspectives: "A vast range of experts are cast into doubt: and they are the experts on precisely those issues, like poverty, the family and welfare, that are up for legislative debate," argues Laura Flanders (151).

Reversing this tendency, however, is no easy task and must be done on multiple fronts. The advocacy of feminist journalists like Flanders and other critical media scholars and left journalists has been one way to expose problems in the popular press critiques of feminism and to bring a greater range of feminist perspectives to the public eye. However,
feminist rhetoricians can join with this effort to close the gap between the representations of the "women's movement that get headlines" and the "one going on on the ground" (Flanders 105). Those of us who study, write about, and teach feminist rhetoric are well-positioned to participate in these efforts by analyzing, as I have done here, how feminism and women's studies are taken up in popular press representations and to argue for representations that will be more accurate and nuanced. However, rhetorical analysis must be joined with rhetorical action. Efforts to reverse the terms of the critique have to be addressed on multiple levels, including practical action. Messer-Davidow argues compellingly that included in the agenda to address anti-feminist and anti-liberal higher education attacks must be "coalition building across the Left and the moderate center; effective presentation of progressive higher-education values to other communities; electoral politics supporting progressive, liberal, and moderate candidates; restaffing of government agencies; and the acquisition of legislative, lobbying, media, and fundraising skills" (70). Combining effective rhetorical analysis with effective rhetorical action in the public arena will offer feminists a fighting chance at countering critiques of feminism and women's studies that rely on trash and shock rhetorics.

Notes

1. I draw the title of my essay from a reference made by Nancy Miller, who refers to Susan Gubar's critique of the tradition of feminist misogyny. She notes that a line from Gubar's essay was cut out by the editors of Feminist Studies: "With friends like these, does feminism need enemies?" (167). Miller notes with dismay that Gubar's comment "was considered too pointed for the pages of Feminist Studies (too unsisterly?)" (167). Miller dredges up this "forbidden" sentence in her analysis of feminist "trash critiques," and I have appropriated this expression for my own use here.

2. FAIR's mission statement from its website reads as follows: "FAIR, the national media watch group, has been offering well-documented criticism of media bias and censorship since 1986. We work to invigorate the First Amendment by advocating for greater diversity in the press and by scrutinizing media practices that marginalize public interest, minority and dissenting viewpoints. As an anti-censorship organization, we expose neglected news stories and defend working journalists when they are muzzled. As a progressive group, FAIR believes that structural reform is ultimately needed to break up the dominant media conglomerates, establish independent public broadcasting and promote strong non-profit sources of information" ("What's Fair?").
3. Bal’s analysis of the rhetoric of trash critiques appears in a review essay on the book *Narrative as Communication* by Didier Coste.

4. Patai and Koertge insist that “going public” with criticisms of feminism constitutes a crucial feminist act. Speaking out against problems in feminism is the responsibility of feminists, they claim: “We believe that it is feminists, not their opponents, who must speak out about contemporary feminism’s tendency to turn into a parody of itself [through ideological policing, intolerance, and poor education]” (xv). Adages about “not airing dirty linen in public” should not be heeded precisely because feminism is about questioning and dismantling “traditions and institutions that harm women by impeding their development in all spheres” (xiv).

5. Commenting on the absurdity of Sommers’ conflation of Faludi and McKinnon, reporter Laura Flanders from FAIR argues, “If audiences were used to televised discussions between a variety of women’s rights advocates, Sommers’ suggestion that anti-pornography lawyer Catharine MacKinnon and journalist Susan Faludi belong to the same camp of “gender feminists” would have struck viewers [and readers] as patently absurd” (146).

6. A series of archived email messages on the Women’s Studies national listserv take up feminist responses to *Professing Feminism*. The messages represent a wide variety of views about the book. These reviews appeared on WMST-L over a period of months in late 1994 and 1995.
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