

An email exchange with a lady at *The Huffington Post* concerning the possible publication of Mike Buchanan's blog piece, 'Gender feminism: The approaching crisis.'

Mike Buchanan's text in black font.

The Huffington Post's lady's text in red font.

---

Good morning. Please find attached my first proposed *HuffPo* blog post. I spent some time trying to work out how to sign up as a blogger, but couldn't find out how to. Could someone please point me in the right direction? Thanks.

---

Hello there Mike, thanks for sending this over. Regarding being signed up as a *Huffington Post* blogger, we make that decision and create a *Huff Post* blogger account if we deem that a blogger will be a good fit for the site after reading their proposed first blog.

Our site is all about starting conversations, and we are more than happy to host blog posts demonstrating a host of varied and opposing opinions, but we will not run anything that is deliberately inflammatory I don't know what you mean by this. You have gender feminist bloggers such as Ellie Slee while opposing arguments which are 'deliberately inflammatory'? Are you simply unwilling to host anti-feminist bloggers? If so, I've wasted my time penning the piece and I'm afraid as a result, we would not be able to run this blog post as it stands. You would need to tone the language markedly for our purposes and also, you make state an awful lot of opinions as facts Can you tell me where, and I'll provide evidence? and make factual assertions that have no links Can you tell me where, and I'll provide evidence? Anything you state as fact needs to be backed up. Happy to do so, unlike feminists.

Also, we do not allow personal attacks and you single out quite a few people. How are public challenges of people who've made DEMONSTRABLY misleading statements in the media – in this case Kat Banyard, Caroline Criado-Perez and Janet Street-Porter – 'personal attacks'? When journalists call people to account for their misleading statements, are THEY engaging in personal attacks too? If so, this would make a mockery of investigative journalism.

If these concerns could be addressed, we could take another look with a view to giving you a right to reply.

---

Hello again,

Ellie's post in our opinion was not deliberately inflammatory, otherwise we would not have published it. We have hosted many blog posts arguing against many aspects of feminism, but we would not host something saying that all feminists are wrong, as that is simply inflammatory and looking to provoke. We prefer considered arguments.

You say that the individuals concerned have made 'demonstrably misleading statements'. You would then need to demonstrate this with links to articles where they have done so.

---

Thank you. If you read the early part of the piece again, you'll see that I don't say 'all feminists are wrong'. I wrote, "Hoff Sommers defines equity feminists as people (not always women) who believe in equality of opportunity, equality under the law etc. The vast majority of people who self-identify as feminists are equity feminists, and while I wouldn't identify as a feminist, I believe in those things too." Far from writing, 'all feminists are wrong', I wrote that I believe what the 'vast majority' of them aren't. As far as our public challenges of Kat Banyard (*Channel 4 News* interview), Caroline Criado-Perez (BBC *Three Counties Radio*), and Janet Street-Porter (*Daily Mail* article) are concerned, they can be found here: <http://j4mb.wordpress.com/our-public-challenges-to-feminists>. I believe in each case the fact they've made demonstrably misleading statements (from the evidence we provided in the pieces) and assume they'd have provided me with counter-evidence if they thought our arguments were flawed in any way. I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

---

Hello again Mike,

I did not say you said all feminists are wrong, but it is what I felt you were implying. Honey badgers are well known to be anti-feminist for example.

And again, regardless of whether you feel the named are wrong, we do not wish to run blog posts that single people in this manner. We haven't run any blog posts attacking you personally on the site so I feel it is unnecessary for you to name people in this way. Simply linking to your website like that would not suffice for us. As I say, we wish to have balanced conversations on *The Huffington Post*.

---

Thank you. Of course Honey Badgers are anti-feminists, that defines most of them (there are a few female MHRAs who identify as non-feminists rather than anti-feminists, just as there are a few male MHRAs who do). How can you have a 'balanced conversation' on HuffPo with respect to feminism if anti-feminists such as these women aren't given exposure?

You wrote, "You say that the individuals concerned have made 'demonstrably misleading statements'. You would then need to demonstrate this with links to articles where they have done so." I provided links to the material demonstrating precisely what you asked for, showing the statements were demonstrably misleading – a TV interview, a radio interview, and a newspaper article – and now you say, 'I feel it is unnecessary for you to name people in this way'. Writing the blog post and exchanging emails with you has taken up a good deal of my time, and it's becoming painfully clear that you're unwilling to publish a post that vigorously challenges gender feminism. Can you please confirm this is the case, then we can stop wasting each other's time? Thank you.

---

As previously stated, we are not interested in hosting the post you emailed me for the reasons stated. Thank you for your time.