



# The Myth of Male Power: Why Men Are the Disposable Sex Part 1

WARREN FARRELL



*In dialogue form, the author reviews the highlights of the book version of The Myth of Male Power. Farrell takes us into our legal system, world history and religions, the psychology and sociology of success, suicide and love, and the politics and psychology of domestic violence, date rape and sex. He shows that men's corporate and political power has blinded them to the definition of real power: "control over one's life." Men are shown to be the "disposable sex." Their façade of strength camouflages an inability to detect feelings of weakness and powerlessness. Farrell envisions gender studies as helping both sexes make an evolutionary shift from a focus on survival to a proper balance between survival and fulfillment. He proposes "gender transition movement" from the rigid to more flexible roles for men and women.*

**Key Words:** men, boyhood, gender, social roles

Introductory Note: The following is a transcript of conversations between journalist Tom Howard and Warren Farrell that were taped in 1993 when Dr. Farrell's book *The Myth of Male Power* was published. The book remains in print (with an updated introduction for the 2001 edition) and CDs of the script are available privately at <http://www.warrenfarrell.com/cds/html>. Dr. Farrell wrote the basic script of the exchange himself, emphasizing the book's highlights. The dialogue format makes his book even more accessible, as if you are having a conversation with Dr. Farrell at a party and he is in direct dialogue with you about every question you might have about the cross-cultural, psychological, historical and legal issues related to men and women. In these fast-paced exchanges on both the written transcript and CD versions of *The Myth of Male Power*, the book comes alive. While the CD best captures Warren's personable and engaging style, the written script presented here encourages the more careful analysis appropriate for an academic publication. The written script also allows for an easier comparison to the full text of the book version of *The Myth of Male Power* with its extensive endnotes. The reader is encouraged to consult the book's precise notes and government sources on which this dialogue is based.

With Dr. Farrell's permission, this is the first time the text of the conversations has been made available in this form. What has happened during the nearly twenty years that have passed since the book appeared is testimony to the author's prescience. With the loss of blue-collar jobs and a dangerously weakened economy, the situation for men as Dr. Farrell described it in 2001 has worsened, especially for young males. By distinguishing between external power (for example, control over others) and internal power (control over one's own life), Dr. Farrell simultaneously navigates three experiences of male power and powerlessness: the external power (and often oppressiveness) of the few; the *external powerlessness* of *most males*; and the different types of *internal* powerlessness experienced by virtually all males. We often forget that when pronouncements are made about "men" it is not made clear that reference is being made to only the external power of a very small number of corporate and political moguls, not the internal and external powerlessness of the blokes, guys and lads of this world. Finally, Dr. Farrell does not omit reference to boys in his discussion. This is important, since as he makes clear, the stage for the internal powerlessness of virtually all males is set early in a boy's life. This is true not just in the United States, but in all cultures and classes.

*New Male Studies* is proud to offer this contribution in two parts. In several places, statistics have been updated. The most current data present an even bleaker picture for boys and men and *The Myth of Male Power* helps us understand both why that was so predictable and exactly what needs to be changed to create a healthier masculinity for the future. In brief, Dr. Farrell explains why raising our sons successfully in the past differs from raising our sons successfully for the future.

Warren Farrell is also the author of *The Liberated Man* (1975; updated edition, 1993); *Why Men Are the Way They Are* (1986); *Women Can't Hear What Men Don't Say* (1999); *Father and Child Reunion* (2001); *Why Men Earn More* (2005), and co-author of *Does Feminism Discriminate Against Men? A Debate* (2008). He is currently co-authoring, with John Gray, *Boys to Men*. He lives physically near San Francisco, and virtually at [www.warrenfarrell.com](http://www.warrenfarrell.com).



Tom Howard: Warren, right up front, I have been fascinated about this concept in your book about power. What do you mean about power?

Warren Farrell: In the *Myth of Male Power*, what I am trying to do is redefine what we mean by power. I'm saying that power is the ability to control our own life. If we have the ability to control our own life, we have power. We don't have power if we are working for somebody else and if we feel obligated to take a job we don't like in a coal mine or become a principal rather than a teacher because it earns more. If we love teaching but become a principal, we earn more money and like it less, and then we die sooner as a result of stress and someone else is spending our money while we are dead. I don't call that power.

Tom: You point out in your book that men, on average, die earlier than women. Are you hoping that one result of this book will be to give men and women information that will help men live longer?

Warren: Definitely, and that means getting men to understand what their feelings are, being able to express those feelings, getting society to understand what we are doing that is leading men to becoming 85% of the homeless, most of the alcoholics, most of the gamblers, 94% of the prisoners and most of the victims of homicide and suicide. It's funny, Tom, that we had really very few problems understanding that blacks are more likely to be victims of these problems because of their powerlessness as a group. But when men as a group are victims of each of these problems we can't conceive that it might be because they have a different form of powerlessness.

Tom: I've heard lots of women saying they are really impressed with the sense that they get that you understand how they feel as women as well as able to explain what is going on with men. It seems to me that one of the things that you really emphasize in this book is that although you think it's time for us to pay attention to what happens to males as far as powerlessness is concerned, you are not in any way suggesting that we start denying women's experiences of powerlessness.

Warren: Absolutely, and it would be really sad if I have to spend ten years of my life, ten years from now, countering people who are saying: "Okay, I understand that men are hurt in various ways" and now put down every woman that they have been involved with. It has been my intent to explain how the roles that I have grown up with have been so unnecessarily limiting to both girls and boys.

Tom: So you don't think that the old roles were good?

Warren: I don't think they were good for the standards that we have today. But I do think they were good for the survival of the species. I will explain in this tape that the roles that used to be functional for survival have now become dysfunctional. They have become dysfunctional in an evolutionary instant and that is why making the transition is so tough.

Tom: So, you will be taking us from a personal level to a more societal level?

Warren: I will be looking at both the past where the sexes had to be role mates to looking at the future where the sexes, I believe, desire to be soul mates.

Tom: On a personal level, what made you so interested in the women's movement for so many years, Warren?

Warren: I think first, I remember my mother being so happy in many instances of her life when she had her own sources of income and when she did not have to ask my father for money, like a welfare recipient does to the government. I can remember feeling sad that the girls weren't taught to play

team sports with us boys. I had a girlfriend who I especially wanted to play team sports with me. They were taught to be prudish in sex and you can understand why I did not like that! And we guys were taught to be sex maniacs. The whole concept of roles, where people have to fit into straightjackets is really sad to me, and really confining and really anti-human. The women's movement was the first thing that came along that started questioning the same things I was questioning, so I assumed it would be helping both sexes free themselves.

Tom: Were women more interested in all this stuff than men from the beginning?

Warren: Yes. Historically, for women, relationships were their source of income; for men, income was their source of relationships. My audiences were about 90% women and about 10% men. Most of the men were dragged there by women. This only reinforced that women were the smart ones and they were stuck with us guys.

Tom: There must have been some ego gratification in being the country's leading male feminist, no?

Warren: Not an ounce! Yes, I really secretly loved this perspective. It allowed me to see myself as one of America's sort of new-age guys, sort of a new top gun. Feminists would often ask me such things as: "Warren, how can we clone you?" "Do you have a brother?" "What in your background made you so secure?" I have to say that really reinforced my secret pride; and that the three or four new speaking engagements I got after almost each engagement allowed me to have a lot of financial security.

Tom: I would think that is an important point. Financial security usually leads to ideological lockjaw, so what loosened your jaw so to speak?

Warren: I think what loosened my jaw was reality. As most of the women who were my strongest supporters got divorced, I could only assume the problems were their husbands, and most of these women agreed that the problems were their husbands! But one of the things that I observed in some of my feminist women friends was that they had something in common, and what they had in common was their increasing anger toward men and almost a restlessness in their eyes that did not seem to reflect a deeper inner peace. And I think that as I was observing that, one day, in one of those rare moments of internal security, it hit me, and I asked myself whether I had had a positive impact. I wondered why so many more women than men were listening to me, and this was because I was listening to women and not listening to men. I reviewed some of the tapes from the hundreds of men's and women's groups that I had started. I noticed that when women were criticizing men I called it insight, women's liberation, high self-esteem, but when men were criticizing women I was calling it sexism, male chauvinism, defensiveness, men rationalizing, backlash. I think I did it politely but the men got the point. Soon the men were not expressing their feelings and I found that I was criticizing these guys for not expressing their feelings right after I was criticizing them for expressing their feelings.

Tom: Then what happened?

Warren: After listening to the tapes, I started listening a lot more to men. But then when women asked "why are men so afraid of commitment," or when feminists said that "men have the power" my answers incorporated a different perspective that I think was accounting for both sexes' perspectives, and I noticed that overnight my standing ovations started to disintegrate.

Tom: So you found that it must have taken more internal security on your part to speak on behalf of

men rather than speaking on behalf of women?

Warren: Or more accurately to be speaking on behalf of both sexes and not only on behalf of women. Yes, it did take more internal security and it also took some more financial security. There is another side to it, that although women's standing ovations had dropped off, there were also women that wrote to me that these perspectives were helping them feel much more loving to their husbands and their fathers and their men friends.

Tom: So, once they heard what you had to say, they had to think about it and come back to you?

Warren: Exactly. I remember one woman walking out of my lecture and writing me two weeks later that she ran by the things she objected to with her husband, and her husband said he never felt so understood by her before, so she came back to hear the lecture for a second time to get a different perspective.

Tom: And this is what probably what encouraged you to write more.

Warren: It was exactly that type of letter that encouraged me to write more. The women were usually more articulate about saying "put this stuff in writing more," and "I didn't like it at first but it's helping me a lot more than your praising of women."

Tom: Okay, then have we been misled by feminists?

Warren: Yes, but it is not feminists' fault.

Tom: How is that?

Warren: Men have not spoken up and women cannot hear what men do not say. I think that this has been the fault of men. Men have to take the responsibility to say what they want in order to change a war in which only one side shows up, to a dialogue in which both sexes speak up.

Tom: How do we do that?

Warren: By not assuming that an audiotape or a book about relationships, such as this, is for women. Men must take the responsibility to end the era about relationship issues as women's issues only. Women have contributed a ton and men must contribute too before we are ready for a real gender synthesis.

Tom: So, is the myth of men in power the flip side of feminism?

Warren: No, feminism says the world is patriarchal and male dominated. The flip side would be the world is matriarchal and female dominated. I will be explaining why it's both male and female dominated in different ways. I would be as strongly opposed to a view that the world is female dominated as to a view that it is male dominated because, as I will try to explain, I believe both are inaccurate.

Tom: Warren, are you a men's liberationist, a feminist, both, neither?

Warren: I guess like anyone else, I would rather be listened to than labeled. But I'm willing to calling myself a male liberationist or a masculinist as long as you define a male liberationist as for equal opportunity and equal responsibility for both sexes, and also a feminist when a feminist believes in equal opportunity and equal responsibility for both sexes. I oppose movements when either one of the sexes says our sex is the oppressed sex and therefore we deserve rights. That to me is

not gender liberation but gender entitlement. So ultimately I am not really in favor of a woman or men's movement, but a gender transition movement. However, I oppose skipping past a men's movement until men have equally articulated our perspective. I think that then and only then can it exist.

Tom: Do you see a need for women's studies or men's studies? Or do you take the feminist position that history is men's studies.

Warren: I see a temporary need for both studies where the principal studies of women studies are to question the traditional female role. I strongly support that we question the traditional female role. Nothing that we have now questions the traditional male role in society, least of all history. History is something that sells to boys the traditional male role, the male role of hero and performer. Every history lesson tells a boy that if you perform you will earn love and respect and that you will be seen on these pages, or if you fail you will be nothing, you will be invisible. To a boy, history is pressure to perform and not relief from that pressure. Feminism, to its credit, is relief from the pressure to perform the traditional female role and seeks to be outside its confines. To a boy, then, history reinforces that traditional male role and therefore because it reinforces the traditional male role it is the exact opposite of women's studies.

Tom: Women's studies is also about women's rights.

Warren: Yes, this is why we also need men's studies. Women's studies tell women that they have the right to what was traditionally the male role. Nothing tells men that they have the right to the traditional female role, for example, the right for a dad to have equal rights to be home with the children while the mother financially supports the children and the husband.

Tom: Before we continue the men's portion of gender transition, do you see the feminist movement being mostly positive or negative?

Warren: Actually, I cherish the feminist movement especially because it did many things to pave the way for flexible schedules. I love the area that it has allowed for flexibility in child care options. I love the fact that because we love women we have developed improved safety standards at work that we have never had before. When I see girls playing team sports like baseball and soccer it really moves me to tears because I remember girls in my day never having the opportunity to do that and as a result they did not understand how to separate the issue from the friendship. They took things personally, they didn't have the understanding that many girls have today. They didn't take the tough spots of losing to the other team and then winning.

Tom: So, you cherish the positive parts of feminism, but what about the negative parts?

Warren: It made us focus on the fact that working mothers worked more hours inside the home, but no one told us that working fathers worked more hours outside the home. In essence, feminism taught us that God could be a she but not that the Devil could also be a she. It showed us the shadow side of men and the light side of women but it neglected the shadow side of women and the light side of men. And it neglected to acknowledge each side, each sex, has the shadow side and the light side within it.

Tom: I know that the book and this tape are called *The Myth of Male Power*, but are there ways that a woman experiences a greater sense of powerlessness than her male counterpart?

Warren: Absolutely. For one thing, a woman's size leads to a greater fear of being overpowered and being vulnerable to especially rape, robbery and assault, and she is more likely to fear pregnancy and date rape and aging. She receives less socialization to take a career to support her husband and children and therefore often feels pressured to marry a man who earns more rather than choosing from all the available men. She has less exposure to team sports with that blend of competition and cooperation that team sports creates. We often think that team sports often focuses on competition. In fact team sports helps a woman know when to compete and when to cooperate.

Tom: I suppose that women have the little problems like the issue of walking into a bar without being bothered?

Warren: Exactly, and fortunately most industrialized nations have at least acknowledged these female experiences. The unfortunate part is that the conclusion is that women have the problem and men are the problem. What's missing from that picture is the acknowledgement that men have a different experience. Take for example a man's marriage that has become alimony payments or his home becomes his wife's home and his children become child support payments for children that have been turned against him psychologically. This man feels that he is spending his life basically working for people who hate him. He feels desperate to feel love but he also feels that another marriage will ultimately leave him with another mortgage payment, and more children turned against him and a deeper desperation. Then when he is called commitment phobic this man does not feel understood. When a man tries to keep up with these payments and works overtime and someone accuses him of coming home late or being a workaholic and he tries to cope by drinking and then someone calls him a drunkard, he doesn't feel powerful, he feels powerless.

Tom: What do you see as the most serious discrimination against men?

Warren: Draft registration of our sons, but not our daughters. In post offices across the United States, certain service posters put pictures of a man with these words posted across their bodies: "Register: A Man's Got to Do What a Man's Got to Do." Can you imagine if a post office had a poster of a Jewish person saying: "A Jew's Got to Do What a Jew's Got to Do?"

Tom: Ouch.

Warren: What if because we register men to be killed off in war, that's their role? What if we registered women to produce male children to replace those men killed off in war? What if we had selective service poster with pregnant women with these words written their bodies: "Register: A Woman's Got to Do What a Woman's Got to Do."

Tom: Obviously there would be a few women that would say that a woman's body is a woman's choice.

Warren: Exactly. A slogan for a woman is: A woman's body, a woman's choice. Our slogan for a man is: A man's got to do what a man's got to do. Now the question to me is this: How is it that if any other single group is singled out to register for the draft based on its characteristics at birth, be that group Black women Jewish or gays, we would immediately recognize it as genocide. But when men are singled out based on their sex at birth, then men are stupid enough to call it power.

Tom: Well, now that women are joining the military is that making things a bit more equal?

Warren: Actually not. Women have equal rights to join the military, but not equal obligations to register and once they are in the military women have increasingly equal rights to fight in combat

position but not equal obligations to be in those combat positions if they are needed.

Tom: If the President of the United States was to establish affirmative action lets say to the military, what might that look like?

Warren: Imagine a moment: music playing in your car radio and an announcer voice interrupts with a special bulletin from the President and for some reason you decide not to switch stations, and the President denounces that since 1.2 million American men have been killed in war, “as part of my new program for equality we will draft only women until 1.2 million American women have been killed in war.” The single largest barrier of getting men to look within is that what any other group would call powerlessness men have been taught to call power. We don’t call male killing sexism, we call it glory. We don’t call the 1 million men killed and maimed in one battle in WW I, the battle of the Somme—we don’t call it a holocaust, we call it serving the country. We don’t call those who selected those men to die murderers, we call them voters.

Tom: If I get this right, what you are saying is that power is the control of one’s life. First, elaborate on that a bit, and second, could you deal with whether men have the power we think they have in traditional ways that power has been defined—the power of money, influence, status, that type of power. Could you start with the “control of your life power?”

Warren: Sure. In 1920, women lived one year longer than men, but today women live seven years longer. We acknowledge that Blacks dying six years sooner than Whites reflects the powerlessness of Blacks in society, yet men dying seven years earlier than women is the reflection of powerlessness of men in society. If power means having control over one’s life then there is no better ranking in race and sex roles combined in power over our lives than the life expectancy figures. I will give you those figures in a second. At the top is females, White: average life expectancy 79. Second place is females, Black: 74. Males, White in third place: 72; males, Black in fourth place: 65.

Tom: So, men’s shorter life expectancy is one example of powerlessness when powerlessness is defined as control over one’s life?

Warren: Yes, and another is man’s greater tendency to commit suicide.

Tom: I know men commit suicide four times more often than women, but is that true in all age groups?

Warren: No, until boys and girls are nine, their suicide rates are identical. It’s from 10-14 when the boys’ rate becomes twice as high as the girls; from 15-19, four times as high; and from 20-26, six times as high. In absolute numbers as boys are exposed to male roles, their suicide rates increases 25,000%.

Tom: Wow, what about for older men vs. older women?

Farrell: The suicide rate for men over 85 is 1,350% higher than for women over 85.

Tom: Astounding. We never hear about those kind of figures. Now part of control over one’s life has to deal with being a victim of violence. We hear that women are victims of violence more than men. Is that true?

Warren: No. Overall men are twice as likely to be victims of violence over women, even when rape is included. And men are three times more likely to be victims of murder.



Tom: In a sense it sounds like you are saying that men are the invisible victims of murder.

Warren: I am. For example when Rodney King was beaten by the police, we call it violence against Blacks and not men, but if “Regina King” was beaten I think many people would have considered it as violence against women.

Tom: Before we get to the traditional forms of power, I am fascinated by these unconscious ways in which male powerlessness is invisible. Do you have any other examples?

Warren: I don't know if you remember Steve Petrix, a journalist who lived here in San Diego. Everyday he returned home to have lunch with his wife. One day he got to his door and heard his wife screaming. She was being attacked by an assailant. Steve fought the assailant off while his wife ran to call the police and the intruder killed Steve. Steve was playing an invisible role, the role of unpaid bodyguard. We think of men as being violent to women. The invisible role we never think of is a man's role to be expected to protect any women he is with any time she might be threatened.

Warren: You have a subtitle in *The Myth of Male Power* called *Why Men are the Disposable Sex*. Is this one way how the men are the disposable sex?

Warren: Yes. These involve the expectation of men to be the unpaid bodyguards, or of men to be the sex to register for the draft, or volunteer fire fighters, or to be almost 100% of the members of the most dangerous professions, the hazardous jobs. These are just a few of the ways that men are expected to be the disposable sex, and we don't recognize them and therefore they are invisible.

Tom: Okay, let's move on to the traditional forms, like who makes the bucks?

Warren: Let's get right to the nitty-gritty here. When it comes to money, what counts between the sexes is net worth—the money that's left after expenses and liabilities are subtracted. For example, if men make twice as much but are also expected to pay more for child support, alimony, mortgage payments, then it's the net worth, not the gross income that lets us know which sex is faring better financially. Interestingly, when I wrote *The Myth of Male Power* in 1993, the most recent net worth data available was based on the 1980 Census. The net worth of single women “householders” (the primary owners of homes in a non-married household) was 141% of their male counterparts; as of the 2000 census, it was 93%. A good litmus test for the degree to which we care about men and women is to ask this question: “Am I more concerned about single women having 93% of men's net worth in 2000 than I was when single men's net worth was only 71% of women's (based on the 1980 Census).”

Tom: So you are not saying women have higher gross income, but rather that more men are more likely to, for example, support wives rather than wives to support husbands and therefore that his income is more likely to be divided up.

Warren: Yes, and this is especially true after divorce and it often means that women receive the home a man pays for and also receives the children that men pay for. Its important to note though that the woman has a time obligation the man does not have. That is, she spends time with those children, but it is exactly this woman's time obligation that the man is paying for. When men earn more to pay for a home that they are not living in, they of course increase their gross income to pay for that, but not necessarily their net worth.

Tom: And when the man and woman start dating, he is more likely to pay and she is more likely to be paid for?

Warren: Yes. So he earns more money to pay for the dinner, the theater, the gas but he also has more spending obligations.

Tom: Now what about the wealthiest people, aren't they mostly men?

Warren: No. Surprisingly the IRS [in 1993] reports that the wealthiest 1% of the population, those with assets over a half million, among those people women's net worth is also more than men's.

Tom: How can so many of the wealthiest people be women when women hold none of the top corporate jobs?

Warren: In part by marrying those men that hold those jobs when those men die. Women compete hard for those men who compete hard.

Tom: Well, if women have more net worth so to speak, it would stand to reason that they would also have more buying power more spending power. Do they?

Warren: Yes, they do. A study of large shopping malls including men's shops and sporting goods stores found seven times more floor space is devoted to women than to men.

Tom: I've noticed that.

Warren: Both sexes buy more for women. The key to wealth is not how much someone earns but what we spend on ourselves, either by our own discretion or what is spent on us. Overall, women control consumer spending by a wide margin in every consumer category.

Tom: Are you implying that control of consumer spending by women gives women other forms of power?

Warren: Yes, it does. When women spend more and watch more TV in every timeslot, networks can't afford to bite the hand that feeds them. Women become to TV what bosses are to employees.

Tom: And what is the result of that?

Warren: Women as victim shows are becoming increasingly popular. For example, Law and Order, featuring both sexes as victims, was among TV's most popular shows for ten years--until Law & Order: Special Victims Unit came on the air. The "Special Victims" were 712% more likely to be women than men. It took only two years for the Special Victims version—with 121 women and 17 men as victims--to surpass Law & Order in the ratings. For the next nine years it surpassed Law & Order in the ratings every year. Finally, Law & Order dropped off the air (in 2010).

Tom: Its sounds like, Warren, what you are saying is part of male socialization for powerlessness is teaching men to spend more on women?

Warren: Yes. A fundamental form of sexism is called the spending obligation gap. In restaurants men pay for women 10 times more frequently than women pay for men, and the more expensive the restaurant, the more the man pays. Women say: "Hey wait a minute, Warren, men earn more!" But when two women go off to a restaurant they don't assume that the woman who earns more will pay the bill.

Tom: That's a good point.

Warren: The expectation of a man to spend more on a woman creates the spending obligation gap.

Tom: How do you think this expectation to spend more on women affects men's lives and their personalities? Let's get personal Warren. How did this affect you when you were younger?

Warren: I got the sense of the spending obligation gap as soon as I thought about my first date. As a teenager, I used to love babysitting. I loved kids, but it was also the only way I could raid a refrigerator for free and get paid and have no one holler at me. Then I got to the dating age and, alas, babysitting paid 50 cents an hour and mowing the lawn paid \$2 an hour. I hated mowing the lawn and the humidity of New Jersey and the bug biting and the noonday sun made it unpleasant, but as soon as I started dating, I started mowing lawns. For boys I think lawn mowing is a metaphor for the way we start taking jobs that we like less because they pay more. Then around the junior year of high school boys start to repress interest in foreign languages, literature, fine arts, sociology and anthropology, because we know that an art history major will make a lot less than an engineer and as a result in terms of spending expectations he knows that he might have to support a woman because he can't expect a woman to support him. Over 85% of students who take engineering as a major are men and over 80% that take art history are women, and the reason I am saying this is that spending obligations that lead a man to choose a career he likes less than one that pays more is a sign of male powerlessness and not male power. But when he takes that job, women will often assume he will pay because after all "he earns more" and because both sexes' expectations reinforce male powerlessness.

Tom: Okay, if men have lower net worth and greater spending obligations, don't they at least have greater influence power?

Warren: In business and government, for sure. But let me explain why influence power is not real power. For example, if we told mothers, "Hey listen, Mom, the more children you have the more power you will have," most mothers would be intelligent enough to laugh at us. But if we said the more children you will have the more the more people will love and respect you, she would legitimately feel pressure. She would not be feeling empowered. But we tell men, the more people you supervise, the more power we have, and we buy it. Men, we are really the stupid sex. Men call things power that any woman would be smart enough to call powerlessness. Real power, then, does not come from caving into pressure to expand our obligations. It comes from deciding what we want to do with our life.

Tom: But didn't a lot of men at least have the satisfaction of having influence over others, something that women didn't have?

Warren: Almost every woman had a primary role in the female-dominated family structure. Only a small percentage of men had a primary role in the male-dominated governmental or religious structures. Many mothers in a sense were the chairman of the board of a small company, their family. Conversely, most men were on the assembly line of their company, either a physical or a psychological assembly line. While theoretically the man was the master of the house, most men felt like they were a visitor in their wife's castle in the same way a woman would have felt as a visitor in their husband's place of work. From a woman's perspective, a man's home is his castle; from a man's perspective, a woman's home is his mortgage.

Tom: You know, Warren, we heard a lot about women working in two jobs and men working one. True?

Warren: No. Women do work more hours inside the home, but what we don't hear about is that men work more hours outside the home. The average man commutes farther, spends more time doing yard work, repair work and painting, and when all these are combined, as a University of Michigan study reported in the *Journal of Economic Literature* in 1991 found, the average man worked 61 hours a week. The average women worked 56 hours.

Tom: So, Warren, overall in the larger picture, this frequent comparison we hear all the time about women and minority groups such as Blacks, I would think that you say that's quite off base?

Warren: It's very off base and the off-baseness started right about the 1970s, when an article in *Psychology Today* said women were like "niggers" and started comparing the situation with Blacks with the situations with women. It got all these feminists, including myself, starting to compare the oppression of Blacks with the oppression of women and that is where this comparison started that made the use of the gains of the Civil Rights Movement to make women look like victims. Now not that the parallels didn't have a germ of truth, but what none of us realized was how each sex was, historically speaking, the other sex's slave in a way. Therefore neither sex was a "nigger" because a "nigger" implies that all the slavery was one-sided.

Tom: Well, in what way did men have an equivalent experience to Blacks and slaves?

Warren: Blacks were forced via slavery to risk their lives in cotton fields so that Whites might benefit economically, while Blacks died prematurely. Men were forced by the draft to risk their lives on the battlefields so that everyone else could benefit economically, and men died prematurely. The disproportionate amount of Blacks and males in war increases both Blacks' and males' likelihood of experiencing problems such as post-traumatic stress, of becoming killers in post-war civilian life, and of dying earlier. Both slaves and men died to make the world free, but it was someone else's freedom. Slaves had their own children involuntarily taken away from them. Men still today have their own children taken involuntarily away from them. We tell women they have the right to their children and we tell men they have to fight for children (in divorce). Blacks were forced via slavery into society's most hazardous jobs. Men are forced by socialization into the most hazardous jobs. Both slaves and men used to make up 100% of the death professions. Men still do. When slaves give up their seats for Whites, we call that subservient; when men give up their seats for women we call it politeness. Similarly, we called that a symbol of subservience when their master entered the room, but it is a symbol of politeness if men stand up when women enter the room. Blacks are more likely than Whites to be homeless; men are more likely than women to be homeless. Blacks are more likely than Whites to be in prison. Men are 16 times more likely than women to be in prison. Blacks die earlier than Whites. Men die earlier than women. Blacks are less likely than Whites to attend college or graduate from college. Men are less likely than women to attend college: 37% vs. 63%.

Tom: Some people are going to be surprised by those figures, but what about in the workplace?

Warren: Apartheid forced Blacks to mine diamonds for Whites. Socialization expected men to work in different types of mines to pay for diamonds for women. Nowhere in history has there ever been a ruling class who worked to afford diamonds to give to the oppressed class, hoping that the op-

pressed would like them more. Blacks are more likely than Whites to volunteer for war in order to earn money and to gain skills. Men are more likely than women to volunteer for war for the same reasons. Blacks are more likely than Whites to subject themselves to the child abuse of boxing and football in hopes of earning respect, money, and love. Men are more likely than women to subject themselves to the child abuse of boxing and football, also with the same hopes. It would also be very hard to find a single example in history in which a group that cast more than 50% of the vote got away with calling themselves the victim. Can you think of an example of a repressed group that chooses to vote for their oppressors rather than their own members taking responsibility for running for office? Women are the only minority group that is a majority, the only group that calls themselves oppressed who can control who gets into every office in every community in the country. Power is not in who holds the office. Power is in who chooses who hold the office.

Tom: Good point.

Warren: Blacks, the Irish and Jews never have had close to 50% of the American vote. Women are the only “oppressed group” to share the same parents as the oppressor, to be born in the middle class and the upper middle class as frequently as the “oppressor” and to own more of the cultures luxury items than their “oppressor.” They are “oppressed” group whose labor has enabled them to buy the \$50 million of cosmetics sold each year, the only “oppressed” group that spends more on high fashion brand name clothing than their “oppressors,” and the only “oppressed” group that watches more TV in any time period than their “oppressors.”

Tom: Well, feminists at one time were comparing marriage to slavery with females as slaves.

Warren: It really seems like an insult to women’s intelligence to suggest that marriage is female slavery when we have 25 million American females who have read an average of 20 romance novels per month, often with the fantasy of marriage. So, we have to ask if the feminists are suggesting that these 25 million women have enslavement fantasies because they fantasize about marriage, and this is the reason why Danielle Steel was once the best selling author in the world. Never has there been a slave class who has spent a lot of time dreaming about being a slave and purchasing books and magazines that told them how to get a slave master to commit. Either marriage is something different than slavery to women (and it is) or it is a ticket to female options. Or feminists are suggesting that women are not intelligent.

Tom: It sounds to me that you are saying intelligent women have seen that marrying up frees them.

Warren: Exactly. I’ll be explaining in a bit how the woman married to the successful man has often been the one to free herself to have options that men do not have.

Tom: So, bottom line is, what does all this mean?

Warren: By understanding that what we did to blacks was immoral we are willing to assuage our guilt by affirmative action programs and welfare. By thinking of men and what we did to men as not being consequential, and that men are the dominant oppressors and do what they do for power and for greed, we feel very little guilt when men die early in the process. By believing that women are an oppressed slave-like class, we extended privileges to women that had been originally designed to compensate for our immorality to blacks. For women and only women to take advantage of the slavery compensation is its own brand of immorality. For men to cooperate with this, is its own brand of ignorance.

Tom: Are you suggesting that men did all this because they were more altruistic and loving and less power hungry than women?

Warren: No. Both sexes made themselves slave to each other in different ways.

Tom: Tell me about that. What made the sexes slaves to each other, and what suddenly allows us to question this phenomenon?

Warren: For thousands of years, most marriages were in what I call Stage One marriages. They were survival-focused marriage. After WW II, marriages increasingly flirted with Stage Two marriages with a self-fulfillment focus. In Stage One, most couples were role mates. The women raised the children and the man's role was to raise the money. In Stage Two, couples increasingly desired to be soul mates. They could do this only if they were in the middle class though, and only once their survival needs were met could they up the ante and redefine love. In Stage One a woman called it love when a man was a good provider and protector. He called it love if she was beautiful and took care of the home and the children. Love meant a division of labor and that division of labor led to a division of different male and female interests. In Stage Two, love can mean common interests, common values. Love's definition therefore is in transition.

Tom: Well, then, did women begin redefining love first, or were they the most oppressed and most interested in love?

Warren: No. That would suggest that middle-class women were more oppressed than poor women and that middle-class women were more interested in love than poor women. Around the world it was middle- and upper-class women who were best able to redefine love because they were able to be free from the preoccupation with survival. But these women got free from the preoccupation with survival by being married to successful men.

Tom: So weren't these successful men not equally free to begin redefining love?

Warren: No. They were too preoccupied providing the success, the very success that freed the women. They could have protested, but when women showed men the type of love and respect they earned by succeeding they also chose the type of man that was more likely to be a money-machine than a loving dad. Ultimately, of course, it is men that have to take responsibility for changing this role.

Tom: Well, what exactly did the successful men do to that freed women?

Warren: First, successful men created the technology that allowed women to go from being a baby machine, cooking machine, and a cleaning machine to have time for love. If you think about it, a 1890's woman like Abigail had an average of eight children statistically. Cindy, a 1990's woman has options. She can have no children or ten children, but typically she has two children. She is no longer a baby machine. Abigail, the 1890's woman, cooked meals for ten people from scratch. She sewed clothes with callused hands without central air-conditioning and without heating. Cindy can put a pre-prepared meal in a microwave oven and expect help from a dishwasher, a washing machine, a freezer, a telephone, a car, and a 24-hour supermarket. All this led to a women's life span increasing by almost 50% since 1920.

Tom: What did male technology do for men?

Warren: It also increased men's life span, but not by as much. In 1920 women lived one year longer than men and today women live seven years longer than men. Men did a better job creating homes

and gardens for their wives than they did creating safer coal mines and construction sites for themselves. Men went from being a performing machine at home to being a performing machine away from home. In the process, men were disconnecting from their families, from love, and this created in men little deaths everyday.

Tom: You are saying that male technology - that is so criticized by the feminist movement - in reality led to the male role saving women more frequently than the female role saved men?

Warren: Exactly. Feminists sometimes criticized male technology for conspiring to constrict women's reproductive freedom, women's right to choose, for example; but male technology actually created women's right to choose. It created safe birth control and created safe abortions. Birth control for women did more than any other single thing to free women and it would do more than any other single thing to free men. Men invented the female pill, but no one invented the male pill.

Tom: So all this created a woman with a longer lifespan?

Warren: It created a woman who had more options, if she was married to a successful man. For example, when a successful woman meets a successful man they appear on the surface to be equals, but if they marry and consider children she almost invariably considers three options. Option one: work full time; option two: mother full time; and option three: some combination of working and mothering. He also considers three slightly different options. Option one: work full time; option two: work full time; and option three: work full time—or even work overtime or two jobs. So we are living in an era of a multi-option women and the no-option man. But remember, the woman can only have the multi-options if she is married to the successful man. And because women know this or they sense it, this has led to the continuing pressure on men to be successful in order to get female love.

Tom: So, it sounds to me that you are saying that men are kowtowing to this pressure rather than protesting it?

Warren: Yes. Society will never change until men speak up. But the important thing about women's options is that it allows a woman to tailor-make her life to her personality.

Tom: Tell me about that.

Warren: Some women prefer a career, some prefer children, some prefer to mix and match by being involved full-time with a child for a year or two with or without hired help and then returning to work part time for a while, then full time, then not at all.

Tom: There are all kinds of options.

Warren: Exactly. For men, children mean just more of the same: intensifying his commitment to the workplace. This allows very little variation to account for variations in a man's personality. The message to men is basically "Like it or lump it."

Tom: So feminism has not created equality, but it has created more than equality for women.

Warren: Yes. Had feminism focused on equality, its impact would have been more egalitarian and less politically successful. It would have had to emphasize women's responsibilities such as risking sexual rejection and taking sexual initiatives.

Tom: The kind of things men have to do all the time—risking rejection anytime they approach

women.

Warren: Exactly. The types of things that turn men into the jerks because they do the initiating too quickly or not soon enough and they appear like a wimp. That type of responsibility.

Tom: What other kinds of responsibilities?

Warren: The kinds such as: women must not just pay for dinners by option, but by obligation as often as men pay; or women, you should expect yourself to marry down economically as often as you marry up economically; or women, choose careers that you like less to support the families more, so you can marry a man who is earning less so he can support your living. These things would be far more egalitarian.

Tom: Because that would have emphasized the responsibilities as well as the options.

Warren: Precisely. It would have emphasized responsibilities, not just rights. But by emphasizing responsibility many women would have backed off and the movement would have been less successful.

Tom: If all these things were benefiting women, why did women become so angry at men?

Warren: Because the women married to successful men started to want from these men things that they didn't have, like time—time to love, time to come home early and pay attention to them, vulnerability—in order to become successful you can't be too vulnerable. Sensitivity. Characteristics which if a man had these characteristics would have prevented him, as a rule, from being successful, and therefore would have prevented these women from marrying them.

Tom: Sounds like a double-bind for men.

Warren: For both sexes.

Tom: So when the women did not get these things from men they became angry?

Warren: Yes, but that was just the beginning. The anger led to women initiating divorces. Two-thirds of divorces are initiated by women, and it was divorce that really created the anger.

Tom: How's that?

Warren: Divorce dumped women into the workplace without workplace skills. And it dumped women into the marketplace of men, but not with men who were addicted to a 40-year-old with two children but to two 20-year-olds.

Tom: So that men wanted two 20-year-olds instead of one 40-year-old. Well, I can see why some women would get angry about that.

Warren: Yes, and feminism grew politically by adding to this anger and feeding off it. It explained to women that you are segregated and put into lower paying and meaningless jobs without saying, "Wait a minute women. Men are also segregated into jobs, hazardous jobs, the 'death professions'" Feminism is so powerful that it blinded women to the men around them who are also segregated into different types of lower paying meaningless jobs: the short order cook for example, the dishwasher in the local coffee shop, the migrant worker that picks up the vegetables that are on her table, the custodian, the car washer, the busboy, the gas station attendant.



Tom: The invisible men.

Warren: Exactly, and by being blinded to these men, she missed the larger picture, that when either sex had minimal skills that commanded minimal wages in different types of meaningless jobs, by being blinded to this larger picture she became increasingly angry.

Tom: Did the anger also come from the fact that men as a group earn more than women as a group?

Warren: Simultaneously feminists focused on the fact that women as a whole earned less and did not focus on any of the thirteen reasons why women earn less. Since *The Myth of Male Power* was published in 1993, I did research for a book published in 2005 titled *Why Men Earn More: The Startling Truth Behind the Pay Gap—and What Women Can Do About It*. I was able to identify not thirteen but twenty-five measurable differences between men and women's work-life decisions. I discovered that each of men's choices resulted in men earning more; that each of women's choices resulted in women having more balanced lives—and therefore, usually happier lives. The main finding was that the road to high pay is a toll road: the tolls of working more hours, traveling overnight and weekends, moving to undesirable locations, hazardous jobs, unsanitary jobs, night shifts and so on. The pay paradox is that pay is about the power we forfeit to get the power of pay. You can see in this list of 25 ways to higher pay exactly how many are “tolls”—or tradeoffs. All 25 are in the endnote.

Tom: What do you think was the most important misrepresentation that feminism perpetrated leading to an unnecessary increase in anger among women?

Warren: Feminism encouraged women to interpret men's tendency to earn more for different work as an outcome of male dominance rather than as a symbol of male subservience.

Tom: Subservience.

Warren: Exactly. They didn't see it is an outcome of male obligation to go where the money was, not where the fulfillment was. For a man, following money was primary, following fulfillment was secondary. For him, divorce also created a change; he still followed money to support his family economically, but after divorce he had no family to support him emotionally.

Tom: In your view, Warren, are men doing anything other than being silent about this?

Warren: They are doing what most silent people do. They are becoming passive-aggressive. Rather than confronting the female anger, men are increasingly feeling that their only form of relationship power is not getting into a relationship. In my opinion this is really sad for both the sexes.

Tom: It puzzles me that men would be neither changing nor speaking up about this.

Warren: Divorce has led to women changing because divorce has changed women's source of income. It changed it from men only to some combination of men and work. Divorces did not lead to men changing because divorces only increase the pressure on men to focus on income. It led to millions of men taking on five payments that are rarely assessed to women. After divorce men take on child support, mortgage payments on a home they no longer live in, apartment renting, alimony and dating. This led to men doing more of the same and therefore being more of the same. Men did not complain because the very core of male socialization is that when the going gets tough, the tough get going.

Tom: That is so true and sometimes I wonder how much women understand the degree to which we as men feel that the essence of who we are involves not complaining. So both sexes are in transition, but women are handling the transition better?

Warren: Yes. Divorce led women to the primary fear of economic dependence and left men with the primary fear of emotional dependence even though both sexes experience an increase in both types of dependencies. But it is much easier for the government to help the women economically than it is for the government to help the men emotionally. It is easier for the government upon divorce to require the man to give the woman money than to require the woman to give the man emotional love or sexual love.

Tom: You mean there is no bill in congress to subsidize prostitution?

Warren: Right. At least I have not noted that as part of the health plan.

Tom: Do you have much hope in the future for the two sexes?

Warren: Yes, I do, because this is really the first time in human history that the qualities it takes to survive as a species is compatible with the qualities it takes to love. In the past choosing the killer male led to the survival of the fittest, in the future choosing the killer male may lead to potential destruction of everyone. So what was functional has become dysfunctional.

Tom: And choosing the killer male was not compatible with choosing the loving male.

Warren: Correct. In the past men had to be cut off from their feelings or they would not be willing to die to protect the family and the community. So women had to fall in love with people who were inherently incapable of loving. In the future women are able to fall in love less with the killer and more and more with the nurturer-connector. In the past, survival, marriage, and the family all required the killer male. In the future, survival, marriage, and family will all require the communicative male.

Tom: You said what was once functional has become dysfunctional. How does that relate to the whole idea of dysfunctional families?

Warren: Completely. We often think of our family, now what our therapists call our "family of origin," as dysfunctional. I think it would be more accurate and also more compassionate to call our parents Stage One functional. For example, when divorce would have led to starvation, societies were forced to make divorce a taboo. So since a family had no option but to work together, co-dependency was viable. Stage One functional.

Tom: So what comes next?

Warren: The ability of men to create technology that allowed people to get beyond starvation problems allowed people to have the freedom to say, "Is my husband somebody who is paying attention to me? Is this really love?" which allowed women to initiate divorces. Divorces then allowed women and men to say, "Wait a minute. I have to prepare myself to not be co-dependent, but to be independent."

Tom: So once divorces became allowed co-dependency was no longer functional?

Warren: Precisely. Now in Stage Two, co-dependency has become dysfunctional, but not understanding this has led us to blaming our parents rather than crediting our parents with having

worked so hard to create the conditions to allow us to ask questions like: Are we communicating, are we listening, are we loving each other? Our parents couldn't afford to listen because if our fathers were listening to their feelings, they would say I don't want to work at this type of job to get ten children through a Depression.

Tom: But what our fathers and those so-called dysfunctional families of the past that we are blaming, what they were actually doing is teaching us survival skills.

Warren: And they were teaching us survival skills for their time and even our own time, because if the great Depression comes again or that recession comes again we are going to need those survival skills of cutting off our feelings. Feelings, depression, things like that are luxuries of people who have taken care of their survival skills.

Tom: It sounds that you feel like we have been unnecessarily blaming our parents and blaming men.

Warren: We've ironically been blaming both groups that have freed the world to go beyond survival concerns and to get into things like we are doing today: going down the road in a car, listening with this technology to a tape that gets us to think more in a refined and better way about the world.

Tom: And there is something about a non-blame approach that you think is beneficial as we move into Stage Two?

Warren: The non-blame approach I would not suggest if there was really a need for blame; however, it is wonderful when there isn't a need for blame because the non-blame approach is very therapeutic. The blame approach is non-therapeutic.

Tom: You talk about in your book a non-blame approach allowing us to become much more loving and accepting and moving from Stage One to Stage Two in a way that makes life more fulfilling for all of us.

Warren: Instead of having the war of a women's movement and the war of a men's movement, we have the option of a gender transition movement where we are looking inside ourselves and saying, Yep, we're stuck in the past of what was functional for our parents and we have an opportunity we should be celebrating in a way we have never celebrated before. For the first time in human history we have the option to love each other and what we are doing. Instead, we are spending twenty-five years blaming men and that is sad.

Tom: I think that what I hear you saying is that in Stage Two successful men have freed women but forgotten to free themselves and that in Stage One both sexes were slaves in different ways. Okay, what about the feminist claim that women were treated as property?

Warren: Women were treated as property, but what the feminists missed was that men were treated as less than property. Men were expected to die before their property was hurt. They were expected to protect their property before themselves. If a woman committed a crime under English law, the man went to jail. Feminists never told us about that. Even if a woman spent too much in running her home, it was the man that went to prison.

Tom: Why property was often passed down through men and not down through women?

Warren: Property was passed down through men because men were not worthy of a woman until

they had property. It was the man's responsibility to provide the property.

Tom: So providing property was a sign of obligation, not a privilege?

Warren: Yes. This did not mean that the man had more obligations in the larger picture than women did. Women had the obligation and responsibility to provide for the children. Neither sex had rights. That is the misunderstanding of the last 25 years. It was expected that the sexes had rights. Both sexes did not have rights, but obligations and expectations, and if they fulfilled those obligations and expectations, they received status and privileges. The status and privileges were the bribes to get people to fulfill their obligations.

Tom: In other words they got status for being subservient?

Warren: Essentially yes. For example, men got the status of being a hero for being a good servant. The very word hero comes from the Greek word *sirow*, from which comes our word servant as well as our word slave, as well as our word protector. And that is perfect because that is what a hero was—a slave who was supposed to serve and protect. To protect the community in general was part of his job and to protect women and children in particular. In exchange, heroes received the respect and love of those who they protected. But appreciation is a tricky thing. Just as the appreciation we gave our mothers for cooking kept them cooking, so the money and medals we gave men kept them slaves to their role as hero. In some respects appreciation keeps a slave a slave.

Tom: Was it mostly in war that men were the disposable sex or less than property?

Warren: Mostly, but definitely not exclusively. Historically men have been the beast of burden, whether they built the pyramids, or the railroad tracks across America, in which thousands of men died, basically so that we could be served dinner in a dining car. In almost every country and every century, men were not thought of as animals or property. They were just used that way. In the 15th century the Incas did not have horses to speed messages up and down their mountain pathways, so they used men. They paid them money, which fed their families when the men died.

Tom: Hold on, weren't these rules made by men?

Warren: These rules were made actually by the needs for survival. The rules were technically made by men, but what does it say about men that they made rules to sacrifice themselves for their families? The rules were made not to serve men's needs, but the needs of survival.

Tom: The survival of the whole group?

Warren: Exactly. The survival of the whole group, and what was needed for survival was reinforced by both sexes. Women inside the home and men outside the home—they both reinforced it.

Tom: In our own country though, haven't women been more of the second-class citizens?

Warren: That has been the theory, but it is not correct. Both sexes have been second citizens in different ways. For example in the Civil War, two groups were able to avoid the draft, women and upper-class males. Any female was the equivalent of an upper-class male in this respect, except that even upper-class men had to buy their way out of death. Some upper-class men could do this by paying \$300 to a poor man. This allowed the poor man's family to survive, while over half a million poor men died in the war. So in total, 623,000 American men during the Civil War were killed. That is the equivalent of eleven Vietnam Wars. Try to imagine eleven Vietnam Wars in a row where

only women were drafted and killed.

Tom: Wait a minute, Warren, one of the things that I hear women say is that war is a “man’s thing” that men are the ones who create war.

Warren: It was the man’s role. For example, in the Civil War, even upper-class men would not run ads looking for replacements because the women would not allow it. In the North and South, women would hiss at men if they tried to avoid war. Both sexes still hiss and boo.

Tom: So, a man has a strong push to try and become a hero. Is this push for men to fight from women true historically and across different cultures?

Warren: Absolutely. There are no enduring legends of the beautiful princess falling in love with the conscientious objector. The princess falls in love with the prince who can provide for her or a warrior who can kill for her. Both the killer and the prince could protect her. The deeper purpose of violence against men was to prevent violence against women. Both sexes prepared boys and men, from everything from circumcision to games, to endure pain, to deny pain, and to continue protecting until they died.

Tom: So were the women always falling in love with the men who were invulnerable?

Warren: No. They were falling in love with the men who appeared to be invulnerable. In fact, though, the ability to kill always requires the vulnerability of being exposed to being killed. The irony of male eligibility is that it is created by a male vulnerability that is masked as invulnerability. To this day that is the male tragedy.

Tom: Okay. Warren, what incentive do women have to give up this power of having a class of people called “men” brainwashed into protecting them and at the same time being fool enough to call it power?

Warren: No incentive [laughs]! No, actually there are two incentives. First, when men are expected to protect women with their strength, the risk is that the very strength that protects them in one instance can be used against them in another. Second, the disconnection from feelings that is required to be shot at on the battlefield or hurt on the football field does not a loving man make. Thus the athletes that the cheerleaders cheer for are involved in one-third of the on-campus sexual assaults.

Tom: You are suggesting that we are still preparing men to be disposable?

Warren: Very much so. Look at football, boxing, wrestling, ice hockey, auto crashing . . . I mean auto racing. Yet the United States Senate is proposing to make violence against women a hate crime at the same time we are calling violence against men “entertainment.” The most attractive girls in high school are still cheering for violence against men. They even give their love for men being violent unto themselves. They give their love for people who play “smashface” (football) the best. Basically, you can think of junior high football as taxpayer subsidized child abuse.

Tom: Child abuse?

Warren: Well, perhaps more accurately taxpayer subsidized “boy abuse.” Every one of us, who pays taxes, contributes money to subsidizing this boy abuse and we pacify ourselves by calling this “education.” If we encourage girls to get male approval by getting spinal cord injuries, enduring con-

cussions and ruining their knees for life, we would have no trouble recognizing it as subsidizing violence against women. When girls do it, we abhor it. When boys do it, we cheer for it.

Tom: Very simply you are saying we celebrate violence against men.

Warren: Yes. Think of how we name our football teams after violent societies: Vikings, Aztecs, Trojans; or fierce animals: Tigers, Bears, Panthers. Even our cars are called Jaguar, Cherokee, Cougar, Fury, Stealth. Just imagine for a second, your daughter being picked up by a guy driving a Ford Fairy, or a Dodge Daisy, or a Plymouth Pansy. Imagine a grown man rooting for a team named not the Giants, but the Munchkins, and not the Atlanta Braves, but the Atlanta Sensitives.

Tom: Cute. But tell me this, almost all of us cheer for male violence in these sorts of situations. Why is this?

Warren: This is a really crucial question. The answer is because “our team winning” really meant “our society protected.” The loss of a man had to be risked to prevent the loss of a society.

Tom: Tell me this; do you think that male violence is inherent?

Warren: If male violence was inherent there would be no need to create a social structure bribing men to become violent. Fortunately there are three conditions that lead to men being non-violent.

Tom: What are these three conditions?

Warren: The society needs to have adequate food, it has to have adequate water, and it needs to be isolated from attack. During various times in their history these sorts of conditions prevailed in Tahiti, in Minoa on Crete and among the Central Malaysian Semai. When men were not needed to kill, women did not reward warriors with love and men did not try to obtain love by killing. This was neither women’s fault nor men’s fault. It was simply that killing was not needed to survive.

Tom: So the historians have been suggesting that matriarchal societies were superior because men and women worked in partnership. But what the historians are ignoring is that partnership was not the result of matriarchy, but the result of these three conditions being met?

Warren: Yes. When these three conditions were met, men did not have to be off killing, so that they could be back at home having a partnership. It is false to call that patriarchy or matriarchy. It was just different survival conditions.

Tom: Aren’t these historians calling it matriarchy because female gods were primary and not male gods?

Warren: Male gods were primary when protection was the primary need, but they were not primary when protection was not the primary need. The sad part about this matriarchal labeling is that it makes male sacrifice look like male dominance. It makes peace and partnership look like the product of women, instead of the outcome of adequate food and water and a good defense by the sacrifice of men.

Tom: Okay, how long do you think it takes for men to go from violent to non-violent?

Warren: Men adapt amazingly quickly when we give them new approval cues. The Japanese man

had no problem turning his sword into stock shares. After World War II we thought of the Japanese man as extremely violent, but now we think of the Japanese man as much more peaceful.

Tom: Feminists say that empire building is the proof of male greed, male violence, and male aggressiveness.

Warren: Both sexes have greed and aggressiveness as their shadow side. Both sexes needed greed in order to access supplies of food in times of shortage. But there are two important things to know about empires. First, empires were to countries what insurance policies are to individuals. They were for security, both to stave off attack and to have access to food and raw materials in times of famine and war. Second, we all complain about the killing that men do, then we choose to live in countries like the United States that were created by the killing that men did. Men often died for property. Women often live on the property that was their husband's grave. Major powers became major powers by the death of boys.

Tom: We often hear that women are nature's civilizing balance.

Warren: By taking care of the killing for women, it can be said that men civilized women.

Tom: Wow! That is a fascinating way of conceptualizing this whole thing. Let's deal with the issue of self-esteem. Feminists such as Gloria Steinem, for example, in her book *Revolution From Within* says that women were second-class citizens in the sense that they were the sex that developed low self-esteem.

Warren: Both sexes learned to define as high self-esteem what was really a high degree of conformity, the opposite of what we today hold as self-esteem. Conformity to what the society needed. Spartans, if they were preparing for war removed their boys from the home at the age of seven and put the boys through desensitization to feelings, floggings that were so fierce that many died in the process. Now preparing a boy to die at the age of seven does not create in him high self-esteem. In Stage One, we gave both sexes status and appreciation in exchange for making themselves subservient, a slave to roles necessary to perpetuate the species. That is a very different definition of self-esteem than we think of today, about having a high degree of internal security allowing people to be in touch with their feelings that would have allowed them to not be slaves to certain roles.

Tom: What about the argument of polygyny, of one man having many wives, that it was a sign of women as men's property?

Warren: Polygyny was a system by which a rich man had more than one wife so that a woman would not be stuck with a poor man. The man who was deprived was actually the man who was poor. He was deprived, in essence, because he could not afford a woman. Perhaps the greatest example of polygyny is among nuns who "marry Christ." While Christ promises to protect many women, the nuns take vows of celibacy. Polygyny is often thought about of a way to give men lots of sex, but Christ's wives would not have been celibate if the main focus of polygyny was the satisfying of male sexual desires. Polygyny was in fact for the protection of women by the best male saviors. Christ was the best of the saviors; priests were the human manifestation. Priests provided protection without the sexual demands. They provided the ability to listen to women without burdening her with having to listen to him.

Tom: If all of this protection of women is built into our psyches, should we even bother trying to change it?

Warren: Conservatives say this is the way it was in the past and this is the way it will be in the future. I say, no. The important question is not whether it is natural, but if it is functional. If a baby is born naturally with a handicap we don't say, "Listen baby, your handicap is natural. We are going to help you increase it." This is what we do in essence with men's aggressiveness and women's passivity. That division was functional in the past, but now for the first time in human history both sexes have the chance to be full human beings. In fact if we are going to survive we need to stop training men to be killers and to train women to be independent enough to not be dependent on the killer-protector, who with nuclear technology will really be the killer-destroyer.

Tom: Aside from violent sports and male-only draft registration, in what other ways are men being prepared for disposability?

Warren: The death professions are all almost 100% men.

Tom: I assume by death professions, you mean hazardous jobs?

Warren: Yes. Jobs like lumberjack, trucker, and construction worker, jobs that lead to 94% of occupational deaths occurring to men. A few people are aware that every day almost as many men are killed at work as were killed on the average day in Vietnam.

Tom: So, when the feminists said women were being segregated into all the worst jobs, what we didn't hear from them is that men were being segregated into the death professions?

Warren: Yes. Feminists, like myself, were also not accurate when we said that women were segregated into all the worst jobs. For example, when the jobs related almanac ranked the 250 jobs from best to worst based on a combination of salary, stress, work environment, outlook, security, and physical demands, they found that 24 out of 25 of the worst jobs were almost all males' jobs.

Tom: Some examples?

Warren: Truck driver, sheet metal worker, roofer, boilermaker, lumberjack, carpenter, construction worker or foreman, construction machinery operator, football player, welder, millwright, and iron ore miner. All of these jobs that I just mentioned have one thing in common: 95-100% are men.

Tom: And you are saying these are not just hazardous jobs, but jobs that have the worst of everything, from salary, to stress, to outlook, to security and so on. Why are professions like this likely to have such a high percentage of men?

Warren: Remember what we said about men having higher gross incomes, but lower net worths because, for example the woman may have the burden of caring for three children but the man has the burden of supplying the income to those three children, himself, and his wife? So he is more likely to have a job that will take care of providing the income for all those people.

Tom: A job under desperate situations.

Warren: Exactly. Just as women are likely to wake up at three in the morning to breastfeed a crying baby, so is a man likely to be driving a truck at three in the morning to be able to supply the money to feed them.

Tom: When you suggest the death professions pay more as a sort of "death professions bonus" as you call it, are you also implying that jobs with a high percentage of females pay less because they have more desirable conditions?



Warren: Professions that have 85% or more females have in common seven of eight characteristics, what we may call the female occupation formula. What are common to these eight characteristics are two things. One is that they are desirable and, second, because they are desirable, they are much more in demand and because more people want them, employers can afford to pay less.

Tom: I think it is my job here to ask you what these eight characteristics are.

Warren: (1) First, the ability to psychologically check out at the end of the day. For example, a department store clerk can check out, a lawyer can't.

Tom: You mean not taking the job home with you?

Warren: Exactly. (2) There is physical safety: a receptionist more likely to be female has physical safety, versus that of a fire fighter. (3) Indoors: a secretary is indoors, a garbage collector is outdoors. (4) Desirable hours or flexible hours: a nurse, more likely to be female, has more desirable hours than a medical doctor who is more likely to be male and has less desirable hours. (5) No demands to move out of town, "or else" (that is, it means it's time to "move it or lose it"): a corporate secretary does not have a demand to move out of town, a corporate executive does.

Tom: Which is why IBM used to be called, "I've Been Moved."

Warren: Right. The seventh and eighth desirable characteristics are: (7) High fulfillment relative to training. This would be a woman who is a child care professional versus a man who is a coal miner. Most people would say that the child care professional has a little more fulfillment; and (8) an ability to work close to people in a pleasant environment is the eighth; for example, restaurant hostess versus a long-distance trucker.

Tom: So it is a myth then that women are segregated into the worst jobs?

Warren: Yes, it is a myth. The worst jobs are almost all male jobs, which they take because on average they have more mouths to feed.

Tom: Well when it comes to these hazardous jobs is there an effort to make them as safe as possible?

Warren: No. The United States has only one job safety inspector for every six fish and game inspectors. We have a work death rate 3-4 times higher than Japan's. If we had the same rate we would save the lives of 6,000 men and 400 women each year. To put it in another way, we kill 6,000 men and 400 women each year unnecessarily as a result of our lack of attention to work safety.

Tom: Many people are going to say that this is the first time they have ever heard this kind of thing. Why do we hear so little about the plight of these men?

Warren: Partially because men don't speak up and partially because of the location of men's work. Think about the garbage man. The garbage man works outside. You don't go up to him and ask him his name and say to him "What is your life like?" or "What is your experience with women like?" If you didn't go up to your secretary and get to know her a little bit as a person and ask her what her experience of men was you would be considered a sexist, you would be considered aloof—you would be considered arrogant. So we find out a little about our secretary's experience with men, but not about our garbage man's experience with women. That is because the place of man's labor is frequently so distant and outside the home. The logging, the trucking—we don't stop the logger, the trucker, or the construction worker and ask him what his experience of the world is.

Tom: You know, Warren, that reminds me of something else that I have heard you say, that when a woman meets a doctor we often overhear her saying to her woman friends that she met a wonderful doctor, but we rarely hear a woman say to a woman friend that I met a wonderful garbage man.

Warren: Yes. The garbage man is much more likely to be invisible in her life. Invisible to her, and she does not seek him out, so she really does not see him.

Tom: What are the consequences of these “second choice men” being invisible?

Warren: We hear, for example, things like the “glass ceiling”; women’s experience of discrimination, but we don’t hear about men’s experience of discrimination because no one talks to these men, and no one sees these men, and no one hears these men. So we don’t hear about the equivalent of the glass ceiling, what I would call the “glass cellar.”

Tom: The “glass cellar.” What does that mean?

Warren: Meaning, the invisible barrier that keeps men in 24 out of the 25 worst jobs, and these are what I call the “glass cellar” jobs.

Tom: In the book version of *The Myth of Male Power*, you take the reader on a journey around your neighborhood and try to make the experience of these invisible men more visible. Can you take us on that trip here?

Warren: I remember how I had just finished researching how about 70% of the garbage collectors in San Diego suffer job related injuries in the past year alone. As I was finishing up my research on that I heard the roar of the garbage truck go by my house. For the first time in my life, as I went to go take the garbage out, I actually allowed myself to look in the face of the man picking up the garbage. It was not until two or three weeks later that I allowed myself to talk to him, to make a connection with him as a human being. Then I was starting to see things that I had never seen before, I saw the lumbar support belt he was wearing, and it reminded me of the disproportionate chance for back injuries I had read about. Hernias, rectal cancer, cirrhosis of the liver or plain being hit by a passing automobile.

Tom: Many people have no idea how much hazard there is in that profession.

Warren: This recalled to me the story of a garbage collector that I just finished reading about, named Terry Hennessey. This is a real story. He had been compacting trash in San Diego and several bags of human blood splattered into his face while he was compacting the trash. Just a few weeks later he found a World War II hand grenade with a pin in it (it’s pretty hard to find a hand grenade without a pin in it) and some months later, Terry picked up a load of radioactive waste. His colleagues tell similar stories. One of them tells the story of battery acid exploding on their clothes and faces and of the compacting process causing chlorine to shoot out of an exploding container, setting a man on fire. Others tell of experiences of hot fireplace ashes being dumped into the trash and igniting the backs of trucks, or of liquid cyanide being poured over them.

Tom: Why don’t we hear about any of this?

Warren: In part because men never speak up and they tend to turn each other’s misfortune into humor. If they have an experience with cyanide, they start calling each other the “Cyanide Man” or the “Radioactive Man” and so on. The result was that I never really felt anything for these men because I had never heard how they were feeling. The first time I remember myself actually smiling

at my garbage man, frankly, it was a self-conscious smile. It was like an effort. I was aware of what I was doing. And it wasn't until later that day when I saw a pregnant woman I just reflected back on how automatically I smiled and connect to her. Inside of my smile was sort of an unstated statement that I was appreciating her joy, her adventure, her contribution, and I really became aware of the contrast between the self-conscious smile of the garbage collector and my automatic, loving, connecting smile to the woman.

Tom: It came so easily.

Warren: It came so easily, yeah. And I realized how I never in my life supported any garbage man's smile that expressed appreciation for his contribution. Although when I thought about it, here he is, supporting what the pregnant woman creates and carrying a different load.

Tom: I like that. He supports what the pregnant woman creates and carries a different load. But what else did you see differently?

Warren: Well, as I got to the supermarket and was sorting through chicken breasts, I always remember normally speaking being more aware of the crimes committed against chickens than the crimes committed against the workers that were preparing the chickens. You probably remember the incident of the 2,000 workers at the Morale Meat Packing Plant that 800 of them had become disabled in one year. Some of the workers at the Morale Plant were chopping and carving at a rate of a thousand movements per hour. And then I thought about 40% of these workers being disabled, disabled enough to leave their jobs for a year and each worker's hand essentially being a time bomb.

Tom: Now are you implying here that most of these workers were men?

Warren: In the 57 highest risk jobs at Moral almost 90% were men. But I think what was most astonishing to me was that dozens of these men who had to undergo surgery, surgery that required one to two months for their hands to heal were instead required to work immediately after the surgery.

Tom: Not to make light of any of this, but Warren it sounds like enough to almost make you a vegetarian.

Warren: Yes, until you start thinking about the vegetables. If you think about vegetables being sprayed with Parathion and the Parathion is sprayed on the vegetables by about 90% men who are flying planes or are in tractors. And as they fly the planes over the vegetables and the Parathion gets sprayed over the vegetables wind usually blows it right back into their faces, which is why they die so early. And that's in a sense the microcosm of the entire agriculture industry. I used to think of the agriculture industry as being one where you know the farmers and the women work side by side. In fact 24 out of 25 people who are killed in agriculture are men, and agriculture is the second most dangerous industry.

Tom: What kind of impact did this have on you personally when you go to have a meal at night?

Warren: Well, it's almost embarrassing because even if I have a microwave dinner, I will literally be—I'm probably the only person in this country that has this reaction—but I literally feel thankful about the vegetables and the dinner and the sacrifices that were made, the meat, also the way the dinner was packaged and the people that trucked it to me. I mean I just think to myself, "Here I am in three minutes preparing something costing me very little of my time and very little of my

money and all these people have, in a sense, worked for me, and in many cases, risked their lives for me." I just feel this enormous amount of gratitude.

Tom: You have a picture in *The Myth of Male Power* of men migrant workers, sleeping on the hillside in your town of Encinitas outside San Diego.

Warren: Yes, the picture struck me after I came back from shopping the local supermarket on Encinitas Boulevard near San Diego and I counted about 30 migrant workers in less than a six-block period. Each of them was looking soulfully into the eyes of every passerby. I'll never forget the look on a man's face as the two men he was standing with were picked up as he was left behind.

Tom: And almost all of these migrant workers standing out there waiting to be picked up were men, right?

Warren: Of the thousand or so that I've seen in my ten years of living in Encinitas, all of them have been men. I see some of them sleeping at night in the hills and I'm very touched how most of these men are sending a good part of their wages back to their children and wives back home in Mexico, whom they see only once or twice a year before they once again risk imprisonment by illegally crossing the US boarder. We have no men's movement calling these men oppressed for providing money for women from whom they're receiving neither cooking nor cleaning and for providing their wives with homes while they sleep on the ground.

Tom: When a field worker is radicalized he is taught to see the classism.

Warren: Exactly, but he remains blind to the sexes. When we call Mexican men patriarchs as if their roles of their society serve them at the expense of women it is really we who are being the sexists.

Tom: Yeah, I see your point. Okay, well, this has been quite a trip so far. But I think what I learned most from the section of the book *The Myth of Male Power* was what you were called when you encountered the fire truck.

Warren: When I heard the siren of the fire truck it was like it allowed me to recall how firefighters' death rate from cancer has increased 400% more than for the population at large, and how the average age for cancer death rates among fire fighters is 52.

Tom: You know, I think all of us had always figured that the danger for firefighting, what fire fighters were dying from was the smoke and from the fire.

Warren: Me, too, but when I read about the cancer rate I remembered how back to the MGM Grand Hotel fire in Las Vegas in the 1980s and how it left 70 people lying dead and rooms untouched by fire and unclouded by smoke. That was my first awareness that it was really plastics that created more danger when it went to fire because of the toxic emissions. That created more danger than the fire or the smoke per se.

Tom: Well, wouldn't oxygen tanks and breathing equipment reduce that danger?

Warren: Yes, but breathing equipment reduces communication and oxygen tanks take about a minute to put on. Flames can move as fast as a thousand feet in one minute.

Tom: You're saying that many firefighters choose to forfeit their own lives to save others.

Warren: Yes. Especially volunteers. Feminists said 'volunteerism' was a women's issue--that women

were the sacrificers who under-valued their worth. Disregarding the fact that many husbands work to support women to do fulfilling work, 80% of firefighters in America are volunteers and 99% of those are males. If we acknowledge women's contribution as volunteers I think it would also be helpful to appreciate the uniqueness of a million men exposing themselves to death to save the lives of strangers and all for no pay, except the 'social bribe' of our appreciation.

Tom: Yes, a little appreciation balancing here.

Warren: Yes, and actually the balancing reminds me of probably the last insight I had on the trip. I pulled into my driveway and I saw some movers balancing this large couch through a neighbor's doorway. And I could hear what I gather was a father warning his son. The father was saying, "Watch the way you lift. You're going to end up with a back like mine." As I walked into my house, I had a different appreciation for my refrigerator and how all my file cabinets were moved.

Tom: So these were all the services performed by men that were invisible, which is interesting because we think of women traditionally as doing all the invisible work.

Warren: Yes, in fact a friend of mine who read a first draft of the first chapter of *The Myth of Male Power* chastised me for leaving out the contribution of coal miners, and when I said I didn't see the evidence of that around me every day, he corrected me and said, "No, no, you see the evidence of mining around you all the time, every day. It's just the miner who's invisible to you. You don't see him around you every day."

Tom: Explain.

Warren: He told me to look in the mirror while I was shaving and check out the fillings that contained not only gold and silver but mercury and petroleum composite. He corrected my tendency to think of mining as coal mining rather than metal mining and oil and gas extraction. He then explained how my eyeglasses contain not only metal but also plastic and the plastic contained metal and coal, and how every time I turn the light on it is shining through glass bulbs containing tungsten, mercury, and phosphorus and even the electricity to produce the light comes through copper and aluminum wires from generators, and the generators are also made from copper and they're spun by tungsten turbans which are powered by steam that is produced from uranium or from coal or from oil.

Tom: Okay. So, the next thing that you're going to be telling me is that your clothes are made from miners.

Warren: Well, as a matter of fact, in many of our clothes there are bits of iron and/or limestone or coal.

Tom: Okay, what makes mining so dangerous?

Warren: Rocks falling from mine ceilings that cause concussions, dangling wires that electrocute miners. You can just imagine if in an office situation we had ceilings falling in that were killing secretaries and if the electrical wires that were dangling were electrocuting secretaries. Imagine how much in this country we would be caring about workplace safety and how much the secretaries would be suing the companies if they were the victim of electrocutions rather than dirty jokes.

Tom: Well, you know, being aware of all these things now how do you sleep at night?

(Part II will appear in *New Male Studies*, 1.3, August 2012)

### About the Author



Dr. Warren Farrell has been chosen by the *Financial Times* as one of the world's top 100 thought leaders, and by the Center for World Spirituality (in 2011) as one of the world's spiritual leaders. His books are published in over 50 countries, and in 15 languages. They include two award-winning international best-sellers, *Why Men Are The Way They Are* plus *The Myth of Male Power*. He can be reached at [warren@warrenfarrell.com](mailto:warren@warrenfarrell.com)

NEW MALE STUDIES: AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL (NMS) IS AN OPEN ACCESS ONLINE INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION OF ISSUES FACING BOYS AND MEN WORLDWIDE. THIS JOURNAL USES OPEN JOURNAL SYSTEMS 2.3.4.0, WHICH IS OPEN SOURCE JOURNAL MANAGEMENT AND PUBLISHING SOFTWARE DEVELOPED, SUPPORTED, AND FREELY DISTRIBUTED BY THE PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE PROJECT UNDER THE GNU GENERAL PUBLIC LICENSE.

THIS ARTICLE HAS BEEN DOWNLOADED FROM [HTTP://NEWMALESTUDIES.COM](http://newmalestudies.com).