If she was a noise, she'd be an electric sander in the apartment next door, relentless, high-pitched and impossible to ignore. As it is, she compares herself favourably to both Simone de Beauvoir and Madonna. For the past two years, Camille Paglia, Professor of Humanities at the University of the Arts in Philadelphia and controversial author, has been making a living irritating the hell out of practically any ideology which wanders into her sights. Here she is on feminism:

Contemporary feminists, who are generally poor or narrowly trained scholars, insist on viewing history as a weepy scenario of male oppression and female victimisation. But it is more accurate to see men, driven by sexual anxiety away from their mothers, forming group alliances by male bonding to create the complex structures of society, art, science and technology.

And here she is again on conservative family values:

Gay men are the guardians of the masculine impulse. To have anonymous sex in a dark alleyway is to pay homage to the dream of male freedom... Similarly, straight men who visit prostitutes are valiantly striving to keep sex free from emotion, duty, family—in other words, from society, religion and procreative Mother Nature.

A self-proclaimed bisexual feminist, Paglia has little sympathy for either the Left or the Right. Indeed, she argues that the liberal-conservative binary no longer holds. Speaking at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1991 she told her audience: “The liberal and conservative dichotomy is dead. The last time it was authentic was in the 50s, when there really was an adversarial voice coming out of people I really respected, the New York Jewish intellectuals like Lionel Trilling and the people of Partisan Review.”

A child of the 60's revolution herself, Paglia argues that her generation squandered its intellectual inheritance with excesses and built, in the place of a true revolutionary consciousness, a hollow shrine to political correctness. Her targets are liberal scholars and their courses—the gamut of post-60s humanities fodder, from standard Marxist-feminist critiques through to poststructuralist models. Superficially, there’s little to distinguish her rapid-fire attacks on the new liberal orthodoxy from those of disgruntled academic traditionalists. What differentiates her, however, is not rhetoric but speaking position.

Paglia talks as an insider, a feminist/lesbian scholar who has no relation to the WASPish moral-values of discrimination. The last time it was real was in the 50s, when there really was an adversarial voice coming out of people I really respected, the New York Jewish intellectuals like Lionel Trilling and the people of Partisan Review.”

The well-intentioned report in question proceeds from a premise of “the basic goodness of sexuality.” (It is a vision which, Paglia notes, “would have made Doris Day and Debbie Reynolds—those 50s blonde divas—proud”.) Departing from this optimistic view of sexuality, the report proceeds to apply a feminist-Marxist critique to contemporary sexual politics, targeting “our cultural captivity to a patriarchal model of sexuality and its ethic of sexual control”. Christian values, it argues, demand that marginalised groups are treated with tolerance. The ultimate vision is of a “nonpatriarchal future” where everyone can get along free of discrimination.

In this revised Christian brotherhood, newly purged of racist, sexist and homophobic overtones, Paglia discerns something smelly, however: “the revival of the old Protestant ethic, masquerading in new, hip clothes”. The report, she says, gives us vanilla sex, smothered with artificial butterscotch syrup. In its liberal zeal to understand, to accept, to heal, it reduces the grand tragicomedy of love and lust to a Hallmark card. Its uncouth normalising of dissident sex is imperialistic and
oppressive. The gay world is stripped of its outlaw adventures in toilets, alleyways, trucks and orgy rooms... This is censorship in the name of liberal benevolence.

Paglia discerns the same trimmed-lawn view of sex and emotion in much feminist ideology. Central to this repression, she argues, is a reluctance to engage aesthetics or psychoanalysis. The result is a feminist politics which has failed to come to terms with beauty or pleasure and can only fall back on a monolithic view of lust as something men 'do' to women.

Strip back the hysterical cant, and Paglia is on to something. Indeed, she's managed to popularise a debate which has been raging internally in the women's movement for the past decade. As Australian feminist scholar, Elizabeth Grosz noted recently in an interview with the Sydney Morning Herald, many feminists disagree strongly with the essentialist critique of patriarchy popularised by authors such as Naomi Woolf. Says Grosz: "Woolf is part of a return to telling women what they should or shouldn't be doing. She sets up an appearance-reality split which I find deeply disturbing because it presumes that we have layers of appearance we can peel off and get to the 'real' woman or person underneath."

Grosz's comment fingers something dear to Paglia's heart: the centrality of the mask to Western philosophy and, in particular, aesthetics. The title of her major work, Sexual Personae, was inspired by Ingmar Bergman's film Persona, meaning literally clay or wooden masks worn by actors in Greek or Roman theatre. Western personality, Paglia argues, originates in the idea of mask, and society is "the place of masks, a ritual theatre". Underlying this theatre, Paglia discerns an age-old drama, the conflict of reason and nature.

In an abandoned preface to Sexual Personae, she wrote: "Civilisation is an ethical stronghold, the Appollonian palace that reason has built... Sadean nature, the dark hero of Sexual Personae, is the Dionysian ... raw, brute, earthpower". In Paglia's thesis, the gross continuum of nature lurks just below the surface of culture always threatening to spill over. The nature-culture split is a well-worn dichotomy, but it explains why she has little sympathy with liberal attacks on Western reason and culture. In their zeal to critique the rigidity and hierarchical logic of patriarchy, Paglia argues that liberals have fallen into the trap of romanticising nature and forgetting the pagan chaos of the swamp from which we emerged.

It's an old thesis based on an essentialist view of history, nature and culture. And, ironically, it's one which leads Paglia down the same path of crude biologically-based distinctions which the feminists she criticises have followed. Despite her own calls for greater scholarly rigour and her claims that modern humanities academics are poorly or narrowly trained, Paglia's own intellectual inquiries ultimately lack depth or consistency. Her engine is reactive rather than inventive.

Despite this major weakness, however, Paglia does have something to offer current debates. Her brutal honesty is a welcome relief from the pussy-footing self-justification which often passes for analysis in cultural studies and theory forums these days. In an era where oppositions seem to be dissolving, where it's getting harder to tell your left from right, Paglia's brand of hysterical opposition is a strangely appropriate antidote. As a theorist she has a lot in common with the 60s rock 'n' roll she loves so much—it's a raw, angry energy which refuses to be fed pacifying words. And, in this sense, she may be just the irritant contemporary liberal debate needs.
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