Women's Studies (Miss Columbia I) Press Releases

(Chronological Order)

June 21, 2007

Columbia University's Priestesses

A Federal class action lawsuit attacks Women's Studies at Columbia University for using government aid to preach the religionist belief system "Feminism" and for discriminating against male students and male alumni.

The U.S. Supreme Court does not require a god-centered belief system for the establishment clause of the First Amendment to prohibit government action aiding a religion. Legally, religion can stem from moral, ethical or even malevolent tenets that are held with the strength of traditional religious convictions. Federal financial aid, State funds and other assistance help proselytize Feminism at Columbia in violation of the establishment clause.

Equal protection under the Fifth and 14th Amendments do not permit programs with a discriminatory impact that are motivated in part by ill will toward a particular sex—no matter how many tears or tantrums the majority uses to justify its discrimination. As a bastion of bigotry against men, Columbia has thrown its influence and prestige into violating the rights of men by offering a Woman's Studies program but no Men's Studies program.

Women's Studies are now the varsity sport of choice for campus coeds. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 has downsized or eliminated men's varsity teams, now it's time Columbia and other colleges do the same to their vociferous coeds or provide equivalent benefits to men in the form of Men's Studies programs.

April 15, 2009

Interim Ruling in Favor of Columbia's Women's Studies

A Federal Magistrate Judge recommends the dismissal of a lawsuit challenging Columbia's Women's Studies Program for violating Title IX and the Constitution.

Magistrate Kevin Nathaniel Fox, a Columbia graduate, concluded that the two plaintiff alums, attorney Roy Den Hollander and recent Columbia College graduate William A. Nosal, suffered no harm because they did not enroll in a Women Studies' course or were denied admission to one.

"The Magistrate completely miss-read the complaint, or only read Columbia's response," said Den Hollander. "Under Title IX, it is the absence of an opportunity for an equal educational experience that is the injury." "When a college only has a guys' rugby team, the injury to girls who want to play rugby is that there is no girls' team." "Mr. Nosal and I told the Court we tried to take Men's Studies' courses at Columbia, but there were none—that's the injury." "Why this Judge thinks we had to enroll or try to enroll in Women's Studies' courses is beyond me." "It's not the law, and I like to think I'm not that masochistic."

The Judge also found no equal protection injury, once again because the plaintiffs did not enroll in a Women's Studies' course or try to. The discriminatory harm is that Women Studies give females an advantage that prevents guys from competing on an equal footing in education, the work place, the courts, the culture, and society as a whole. Now you might disagree with that, but that is what the complaint alleges, and at this stage in a case, what the complaint says is considered true. "Obviously the Judge interjected his only factual and ideological beliefs in order to recommend dismissal," said Den Hollander. "You're not suppose to do that, but it

happens all the time, especially when taking on the post-modern Feminists in a system where men just don't count."

Den Hollander continued, "The Judge considers the discrimination against the plaintiffs as insignificant, a 'subjective chill—he calls it.'" The U.S. Supreme Court says differently: ""Discrimination itself, by perpetuating 'archaic and stereotypic notions' or by stigmatizing members of the disfavored group as 'innately inferior' and therefore as less worthy participants in the political community, … can cause serious noneconomic injuries to those persons who are personally denied equal treatment…." *Heckler v. Mathews*, 465 U.S. 728, 739-740 (1984).

"The Courts are suppose 'to protect unpopular individuals … and their ideas from suppression—at the hand of an intolerant society,' *McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Com'n*, 514 U.S. 334, 357, 115 S.Ct. 1511, 131 L.Ed.2d 426 (1995), but today in America they are essentially useless for protecting the rights of men—probably time for a different strategy," remarked Den Hollander.

The Magistrate Judge's recommendations go to Judge Lewis A. Kaplan, who will decide whether to accept, reject or modify them—bet he accepts them, and then there will be an appeal to the Second Circuit.

April 27, 2009

Ruling in Favor of Columbia's Women's Studies

A Federal Judge dismissed a lawsuit challenging Columbia's Women's Studies Program for violating Title IX and the Constitution. The attorney and one of the plaintiffs, Roy Den Hollander responded, "When it comes to Men's Rights, judges act with an arrogance of power, ignorance of the law, and fear of the Feminists."

Judge Lewis A. Kaplan mischaracterized the central claim of the case as a violation of the Establishment Clause which he called "frivolous… absurd and without merit." Den Hollander, replied, "The only thing frivolous and absurd is men looking for justice in the courts of America. It's time we find justice elsewhere."

Judge Kaplan irrationally ruled, "Feminism is no more a religion than physics." Den Hollander replied, "Feminism believes that the differences between the sexes are the result of social conditioning. Science, which includes physics, disagrees." Den Hollander added, "Religion means an irrational belief system. What's more irrational than believing sexual roles have nothing to do with genetics or evolution or that because of sex, one group is entitled to preferential treatment. The Judge obviously never studied science, but clearly believes in Feminism."

Religion requires irrationality and acting against one's self-interest. So think irrationally and do something stupid and you've got Feminism or femininity.

"What do you think his decision would have been if a college offered only Men's Studies but no Women's Studies?" Den Hollander asked.

In accepting the Magistrate's decisions, Kaplan concluded that the two plaintiff alums, attorney Roy Den Hollander and recent Columbia College graduate William A. Nosal, suffered no harm because they did not enroll in a Women Studies' course or were denied admission to one.

"Judge Kaplan obviously ignored the equal protection and Title IX arguments to give us and the class of men the bum's rush out of court," said Den Hollander.

"The Judge completely miss-read the complaint, or only read Columbia's response," said Den Hollander. "Under Title IX, it is the absence of an opportunity for an equal educational

experience that is the injury." "When a college only has a guys' rugby team, the injury to girls who want to play rugby is that there is no girls' team." "Mr. Nosal and I told the Court we tried to take Men's Studies' courses at Columbia, but there were none—that's the injury." "Why this Judge thinks we had to enroll or try to enroll in Women's Studies' courses is beyond me." "It's not the law, and I like to think I'm not that masochistic."

The Judge also found no equal protection injury, once again because the plaintiffs did not enroll in a Women's Studies' course or try to. The discriminatory harm is that Women Studies give females an advantage that prevents guys from competing on an equal footing in education, the work place, the courts, the culture, and society as a whole. Now you might disagree with that, but that is what the complaint alleges, and at this stage in a case, what the complaint says is considered true. "Obviously the Judge interjected his only factual and ideological beliefs in order to dismiss," said Den Hollander. "You're not suppose to do that, but it happens all the time, especially when taking on the post-modern Feminists in a system where men just don't count."

Den Hollander continued, "The Judge considers the discrimination against the plaintiffs as insignificant, a 'subjective chill—he calls it.'" The U.S. Supreme Court says differently: "Discrimination itself, by perpetuating 'archaic and stereotypic notions' or by stigmatizing members of the disfavored group as 'innately inferior' and therefore as less worthy participants in the political community, … can cause serious noneconomic injuries to those persons who are personally denied equal treatment…." Heckler v. Mathews, 465 U.S. 728, 739-740 (1984).

"The Courts are suppose 'to protect unpopular individuals … and their ideas from suppression—at the hand of an intolerant society,' McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Com'n, 514 U.S.

334, 357, 115 S.Ct. 1511, 131 L.Ed.2d 426 (1995), but today in America they are essentially useless for protecting the rights of men—time for a different strategy," remarked Den Hollander.

"If there is any question as to who runs the courts, Judge Kaplan's swift boot to men once again makes clear that the Feminists do. Most Judges are just plain scared of the Feminists," concluded Den Hollander.