

**Foundation for Male Studies – Second Annual Conference:
Looking Forward to Solutions**

New York Academy of Medicine
April 6, 2011

Dr. Edward M. Stephens, President of the Foundation for Male Studies:

Good morning to those of you in the audience, and welcome. Maybe good afternoon to some of our international audience. Or it may even be in the middle of the night. I am Dr. Ed Stephens, the president of the Foundation for Male Studies. And this is a second annual conference - Male Studies: Looking Forward to Solutions.

Why Male Studies? Because the problems you will hear about from these experts have to be addressed. The consequences of not resolving these questions concerning the well-being of men and boys are too dire to contemplate. The gates to successful lives have been closed for millions of males worldwide. Today we are seeking the keys to open those gates. It is impossible to predict the future, but what we should do is to prepare for it. That is the goal of the Foundation of Male Studies. To fund courses, programs and departments of male studies that will spearhead research to reverse the international epidemic of the decline of man.

I'm now going to turn the program over to our moderator, Mr. Guy Garcia. Mr. Garcia is the author of *The Decline of Men*, a former vice president of AOL and an award-winning journalist. And he will now conduct us through our exercises.

Guy Garcia, Conference Moderator:

Thank you. I'll have a couple of remarks in a minute, but first I'd like to introduce Marianne Legato and Tom Mortenson. Dr. Legato is the founder and director of Columbia College of Medicine's Partnership for Gender-Specific Medicine, editor of the first text on Gender Medicine, and founder of the *Journal of Gender Medicine*. Dr. Mortenson is Senior Scholar at the Pell Institute for the study of opportunity in higher education and editor and publisher of *Post-Secondary Education Opportunity*.

Maryanne J. Legato, MD, Founder and Director, Partnership for Gender-Specific Medicine, Columbia College of Medicine:

Good morning to those who are here with us in the audience and to those of you around the world who are listening.

We studied men exclusively in clinical investigation for reasons of practicality and safety. And up until 1990, when American Feminism prompted the government to start an agenda on looking into the health of women, and testing women directly. The harvest of information about women indicated that they were in fact substantially different in all the systems of the body, compared to men. And paradoxically, prompted us to turn what I call a gender-specific lens on men's unique abilities, talents and vulnerabilities. The differences between the sexes are legion, and terribly important, and far more extensive than we ever realized.

The emphasis on male health in the public press can be illustrated by this copy of Rodale's Publication, Men's Health. And the blurb on the cover says, "Strength and Calm. Expert Advice on Getting Fitter, Looking Leaner, Eating Better, Investing Smarter, and Crushing Any Opponent." The emphasis is as it always has been, on youth, physical fitness, stamina and conquering any opposition. In fact, the vulnerabilities of men indicate that we have exploited them, and ignored their unique needs. They are in fact, so much more vulnerable than women, that they die six years before women in most civilized nations.

You'll hear a whole range of opinion about the specific needs of men throughout this conference, and I hope you leave it with a new look and a new feeling about the importance of focus, intelligent study of the vulnerabilities of men as well as their advantages. And I hope in ten years, the covers of magazines for men will include more than muscular development and conquering the enemy. Thank you.

Guy Garcia, Conference Moderator:

We're gonna hear from Mr. Mortenson in just a moment. But I do think it's worth pointing out that the substance and range of expertise today goes beyond anything that's traditionally associated with, for better or worse, has been called the gender wars, or, in my book, I call it *The Decline of Men – the subtitle is How the American Male is Tuning Out, Giving Up and Flipping Off His Future*. The idea for this book, I come to this from, as a journalist, as a sociologist, as a researcher, and when I was a staff writer at Time Magazine, during the 80's and 90's, the magazines at Time Incorporated that made the most money, catered to males; the most respected editors at Time Inc. were men, the president and CEO of Time Incorporated was a man. Just a few years ago I noticed it had completely changed – within the course of five or six years, the CEO of Time Warner, of Time Inc. was a female, all the top editors are female, and it is the magazines that catered to women that are making the most money, and driving the company.

I asked an executive editor at Time Magazine to explain the sudden shift; what happened to the men? "We don't know," she told me, "but we know they're not reading magazines." It was disturbing enough that they didn't know that men weren't reading magazines, but the fact that they didn't know or didn't seem to care, really got my attention. So in just a few years, men as a force, as an audience, have practically disappeared from Time Inc. Why? I started to investigate the riddle of the vanishing males, and the more I looked, the worse it got. Men were falling behind women in education, their wages were stagnant or falling, their place in the family was eroding, and their self-esteem was being chipped away by depictions of men on TV and in the media as losers, jackasses, slackers, deadbeats.

In Harlem I spoke to educators who said that the only role models for young men being raised by their mothers were dropouts, rappers and gangsters. And at Harvard University, professors told me that men as a group had lost their ambition and drive.

By 2009, thanks to the He-session, where more than two-thirds millions of jobs lost were those that once belonged to men, women now outnumber men in the workforce for the first time in American history. In the media, men and testosterone were blamed for the failure of the institutions and industries that they had built, and even the recession itself, even as they suffered disproportionately from its effects. At the same time it was becoming obvious that the attributes that had powered men through history, physical strength, risk-taking, single-minded focus, were no longer necessary for success. In fact, the skills most in demand in the 21st century

economy - communication, networking and collaboration are the same skills that women were apparently better at.

Meanwhile, the skewed ratio of women to men in colleges meant that the pool of educated professional women was growing, even as the pool of similarly trained men was shrinking.

What's more, this is a global phenomenon. A whole generation of men in their 20s and 30s, in Japan have become grass-eaters. Guys who are opting out of marriage, careers, and consumer economy. Japanese sociologists cited two main causes. One is the rapid rise of empowerment in women; the other one is a long and severe recession. They've had the first condition for a long time; the second one, in some ways, has only begun.

We know that when men have no jobs and no hope, they can become violent, dangerous and desperate. No wonder incarceration rates in the U.S. are the highest in the developed world.

The downward-cycle and the danger and risk for all of society is clear, yet nobody seems to care. On radio talk shows, men and women would call me to say men were getting what they deserved. When I pointed out that women were increasingly now doing jobs that men once dominated, and still were bearing the brunt of household upkeep and child rearing, and that in many American families, women were now stuck doing the work of both genders, there was grudging admission that I might have a point.

Meanwhile, men are constantly under attack for being too weak and being too dominating; for being too rigid and too accommodating. Emasculation is a national blood sport. When George Bush unilaterally invaded Iraq without evidence of a threat, he was called a reckless cowboy. But when Barack Obama waited for an international consensus in Libya, he was accused of being too weak to lead the country ordered to "man up".

A couple of years ago, the New York Times ran an article on the shrinking pool of men on college campuses, The New Math on Campus. Instead of showing concern for the social implications of declining male enrollments in colleges across the country, these men were vilified for taking advantage of gender inequality to play the field instead of settling down. Once again, women were the victims and men were the bad guys.

The decline of men is not new. And some of the men and women in this room have been sounding the alarm for years. What's new is that the problem is accelerating to the point where even Feminists have begun to recognize and endorse the overwhelming evidence that men are in trouble.

Can we channel the frustration and fear that so men feel today into something coherent and constructive? Can we move beyond blogger back-biting and ideological friendly-fire to enlist women and youths in this call to action? Can we transcend the gender wars and raise the discussion to a national level that addresses the social cost to all Americans if men are systematically beaten down and marginalized, degraded and diminished? I believe we can; I believe we must. And that's why we're here today - to reverse the decline and work together for equality and a better future for all.

I would like to introduce Mr. Mortenson, who will talk about the male shortfall on education and its impact on unemployment.

Tom Mortenson, Senior Scholar, Pell Institute:

My name is Tom Mortenson. I have been a higher-education policy analyst for a little over 40 years. I study populations and their attendance patterns in higher education. But I started my career in 1970, if somebody would have asked me, what are the underrepresented populations you're concerned about, I would have said "well, clearly, it's poor kids, Black kids and girls." Today, I would answer that question as, "low-income first-generation kids, the underrepresented minorities of Blacks, Hispanics and American Indians, and boys." In reading the great sea change over the last 40 years has been the progress of girls and, by implication the lack of progress of boys. So, we're going to work our way through these slides, and I want to start off describing what's going on in the lives of men, because I don't think people understand how serious the degradation of male life has become. Then I want to talk about the worlds of work, which is sort of the core of this presentation. The bottom line is; the take-away is the world is changing and men aren't. They're not adapting to it. The world that requires more education than ever before, and males have flatlined for about 40 years now. And I want to talk about males in college briefly; briefly about male voices.

This is data from the Bureau of Labor and Statistics. The share of the population of men that are actually employed. The data began in 1948; the most recent data is from 2010. The key line is the center line for the population 25 years and over. In 1948 about 87% of men 25 and over were employed. Today that's down to about 67%. Almost 20% of the men of the population that should be working, aren't. The decline is also significant in the key working years of 25 to 54. What's interesting here is the 55-64-year-old men, those men that worked their lives as farmers and in manufacturing industries and lost their jobs - they had the falling-out earliest; they've made somewhat of a modest recovery since then, but again their labor force - employment is near record lows. And you'll get the sense as I go through this presentation - my perspective that male identity is based in work. Men must be productively employed to fulfill their social roles. And we'll talk about that in some detail as we go through here.

The share of men that are unemployed is higher in 2010 than it has ever been. Male unemployment rate tends to fluctuate with business cycle. We're clearly in a very severe, great recession now. Men have not yet worked their way out of that, and as you'll see in a moment, it's because they're tied up in industries that are unlikely to recover, when the recovery occurs. The male unemployment rate is higher than it has ever been. The average weekly hours worked by men, lower than it has ever been. Again, this is data from the Bureau of Labor and Statistics. I go back, I seek out this data, I cultivate relationships with the economists at the Bureau of Labor and Statistics, and they gear me toward this kind of data.

In 1956, when this time series began, men worked almost an average of almost 44 hours a week; it's now down to 40 hours per week. Men are working less.

Annual income for males. I mainly want to draw you attention to the median line because the facts are most troubling here. Median means that half of all men earn more; half of all men earn less than this particular income level. In 2009, median male income was less in constant dollars than it had been in 1973. Half of all men are making less in 2009 than they did in 1974, in constant dollars. 1973 is in many respects the turning point in the economy; it's the advent of the human capital economy in the United states, where there's been this massive redistribution of income according to educational attainment; we're almost 40 years into this right now; as I said, the flatlining of males in education means that at the margin, males have simply not caught on to this great sea change that has occurred. The average is up because a few males are doing very, very well. But on the whole, and the median is a better measure of what is going on, I'm

sure Bill Gates and Warren Buffet sort of skew that distribution a bit. But on the whole, when we talk about medians, males are doing less well today than they did almost 40 years ago.

I want to spend a little bit of time on this suicide data, for a couple of reasons. It's clear that we've had an explosion in suicide rates amongst young men, since about 1960. But there's a much longer time series than this data. And when I've calculated the ratio of male to female suicide rates in this 15-24 year-old population, a very interesting trend emerges. Between 1900 and 1930, the ratio of male to female suicides was about 1.5 to 1. That is, males in this age range were about 50% more likely to kill themselves than females. Obviously we have wars and recessions going on, affecting this data to some, but then, beginning in 1930, this ratio starts to rise, from 1.5 by the end of the 1930s, it's twice; males are twice as likely to kill themselves. And this ratio continues to rise almost consistently, persistently up until the mid-1990s when it gets over six times likely. Now what this tells me is that the problems of young males really begin around 1930.

I'm one who studies higher education enrollment data, and females surpassed males in college enrollment in 1981, so it would have been easy to think that male problems begin about 30 years ago, when we're well into this human capital economy. But the suicide data say, really the advent of male problems began about 50 years earlier - around 1930. And this tends to support my hypothesis that the problems of males are fundamentally, their disconnection, lack or engagement with changes that are occurring in the economy. There's a second point I want to make with this chart. And that is, after the mid-1990s, the suicide rate for young males dropped sharply. There's almost no good news in the data I'm going to put up here today. But this is a very important piece of good news. In the 1980s and 1990s, the mental health community decided that we had an epidemic of suicides in the United States. And it was the mental health community - not the education community - it was the mental health community that we had a problem, and we needed to address it. I live out in Iowa. My wife has worked in K-12 education for many decades, and we use a program developed here in New York City, Teen Screen, Developed at Columbia University, to screen adolescent youth for mental health issues. It has to be done very carefully. The parents have to give permission when results identify an individual with mental health issues, as that individual has to be referred to a mental health professional. But it is clear that the mental health community - not the education community - the mental health community identified a problem and dealt with it. And frankly, I'm still waiting for the education community to get organized and show us that the education community can also do something to affect the health of young men.

This is the incarceration rate. Federal and state prisons. We're just off of the peak in 2009, but the history is pretty clear. Frankly, this surge is attributable again, to something that happened in New York; it's the Rockefeller Drug Laws, where we decided to make use and possession of drugs a criminal offense. Much of this growth in male incarceration rates is attributable to what got started here in New York. But it's clear that we have a huge incarceration rate; a problem in the United States. We have the highest male incarceration rates in the world. I want to repeat that, because there are huge dollar signs attached to this. We have the highest male incarceration rates in the world.

Civic engagement. There's a number error on my chart; I apologize for it; that should be 77.9%. When we try to measure other aspects of male engagement; what we'd want to think of as responsible adult male behavior, it's also clear that men are disengaging from civic life, measured here, in terms of their registration of voting in presidential elections - declined actually from 77% down to about 63%. Percent actually voting, from 72% down to about 55%. Males are disengaging from civic life. There are many dimensions to civic life; you can't measure all of them; this one happens to be one favorite by the census bureau, so we post that data.

And then we find that men just aren't getting married. In no small part, because they're simply economically unprepared for the responsibilities of marriage. And the census bureau feeds us this data - in 1977 about 6% of men between the ages of 35 and 54 had never been married; that's now up to 18%. It's kind of hard to have families in the traditional sense, if men aren't getting married. What is happening is that women are going ahead and having babies without being married. In the most recent data from the National Center for Health Statistics, over 40% of the babies born in 2008, were born to unwed mothers. Women are persisting in forming families (at least having children), even though they're not married. When I was a kid, and I graduated from high school in 1961 - I remember that 5% figure. The women that had children at that point were socially ostracized. We were told that they were accidents. Now it's quite a deliberate strategy of women who want to have children, and can't find a partner to go ahead and have children anyhow.

And as a result, the portion of children living with a father is in decline. In 1960, close to 90% of all children were living with families with a father present; it's now down to about 73%. Fathers are disengaging from family life.

And the last social pathology measure I'll put up here is poverty rates for males - they're at near-record highs. This tends to fluctuate with the business cycle. The peaks in poverty rates for males correspond perfectly with the recession phase of the business cycle and it's quite likely that when we get 2010 data, the poverty rates for males - that that rate will continue to go up as it has in the past. Men are not getting through the current rate of recession successfully at all. The kinds of jobs that men have lost are not going to be brought back.

So I want to talk about this Worlds of Work. Again, from my perspective, male identity is based on productive engagement - work - for which you get paid. And the fact is that the world of work is changing in ways that require more higher education than we've ever required of workers in the past, and the men don't seem to get this message. And as an educator, I go back into the education system, and I'm looking where we could make improvements in males' lives - believe me, it has to begin in education and it has to begin fairly early in education.

This is total employment in the United States. Bureau of Labor Statistics data. We've gone from a little over 50 million employees right after World War II, up to about 133 million today; I know we've lost about 7 million jobs in the current great recession. These little bumps on this ski slope is the recession phase of the business cycle. We tend to lose jobs in the recession phase, and then we add them back in when the economy recovers. But as Paul Krugman and others have pointed out in this last decade, there has really been no gain of employment in the United States. That's not really the key issue though. This is the key issue: The nature of employment in the U.S. labor force has changed enormously across industrial classifications. Enormously since the end of World War II. In 1948, about 48% of the jobs in the economy were in goods-producing industries like manufacturing, for example. That's now down to about 15.5%, and anybody can extrapolate this line out and get a pretty good idea of when it's gonna hit zero. These are jobs that paid men well for the work that they did, and we're losing those jobs. And I don't see any reason from this kind of data or other labor economists' estimates of what's likely to happen in the future, that we're going to get those jobs back. We're losing male jobs. What is growing are service-providing industrial employment opportunities, and I'll talk about that in a little bit more detail.

We've gone from 41% of the jobs in the economy in 1948 to over two-thirds today - are in private-sector service-providing industrial employment. Government has grown slightly or grew slightly from 1948 up until the late, mid-1970s, and have sort of flatlined since then.

Now we're going to break these down in a little more detail. This is manufacturing share of total employment; it's gone from a peak of around 27, 28% in the early 1950s, down to less than 9% today. Manufacturing is dying. And the real story here is really agriculture. Keep in mind, I live in Iowa, I live out in a cornfield in Southern Iowa, so this hits sort of personally here. If you go back to the 1910 census, 35% of the occupations listed in the 1910 census were either farmer or farm laborer. Today, less than 2% of employment in the United States is in agricultural industries. So that's likely what's going to happen to manufacturing; will be down; and asymptotically approach about 2% at some point out in the future. Constructions, more or less a constant 5%; goes down a little bit during the recession phase; the business cycle; natural resources and mining never was big, and is also disappearing. What's growing are jobs in service industries in the private sector. And the big one here of course, is health and education, which has gone from about 4% in 1948 up to about 14% today. Good jobs in health and education all require college degrees. It's just the nature of the business. The fastest-growing sector, health and education, also happens to be, as you'll see in a minute, the sector that employs the fewest men. But also, substantial growth in professional and business services, leisure and hospitality industries, financial industries, other service industries - this is where growth is occurring. It's not really occurring in government; this is local government, this is mainly k-12 schoolteachers, state government is about a constant 4%; the federal government's gone from about 4% to about 2%; they seem to be trying to outsource everything at the federal level. We'll see if we can do that with the military budget.

The male share of employment by industry in construction? 90%. Mining. 86%. Transportation, utilities, the truck drivers, 77%. Agriculture, 75%. Most of these are industries that are in decline. Construction is flatlined; but it doesn't grow, it's just at a constant 5%. Mining is in decline. Agriculture, manufacturing - in decline. The industry that's growing the fastest - education and health services - has the smallest share of male employment - only 25% of the employees in education and health services are men. That's where growths are occurring and the men aren't there. And these are also industries that require substantial amounts of post-secondary education and training.

Changes in shares of total employment in education and healthcare grown the fastest; professional and business, leisure, hospitalities - these are service industries; they require a lot of post-secondary education and training, and the women that have gone to higher education for the last 40 years I've been able to observe, have gone into these industries, and have done well in their careers. Men are heavily tied up in manufacturing and agriculture, and frankly those are dead-ends.

Males in college. The story here is one of flatlining. Flatlining over the last 40 years or so. In the United States, we require compulsory school attendance up through about age 16. It varies slightly from state to state; some states are talking about raising compulsory school attendance to as high as 19, but I would doubt that they're gonna be able to pull that off. In any case, if you look at male enrollment rates beyond the compulsory school attendance age, flatlined for 16 and 17s; we have this bump back here; this is the Vietnam War; this is when we had conscription for service in the Vietnam War; an exemption from conscription from military service for full-time college enrollment. It's pretty clear that we know how to get males into college. You point a loaded gun at their head, and say "You're gonna go to college, or you're gonna go into a war zone." We've done this natural experiment and it worked quite effectively. But even today, we're not much above - for 18 to 19-year-olds, what we were during the Vietnam War. And we're actually about the same level here for 20 and 21-year-olds. But there's not much growth here - If

I had time I would have put up the chart for women, and you'd see rather steep curves across all these age levels where school enrollment is voluntary.

Educational attainment; I take the baccalaureate degree as the end of the education pipeline, and obviously it isn't true for everybody. But for 25 to 29-year-old males, that proportion of the population with a bachelor's degree grew substantially after 1940, peaked in the 1970s, and actually today is below what it was in the mid-1970s. Here's where you get into this flatlining kind of thing. It continues to grow for 25-year-olds and over because we're including older men here.

We're in a fairly unique situation now; unique that is, when we compare ourselves to the European countries, where our young women are substantially better educated than their mothers. And our young men are substantially less well-educated than their fathers. Keep in mind - the economic changes that I just described require more post-secondary education and training than the economy has ever required before, and we've sort of flatlined. We've been in this flatline condition now for 30-40 years. The world is changing, and males are not adapting to this new world.

This is the share of bachelor's degrees awarded to males since 1870, since we started collecting this data in the United States. At one point, in 1870, 85% of the bachelor's degrees went to men. Then you see this enormous disruption caused by World War II. At one point, 43% in 1946, the bachelor's degrees went to men. Then you have you have the GI bill; veterans returning; got up to 76% going to men, but what happens here, around 1970, this long-termed slide resumes. From 1940 to 1970, then jump over here to 1970, and this long-term slide resumes. So now we're down in 2007 to about 42.6% of the bachelor's degrees are being awarded to men, even though men are about 51% of the college age population. Men don't get it. The education system is failing to keep our boys engaged in learning long enough that they pick up the education and training that they need for the jobs that are going to be out there during the next 40 years of their working lifetime.

I have some data here on male voices; I think it's important that we listen to males. And there's two charts that I really want to highlight; the first and the last in this sequence. This is data collected from the UCLA Survey of American College Freshmen. On life objectives considered to be important or essential, and I've contrasted the male to the female responses to this question. Basically, to be successful in their own business, males are 8.8% more likely than females to say that that is very important or essential to their life objectives. Keep current with politics; males seem to be more interested than females. Influence the political structure. Make contributions to science. Have administrative responsibility. At the other end of this scale, at the bottom, are those areas where women say that these life objectives are more important than men. Women college freshmen report that they're more likely than men to be interested in helping others in difficulty, understanding other countries, joint community action programs, influence social value, join the Peace Corps, promote racial understanding, and the like. When one looks at this data, and I have a very extensive PowerPoint presentation that goes into this in more detail, you come across a pattern that leads me to believe that men and women are attending college with different objectives in mind. They're after different kinds of things. Those that make it to college, men want to be successful in their own business. Men, and I think others that study the behavior of boys, aspirations of boys, have found this - I'm sort of repeating what Michael Gurion and others would have said. Boys have big dreams. I think that's important. Boys think big. They think great thoughts. And the concern is that unless they get the education, to fulfill those dreams, they'll be frustrated in their lives.

How do freshmen men and women spend their times? I'm afraid this is kind of a sorry story. The freshmen men are more likely to spend substantial amounts of time on exercise and sports, watching TV, partying and playing video games. Especially video games. We'll go into this data in a little bit more detail. Time spent on sports. It's always been higher for males since 1987, last time I tabulated. This was through 2006. Somewhat increase in the share of women reporting this; 6 or more hours per week - but males have always spent more time on exercise or sports - and there's all sorts of other data from the American Time Use Survey, for example, that supports this - that the boys do an awful lot of playing while they're in college.

Watching television. That's tapering off over time, but boys still tend to do more of it than women do. Partying. I've always wondered if the boys are spending this much... who are they partying with? When I went to college, we used to party with girls. But it's not obvious from this kind of data that that's occurring. Partying is tapering off; obviously dating customs are changing.

Playing video games - this is where the boys win hands-down. Lots of time wasted playing video games. Studying and homework. Girls. If you're a college professor, you understand this kind of data. The students simply aren't studying as hard as they used to. But the girls, at least, spend considerably more time than the boys do.

I'm gonna skip over a couple of things here, cause I want to end on one - this chart and the next one. Again, this data from the UCLA Freshmen Survey, Why do boys go to college? To make more money; because they don't have anything better to do. The women, on the other hand, are more likely to report they attend college to become a more cultured person, gain general education, prepare for graduate professional school, learn interesting things. Put yourself in the position of a college admissions officer. What kind of students do you want on your campus? This helps explain why, on a typical college campus, it's about 58% female and 42% male. The women want to be there; they know why they're there.

Last chart, again. Listen to the voices of young males.

Attitudes toward teachers. Males are more likely to report that teachers have an annoying or superior attitude. They're turned off by their teachers. Teachers were opinionated and inflexible. Teachers are more concerned about themselves than their students. Males have a problem with their teachers in the classroom. The girls on the other hand are more likely to report that they like their teachers, and felt they did a good job. Teachers respected them, treated them fairly, teachers have been caring and dedicated. These problems really begin long before college. In my view, they seem to be, from the data that I look at, beginning to emerge in the middle school grades. And I've often thought that probably we're talking about the onset of puberty, the changes, biological changes that are occurring in boys and girls at that age. But it's certainly true that the boys are not finding the K-12 experience exciting, engaging in that the way that girls are. And as a result, they're graduating from high school at lower rates than girls are, they're going to college at lower rates than girls are, and they're completing college at lower rates than girls are. And that's why today, about 58% of the bachelor's degrees are going to women and about 42% are going to men. Thank you.

Guy Garcia, Author, *The Decline of Men*, Conference Moderator:

We know nothing for young men is more important than the relationship with their fathers. We know boys who grow up without a strong father figure in the household are more likely to have

troubles in their own relationships, or not marry at all; to be divorced themselves. To get in trouble at work, or with the law, with drugs; just a ton of bad things happen statistically. So, this can be, when you start putting numbers - and there's more to come - the danger, the real danger is that this becomes a downward spiral, where it's reinforced from all sides, and is passed on from generation to generation.

Now I'd like to introduce Gordon Finley. Dr. Finley is Professor of Psychology at Florida International University, with research interests in fatherhood and divorce. He'll be speaking to us on how emerging current realities and future trends will affect the roles of fathers and families, and children's lives.

Gordon E. Finley, Ph.D., Professor of Psychology, Florida International University:

If you think back to the components of the role of being a father, in life, the central component always has been breadwinning. And if you look Tom's data, and you think of Tom's data, we have to ask the question, "Is it possible for men to be breadwinners?", "Is it possible for men to become fathers, and to become breadwinners?" And the downward trajectory of Tom's is at best, not encouraging. This in my opinion is a very, very serious issue, and there was a famous book in 1955, Parsons & Bales, in which they said there are two kinds of roles in the family. Men had instrumental roles; women had expressive, emotional roles. The key part of the instrumental role for fathers, was breadwinning, and looking at Tom's data, and I'm gonna spend more time on this as I go through this. But as we start to the future of fatherhood, I think it's fair to ask, "Can men become fathers if they are not breadwinners?"

The one I'm gonna use this morning, is percent of all college degrees, females vs. males, 1966 to 2019. And the projections at the end are not his, they're from the U.S. Department of Education. Again, all of this data we're talking about - huge numbers of people - all from the U.S. Department of Education.

Ok. What are the take-home messages? All college degrees - Associate of Arts, Bachelor's degrees, Masters degrees, Business degrees, Law degrees, Medical degrees, PhDs - all of the degrees combined. Ok. What are the take-home messages? The first, and I like this one, because it's very dramatic; the first shows a lot of what Tom was talking about, if you go back to about 1966, you see about 61% of composite index, degrees went to male, and you go to projected to 2020, and you're down to 39%. This is a straight, downward trajectory. By contrast, for females, it's a straight, upward trajectory. Obviously, when you're talking about percents, it has to sum to 100. But I think this figure demonstrates, is the gender gap that we've been hearing so much about for decades. The gender gap, back in 1966, you can argue, that females, were in fact, victimized; females were, in fact, poorly treated. You can see that down at the 39%. For the projections up to 2020 however, it's hard to find female victimization in these data. It is easy to find male victimization. In these data, male inequality, in these data, but it is hard to find female inequality in 2020. And again, these are not Mark's projections, these are U.S. Department of Education projections. Ok. That's one message.

The second take-home message is that because unfortunately the same year as Tom talked about, and that's 1981. Equality, educationally speaking, at least in terms of degrees; equality was achieved in 1981. Women and men were receiving equal numbers of degrees, in 1981. So what is the women's movement been doing for the three decades? Where is the evidence of educational inequality for the last three decades? Why do we have, and why do taxpayers... I live in the state of Florida, which has just been taken over by the republicans at all levels, and we

hear nothing but taxpayer this, taxpayer that, taxpayer something else... why are taxpayers continuing to fund women's centers on university campuses? Why are taxpayers continuing to fund women's studies programs on university campuses? If you look toward the right portion of this figure, in 2010, is there a need for women's studies programs? In 2010, is there a need for women's centers on campus? And the answer obviously is no. The need is down here. In 2010, what we need is men's centers on campus, that will do for men, what the women's centers have done for women - that is help them, support them, give them positive feedback, give them financial assistance, give them tutorial assistance, give them the kind of help that they need to get away from 39% and to move back three decades in history to 1981, where there was a point of equality. I think this is an important point. You will not be seeing this figure from the NOW, the National Organization for Women, but we have to face reality. Again, this is reality. This is numerical reality - the same way that Tom charted the decline of male occupational opportunity, the decline of the chance for men to become breadwinners, to become fathers. Likewise, we have to look at what is happening at our institutions of higher education, and the answer is that we are continuing to pour money into something that we don't need to pour money into. We need to pour our increasingly scarce educational dollars; we need to pour our money into men's centers, male study programs, and so forth. And a lot of you, this particular graphic is the kind of evidence that Ed should be very happy about.

Ok. We talked about those two things... Oh yeah, one other thing I'd like to talk about, and Tom started on this. For decades, some people have been talking about the boy crisis in education. Initially, these concerns about the boy crisis in education were ignored. After they were ignored, they were denied, and now, it's impossible to continue with that. Once people began talking about the boy crisis in education, then we had a plethora of possible explanations. One explanation that I have not heard much about, and I believe deserves far greater attention, is something that Tom Brogue and others have called the greatest generation. So what was the greatest generation? The greatest generation was men. The greatest generation was men who fought in World War II. Those who survived, came home from World War II, when they came home, they were given adulation, the war to end all wars, and, most critically for our present discussion, they were given the GI Bill. They took the GI bill, they ran with it, they went to colleges, they went to universities, they went to professional schools, they went to business schools, medical schools, law schools, academic higher education, got doctorates, and this greatest generation helped (I'm not saying that it caused), helped to propel the economic prosperity of the 1950s. The point of thinking about the greatest generation in my view, is that, if you think about the greatest generation, you recognized the accomplishments; the educational accomplishments they attain. What this does, is it weakens all arguments about boys being inferior, men being inferior, they can't handle academic work, and so forth. Unless you want to argue the male gene pool has changed in the last half-century, or so, then you have to say, well, it's probably not neurological factors, it's probably not genetic factors, it's probably social factors. And my view is that what made girls and women so successful was basically social engineering. That girls and women claimed they were being discriminated against, demanded resources, they got a lot of positive feedback, they got tons of resources, they got the educational system re-adjusted to their learning styles and, above all, it worked.

So what do we do for boys? We do the same thing. We take all the resources, call this the GI Bill for Boys and Men. You take all the resources that we have been giving to girls and women; you take those resources; you take that social support; you take that positive feedback, the financial support; Male Studies on campus, and give everything that was given to females that helped them to move up here; to give to males, to help correct that. Will you ever get back to 1981? I

have no idea. But by looking at what worked so very, very effectively for girls and women, and applying that to boys and men, you have a chance, it seems to me, to get back to 1981.

Ok. The educational problem, and the occupational problem that Tom outlined, is really a major issue for fatherhood. And again, I just leave you with the question, since fatherhood traditionally has had one of its major role components, breadwinning, and Tom's data are so bleak and barren, for the occupational opportunities open to men, can we have men moving into the fatherhood role with such bleak and barren occupational opportunities? I'll leave you for that to think about.

Second major threat to fatherhood is social attitudes. A lot of people will be talking; everybody will be touching on this. The problem in our society is that the dominant discourse is very simple, very straightforward. The dominant discourse in our society is female is good, male is bad. That's very serious. It's pervasive. And as a psychologist, what I think, it's not possible to underestimate the power of the constant daily drip of negative feedback, negative social attitudes, that boys are receiving very, very early in life. You just cannot underestimate the impact of that, in terms of boys' and men's drive, seeking to achieve, seeking to do well in education. I'll just give two quick examples, both linked to education.

For a while there was a t-shirt marketed, widely marketed, across the United States; had a picture of a little boy on it; had pictures of rocks coming toward him. And the caption underneath was "Boys are stupid. Throw rocks at them." This was a widely-sold-shirt. I'm not gonna mention the manufacturer; I don't wanna help them out. Two messages. First, the obvious. Boys are stupid. Well, how many days of the week as a boy, can you walk around, seeing those t-shirts, Girl Power, Girls Rule, all along the same lines? How many days a week can you walk around seeing those t-shirts, without getting the message, and the message is, you're not one of them, and no, you don't rule. You know, you don't have power, and girls are entitled to throw rocks at you.

Ok. The second thing I would encourage you to do; go to any website of choice; ignore the text, and just look at the pictures. Flip through all the different pages, and count the number of white males you see in those pictures. Most of you will not need more than one hand. And this too, is giving a message; a negative social message. The solution I think for this is that we need to come to value boys and men to the same degree - this is a social attitude message - we need to come to value boys and men to the same degree that we value girls and women. A second message is, I frequently see in literature, talking about transformation of boys to men. We need more talk about the transformation of men to fathers. The third major problem is non-marital childbearing. In the 1950s the percentage of children born out of wedlock was 4%. This is the time of the greatest generation which I spent some time talking about earlier. Today it's 40%. In the Black community, they say it's 72%. The problem for children, both girls and boys; the problem for children is that living in a single-parent household, the problem of non-marital childbirth, is instability. In these cohabiting unions is high turnover; there's high change; major problem is that you have both partners with children by multiple partners, and most of the time this is in the context of low education, low socio-economic status, unemployment, and all of this is a guaranteed formula to sever the father/child relationship. So why is this a bad thing? It's not mentioned. In the upside, when you have nurturing and involved fathers, all the outcomes are consistently positive. Research shows they are consistently positive. Even more important than that (and again I'm moving quickly as the amount of time), even more important than that, is that there have been studies looking at mothers and fathers, and looking at their ability to attenuate or reduce negative developmental outcomes in adolescents and young adulthood. And what these studies consistently show is that fathers have a much more powerful impact than

mothers do on curbing high-risk behavior, negative outcomes, just take the host of all negative outcomes you can think of, and fathers are better at curbing these, attenuating them, reducing them, than mothers are. So what's the bottom line message? The bottom line message is that children need more than a mother and a check. If we go back to the great society programs of Lyndon Baines Johnson, the solution to the problem of disadvantaged children was mothers and a check. Today it is mothers and a child support check. But either way, children need their fathers. Again, (let me see if I can reorganize quickly begetting my timeframe).

Divorce. My main area of research. I think we need a new look at divorce. A common sense look at divorce. Let me suggest that all of you try this. Think of all the children you know - your own childhood, relatives, extended family network, children today, and ask the children, do you love both your mother and your father? The overwhelming majority of children will say, "yeah," the overwhelming majority will love both their mother and their father. Once you realize that, and then once you look in contemporary divorce law, which separates mothers and fathers, which gives sole physical custody to the mother, 85-90% of the time, which gives, house, and all these kinds of things to the mother - you have to recognize there's a huge yawning gap between what children want, which is, children want both of their parents. They want both of their parents. Social science research, some of it done by me, some of it done by Sanford Brager, William Debreeze in Arizona, and a number of other places - clearly demonstrates that if you look at children of divorce, and ask them what they missed during childhood, or what they wanted, that overwhelmingly, what these children wanted - they missed their fathers, they wanted their fathers in their lives.

So it's not that... a mother and a check doesn't work. A mother and a check doesn't cut it. Children of divorce want their fathers, and as I've tried to indicate to you a moment ago, just telling you about the research, the research shows that fathers are far more effective at curbing negative developmental outcomes than are mothers. So what's the problem here? The problem here actually is government. The reason that we have the divorce structure that we do today is because of government incentives for mothers to divorce their children's fathers. At the federal level, it's Violence Against Women Act, which is all based on fraudulent ideology; totally inconsistent with social science research; at the state level, it's the problem with state legislators, and family court judges. What is needed at the state level is equal shared parenting, not the cookie-cutter formula we already have, which is 85-90% of children getting sole custody to the mother.

In my closing one minute, children need more than a mother and a check. The final closing one minute, 30 seconds, is that one of the ways, one of the factors that's involved in generating this speaker, is that over the years, women have claimed to be victimized. Over the years women have claimed they are not receiving equal treatment. To provide a partial correction to that perspective, I'd like to take a famous quote. Close with a famous quote. Brilliantly insightful quote, which I think gets at the issue that we're talking about. "All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others." "All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others." George Orwell, *Animal Farm*, 1945. Thank you.

Guy Garcia, Author, *The Decline of Men*, Conference Moderator:

Listening to Gordon and Tom, I couldn't help to remember a study I worked on with OTX Research, was published in *Fortune Magazine*, this relates to how, both of the things they were talking about, lead over into the 21st century workforce, they, what we surveyed young, professional white collar men, and divided them by age, and we found that younger men, under

30, were more likely to be accepting a woman as their boss. But they were much more likely than older men to be optimistic about their futures than women of their own position in the company. That's just one other dimension that fits into the value of things we're talking about. Those are, and introduce our next speaker, the last one before our break, Michael Gilbert, the Senior Fellow at the Annenberg Center for the Digital Future, at the University of Southern California, and the author of *The Disposable Male*. He's gonna speak to us about the current mental state of gender affairs, how that fits onto the future.

Michael Gilbert, Senior Fellow, Annenberg Center for the Digital Future, University of Southern California:

Thank you very much, it's a pleasure to be here today. This subject, is as you might expect, a very big, and a very complex topic. And as I struggled with how to present this in 25 minutes, it occurred to me that we might best analyze the current state of males and masculinity by tracking the progress of a young boy on his way to adulthood. Looking at some of the challenges, perilous points that he might encounter on the way. And the point at the end that I'd like to share today, is a lens that's rooted in our natural history, in the evolutionary process that has contoured our body, and shaped our biology and delivered this remarkable 3-pound organ at the top of our head. You've seen these depictions before, this is one of my favorites. About the progress we've made in an evolutionary context. The end result of human evolution has really been a flowering of cultures, and radically different variations on the passages in human growth, but for today's purposes, what we're really interested in are the universal patterns that apply in all these very diverse cultures and particularly as they relate to this young man's, this young boy's journey to adulthood. Now, we don't have a great deal of time, this will be more like a sprint than a slow and casual walk, but hopefully we'll also have a few moments to explore the really important issue about these universal patterns of behavior, which is why they've developed across so many cultures. And maybe then we'll have an opportunity to judge their current relevance. So let's begin at the schoolroom door. We've heard much today about the poor state of men in education, and I won't go into all of it, but I would like to focus on the very beginning of that process.

It's the first time a young boy will encounter a major social institution. Like 95% of young boys today, he will enter a co-ed educational class. Less than one in ten (I guess Tom says it is slightly more than one in ten) of his instructors in elementary school will be male. So will the number of administrators, and because of the co-ed mandate, there needs to be a uniform teaching methodology, and that has really evolved to be the manageable female role. Make nice and quiet, share values, penmanship. We all know that boys suffer disabilities at several times the female rate, they develop much more slowly, and at five or six years old, they don't want to sit still. They want actions, they want games, winners and losers - and instead, a lot of them are just punished, medicated and controlled, for occasionally being rambunctious boys. One study I saw put one in five Caucasian boys spends time on Ritalin or Adderall during his school years. Now, except for current Western cultures, all historical societies, and most current societies separate the young children. At least through towards adolescence; providing them with different kinds of training, different kinds of handling, and in fact, there's significant evidence that even though girls do better in co-ed schools than boys, they do *even* better in single-sex schools. Boys doing much better. These options are opening up, but only very slowly. So, before I abandon the subject, which has been so well covered, I guess I would ask, "is it possible that our fetish for immediate co-ed education is condemning boys to being behind and a state from which they will never recover?"

Another signpost on the road of our young boy growing up will be initiation. The various kinds of initiation processes that are universal in every culture, exclusive for boys in many cases. They're valuable, their pathways to maturity signposts for youth, young men, as they grow to maturity. And today, we've essentially eliminated them. We've either taken them away or we've taken away their gender-specific value. Let's consider the Bar Mitzvah. Classic male initiation rite. 13 is young for us to consider boys to turn into adults, but 5,000 year ago, when the sages were writing this down, life expectancy was about 35, and you needed to be pretty much grown up by 13. In the trendy 60s, the progressives drew to this, and said, "why only boys are getting these kinds of initiation; why is it just boys get a Bar Mitzvah?" And so, this begat the Bat Mitzvah, which is essentially a similar circumstance. But girls and women go through a whole series of powerful female reaffirming experiences. Adolescent boys, regardless of their religion, do not flower into a transformative process at adolescence. Their bodies don't move to lunar rhythms, menstrual cycles. Jewish boys will not have a sweet sixteen, they won't be given away in marriage - that is a bride centered ceremony - behind a mysterious veil. Jewish husbands will not get pregnant, they will not go through the tumult of birth, they will not suckle infants at their breast. They get a light hit of oxytocin - just enough to keep them focused - nothing like the rush that their mothers are experiencing. All these powerful, recurring, female offering passages are unavailable to males. Even the religious identity of a Jewish father will be a function of the child's mother. The sages knew that that was something we could keep track of. And indeed, In today's highly educated society, his wife may not even take his surname. Men are deprived of all these passages. They move in a straight line and not much happens to them. They don't experience these, and in a sense, these male initiation rites were there to compensate for all these passages that boys didn't get. So now, unless you're orthodox, the Bar Mitzvah is no longer gender specific, it's not about male-ness - it's what happens when you're Jewish, you turn thirteen, and you have your first really big payday. Responsible manhood is really a state of mind and boys really have to be introduced to it. They need sign posts, they need places to cross over. They need to graduate to adulthood. And maybe this is why we read so much today about, you know, man boys - boys into their thirties, forties - they behave in adolescent ways. Perhaps it's because they never had these opportunities to cross over.

Another way-station on the way to maturity for young boys is athletics. A subject also touched on earlier. Athletics - most of our eons that preceded our time here, life was about survival and tribes didn't have a whole lot of time for fun. And when they did have a spare Saturday afternoon, they essentially devoted it to training and assessing their male youth. We've turned this serious business into an enjoyable spectacle, and we see this in some of the classic track and field events - archery, javelin, relay races, marathons. Marathons were how tribes got news back to the home base. It's from sporting competition that men learn a great many important things. They learn about preparation and training, they learn about authority lines and structure, teamwork, they learn about winning with grace, losing with dignity. And indeed athletics provide an enormous number of initiatory experiences - those that remain. In fact, war is really the hunt. It's a war by proxy. A harmless, entertaining way to let off steam and it's very important to men. It's particularly important as they move in to high school years and college years and although surveys say that competitive sports for women, especially team competitive sports, aren't as important. Nevertheless, women make up massive majorities in great swaths of the academy. In the humanities, in the language department, Social Studies, English, even student government. Men are becoming an endangered species. But apparently, it's not enough that we spend equal amounts of money on all of our students, regardless of their gender, Title Nine comes along to force equality in athletics. And in that process, a great number of male athletic resources have been eliminated to accommodate equal numbers for women in an academic environment. There are of course, no remedial programs to bring male numbers up in

all of those academic departments where they're an endangered species. But in sports, a crucial area for man - a vital social institution, there, it's fifty-fifty.

Young men encounter another passage at the age of eighteen, when they are constrained to enlist, register for the draft. If they don't, it's a \$250,000 fine, up to five years in jail, and they will have a very hard time getting a student loan. Women don't have to register. Now, I'm personally torn here. Do we celebrate a male passage that's actually survived or do we damn this for it's obvious and blatant sexism. Without apparently doing a whole lot of thinking on the subject, virtually every society has a lot of the warrior function to males. This pace is apparently not fast enough for something called The Military Leadership Diversity Commission empowered by congress a couple of years ago which argues for opening up the complete role of combat functions to women. No one does this. Not even the Israelis, surrounded as they are by hugely greater numbers. The Commission wants to do this, to quote: "Dismantle the last major area of discrimination in the armed forces. "Imagine that, now - an armed forces, a military function, that actually favors men. Apparently this commission couldn't. As an adjunct thought to this, it's also true, and I'm using here today an evolutionary lens. Foreign affairs - relationships between tribes, between other nations - once again has always been an exclusively male preserve. And what I'd like to do for the purpose of this part of the journey is to ask you to join me in a thought experiment. Let's assume for the moment that last year, we'll find out about it next year from Wikileaks, that a terrorist threat emerged against American diplomatic installations in Pakistan, say in Lahore, Pakistan's second largest city and Peshawar, home of the Pashtun Taliban. Needless to say, first on the scene, would be the Council Generals in Lahore and Peshawar. Immediately our Pakistani ambassador would be notified as well as the ambassadors in other threatened Arab countries in Egypt, The United Arab Emirates, and Lebanon. Our ambassador to the United Nations would of course immediately contacted, if she wasn't available, the deputy ambassador to the United Nations. And of course, this would be a briefing item for our Secretary of State, third in the line of last four Secretaries of State. And with the threat to our borders, The Secretary of Homeland Securities. *[note: slides of each of these individuals were shown as the speaker mentioned each position - they are all women.]* An argument can be made, indeed I might make it myself, that this would be a more peaceful world if it were run by women. We'd have some spats and some angry little things going on. But unfortunately, we are not living in that world. And this is not about prying Julian Assange loose from a feminist Minister of Justice in Sweden, this is dealings in Arab countries, in Peshawar, where shaking the hand of somebody who's not related to you of the opposite sex is a really complicated piece of business.

Now that we know that our foreign affairs are in good hands and the border is secure, let us turn our attention to the last stop here on a young man's progression and that is when he joins the workforce. It's always good to quote a female when you're having these kinds of discussions and I do want to draw your attention to every known society, everywhere in the world there was no equivocation here. And also the word learns - that the young male learns. So we've got to recap the process of our young boy. He's been neutered or medicated in school, he's been deprived of initiation opportunities, he's challenged for resources on the playing field, struggling to find his place in the military where women who made up about five percent of the military in the mid seventies now make up about fifteen percent. And what happens is he comes face to face with the essence of the eternal pair of bon bargain.

Man, it turns out, needs to bring something to the table other than testosterone bolts and their good looks. And to put it in today's fast food terms, if there is no burger, there are no buns. This is about pregnant women needing a thousand extra calories a day, about the complications of going out on the hunt with a dependent infant clinging to you. And yet in urban America today, based on some of the statistics we've seen about women graduating in college, women are now

in their twenties earning more than men in almost every urban center in America. Here in New York, it approaches twenty percent more. This is not hard to figure out since more women in that age group have college degrees. It seems now that women not only have to cook the bacon, they have to bring it home. Is resource provision really a continuing female interest - is male resource provision? And in fact the study that I saw recently suggests barely one in seven women now think that their male partners should bring home more in the way of the financial resources of the partnership. Social thinkers are given to thinking about what the social constructs are, and for me, the social construct is paternity. That's the thing we figured out. Paternity and its attendant obligations is the social construct. What do we do with the men? And of course, as you've heard today and we'll hear more about, we're doing everything we can it seems to deconstruct this function. You've heard a lot today about the recent depression. I have a figure that it was actually four out of five jobs lost were male jobs - 82 percent. Men will still dominate at the top. They are not about to yield the ground to other men, let alone women. They'll be there in the action roles, technology, science, the gaming industry, and what's left of muscle work. But notwithstanding the bargain suggested by Margaret Mead, last year women became the majority of the American workforce.

So let's step back and ask the fundamental question: does it matter that men are fading off to the side lines? And do men really win here? Enabled by a global high-tech economy, what's happened is that the male economic hierarchy has turned from this to this. *[slide showing comparison between an Egyptian pyramid and the Eifel Tower.]* There has been an elongation, a top group of alpha and beta males, a long swoop to a massive body of bottom feeders. The average pay of an American CEO has some time ago passed 400 times that of his average worker. Today, really, men are either peacocks or pigeons. There doesn't seem to be anything in between. In effect, the middle isn't holding anymore amongst males. The average Joe is below average. Too many young men are listless, living at home, deep into their thirties. What are the implications of a generation of unambitious, undereducated, and disconnected males? A coarser social structure, more misogynist music, louts, angry males, marriage becoming ever more delayed, ever more elastic and ever less important. The family structure which marriage centers will continue to erode. Does the marginalization of men matter? It will matter acutely to educated young women who are looking for a partner and a co-parent. And it will affect us all, afflicting millions of little hurts and billions of inefficiencies. And maybe, just maybe, a collapse of the culture's masculine will.

In closing, I want to say that I've asked to look towards solutions and to look to the future and it is very hard to gain any sort of positive enthusiasm about what's ahead for men. It needs of course to begin with a recognition that there's a problem and this convocation speaks to that need. And I certainly have seen a bit of a shift over the last ten years. The numbers are so crummy, men are so obviously in trouble - the sixty-four college issue for example. In fact, even the feminists know that there's something wrong. They keep kicking out through some sort of spastic reflex and attacking men. We'll no doubt hear from the American Association of University Women that women only make up forty-nine percent of motorcycle repair classes.

But, this is I guess the world we're in. Truly, we've gone from sublime in the women's movement to ridiculous. I can find and summon positive things to say about men when I'm talking to groups of men, to the organizations and companies that occasionally ask for my advice, down at the level of living every day. But on the big issue of the Western culture's malaise, I lay it back on Rousseau and some of the enlightenment philosophers and their concept of the tabula rasa - the notion that we are born blank slates. This is an affront against nature and we're still paying the price for the idea that we can engineer values. Nature is imperial. We saw that in Japan recently and we denied nature at our peril. We're deep wired; we have animal drives, fears, and instincts.

And while we're out here pushing the frontiers of cyber space, we need to remember in social policy that there are cavemen and cavewomen at the keyboards. Sexual distinction is something to celebrate and use and not deny. We need a massive change in the zeitgeist to address the imbalance with the goal of resurrecting a well-adjusted confident masculinity, because in my experience, confident and strong males do not fear strong women, they want to find one. It's not a zero-sum game between the sexes. Men diminished means women diminished. Finally, in going forward, we need to honor masculinity's natural roots - those animal roots - clear a pathway to a robust and responsible 21st century manhood. Thank you very much.

Guy Garcia, Conference Moderator:

Thanks, Michael. You know it's worth keeping in mind that we know since the 1950's that when men are developing their own identities, reaching puberty, the way they define themselves is I am not Mom. So imagine growing up when Mom is the wage earner, Mom is successful, and Mom is the one who is running the household. That's not who they are, so you know, that's kind of a tight bind.

Dr. Edward M. Stephens, President of the Foundation for Male Studies:

My quick message is very simple. The goal of the Foundation for Male Studies is to fund courses, programs, and departments of Male studies. It will spearhead research to reverse the international epidemic of the decline of men. And today, as I stand before you, I would like to ask for the first million dollars. It can come from other granting foundations, it can come from individuals, it can come in bits and pieces as it has come up to this particular point. But, a million dollars would simply begin to give us the tools to expand what we've done here both with this conference, with these scholars, in the direction of the creation of the body of scholarship necessary to reverse this process: the decline of men, which is actually a decline for all of us. So I'm counting on our audience across the globe to hear this message, I'm counting on all the bloggers that are tuned into this and broadcasting this. Anyone can contribute to this by going to malestudies.org to the donate page and by contributing, make a difference for yourselves, for the women in your lives, for your children. Now back to Mr. Guy Garcia and our program. Thank you.

Guy Garcia, Conference Moderator:

Thanks. Now I'd like to continue by reintroducing Dr. Legato who's going to speak to us on the decline of male health or why men die first.

Maryanne J. Legato, MD, Founder and Director, Partnership for Gender-Specific Medicine, Columbia College of Medicine:

Thank you. These data are based on my book, aptly entitled: Why Men Die First and it is been out for a year now and much of what I'm going to say is contained there. We are interested in medical research and in biology in both what we call biological sex, that is, what's hardwired into our genome and is irreducible and predictable, and gender which is the consequence on the phenotype of environment and experience. We know now that the environment and experience has a profound impact on gene expression and the structure of the brain for example, and

therefore behavior actually changes physically, chemically with the impact of experience. So the question that I would like to ask is why do men die first? Is it hardwired into the genome of men or does it have to do with our ignorance about their unique vulnerabilities and the consequent inability that we have to help them or foster their resilience? And do we as a society expect things of men that guarantee that they will be exploited and that they will die before women. In most civilized societies all over the world, more men do die than women and in this country and other European civilizations, women live six to eight years longer than men. The causes of death begin with an extremely sad statistic. There is a high incidence of murder and suicide that claims six percent of male children who die between the ages of twenty-one and twenty-four. And murder and suicide remains the second most important cause of death until men are forty years of age.

The irony of our having done all research on men, with the exception of the last two decades, is that it doesn't seem to have helped men's health. Men are still dying earlier than women and the question that I've asked as a biologist and as a medical doctor is what are we missing? We know some things about the intrinsic biological vulnerability of men. A male fetus is significantly less likely to survive the womb than a female fetus. We know that newborn baby boys are six weeks behind girls in terms of their maturation of many of their organs. And as I said, suicide and murder is the second most important cause of death for boys until the age of 35 to 40. When heart disease claims them as the most common cause of death starting in the thirties for the rest of their lifespan. In my opinion we have to turn our research, search line if you will, on the real issues that cost men their lives. Over 20% of adolescent boys die of suicide, murder, or meet a violent end because of unrestrained risk-taking behavior. Depression in men of all ages is underdiagnosed and therefore undertreated. And men are more susceptible to infection, biologically speaking than women. My interest in gender specific medicine, which quite simply is the study of the differences between males and females and in their experience of the same diseases. Gender specific medicine is not just about women and certainly we have harvested for the first time in medical history a huge body of important data that describe the unique characteristics of the female as a result of better research done on women themselves and we have stopped extrapolating what we find in men to women without primary verification by testing women themselves. We have developed therefore a way of looking at each sex with an eye to their unique strengths and vulnerabilities and therefore could promise more effective prevention and treatment of disease in men as it has in women.

Now, what makes us male or female? Whether we are male or female, as all of you know, is the consequence of just two chromosomes - the X and the Y - which are fascinating and which have developed and separated out from the general genome about 300 million years ago. Females of course have two X's and males, an X and a Y. The X chromosome is extremely important. It contains though only 4% of all human genes. It cannot exchange over most of its extent with the Y chromosome and the area in which it can combine with the data or the sites on the Y for repair and exchange of genetic information is very small. We'll see that the Y chromosome itself has an inability to combine with any other chromosome along most of its length. Many of the genes that have to do with intelligence are located on the X chromosome and may be closely linked to a gene on that chromosome which dictates a preference for the most intelligent males. The Y chromosome has been considered to be deteriorating on the verge of disappearance and a rudiment of what it was in the past. In fact, new research on the Y chromosome tells us some very interesting material. In the first place, the Y chromosome can repair itself as a result of its unique structure. Along most of its length, it is composed of eight long palindromes which is to say the first half of every palindrome contains the genetic information that is within that palindrome and the second half of the palindrome contains the same information, but in reverse. So for repair, the ingenious Y chromosome makes a hairpin turn and exchanges

reparative parts within its own structure. It is conceivable that this unique inability to exchange all of its genetic material with other chromosomes - specifically the X - is an evolutionarily selected method of preserving maleness for the human race and for all species that have two sexes. In fact, there are 78 protein coding genes within the Y, but collectively they encode only 27 distinct proteins.

So, to sum it up, the complexity and reach of the Y in human biology has been underestimated and the wasteland concept of the chromosome is outdated and is in fact an error. In fact, the Y chromosome and its susceptibility to mutation and its inability to exchange with other chromosomes does preserve masculinity but it also drives evolution. The oocyte spends most of its time deep within the abdomen and is shielded in relative dormancy from all the events that go on in the environment around it. Sperm, on the other hand, are externally exposed to all the toxins and environmental changes of temperature etc. that have solved the human condition. They are produced in huge numbers and DNA fragmentation, both single and double DNA strand breaks are proto-mutagenic chains that can cause mutations as a consequence of inadequate or defective repair. The damage in sperm DNA comes from oxidative stress from flawed apoptosis, which is the process of eliminating excess cells that is a function of normal development, and because of deficiencies and natural processes such as recombination and chromatin packaging that involve the correction of DNA strand breaks. The Y has poor judgment; the Y cannot detect and optimally prepare oocyte for fertilization and the Y-bearing sperm in particular is more likely to indiscriminately fertilize even a flawed egg. The successful sperm has to compete with about 250 million other sperm, and so speed is the most important feature of a successful sperm as is an intact guidance system that helps it respond to the chemical attractants to the ovum and find it quickly. In a male pregnancy, blood supply to the placenta and to the uterus is lower in the last trimester than it is the case for girls. And finally, the quality and the amount of semen is decreasing over the past 50 years throughout the world. And we have adjusted the values for normal sperm counts downward, three-fold, since the 1940s. Genito-urinary abnormalities are increasing two to four-fold in men. Why? Because of environmental toxins, we think, and possibly because of an increase of estrogens in the environment and in the mother.

Girls are more robust than boys immediately after birth, and in fact, the neonatologist to whom I speak, say that when they hear a baby is in trouble in the neonatal intensive care unit, they pray that that baby is not male. The sex ratio at birth used to be 105 to 107 male births to 100 girls. This is no longer the case. Toxins released during the explosion of a chemical plant, for example, have a more lethal effect on boys than girl fetuses. And testosterone increases the impact of toxins and their affect on the fetuses while estrogen protects against it. Stressed mothers produce more girls. The high level of cortisone in stressed mothers affects the male fetal brain to make it less competent to combat stress both in the womb and after birth. If there is maternal malnutrition, it has a bigger impact on the larger boy fetus and the newborn boy. Interestingly, war favors the birth of sons. This is presumed to be due to the higher frequency of intercourse during wartime because fertilization early in the monthly cycle favors the Y-bearing sperm which penetrates the kind of cervical mucus present early in the cycle so that it fertilizes the ovum before the less competent X-bearing sperm reaches the egg.

Infant mortality is 23% higher in boys than in girls. And low birth weight boys are less likely to survive than girls.

And finally, there is a societal preference in some societies which leads to preferential direction of resources to boys and even to the murder of newborn females in an effort what would presume to correct this vulnerability of boys.

The sex-specific male brain about which we've been talking from a political and educational and economic point of view all morning, really does exist and I've spent last week talking to 500 psychoanalysts and psychologists about the sexually dimorphic brain. Men and women have different brains physically, chemically and in terms of their function. They are quite distinct, and to say that men and women have identical cognitive abilities and identical cognitive methodologies is really, there is no basis for that in science.

The sex-specific male brain, in general, is expert in marking out and defending territory, protecting the mother and dependent offspring and providing them with food, and sexual strategies, which developed, depending on the concentration of women in the environment, developed to ensure maximum numbers of successful pregnancies.

I often think of a planning committee, sitting around a board table, thinking up what would best perpetuate the human race 300,000,000 million years ago, when the sexes became dual instead of single. The survival of the human race has depended on two different and complimentary and sets of skills that suit men and women for quite different functions. Survival depends on a combination of abilities aimed at finding enough resources, including food and shelter, to survive and to successfully reproduce. For one sex, the primary role is marking out and defending territory, protecting the mother and her dependent offspring from capture or destruction, providing foods and employing strategies to produce the maximum number of pregnancies and successful birthing and rearing of children.

If you look at today's male, which is, we think a unique situation, you have to look at today's male understanding that the male of today has all these gender-specific qualities as a result of evolutionary selection over millions of years. Some of these abilities and skills operate to his advantage but others make him vulnerable to early violent death by accident or suicide and exposure over a lifetime to more infectious diseases, most of which are related to sexual exposure. So the male is well-qualified to perform his traditional role, even in the present day, which is simply a wink in the long expanse of evolutionary development, but some of those very talents lead him to vulnerabilities that are very important to consider and understand.

The adolescent male, about whom we've heard so much this morning has really unprecedented vulnerability, and Roland Dahl at the university at the Pittsburg Medical College defines the adolescent male as going through an awkward period between sexual maturation and the attainment of adult roles and responsibility, and he characterizes the adolescent male as a Porsche without brakes. It begins with the physical and biological changes related to puberty, but ends in the domain of social roles and encompasses the transition from the social status of a child who requires adult monitoring to that of an adult who is himself responsible for his behavior. Adolescence is a longer period than it has been in earlier societies, when children, as you heard, when life expectancy was 35, or given adult responsibilities much earlier.

The problem though, with the adolescent male, navigating that difficult transition from puberty to young adulthood, is a disconnect in the timing of an abrupt increase in gonadal hormones that occurs in both sexes at a time of puberty, but which for boys, produces intense emotional liability and high-intensity feelings while the part of the brain that develops risk assessment and emotional control and stability lags well behind. Girls do not have a similar retardation of that center of the brain, and therefore are much less likely to incur the kinds of disasters that face adolescent boys until they are 20. So the vulnerability of the adolescent boy, because of this disparate development of the parts of the brain that teach him to assess risk before giving into impulsive behavior is tremendously important.

The diseases of middle age for men are of particular interest to me as a cardiologist because coronary artery disease affects men a full 15 years before women, and the disease of men can become apparent as early as young men in their thirties, and most men with coronary disease are dead by the time they're 55. Instead of going red for women, in relentless fashion as the American Heart Association has urged us to do, I think we should put on some blue ribbons, and go for men, who are experiencing coronary disease at far too young an age, and succumbing at a far earlier age than women. Women, for reasons we should look at as an opportunity to learn how to protect men, get a pass, and most women escape coronary disease until their menopausal years, a full 15 to 20 years before the disease affects men. It's true that it is the chief killer of women, but in general, it attacks women who are much, much older than men.

We should also consider the questions that we should be asking about men with coronary disease - why does it become such a problem so early? Why does job stress operate differently in men than in women, causing higher blood pressure in men, but not in women. The whole experience of men and women in the workplace is vastly different (I don't have time to enlarge on that now), but it is very interesting that men are very, very competitive, more so than women, and they assess their own success and identity with how much money they're making, and their position in the pecking order of the chain of command in their work. Women are much more interested in teamwork, environment, and as you heard earlier this morning, taking care of each other in general.

And then finally, once they have coronary disease, why can't we do better? Why are they dead before their 70th year? Men pay a huge price for sports. We heard about sports and how important they are to men as a rite of passage, and a field in which they have been uniquely equipped to play. We should consider these three vulnerabilities, as you will, that sports presents to young men, and sudden cardiac death is one of them. 85% of sudden cardiac death in athletes is due to heart disease. And they die an arrhythmic death within minutes on the playing fields. This is not just true of prizefighters, or adults, or professional football players but of adolescents in high school. And there have been proposals to screen children (males) who are going to compete in competitive sports, especially those that involve tremendous physical exertion and tackling of one another, but the cost of that has been prohibitive. Nevertheless, sudden cardiac death certainly affects many more boys than girls as a function of the sports that they play.

Concussion. We have just begun to address the issue of concussion in the techniques of football; opponents now are being change, and the tremendous significance and importance of concussion in causing immediate and long term brain damage are just beginning to be appreciated.

The use of anabolic steroids is another widespread negative consequence for male sports people; it changes the chemistry of the brain, it certainly leads to osteoporosis, and the sexual function of men is importantly impacted by these steroids. So men pay a distinct and gender-specific price for sports to which we should be paying more attention.

They also pay because we ask them to do the most dangerous work in society; we heard of the army being composed at least of 85% of men, and young men. But there are other occupations in which men predominate, which have their own special and unique vulnerabilities, and we should be looking at those risks that the occupation gives to men and the contribution of those occupations and its dangers to the early deaths of men.

Merchant seamen often suffer from depression, prolonged periods of solitude, their isolation on ships which are often for months out at sea, entails lack of emergency medical supplies and equipment, and the harsh architecture of ships has also contributed to the deaths and injury of merchant seamen. There's gear on the deck, the decks are slippery, they're unstable, storms afflict the stability of both the vessel and the people on them. And alcohol is rampant in these lonely, sad, merchant seamen, who often reflect the tremendous consequences, negative, of being so isolated, and so, if you will, suffering from a lack of emergency medical rescue, when they do become injured.

Firefighters, the job of a firefighter as you see, involves periods of intense demand, coupled with long periods of boredom and inactivity. And most firemen have heart attacks on the way back from a fire. And heart disease claims most firemen. Now you may think that the same thing should happen to policemen, but in fact, the cause of death of police force, in general, is not heart disease. The cancer that they experience from smoking and from prostate cancer affects policemen with an inordinately high frequency. And they have a level of stress at the time of mandated retirement that causes them to become increasingly more alcoholic, and because they have handguns at their disposal, suicide is the most predictable cause of an early death in a police officer, not heart disease.

And finally, the construction worker, who still is, as you saw in the occupational charts, most frequently men - they suffer the highest rates of fatalities of any group. And the training requirements are too poorly-supervised, the risk-taking is profound and among them, the highest casualties are in the so-called iron workers, who are those workers who operate at very high levels on scaffolding that you see silhouetted against the sky.

So in summary, as men age, if they survive, they suffer, as do women, all the ravages of old age, their fertility begins to diminish by the age of 35. It's interesting that men of 35 are half as likely to be fertile as men of 25. I think that's an interesting statistic and it points to perhaps why women are choosing younger men over and over. There's some recognition that this might be the case.

Paternal age. It isn't true that you could be; who is it; Tony Randolph, who had his son at 76. Sperm quality does deteriorate as men age, because of the reasons that I told you before. The sperm are more liable to be defective, depending on the advancing age of the father. And these men have children with greater incidences of developmental disability and schizophrenia.

And then testosterone, that valuable hormone that keeps brains and bones intact [the aging male slide] and muscle strength in men begins to deteriorate after the age of 30 by 1% a year and the five consequences of that sadly are listed for you. So in general, although we've done a great deal of investigation of men, I think we are missing some of their most important vulnerabilities, not considering them. And as we were accused of saying, as women, men have had it their way too long is actually not the opinion of all of us. We would like men to have it more our way and have a gender specific focus turned on their own particular health needs their disabilities in the hope that they might last a little bit longer and live happier lives and stay with the rest of us.

Paul Nathanson, Ph.D, McGill University:

Katherine Young is my colleague and she was supposed to give half the presentation and she is unfortunately sick in bed today in the hotel. So I'm going to try to recapitulate what she would say. Now, we distribute our scholarly efforts in different ways. She writes part of what we write,

part of what we produce in our books, and I write part and then we both edit. Now, so this presentation is somewhat different from the others in that we are not social scientists. So I can't present you with numbers and statistics to back up what I'm saying. You'll have to just take it on my authority as a presenter that we've done our homework. We've spent 25 years approximately doing research on men and it wasn't immediately apparent that we should call our series a series on misandry. We came to that conclusion because of most of our research.

Now, the basic problem that we want to highlight is the problem of identity and how boys and men form identity. We are not psychologists but our hypothesis has been and we urge psychologists out there to do more research to either refute or corroborate what we say, that to have a healthy identity, whether it's personal or collective, you have to be able to make at least one contribution to the larger society that is: a) distinctive, b) necessary, and 3), publicly valued. So if those three things don't come together, then it's very hard or impossible to have a healthy collective identity and therefore many of the problems that we are talking about today are going to end soon. So we're not saying that this is the only cause and we're not saying that we don't need social scientists but we are saying that the humanities can provide a larger context in which this problem emerges. So the three historical functions that men have had for whatever reason, whether the reasons are genetically determined or whether they are just produced by the existential conditions in which people live or whatever. The three historical functions have been provider, protector, and progenitor; progenitor meaning fatherhood. So, what our theory is could be summarized as a series of cultural revolutions that have occurred over the past 12,000 years which have profoundly transformed the environment in which men live - men and women. Most of these revolutions are associated with changes in technology, but one of them has other aspects to it.

So now I'll start with the Neolithic Revolution which the first three [gestures towards slide] are what Katherine would have talked about. Although the Neolithic Revolution literally refers to the use of stone implements. Of interest to us is its association with the domestication of plants and the domestication of animals so that instead of being nomadic foragers, people became - either they had herds that they went around with - from pasture to pasture - or they became settled communities that began to live by using wooden holes to cultivate plants and gardens and they supplemented this of course, this food supply, with some hunting and gathering and even scavenging.

So, why do we even mention this here? And that is because - and the Neolithic Revolution was really very short - it evolved quite quickly into the agricultural revolution and that's where the changes are manifest that we want to talk about - because, agriculture which is basically the use of the iron plow, basically, to cultivate fields. The cultivation of fields was massive and that set up little gardens beside your hut, you had huge fields. So agriculture was accompanied by several other phenomena that are very important. One of them is, they allow a much larger population density which in turn produced cities and city-states and city-states in turn produced much more elaborate social hierarchies. And they also enabled specialization so that for the first time people were not all more or less interchangeable, in other words, that some earlier stage basically everyone did everything. But at this stage, work begins to be defined in more specific ways. You have specialists, you have priests, scribes, cooks, bakers, you have engineers who are producing the irrigation that is necessary to cultivate the fields. You have administrators, you have kings. So, I want to talk a bit about this because underlying our whole theory of these cultural revolutions is the gradual marginalization of the male body as a source of identity for men. Now, in the agricultural period which stretches from ancient times until probably the early modern period in Europe, the people with the highest status which was the king and the entourage, and the upper echelons; the elite; they used the male body to lead battle, so the male

body had some meaning for them as a source of identity. You had the vast majority of men were either peasants or serfs - they did back-worthy work in the fields, and so once again, the male body, influenced their sense of identity, but there was this slowly growing middle class of people who did these specialized kinds of work which did not require any particular aspect of the male body. You could be a scribe and not be strong. So this was the beginning of a process that has increased in intensity throughout these revolutions. The industrial revolution of course, is obvious, because at that point, machines began to do things that male bodies once had to do. It didn't do it all at once; none of these revolutions took place in an instant, but there was a gradual process.

Now, I haven't done justice to what Katherine would have said, but that's the general outline. And of course, our paper is posted on the web site, and our books are published; the fourth volume of our "quaternary," which is called "Transcending Misandry"; we have "Spreading Misandry", which is about the ways in which popular culture pervades images of men which are extremely negative. Basically we said that if you look at contemporary popular culture, the ideal man is either the token woman or is evil or acrid. There isn't much in between. In the second book we talk about legalizing misandry, and that was where we looked at where how this negativity toward men becomes institutionalized in legal structures.

The third volume, called "Sanctifying Misandry" is about the ways in which contemporary religion is being used (or misused) to pervade - in the case of religion, it has a metaphysical level - so that we're not just talking about men being nasty, or brutish, or adolescent; we're talking about there being cosmic forces of evil. And if you think that this sounds extreme, it's not really, because although some of the ideological feminists (not egalitarian feminists), ideological feminists, they have had great influence in religious circles. Mary Daly is an icon about feminists for her work in which she basically says, not only that God is a woman, which basically is fine, but the advent of monotheism, or of organized religion itself, was basically a conspiracy of men to usurp the power and authority of women. So a kind of primeval, original sin, except that now, it's men who are the sources of evil, instead of...

Anyway, the fourth volume is called "Transcending Misandry", and here, and that's where this comes in, we're trying to say, well, ok, have them unlearn some of the stuff that we supposedly learned from feminists about men. We now want to start over again and see, well, what can we really say about the history of men from the empirical evidence, and not simply from ideological theory. And I should point out, in case I don't have enough time, that the concluding chapter is about what we call "Intersexual Dialogue", and we present a rigorous method by which men and women, or any other groups in conflict can come together and have a constructive exchange, and it means something that we both have experience in - into religious dialogue - which has become a cliché, and partly because it amounts for most people getting together in church basements, and saying nice things about each other, and everybody's happy. We're not talking about a dialogue of that kind. We're really presupposing rigorous preparation; knowledge. And we've also composed what we call the "Decalogue of Dialogue". And that is ten principles that presuppose that you must have before you enter dialogue - one of which is simply not assuming that you know something of the other before the other has a chance to say what they are.

Ok but I want to turn back now to the military revolution. And that is - you could argue that there was a change in military technology in the early modern period, which made it less necessary for combatants to use brute strength - all right, so in the middle ages, people could hack at each other required a great deal of strength to wield those weapons. But by modern times, a lot of that is either automated or else the key skills are intellectual and managerial rather than simply brute force, so that the men with highest status in our society are basically

not the men who have brute strength. They are the lowest status - the men who have all the strength are either the people who work in the loading docks in obsolete factories or people who end up in jail, and as a kind of hierarchy in jail, that presupposes the ability to rape other inmates, but the people with the highest status are the people who lose their hands.

So that's about the technological aspects of militarism. What I want to talk about is however, is another aspect, which I think is even more important, and that is the revolution in military recruitment. Now, in earlier times, which is to say since the Neolithic until very recently, recruitment was basically a matter of authority. The king, the chief, whoever it was, simply said, "you, you, you, you're gonna go into this." The burden of either of defending the territory of the garden, or fields, fell to men because they were generally speaking, more mobile, and bigger and stronger. But nobody at that time thought it was necessary to articulate some kind of philosophy that would justify this. That changed in the military revolution, which is basically the French Revolution. And originally the title of this chapter. Because the French Revolution coming out of the enlightenment, established a new social contract, and the contract worked like, not that anybody could choose this contract; it was imposed on them; nevertheless, it was articulated in philosophical terms as a social contract. So full citizenship in the state was given to those who could protect the state. And they assumed that that was men. Women were not considered full citizens. And they were also not given full privileges. So that was the social contract. So for the first time, and it was universal male conscription. So every man was by definition, a soldier for the state, in return for becoming a citizen. And every man was a soldier also by virtue of sex. So the upshot was that identity to an unprecedented degree revolved around the archetypal warrior - that was identity. No matter what men did in everyday life, their ultimate fate; their ultimate destiny was to become soldiers who would spread the revolution or the empire through military means. And that has, even though the French Revolution has finished, in some ways, nevertheless, every European country basically had to adapt the same system in order to protect themselves. And today, most European countries, even the most peaceable countries like Sweden, have conscript armies, and the conscription refers only to men.

There is recently a blog, or several, in the New York Times, every time something comes up about the military, whether it's in Iraq, or in Afghanistan, there's very often some kind of article; the latest one was by a woman who said that women should be allowed into combat, in order that they can rise in the military ranks, and so this spawned an enormous blog and hundreds and hundreds of people wrote in, and it's very interesting to read their comments because not all of them saw the irony of women who wanted to go into combat in order to further their careers, let alone to defend the country. And so there were a lot of heated discussions about whether women could be in combat, or should be in combat or whatever, so it's very interesting to read and I think I refer to that in my paper that I've put on the web site.

As to, and so, coming through now so we've co- come through all these we've got revolutions except the final one which I'll talk about in a minute. We're in contemporary America and as you know, people who I've already mentioned, only male citizens in the states have to register for service at the age of 18; there doesn't seem to be a lot of protest about that from women, but whatever, that is the law. But it's interesting that there's already been a legal case in 1983, Roth-Keys vs. Goldberg, which tested the idea of whether equality under the law supersede a male-only draft, if it were to be re-imposed. And the Supreme Court ruled that in fact equality would take a second, you know, a second run - that was not important; what was more important was to fill the ranks with men.

So, um, you know, these are, these are, this is a problem that sort of just but below the radar. There is no draft at the moment, so people just don't think about it. But it's there. And all the

legal mechanisms are there. And all these legal mechanisms have tremendous symbolic importance.

Now the reproductive revolution, which I'm also going to summarize very briefly, is that this marginalization of the male body as a source of identity is taken one step further in connection with things such as reproductive technologies, some of which either now or in the near future could make it possible for women to give birth without resorting even to sperm banks, you know there are technologies on the horizon - there's Cloning, there's parthenogenesis, and there have been debates over this. And in fact, in Canada was a world commission about 20 years ago, that was instigated by feminists, who claimed that new reproductive technologies; they meant new technologies because they deliberately excluded from the discussion, things like abortion. So they claimed that technologies, in-vitro fertilization, surrogate motherhood, this sort of thing, threatened the identity of women - the collective identity of women - because they reduced the womb to a womb for rent, or what have you. So there's a whole discussion about that - the world commission met; they produced a report, in which they advised extreme caution, about all these things. Unlike in the States where there was no comparable commission, and things like surrogacy, or paid surrogacy are common, in Canada it was supposed to be a last resort, and you weren't allowed to pay for surrogacy. As it happens, there was an ideological rift in the commissioners, and that rift has rippled out over the past 20 years, and the world commission has not succeeded in institutionalizing any of its recommendations. So we don't really know what the result's gonna be.

So apart from reproductive technologies there have been a lot of other signs to men about the meaning of fatherhood. If men aren't necessary, except perhaps for sperm, for reproduction, let alone for fathering; there are other signs, I mean, for example in divorce and custody cases as I've already said many times this morning, custody usually goes to the mother. Then there's the problem of same-sex marriage. Now whether you think that's a good idea or not, one of the problems that emerges from it, which nobody talks about, is that basically it deprives children of either a mother or a father. So if you believe, and we think that there is reason to believe that the fathers have a distinctive role in not just reproduction, but in fathering itself, if you believe that, then same-sex marriage, single motherhood by choice - these are not such great ideas.

So what are things that happen, when you have an identity crisis of the kind we have now, and we do think it's an identity crisis, and we do think that it's related in some way - not being sociologists or psychologists - we can't say precisely what, we think it's related in some way to things like the high suicide rate. There's a lot of stress that is going on, and some of the stress is related to not necessarily concrete things like employment, but to more nebulous things such as identity. So we're calling for more research on how people form identity, how men see their identity, and so forth.

So the reactions to all this would be in effect, if I can't have a healthy collective identity, then I will have an unhealthy one thank you very much, and these are the people who turn to, who attack society - they have nothing to lose. They have no investment in the future of society, or even the present of society. Another response of course, would be just dropping out or committing suicide. Somehow or other, we think that they are related, we ask social scientists to do some research on this and get us some numbers.

So what we've been saying is that in addition to whatever biological factors there are, there are cultural factors that have emerged within human memory. Things have happened that have changed human existence. We do not think that we can simply call ourselves primates and eradicate culture and go back to living in this supposed indolent world of the primeval past. We

are what we are because we have come through history and momentous events within history that have transformed our ways of thinking about ourselves and about the world.

So that's basically what I wanted to say. We have time for questions.

Maryanne J. Legato, MD, Founder and Director, Partnership for Gender-Specific Medicine, Columbia College of Medicine:

Children need a father, it's not just a political or social notion; it's a biological fact. And as I was preparing this lecture last week, I thought about single mothers. And the social absence of the father; that the absolutely obligatory presence of that paternal complement genes that is distinct and uniquely the contribution of the father - added to which is the fact that the sex of the fetus - male or female - is another very important determinant of how those genes are expressed and the ultimate phenotype that emerges. So even though men feel excluded, I'm here to say that they are absolutely essential both as fathers and as male fetuses to the whole process of what emerges as the finished unit - the baby.

Paul Nathanson, Ph.D, McGill University:

And to that, I would add as a suggestion, in all likelihood, the function of a father of a child, probably kicks in - at least the essential function - kicks in not in infancy but probably later on, because of one of the functions of the father traditionally has been to lead the child away from the home into the larger world. And that is not necessarily the kind of immediately emotionally gratifying role, but it's still necessary.

Guy Garcia, Conference Moderator:

Mr. Willcox is the Director of Strategic Planning at the agency who was instrumental in helping Levy-Strauss Company brand Dockers, developing the "Wear the Pants" campaign, that dealt with male roles and their image. Also works on the Miller Lite brand, is a member of the team responsible for producing its "Man Up" campaign.

Matthew Willcox, Director of Strategic Planning, DraftFCB:

As I think telling you about selling pants to men, we'll also tell you something about the men who wear them. And about how they see themselves, and how they're seen by society.

The first caveat, and Paul, the previous speaker talked about so that not being a social scientist - I work for an advertising agency - we're not scientists of any kind at all - really - and, really our agenda is helping clients market their products to different groups. In this case I'm going to talk about marketing to men. We have an agenda, beyond making a connection with the people who buy our client's products - sometimes it seems that brands have an agenda beyond that, but believe me - their agenda isn't entirely commercial. We seek to do this of course, in ways that are positive and constructive, but at the end of the day, we're driven by how we leave perceptions about our clients, and how they've sold. In most cases we're not trying to solve the world's problems - we're simply trying to solve our brand's problems.

I think that this is interesting because it does give us - by not being burdened, I think for larger gender - it does give us a degree of objectivity. And this commercial focus means that we do end up with a good idea of not what objects, brands and materials people will buy, but also what concepts people may buy in the present and the near future.

So - what I originally prepared for this presentation - we conceived doing a review of advertising from around the world - and so decided to stick to a simple, monograph; a linear story - and I'm not going to, as Paul did, I'm not going to go back to 25,000 years before Christ, I'm going to go back 25 years - and the stories about how we've connected with men on the subject of the quintessential male government to pounce, and how we're continuing that conversation today.

So first let me start with a mind far larger than mine. I imagine some of you will recognize this person. This is Malcolm Gladwell - he also has hair rather larger than mine as well. But in 1997, Malcolm Gladwell wrote an article in *New Yorker* - that's not a surprise - Gladwell has been a very, very prolific author in that magazine - in fact - most of his famous books - I'm sure some of you read *Blink*, and *The Tipping Point*, or even *Outliers* - it started out as articles in the magazine, and then expanded to books. A hint for anyone that wants to write about social sciences - perhaps you start off as a small article and somebody will pick it up and make a massive book deal from it. But in this piece, which I want to talk about - it's called *Listening to Khakis* - Gladwell looked at the state of manhood in the last two decades of this section, and you can't read it from here, but the subhead says, *What America's Most Popular Pants Tells Us About Us*. What America's Most Popular Pants Tells Us About the Way Guys Think. And I'm sure that sort of as he did this, he took Khakis as a deliberate choice, because, which you know, they are pretty unremarkable items in many ways - they're certainly not as remarkable as previous clothing that men have worn - this rough I think many were suited for air travel.

And of course, everybody's favorite - the cod piece - and this particular model - the cod piece - which this gentlemen is wearing with a remarkably straight face. That might be if I was an advertiser of the day I might not like the response to that one. But this might be sort of - there are more remarkable items but actually I would argue that khaki pants had a significant change on culture - especially in the workplace, and khaki pants were very much connected to how the workplace changed from a world of offices - from a world of hierarchy - to a more mere autocratic place. With planned office space, where people will have to manage their retirements plans without having one free less pension plans. And - so - even if it might be hyperbole, sort of thing that khaki pants might be important, I think sort of that he took it a bit further in that how khaki pants would have advertised themselves - actually told us a lot about the state of manhood. I'm just going to show you a commercial..

[showed Dockers advertisement - men having discussion about what they can't be. Narrator - "If you're not wearing Dockers, you're just wearing pants."

We call this campaign effectually in the agency "Talking about the switch." Because you never actually saw the person's face, you just heard what they said. And Gladwell kind of felt that this approach nailed men's needs in the late 80s; a society through which sort of dispersion and suburbanization and places like this [displayed slide of Levittown, Long Island] seemed to have taken away the opportunities for men to develop and foster long term bonds with other men. I mean camaraderie has been an aspect of men since time, mythological, from Robin Hood's merry band of men, to the Seven Samurai, to *The Magnificent Seven*, and even more recently, the dudes at *Entourage*. And he felt that what we'd really done out of this; we've captured these zeitgeist, these male zeitgeist by really focusing on the need for male camaraderie. So it was back

in 1987. In 1997 when he wrote the article, we had started with another campaign, which was called “Nice Pants”, and I will play you a commercial from that campaign.

[showed advertisement - in Paris; beautiful woman walks by, saying something in French to a man seated at a café table. He feverously tries to look up the phrase before she disappears into his past. The waiter translates - “She said, Nice Pants.”]

I think what men in the 1990s related to about this, and this is what Gladwell’s piece was as well, was this notion of the naïve or accidental hero; a hapless man who still won. I think perhaps we connected here with men who felt this increasingly hapless state we may have been guilty of giving them hope that they could still win more than they would. But I think interestingly, what this commercial really sort of connected with, was the changing rules of engagement. I’ve actually provided a little bit of an idea that it was a member operating in the world where they were not necessarily the first move. So I think sort of the theme that we drew from this was that this was about men needing clarity; about changing rules.

So when it came to reinvigorating semi-antic brand again, our client at Dockers noted that the brand had been its most powerful when it articulated the male condition just before men had realized it themselves. I think there’s a timeless truth this for many brands - if you can get into something big rather than just a trend, then I think you have a strength and a great wealth of empathy to leverage with people. And as we developed this further, we thought what we needed to do was to write the next chapter of Gladwell’s articles. Every year we listened to men, we listened to women talk about men, we ran blogs where we talked about what should a man be - which we sent to women, we listened to younger men talk about older men, and older men talk about younger men. Perhaps extremely usefully. We also tapped into some very fine academic minds in the area of male studies. And we talked a lot to Dr. Lionel Tiger, the Darwinian Professor of Anthropology at Rutgers, who’s here of course today. And in our search, we obviously came across the book he’d written, *Men in Groups*, which I think you wrote, Dr. Tiger, in the 1970s, if that doesn’t.. 69, in which Dr. Tiger coined the phrase “Male Bonding.” And of course, he’d written another book in the early 2000s, which was very pertinent to the discussion that we’re having, which is *The Decline of Males - the First Look at an Unexpected New World for Men and for Women*.

So as we kind of continued our investigation, there’s an interesting story built which was the emergence of a male crisis, which I believe is far-reaching. We’ve only started seeing the beginning of a story of men not maturing, and not taking responsibility, men failing in education; the statistics have been talked about ad nauseam today - the one I think helped us was the notion that for every hundred males who graduated college, 148 women did. And the statistics already been quoted about the beginning of the recession in 2008, 82% of job layoffs were male. And it doesn’t get much more visceral as well as a statistic, which I know that guy also quoted in his book and publicity around his book which was some work done about the New England Research Institute, which was a 20-year long-term longitudinal study to drops in serum testosterone - a sample of 2000 males. Now we are an advertising agency, we’re not scientists, so we’ve had to basically take these pieces of data as headlines but I can tell you that was particularly visceral what we were; what we were briefing the male creatives.

So our creative solution was an idea that pushed off what has become referred to as a male problem, but rather allowing men to wallow in the problem that some male advertising brands have, we pushed off the original masculine and commanding heritage of Campius - to encourage men to take charge of their life. When I talk about the original masculine commanding heritage of Campius - if you go back 30 years the images you will see will be of JFK throwing a football on

the lawn of the White House - of Hemingway on the deck of a boat, fishing for marlin, or McArthur taking surrender on an aircraft carrier - they were very, very masculine pants. And we developed this (I'm falling a few slides behind) into the theme of Wear The Pants. Now a pretty obvious place for pant brand to go, but nonetheless a work of genius itself, combining both what was innate about the brand, what we wanted the customer to do for a day was to wear Dockers. And of course the societal issues at the time as well.

Here are some ads which we ran, the second dawn of man; here is another one which is kind of more like a manifesto, let me just read some words of this to you... "Once upon a time, men wore the pants, and wore them well. Women rarely had to open doors, let alone ladies never crossed the streets alone. Men took charge because that's what they did. But somewhere along the way, the world decided they no longer needed man. Disco by disco, latte by phony latte, men were stripped of their characters, and left stranded on the road between boyhood and androgyny. There are questions that our society has no answers for. The world sits idly by as cities crumble, children misbehave, and those little old ladies remain on one side of the street. For the first time since bad guys, we need heroes. We need grownups. We need men to put down the plastic forks, pull away from the salad bar, and untie the world from the tracks of complacency. It's time to get your hands dirty, time to answer the call of manhood. It's time to wear the pants.

[next ad]

This was an ad which talks about colored khakis rather than think deeper than that.

So here's a little video we made showing the campaign we made; it's a...

[From video being played: "Dockers had a pant problem. For almost 10 years, the category had been in decline. Khaki. Once the uniform of masculinity - had become the shameful costume of the cubicle-dweller. Our consumer had its own problems. Men's testosterone levels had dropped 17% during the last 20 years. Man: 'Back in the 70s and 80s, man was the man. Today, who the hell knows?' Narrator continues: Additionally, they were losing their jobs and dropping out of school at alarming rates. Men were feeling a lot less like men. And it showed. Our mission was to make the Dockers brand and the men who wear them feel potent once again. Wear The Pants Became the Dockers global call to manhood. The campaign was preceded by a flurry of stunts and digital efforts expressing the decline of manhood. A single print ad in the New York Times launched the campaign. What followed was a spate of reaction - both positive and negative - about man's role in society. Magazines and an aggressive outdoor effort on both coasts introduced new product and this new way of thinking and kept the conversation going until Dockers' big coming-out party in Super Bowl 44. In the week leading up to the big game, pre-bowl teasers and a PR effort told viewers to shazam the upcoming Super Bowl spot - in fact, the Dockers television debut would be the first ever shazamable commercial - the film featured a group of directionless, pantless men, but the main attraction would prove to be the ending. 'Men singing 'I wear no pants!'" Calling all men: It's time to wear the pants. Try for a free pair of Dockers pants at dockers.com. It's free pants, people. Narrator: Those who shazammed the spot were automatically directed to the site and directed to the contest. The site was flooded and the media reacted. [clips of news reports] Narrator continues: Our core message of masculinity officially claimed a spot out of the collective consciousness. In just a few months' time Wear The Pants became a global rallying cry to man. We took an almost irrelevant brand, gave it a strong point of view, with powerful work, and created the liveliest discussion in the category. The brand did a complete 180- all the while conveying a uniquely-crafted message of decency and maturity. The man problem had been addressed, and the pant problem was finally behind us."

So I think we talked about men needing camaraderie before, or that men perhaps needing clarity, I think what we felt men needed at this time, was a wakeup call. And I don't know that if we succeeded in writing the next chapter, but we actually did precede a lot of popular media coverage the same as you would have seen, or course this article Newsweek, which I think ran six or seven months ago. Rather famously the Atlantic, "The End of Men." And of course, a number of books have been around the subject since.

So when we started thinking about what next, started - I'm going to give you a brief preview of the stuff that's happening; it's out there already. We wanted to really, and actually in the theme of this conference, start to move towards solutions, so that we weren't just sort of giving man a wakeup call, we were actually saying well here's something we can do with it. So we went back to our experts, first to the academics, then to the men ourselves. And Dr. Tiger again came up with a very pithy description - when we literally said what advice would you give to men today, his advice was "Men need to find a way to make themselves useful again." And we took that really as a start point for our advertising approach. We did go out and do some research, with consumers, with men and women but, on the subject of men. This is from the research company we worked with, we actually used to temporalize the flow construct and this was kind of interesting, because sort of what came out of this was the men we spoke with were finding it difficult to find things in their normal life and their work, which put them in a state of flow, as you know is a state where your challenges and skills are sort of coinciding a nice place where things become effortless and natural. We found out that men were finding work in particular, a source of anxiety, a source of worry, a source of apathy and even a source of boredom. And men didn't really have an outlet; didn't have structured way of getting to the sense of flow, that find it in doing things accidentally. They were finding fatherhood, they were finding a little fixing things around the house, but they weren't finding these things in their lives in general.

So, what we took as our task was to get men to show their value by challenging them to commit to their passions. Things where we believe that their skills and challenges would meet. This is another ad in the theme of the ones you saw earlier on, but the theme here is "love what you do, or get busy with what you love. Wear the pants."

[next slide/ad] "Listen Closely. That's Your Potential Weeping. Wear the Pants." This was a notion that men weren't as fulfilled as they could be, because the weren't taking up the opportunities to sort of follow their passions. What we did was we constructed a competition which has got a thousand-dollar prize, where we are assessing entrants from men all around the U.S.; from people around the U.S.; where they can say this is something I really wanted to do but I cannot do it because I have to work for a living, doing this, or I don't have the money to do it. And we're assessing those things and we'll make an award. And I'll show you the commercial that supports that... [plays commercial]

"Someday you will sleep the big sleep. What will you leave behind? A 401K? A green lawn? Shoes? A brand new furnace? Your Facebook profile? A freezer full of meat? Maybe it's time you used your manskills. Love what you do. Or get busy doing what you love. It's time to make your mark. Win \$100,000 to finally do that thing you love. facebook.com/dockers. Wear the Pants. Dockers.

And I will just show you I think this is important because what we're doing is showing men using their hands, doing the things that require skills; we call them manskills. And I think sort of, the and think there is really an appetite there for sort of men to do these things. I'll just show you one quick movie; one movie that we've made... [plays video]

Man crafting surf boards; talking about his passion. Headline: "Make Passion Your Purpose. Win \$100K to do what you love. Enter now at facebook.com/dockers. Wear the Pants. Dockers." So I think our final thought was that if we talked about various stages where we had a headline we thought was a need of men, I think really what we believe is that men need purpose at the moment. And, with that, I say thank you very much; if you've got any questions, I'd be happy to take them.

Mimi Elfenbein:

In your advertising field, what differences have you seen in men to women ratios in the business?

Matthew Willcox:

I think it's a field where there are probably more numbers.

Edward M. Stephens, MD:

It has to do with negative images of men in advertising, and actually, the display of violence against men. For instance, in the Super Bowl, there was a can of cola, not to mention, that was ejected from a cooler, striking a man in the genitals. Now, I thought to myself, that would be a very interesting image if a can of cola was ejected and struck a woman in the genitals. So there have been many negative images in the media. So, address that if you can. In terms of the negative images that we see, and perhaps you may then put what you've done in even sharper contrast.

Matthew Willcox:

Now let me think about that for a while. Now I think at men and the advertising focusing on males, it depends who; I'm talking specifically about targeting males. And I think that you don't see perhaps enough advertising suggesting that men sort of take responsibility. So there is one commercial I think, which was also in the Super Bowl, which was for a car brand, sort of said that you're entitled to drive this particular car, because of all of the other things you've put up with. I personally, and I stress personally, don't think that is a particularly positive way of kind of addressing men in order for them to reach their potential. And by and large, I don't know if there is a huge problem through a lot of advertising with the way that men are portrayed. There may be occasional cases where it's not so good, but by and large, I don't think it is a general thing. Certainly in the advertising I've seen.

Female audience member:

I have a question or a statement please. I find it quite the opposite of what you're saying. And that I find that if a woman was portrayed as how men are portrayed, you'd have lawsuits all over the place. But men sort of lay back, and sort of take it in strides. But I as a woman find that very offensive. I find a double standard, that I personally as a woman find offensive. And that only a woman sometimes can speak up and say certain things, and I look for advertisements, as an artist myself, and find overwhelmingly that men are more negatively portrayed than women are portrayed, and that if women are portrayed as we have seen, such as back in the 50's, after World War II, the advertisements that keep coming up, even in our history class, as negative female images, we have swung the other way, and it's not in the best interest of men and women.

Matthew Willcox:

First of all, I think I can address that from the work that we do and our agency does, and I think we're sort of careful not to do that. I think that really the betrayals of men are not so much about violence against men; and the example you chose, is really probably quite an outlier. I think the issue really is in that there are many men who've shown as not having much motivation who are seen shown as a little bit clueless, in what perhaps is seen as butts of humor, which is a different thing I think from being shown in ways where there's violence against them. I think that sort of advertising tends to mirror, and this is not a cop-out, but advertising tends to mirror what's being talked about in other aspects of the media. I think for ourselves what I can say is that we've seen that portraying men in a positive way has, when you're trying to target men, is actually a very good thing to do from a commercial aspect. And if other people aren't doing it, then they're probably missing out on an opportunity to connect with men, and to have that commercial success. But as I said it, I don't think that violence against men is, you mentioned one commercial, but I do think, yes, as an issue which is sort of classic beer ads, that show a gauntless group of men that are doing something. I think in our Dockers commercial with the men not wearing any pants, we were keen to say this is not the ideal state. Perhaps other advertisements actually portray as that being the ideal state.

Edward M. Stephens, MD:

I want to just make this comment here because the sense that men are somehow hapless and aimless now, begins to become a kind of characterization of the gender. What we've seen today from these presenters, is that there are huge social and governmental institutional forces operating, as well as evolutionary forces operating that have displaced the functionality of men. So that if we look at the men who have been displaced in their functionality, and we begin to see them as hapless and shiftless, we are making a major mistake. So what we want to do, is we want to begin to address those social and institutional forces that are marginalizing men. And that's where Male Studies comes in. And that's where our appeal for your support comes in. Now I'm going to turn this back to Guy Garcia, here, as our moderator.

Guy Garcia, Moderator:

I'm going to give Dr. Stephens the last word, but before that, just a couple of thoughts. Does anyone remember the Miller Beer commercial where the guy says something wrong and a giant can comes down and crushes him? He wasn't manly enough... and then there's that Dorito's commercial a bunch of guys in suits making fun of guys down the street doing manual labor? There's a woman at her computer, actually doing the work? I mean there are just so many examples of this. And there are books of... Glen Sachs has actually started campaigns that threaten to sue certain companies for images like that.

What I'd like to do really quickly before we wrap up, is put a human face I think, on some of the things we've been talking about. Which is really what this is all about. A couple of months ago, I got an email from a young man who had read my book, and he talked about, up until then, and I think everything we represent here, and why it's so important that this gets distributed and shared as widely as possible - he felt out of place in modern society, he actually reached a point where he thought he would need psychological help, or his teachers did. Fortunately his parents knew better. He actually took other ways to mend himself, and now he's actually thriving; he's recently graduated from Trinity College in Connecticut, and has a full-time job in real estate, and is going for his Masters at NYU in the Spring. He wrote in this email, "I had a good number

of my male friends feel a deep sense of alienation in modern society; a feeling I would like to curtail through some good old-fashioned activism. At heart, I believe that society has deeply betrayed the modern male, and I have no respect for the politically-correct environment I was raised in, to this day I think it is nothing short of a miracle if any man raised in today's world reaches adulthood without turning into a stereotypical nice-guy. I consider myself one of the survivors."

Now, we met, and struck up a correspondence, and along the way, he shared a poem with me, I'm going to read to you now. I think it sums up a lot of, again, why this all matters.

"The plight of the modern man.

The plight of the modern man is seen around the world.

Somehow we just can't find a plan to woo the modern girl.

Each day he gets up for his job, his mood is low and gray.

For if he makes his woman sob, she'll take his check and move away.

The plight of the modern man curtails the yang ambition

For if a man says that he can, he's mocked into submission.

Nothing he does is ever right, his own society hates his guts

No matter how he tries to fight, he won't escape this prison rut.

The plight of the modern man leaves boys without a Dad

How can you make them understand when their tortured soul is mad.

In years of wounded self-esteem those suns of mars will roam the earth

Through violence, sex and foolish dreams

They'll seek to find their manly worth.

The plight of the modern man was caused by world elites

By members of a demon clan

Who longed to see men kiss their feet

They'll do their best to knock men down and rub their faces in the dirt.

Until a man would rather drown than go through one more day of hurt.

The plight of the modern man will leave all lads without a choice

No more content to raise a hand, their roaring guns will sound their voice.

Society will burst in flames as rebels cause the top to flee,

To strip away an age of shame, to cut the ropes to set men free.

I hardly know a dad that... Fabio is here... I'd like... stand up and take a bow - thank you.

The quickest way to say how I feel about this, how I felt I had to read that poem, is this is a very brave young man who found his way. And was very interested in participating - we need more people like Fabio, we need millions of them. That's the whole point of this meeting. And by the way thanks for the fantastic panel. Amazing stuff.

Edward M. Stephens, MD:

Thank you very much. And I think that my good friend Dick Elfenbein, who is the principal researcher of most of the Foundation work. He said, and this may be reaching a metaphor that is, so to speak, before our time. But he said that we need a Manhattan Project - on behalf of men. The Manhattan Project was that project that was engaged in during the second world war, where we raced to create an atomic weapon before the forces of Facism created the same atomic weapon. So we need a Manhattan Project; we need to bring our resources - men, women, our commercial forces. I feel that what was presented to us, with positive advertising, positive messages. This is commerce coming to the service of society in a way that may sell pants, but it does more than sell pants. It highlights what's important. So I thank each of you for being here; I ask you to go to the Foundation for Male Studies web site, at malestudies.org, and take a look at what you can do support this effort and make a difference for yourself and for the lives of all you hold dear to you. Thank you.

Copyright 2011, all rights reserved.