

Issues Download #4 – The “Wage Gap”

Warren Farrell tells a story that illustrates the modern issues of the “wage gap”:

A tall, silver-haired man . . . stepped forward cautiously. “Listen, I’ve got a problem. In the past few years, our company has been sued for sex discrimination three times. . . . [T]he lawsuits are wreaking havoc on the company and me. They’re forcing us to put into legal fees what we should be putting into products and into raises for people who are working, not suing.” . . .

“Tell me, off the record. Are you paying women less than men?”

He thought about it long enough to make me assume the answer was “yes.” Then he surprised me. “No. In reality, no. But sometimes it appears that we do . . . Sometimes we promote a woman faster than we would a man, giving her the same job title as a man, but she has fewer years with the company. . . . We’d pay anyone with fewer years less, but we move good women more quickly than we move good men, which is really discrimination against men, but it ends up looking like discrimination against women when we pay them less for seniority.”

“Sort of ironic, huh?”

“Yeah. In fact, it’s worse than that. Last year, I asked who was willing to relocate to bail out two of our problem branches: one in Alaska and one in Kansas. No one volunteered. So I offered extra pay. Then one of the men says, ‘Maybe. I’ll have to check with my family.’ I ask if there are any women who want to go. The reaction is, ‘Are you kidding? To Alaska?’ . . . So I offered even more money to go to Alaska.”

I laugh, “I can see it coming. She still says no, he says yes, but now you’ve got a guy with the same job title earning much more than his female colleague. . . . So you want to be fair—even acknowledged for bending over backwards to promote women—but when you’re fair, the men get higher pay because they make more sacrifices, and even when you promote women faster, the men sometimes still get higher pay because they have more years of experience.”

“Yes,” he said. “And the HR people look at the raw data of men getting more pay and falsely conclude women are subject to discrimination. I feel this myself until I look more closely! Anyway, the result of no one understanding this is a lawsuit, an aggrieved woman, damaged morale, and even women managers who are afraid to hire women!”ⁱ

When these issues are viewed from a politicized male perspective, it requires only the most basic understanding of gender dynamics to see why women will tend to be less willing than men to chase a big pay-check all the way to Alaska.

The low-intrinsic-value male may endure several years of the harsh, hazardous, and isolated conditions involved in working on, say, the Alaskan oil pipeline, in order to return with sufficient extrinsic value (money) to place him on a “most eligible bachelors” list. What would similarly motivate his high-intrinsic-value female equivalent?

To the degree women experience less internal and external pressure to become “providers,” it just stands to reason that they will be about that much less willing to accept high-risk, high-stress work involving odd hours, long hours, inflexible hours, long commutes, social isolation, demand for travel or relocation, commission-only wages, exposure to the elements, filthy, hazardous and/or arduous working conditions. Because more husbands than wives are truly, *lastingly* amenable to the role of financial provider, more wives than husbands are privileged with the option to take the kind of work that doesn’t pay so well in order to avoid the kind of work that contributes to men’s shorter life expectancy.

Nevertheless, it is officially accepted as fact that women are paid less than men for the exact same work for no other reason than oppression under “patriarchy.” Actually, with or without passage of the Equal Rights Amendment, “Equality of opportunity now reigns,” say Diana Furchtgott-Roth and Christine Stolba, authors of *Women’s Figures: An Illustrated Guide to the Economic Progress of Women in America*. Ever since the Equal Pay Act of 1963, further reinforced by the Civil Rights Act of 1970, “Employers in the United States may not engage in sex discrimination involving unequal pay for equal work or in discriminatory hiring or promotion practices. Numerous court cases have upheld the statutes.”ⁱⁱ Roth and Stolba comment:

Employment compensation is perhaps the bloodiest battleground in the wars between the sexes. It is also the area in which the most blatant distortion of statistics has occurred. . . . The statistics and arguments deployed

as evidence for the existence of both the “wage gap” and “glass ceiling” do not . . . withstand close examination. . . . Although discrimination is frequently blamed for income differentials, a host of choices made by men and women—personal choices made *outside* the work environment—have important implications for men’s and women’s earnings. . . . For example, 80 percent of women bear children at some point in their lives, and approximately a quarter of employed women work part-time, so a higher percentage of women’s work years are spent away from work. . . . Given those educational and career choices, comparing the *average* wages of men and women is a misuse of statistics and a grossly misleading comparison.ⁱⁱⁱ [Emphasis in the original]

If a man and a woman both started working for a company 20 years ago, yet he’s paid more than she, political correctness points to discrimination and demands that they be paid the same. But further investigation, if there is any, may reveal that the woman had exercised her essentially female-only option and stayed home for four of those 20 years in order to take the central place in the emotional lives of *her* children. One day soon a woman’s “entitlement” to “having it *all*” may be legally enforced. But, until then, the woman is paid less because companies are not in the feminism business; they pay and promote based on work performed on the *job*, not in the *home*.

Often, male/female wages are compared within a given field with-out taking into consideration the differing distribution of men and women among the various *subfields*. Warren Farrell explains:

When we see headlines proclaiming “Male Engineers Earn More Than Female Engineers” and don’t ask whether they are working in the same subfields, we are ignoring, for example, that an aerospace engineer earns about \$73,000 while a transmitter engineer earns about \$32,000.

As a faculty member of the School of Medicine at the University of California, Farrell noticed that his female students were choosing subfields that had three characteristics in common:

(1) contact with human life (for example, child psychiatry) rather than with human suffering and death (surgery); (2) the fewest round-the-clock emergency demands at unscheduled hours; (3) less specialization beyond the basic residency and internship. All three are low-pay formula choices, emphasizing fulfillment and flexibility. . . . nationwide, men are 11 times more likely to become thoracic (chest) surgeons, 8 times more likely to be urological surgeons, and 9 times more likely to be orthopedic surgeons. The distinction is not just between surgery and nonsurgical choices, but between medicine that puts doctors in contact with life versus medicine that forces the doctor to deal with death.^{iv}

Because they must, jobs that deal in death pay more than jobs that deal in life. Both sexes know this at the outset when they choose their field of study. What if women are *privileged* to choose quality of life over paycheck? What if this is being powerful, not victimized? According to Dr. Farrell’s research, when we compare wages within a specific subfield of medicine, men never out-earn women, but women sometimes out-earn men (e.g., general family practice, pediatrics, psychia-try, dermatology, neurology, radiation oncology, etc.)^v

A woman goes home at the end of her 40-hour workweek, but a male coworker goes on to earn time-and-a-half for the last 20 hours of his 60-hour workweek. A feminist compares their *average* hourly pay and concludes that the man is being paid more just for being a man. Because feminism is so well protected from serious, high-profile challenge and critique, it is free to be just about as self-indulgent as it pleases. Nevertheless, on average, “When women and men work *less* than 40 hours a week, the *women* earn *more* than the men.”^{vi}

Says Thomas Sowell, a renowned *economist* (not *feminist*):

The most important reason why women earn less than men is not that they are paid less for doing the very same work but that they are distri-buted differently among jobs and have fewer hours and less continuity in the labor force. Among college-educated, never-married individuals with no children who worked full-time and were from 40 to 64 years old—that is, beyond the child-bearing years—men averaged \$40,000 a year in income, while women averaged \$47,000.^{vii}

It is a testament to Woman’s power that when feminism speaks on her behalf, we forgo skepticism. *Think* about it: Jack and Jane sit side by side—same credentials, same output—they are identical in *every* way.

And yet the Y chromosome is paid 26 percent more? You watch tele-vision, I ask you, is maleness really all *that* popular?

Companies will go to great lengths to protect their image and avoid controversy. Yet, even at the risk of enraged female employees, bad press, and potentially devastating Pay Gap lawsuits, *solely for being male*, Jack is paid \$100,000 while Jane, *solely for being female*, is paid \$74,000? To cut costs, companies will fire longtime employees just to avoid paying pensions. And yet a company will *not* simply fire Jack, hire Jill, save a whopping \$26,000 a year, and lose *nothing*? Despite being irrational and illegal, we're told that this practice continues, all across America, undiminished, decade after decade . . . and we *believe* that.

Stating the obvious: "if women were paid only seventy-four cents on a man's dollar, then a firm could fire all its men, replace them with women, and have a cost advantage over rivals," say Roth and Stolba. But that never happens because: "both the *glass ceiling* and the *wage gap* are rhetorically powerful but factually bankrupt terms."^{viii}

And yet, where this feminist fable is concerned, there's no end in sight. "No matter how hard women work, or whatever they achieve in terms of advancement in their own professions and degrees, they will not be compensated equitably!" shouted Congressional Representative Rosa DeLauro at a "wage equity" rally in Washington, D.C.^{ix}

If we humans will choose *one* sex to stick it to, why on earth would we choose the sex that bands together, screams bloody murder, issues lawsuits, and raises hell over every inequity? Why not stick it to the sex that adamantly rejects victim, complaint, and protest? Why not stick it to the sex that never fights back? Unless, of course, that's exactly what we do.

By bringing us misleading wage discrepancy statistics, feminists promote hatred toward men and feelings of demoralization, hostility, rage, victim and vengeance in women. By not explaining *why* men earn more, feminists fail to empower women with a sense of what they could do about it. In his book, *Why Men Earn More: The Startling Truth Behind the Pay Gap—and What Women Can Do About It*, Warren Farrell—a masculist, not a feminist—explains in painstaking detail exactly how women, if they chose to endure everything men endure, could close the so-called "wage gap."

But feminists prefer an *easier* way. "I am proud," says President Obama, "that the first bill I signed into law was the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Restoration Act."^x When politicians like Rosa DeLauro, Bill Clinton (in his 1999 State of the Union Address), John Kerry (during his third debate with George W. Bush), Hillary Clinton, and Barack Obama pander to the "pay gap" myth, they set in motion laws, policies and pressures designed to *force* equal paychecks, *regardless*.

I'll distinguish between, and label, two overlapping forces operating here: *Reverse Wage Gap*, anti-male forces that reverse-discriminate against males, and what I'll call the *Glass Escalators*, pro-female forces that seek to propel women upward.

These forces include: a gynocentric educational system, affirmative action, feminist quotas, advantages created by myriad female-only organizations of all kinds (absent male equivalents), overcompensation for fear of "wage gap" lawsuits, plus feminist-induced "moral" pressures on employers (to reverse "centuries of discrimination"). Little wonder that women are rising and men are in decline.

The following is excerpted from an Op-Ed commentary by Gordon E. Finley in the *Washington Times*:

A headline by Reuters on Nov. 7 [2008] was startling and certainly newsworthy: "Female U.S. corporate directors out-earn men: study." Yet, one full week later there was no newspaper coverage of this politically incorrect report, though the study was based on 25,000 corporate directors at 3,200 companies . . . Economist June O'Neill, the former director of the Congressional Budget Office, wrote an article titled "The gender gap in wages, circa 2000" in the May 2003 issue of the *American Economic Review*. By factoring in some of the many work-related differences between men and women such as hours worked per week, danger and travel requirements of the job, years of education, years in the field, and many other characteristics, she found the purported pay gap virtually vanished.^{xi}

The “pay gap” may vanish, but, narrow the focus a bit, and the *reverse* pay gap shows itself clearly: “Young women in New York, Chicago, and several of the nation’s other largest cities who work full time have, according to an analysis of recent census data, forged ahead of men in wages. The shift has occurred in New York since 2000 and even earlier in Los Angeles and Dallas. . . . The analysis was prepared by Andrew Beveridge, a demographer at Queens College who first reported his findings in *Gotham Gazette*, published online by the Citizens Union Foundation. It shows that women from 21 to 30 living in New York City and working full time made 117 percent of men’s wages, and even more in Dallas, 120 percent.”^{xii}

Why is it particularly young women in large cities? Because “women have been graduating from college in larger numbers than men, and many of those women seem to gravitate toward urban areas.”^{xiii} Female advantages throughout the educational system lead to higher average female academic credentials (see Issues Download #2), and these Glass Escalators jumpstart women economically. And it is *also* true that young urban women are the women least likely to be married with children and are therefore the least likely to have shifted their priorities from money making to homemaking.

As the current recession heats up, the truth about men’s economic woes becomes harder to hide and ignore. The *Boston Globe*, referring to the year 2008: “Some 1.1 million fewer men are working in the United States than there were a year ago, according to the Labor Department. By contrast, 12,000 more women are working.”^{xiv} As more men lose their jobs, more women are forced to get jobs. Where are women getting these jobs? In female-centric sectors like health care and the service industry—sectors that are booming. Meanwhile, male-centric sectors like manufacturing, construction, and technology industries are in decline. *The Globe* quotes Andrew Sum, director of the Center for Labor Market Studies at Northeastern University:

During the same period, as jobs that allowed less-educated men to support a family have diminished, out-of-wedlock births to young women rose to 50 percent of births, from 20 percent in 1980. “We lost a lot of jobs that used to be an opportunity for these young guys,” Sum said. “But we haven’t figured out how to create good-paying, blue-collar jobs for men who don’t have a college degree.”^{xv}

Relatively less-educated/lower-wage men are not generally viewed as desirable “providers.” As the numbers of such men increase, the numbers of such men rejected, divorced, and shut out of parenting also increase, leaving increasing numbers of single women to raise children.

Despite the reverse wage gap, men “keeping their noses to the grindstone,” overall, still manage to earn a higher average wage. But the “wage gap,” currently down to around 20 percent, is shrinking. And, in the next few decades, cultural trends promise to flip the traditional wage imbalance upside down. The reversal may even accelerate exponentially. If so, it would happen something like this: Should lesser achieving men resign themselves to permanent bachelorhood, they may give up on the quest for “success.” With only their own modest needs to meet, they may be content to get by on low wages. But single mothers, with children to provide for, will be motivated to go after that big paycheck in order to pay those big childcare bills.

In an article for the *New York Post* entitled, “Men Worried They’re Falling Behind in a ‘Recession’—They’re Right,” Maureen Callahan reminds us that 80 percent of recent job losses have hit men.

But there’s something else going on, a sort of free-floating anxiety about not just the current utility of men but what substantial role, if any, they will not have ceded to women in the future. . . . “The Decline of Men: How the American Male is Tuning Out, Giving Up, and Flipping Off His Culture,” by the award-winning journalist Guy Garcia . . . “Like an invisible epidemic with catastrophic implications, the decline of men cuts across all ages, races, and social-economic groups.”^{xvi}

If current trends continue and elite males become no longer prominent enough or numerous enough to steal focus, men’s poor showing every-where else *outside* the tip of the success pyramid must eventually shatter our illusions. We’ll be *forced* into knowing what equalists already know—women rising and men sinking leads not toward, but *away* from *true* gender equality.

But, for the time being, we still have a lot of men paying the mortgage payments. We still have men working overtime to afford alimony and child-payments and we still have a lot of women receiving those payments who are relatively unmotivated to pursue long inflexible hours, harsh and/or hazardous, high-stress/high-wage work if that high-wage comes at too high a price (especially given their role as primary caregiver). And so, we still have a lot of men out earning women.

Owing to what may well be described as Paycheck Idolatry, the assumption is that life's meaning and quality depend solely upon the size of the paycheck. But what if women are relatively *privileged* to forgo 80-hour workweeks and have a life instead? From some perspectives, most careers and all jobs are akin to misery. They pay you to use you, not fulfill you. The more they pay you the more they use you up. Some women really do "sacrifice" their career for a husband, no small thing. But other women are "saved" from a miserable job by their husband. Moreover, for every man whose hard work, dedication, risk taking, and sacrifice lead to a higher wage, there is likely a woman attached to that man who is benefiting from that higher wage. Overall, women may earn less, but they spend more.

"In the U.S. alone, women account for \$7 trillion in consumer and business spending and control more than \$13 trillion in personal wealth, an amount that will almost double to \$20 trillion in the next 15 years," says Fara Warner, author of *The Power of the Purse: How Smart Businesses Are Adapting to the World's Most Important Consumers—Women*. "Women make more than 80 percent of all consumer purchases around the world."^{xvii}

"The serpent in the Garden of Eden knew it first," says Bernice Kanner, author of the nearly identically titled, *Pocketbook Power—How to Reach the Hearts and Minds of Today's Most Coveted Consumers—Women*. "Marketers caught on centuries later. Women are the ones to reach. Since Eve's time they've been the gatekeepers in the kingdom of consumer spending, the ultimate decision makers."^{xviii} According to Kanner, "pocketbook power dominates the world of commerce. It decides not only what and who to buy (politically and entertainment-wise) but also when and where to buy it (online, boutiques, department stores, catalogs)." And, as we already learned with respect to "gender-based pricing," "Women are even dictating to retailers what they'll pay."^{xix}

Statistics compiled by the Women's Entertainment Network, the sales promotion agency Frankel & Co., and others suggest that all told women make 88 percent of the retail purchases in America. . . . Four of every five homes in America have been selected by a woman, as have 7 of every 10 appliances. Women handle 75 percent of family finances . . . and write 80 percent of all checks. Demographers expect that by 2020, through inheritance, marriage, salary, or crook, women will control most of the money in America.^{xx}

Women controlling most of the money wouldn't be a problem if women were as generous with it as men. But they are not, and the biology (evolutionary psychology) of the matter suggests that they aren't going to be in anything like the foreseeable future.

Status—inextricably tied to wealth—is one of *the* primary cues eliciting the female sexual/romantic response. Women's "romance novels" are churned out by the millions. They account for a whopping 40 percent of paperback book sales.^{xxi} These novels *always* feature a hero of *higher* status/wealth than the heroine. And because status is all relative, the higher women rise in status/wealth, the higher the bar is set for men to either rise even higher or suffer diminished marital attractiveness in women's eyes.

"I get the impression that if an African-American man can't produce economically, he's not considered good for much of anything," says interviewer Jack Kammer. "Is it common when a man loses his job for the woman to think he's no good anymore?" "Very common, I see it all the time," replies Doris Caldwell, psychiatric nurse and adviser to the national Black Men's Health Network. "It's a strong idea that the male should be the one who brings the funds in."^{xxii}

As men in the black community have discovered, women earning more than men doesn't tend to put men on easy street as much as it just puts them out on the street. And yet, having observed black women's dramatic rise in educational and economic status leaving the black man in the dust, Ellis Cose makes the case for the "plight" of the black woman:

Is this new black woman finally crashing through the double ceiling of race and gender? Or is she leaping

into treacherous waters that will leave her stranded, unfulfilled, childless and alone? Can she thrive if her brother does not, if the black man succumbs, as hundreds of thousands already have, to the hopelessness of prison and the streets? Can she—dare she—thrive *without* the black man, finding happiness across the racial aisle? Or will she, out of compassion, loneliness or racial loyalty “settle” for men who—educationally, economically, professionally—are several steps beneath her?^{xxiii}

Owing to the relative low status of black men, black women tend to seek relatively high status men of other races or, conversely, single motherhood by choice, leaving the black *man* stranded, unfulfilled, childless, alone, and all too often homeless and/or imprisoned. Clearly, the black *man* has his own experience of a double ceiling of race *and* gender. But the zero-empathy-toward-men rule guarantees that it is the rising female, not the declining male who gets the empathy and victim status.

Newsweek cautions: “Even for women in ‘mainstream’ white America, says [sociologist Donna] Franklin, hard times may lie ahead. Black women may be the leaders in the trend of marrying less successful men, but white women are surely following.”^{xxiv} Because the sexes are so tightly interwoven, doing harm to one sex does harm to both. Nevertheless, framing the economic decline of men (and the resultant rejection of men leading to increases in male homelessness/imprisonment) strictly in terms of its tending to render men inadequate in service to female purposes, thus making *women the* victims, is surely feminist sexism at its most *obscene*.

That aside, the question remains: could what’s happening in the black community be a portent of things to come for society in general? Authors like Stephen Baskerville believe the future is now.

The decline of the American family has reached critical and truly dangerous proportions. . . . Since the 1960s, we have been warned about a growing crisis of single-parent homes and fatherless children. Initially, this concerned mostly low-income communities in the inner cities. Four decades later, it has expanded to the affluent. The erosion of marriage, out-of-wedlock births, divorce, and fatherless children are now mainstream problems that threaten the general society.^{xxv}

Currently, about 34 percent of children in general and 66 percent of African-American children are living in fatherless homes.^{xxvi} David Popenoe, author of *Life Without Father: Compelling new evidence that fatherhood and marriage are indispensable for the good of children and society*, notes that, back in 1960, the total number of years (15.1) the average black male spent living in households with children was about the same number of years (15.7) the average white male spent living in households with children back in 1980. Similar comparisons hold for out-of-wedlock births, teen pregnancies, and percentage of single-parent families.^{xxvii} Many believe that what you see in the black community now is what you’ll see in families within the white community in about 20 years.

As the “wage gap” continues to close, will Man settle for being “settled for”? Or, will Man become ever more shut out of Woman’s world altogether? Perhaps the above talk of prisons and the streets may begin to erode our confidence that the costs women pay for being shut out or rendered less-than in the world of men, necessarily exceeds the costs men pay for being shut out or rendered less-than in the world of women (more on that to come).

Women in general and feminists in particular would like to believe that the women’s movement has been a purely righteous force with an influence purely for the good. But the Duality Principle (closely aligned with “the law of unintended consequences”) guarantees positives and negatives, light and shadow in *all* human endeavors.

It is exactly because the women’s movement has been so widely protected from official critique that its many shadows and destructive byproducts have been so freely indulged. Woman would greatly enhance her prestige by stepping up and owning her fair share of accountability for outcomes both good *and bad*.

Fara Warner, sums up “current reality”:

In the real world, at least 40 percent of marriages ended in divorce . . . and more people, especially women, were choosing to stay single as they gained more and more economic power. As author and professor Laura Kipnis wrote in an op-ed piece in *The New York Times* in January 2004: “The increasing economic self-sufficiency of women has certainly been a factor in declining marriage rates.” . . . “While women control

slightly more than half the wealth now, it will be a tsunami over the next 15 to 20 years,” says Martha Barletta [author of the book *Marketing to Women: How to Understand, Reach, and Increase Your Share of the World’s Largest Market Segment*].^{xxviii}

Indeed, the combined effect of “Fair” Pay Act legislation that tends to *force* equal (or better) pay to women for unequal work, together with over a thousand well-funded female-centric organizations, feminism in the absence of masculism, pervasive pro-female/anti-male sentiment, economic shifts that favor female-friendly job sectors, and a male-hostile educational environment resulting in women earning advanced degrees at increasingly superior rates, all add up to a portent of women leaving men in the economic dust. If heterosexual love, marriage, and parenting have taken a hit in recent decades, the situation promises to get much worse in the decades to come.

“When research finds that *wealthy* women worldwide marry up or don’t marry at all,” writes Warren Farrell, “she [feminist Natalie Angier] blames men for preventing women from making as much and claims women will *never* make as much [italics hers]. By missing the point that the wealthy woman has already made *more* than 99 percent of men she is able to dismiss wealthy women marrying for money or not marrying at all as men’s fault.”^{xxix} [Emphasis in the original] All Fault Is Male?

A mere 15 percent of top female executives ever marry and almost all of them “marry up.”^{xxx} Every modern politician vows to put an end to the “wage gap.” And yet, is the “wage gap”—meager as it is considering the extra financial pressures and the resultant extra efforts, risks, and sacrifices men make in order to make money—all that stands between men and an ever increasing matrimonial/parental irrelevance?

As usual, I’m skating on some very thin ice of political correctness here so let me be very clear about this. *Obviously* I don’t object to equal *opportunity* in the form of equal pay for equal work. I do, however, object to efforts to *force* equal *results* without regard to fairness. I object to using reverse discrimination to undermine all of Man’s extra efforts.

“To rise in the hierarchy,” says gender scientist Anne Moir, “men are much more prepared than women to make sacrifices of their own time, pleasure, relaxation, health, safety or emotions.”^{xxxi} If, in his fervent drive to achieve “success appeal,” a man is willing to sign a contract allowing the company he works for to transfer him at will to any branch office, anywhere in the country, and his female equivalent is *not* willing to sign that contract, then *the man should be paid more than the woman*.

In suffering whatever it takes to earn more, men earn the *right* to earn more. And no Lilly Ledbetter “Fair” Pay Restoration Act should be fabricated to *force* employers to pay women the same, *regardless*. I object to achieving an end to the “wage gap” through the use of culture-wide anti-male bias at levels sufficient to sabotage and under-mine male efforts to compensate for being male.

If cultural hostility toward all things male together with cultural forces that advantage women and disadvantage men socially, educationally, and economically should ever *force* the elimination of men’s desperately achieved economic lead, then along with the disappearance of the “wage gap” I predict a concurrent diminishment of heterosexual love, heterosexual marriage, and heterosexual parenting.

Take a look around—look at the over 50 percent divorce rate, the 34 percent of children raised in fatherless homes^{xxxii}—it’s in process even now. In fact, aged 18 and older, an entirely unprecedented 43 percent of adult Americans were single in 2007.^{xxxiii} And, in the United States single mothers gave birth to an astonishing *40 percent* of the babies born in 2007.^{xxxiv}

When it comes to women’s right to equal pay for equal work, of course, no one would ever question it. Rightfully so. But, when it comes to women’s obligation to be equally generous with the money earned, no one ever considers it. Such a concept is politically incorrect to the point of being unthinkable.

Any and all critique of the feminine may be labeled “sexism” and thus forbidden—but at what cost? Will feminism/chivalry *forever* circumscribe and stifle our search for truth? None of the above is an indictment of women. Both sexes seek love and romance, but the sexes are generally triggered into falling in love according to differing stimuli.

The average man's *first-choice* woman will probably be a woman possessing youth and beauty. The average woman's *first-choice* man will probably be a man possessing wealth and status. On that basis both sexes may be judged "shallow." But Man's attraction to youth and beauty is not purely carnal and Woman's attraction to wealth and status is not simply mercenary.

Youth and beauty are among the primary cues through which men ignite both sexually and *romantically*. Resources and status are among the primary cues through which women ignite *sexually* and *romantically*. Just as men respond to youth and beauty largely because they have no choice, so women respond to wealth and status largely because they have *no choice*. These responses are hard wired.

Why focus on gender generalizations, a practice many will find objectionable? There are, of course, any number of human qualities that both sexes find attractive. Male and female sexualities doubtless overlap more than they diverge. We focus on the divergence, however, because our understanding of gender dynamics comes of understanding not how the sexes are the *same*, but how the sexes are *different*. And the primary *difference* in male vs. female sexualities lies in the degree to which men tend to prioritize youth and beauty while women tend to prioritize wealth and status (more on this coming up).

Individual exceptions abound. There are women who'd be without two nickels to rub together so long as they're with the man they love. Even so, these generalizations well describe the large scale human trends and tendencies in these matters. And it is the large scale trends and tendencies—not the exceptions—that drive the large scale societal machinery. Generalizations are employed in an effort to cut through overwhelming complexity and gain some measure of understanding of how things work in the Big Picture. Statistics, along with other cultural evidence, reveal that in the big picture heterosexual unions are *diminishing* significantly—in longevity, strength, and numbers. The costs to families, to children, and to society are inestimable. Keeping our focus on the large scale, we ask, what is going on here?

To express something complex in simplest terms: male wealth and status—primal cues that commonly, traditionally, instinctually draw women to men most intensely—are in decline. And Woman's sexual, romantic, and matrimonial desires toward Man have tended to decline in equal measure. By contrast, Man's sexual/romantic desires toward Woman haven't changed because Woman's desirable characteristics haven't changed. Man's emotional need for Woman remains as deep as always, but Woman has always gotten *her* emotional needs met primarily through children, family, and sisterhood. Meanwhile, Woman's material need for Man is a fraction of what it once was.

What must be said here is that much of what underlies this hetero-diminishment appears to lie within Woman's own biological *nature*. That doesn't make it Woman's *fault*, but to whatever extent that it is primarily *her* biological nature that is the limiting factor in all this, it is primarily Woman's *responsibility*.

If only focus could shift a bit from women's victimization to women's *power*, from Women's Rights to women's *responsibilities*, a whole new realm of gender politics might finally open up.

All Fault Is Male asserts that the problem isn't high status women turning away from low status men; the problem is low status men turning away from high status women owing to men feeling "threatened." There's truth in this assertion, but it's a truth applied ruthlessly without compassion. It is also a lesser truth often presented as the whole truth. I'll return to this subject, but, for now, I believe the *primary* truth is this: men have not the *least* problem attracting to and desiring marriage with women wealthier than themselves. But higher status women tend to see a lesser sexual/romantic value and *much* less marital value in lower status men; and the "problem" is, men know it.

Lower status men who back away from higher status women do so largely out of *legitimate* fears—fear of being judged and treated as inadequate; fear of eventual, inevitable rejection. The already high divorce rate increases by 50 percent when wives earn more income than their husbands.^{xxxv} And again, women initiate two-thirds to three-quarters of divorces.¹ Thus, the fears of lower status men are not without foundation.

1 It's worth noting that some sources claim 80 percent *or more*. See, for example: David C. Morrow, *How Women Manipulate: Essays Toward Gynology* (West Conshohocken, PA: Infinity Publishing, 2004) p.60. Also, Adryenn Ashley, *Every Single Girl's Guide to Her Future Husband's Last Divorce* (Petaluma, CA: ChickLit Media

In addition, as Man's status declines, many of his most attractive personal assets—confidence, competence, charisma, aggression, ambition—also decline. A woman may sidestep her attraction to male status by claiming, in all honesty, that it is these respect-inspiring qualities in a man that attract her, not his level of success. These driven qualities, however, serve as the best indicators either of a man's current level of success or a man's *potential* for success in the future. Attraction to a man's status or attraction to those personality characteristics that are the best predictors of a man's status, are pretty much one and the same attraction.

Deprived of the sense of purpose that goes with the role of protector/provider, insecure enervated men who may seem to lack even the *potential* for success are being rejected en masse. But I'm not angry because women tend to prioritize status. There's no sense heap-ing the judgments of blame upon either sex for being what two million years of human evolutionary psychology have made them. No, I'm frustrated because women, ego-invested in holding the moral high-ground, tend to deny their part in these gender dynamics. If we're to progress, *both* sexes must be accountable for who and what they are, their innate natures, their choices, and their effect in the world.

Evidence for the two sexes' biologically evolved divergent sexual preferences is overwhelming and examined extensively in book 2, *Love and Respect in the Past*. At this juncture, suffice it to say that men do not go ga-ga over breasts because it is the logical thing to do. Sex is not logical but biological.

While in other aspects men and women may differ only slightly, if there's one area in which the sexes could be expected to differ substantially, it would be the area of sex itself. I would not attempt to assign a number to so nebulous a measure. I would point out, however, that *if* the sexes' sexuality diverged by, say, 25 percent, that would leave a 75 percent overlap in which the sexes' sexuality works the same. Such a vast overlap could easily support those who take a stand in denial of biological difference. At the same time, when we consider how much is made of the 8 percent average divergence in height between men and women, a 25 percent divergence would be more than sufficient to yield *enormous* societal repercussions and consequences.

David M. Buss, avid researcher and author of *The Evolution of Desire*, has exhaustively studied the data and concludes: "In contemporary America, when women make more money than their husbands, they tend to leave them. One study found that the divorce rate among American couples in which the woman earns more than her husband is 50 percent higher than among couples in which the husband earns more than his wife . . . Men who do not fulfill women's primary preference for a mate who provides resources are jettisoned, especially when the woman can earn more than the man."^{xxxvi}

"Perversely," comments Nancy Friday, "Buss's surveys seem to show that the most successful, educated women 'express an even stronger preference for high-earning men than do women who are less financially successful.'"^{xxxvii} Indeed, according to Nancy Etcoff, author of *Survival of the Prettiest*, "Female medical students who expect to pull down large salaries say that they want to marry men whose incomes are equal to or higher than their own: not a single one reports wanting to marry a man who makes a lower income."^{xxxviii}

So, if feminist dreams come true and we become a matriarchy comprised of female "doctors" and male "nurses," what happens to heterosexual love and marriage and parenting?

The crux of the issue is defined by the love/respect dynamic and obscured by a common phrase. Both sexes are said to "fall in love." Whether it is a man or a woman, the phrase is the same, but the *reality* is a bit different. Love truly is at the core of a man's romantic feelings toward a woman. But love is not *primarily* what a woman falls into. Traditionally, and still to this day, a kind of sexualized/romanticized *respect* lies at the heart of a woman's romantic feelings toward a man. I will substantiate that claim at length in book 3, *Love and Respect in the Present*. But, for now, suffice it to say that if a woman can't feel respect toward the man she's with, then she can't feel much of any-thing toward him—sexually/romantically.

Group, 2008) p.65.: "In real life, women file for divorce 85% of the time."

Man continues to diminish and decline and, in so doing, Man continues to lose what he needs in order to gain Woman's respect, through which he gains Woman's love, through which he gains access to the world of women and the emotional sustenance therein. Certainly socialized factors enter into this dynamic, but biologically evolved sexual psychology is also a factor. And the biology of the matter sets limits on how far the traditional model can be stretched before the whole thing starts falling apart.

Anthropologist John Marshall Townsend has conducted studies in which photographs of men were rated for attractiveness and then these same photos were re-rated with the addition of describing the men in the photos as waiters, teachers, or doctors. Not surprisingly, "average-looking or even unattractive doctors received the same ratings as very attractive teachers."^{xxxix} Teachers are, of course, every bit as *lovable* as doctors, but teachers are not as *respected* as doctors, and in their romantic proclivities women tend to prioritize *respect*—so much so that, apparently, waiters need not apply.

Townsend went on to show that women were unanimously unwilling to date, have sex with, or marry men when those men are shown dressed in a Burger King outfit and baseball cap. Yet other women were willing to consider all three when shown pictures of *these same men* now shown wearing suits and Rolex watches.^{xl} By contrast, *Play-boy* currently markets a DVD called "The Girls of McDonald's."

Toward men working behind a fast-food counter, women typically feel little. If a man is not sufficiently respect-worthy, a woman cannot fall in "love" with him. Toward women working behind a fast-food counter, men often feel sexual and romantic desire. A man can fall in love with a woman of *any* status, the only proviso being that he finds her lovable. The differences here are *not* subtle.

The evidence regarding gender and money is comprehensive and conclusive. Like other women's magazines, *Ms. Magazine* features many full-page ads for engagement rings and other gifts men are expected to give to women. Therefore, "I assumed *Ms.* would feature other gifts women could give to men," says Warren Farrell. "I checked the full-page ads of each issue from July 1983 through January 1985—nineteen months. Not one full-page ad for one gift a woman could give a man appeared in any *Ms. Magazine* for all nineteen issues—including two Christmas issues. Wait . . . there's one exception. One issue of *Ms. Magazine* does include an ad with a gift for a man: a subscription to *Ms. Magazine*."^{xli} Even the high-earning "liberated" women reading *Ms.* are neither expected nor invited to spend serious money on men.

"The generous man has higher value as a mate than the stingy man," says David Buss. "If, over evolutionary time, generosity in men provided these benefits repeatedly and the cues to a man's generosity were observable and reliable, then selection would favor the evolution of a preference for generosity in a mate."^{xlii} The degree to which generous men are sexually favored determines the degree to which the genetic trait of generosity (toward women) gets passed down from fathers to sons. To a large extent, female sexual selection molds the male of the species (e.g., the peacock's tail).

On the issue of gender generosity, I'm not accusing Woman of a character flaw (monetarily/materially, women tend to be less generous than men, but in other ways women tend to be *more* generous than men); I'm saying that Woman is relatively unwilling to pay Man's mortgage because she feels a relatively lesser *internalized* need and/or obligation to do so. A man's ability and willingness to pay the mortgage is a key element in what makes the man romantically and matrimonially attractive and desirable. But it doesn't work that way in reverse. Male and female sexualities are *different*.

A woman wearing an Armani suit and Rolex watch may plunk her platinum American Express card down on the table of a fine French restaurant but, by itself, this action is *not* likely to give the man on the other side of that table an erection. By contrast, Katie Roiphe describes the "warm glow of security, as if everything in my life was suddenly going to be taken care of"^{xliii} that sweeps over a woman when that same scenario is gender reversed. It is, in essence, the female "erection" she's describing.

Clearly, male and female sexualities *must* be different. If they were identical, there'd be no basis for *heterosexuality*.

If women are the "fairer sex," what does that leave men as? Men feel such a need to compensate for being male they often *want* the role of sole provider. (Remember the 1950's stereotype—i.e., "Ralph

Kramden”—*insisting* on being the sole provider?) What woman is so insecure of her intrinsic worth that she feels the need to “bring home the bacon” in order to be of value to her family?

In the gender dance men display relative financial generosity because only men *must*. It is one of the key ways men turn women on and it is the *only* way for men to compensate for being relatively less-than in sex, beauty, intimacy, domesticity, and parenting. It is this, not women’s lack of money, that creates the Generosity Gap. As the Spending Gap makes plain, women have the money—they just don’t feel the need to spend serious amounts of it on men. Why would they?

Both sexes spend more on the sex that both sexes love more.^{xliv} When we consider not only all the money women spend but also all the money spent on women, it turns out that “Women influence two out of every three of the three trillion dollars spent in the United States each year!”^{xlv} Yet we are to believe that women’s labor is “unpaid.” Surely, money is more fun to spend than to earn.

Given Woman’s *true* economic situation and the reality of her feminine powers, we can see why, as compared to Man, she enters the work world freer to follow her heart/less pressured and therefore less inclined to sacrifice her time, comfort, safety, and social life in the single-minded pursuit of money. The so-called “pay gap” is the result.

It is clear to all college students that an engineering degree is bound to result in higher wages than an art history degree. So what does it tell us when more than 80 percent of the art history majors are women while more than 85 percent of the engineering majors are men?^{xlvi} All other things being equal, who wouldn’t choose the emotionally enriching study of art over the sterile, numbers-driven study of engineering? But all other things are not equal. The “pay gap” derives out of women’s freer choices, not “discrimination.” Women’s freer choices derive from power, not powerlessness.

Engineering firms are extra motivated to hire women especially to meet quotas—quotas that *must* be met if the firm will qualify to do business with the government (*the* source for many of the most lucrative contracts). With so few female engineering graduates to recruit from, competition for those female grads runs high. Little wonder, then, that despite lesser average initial qualifications, female engineers enjoy higher average starting wages than their male counterparts.^{xlvii}

Back in ’99 when Carly Fiorina became CEO of Hewlett-Packard, the world’s second-largest computer company, she told reporters, “I hope we are at a point that everyone has figured out that there is not a glass ceiling.” Sally Pipes, President and CEO of *The Contrarian: News and Comments on Women’s Issues*, concurs:

Certainly no such obstacle prevented her rise to a position for which she was not ideally suited. Her bachelor’s degree from Stanford, for example, was not in computer science or engineering but medieval history and philosophy. . . . She held important posts at Lucent Tech-nologies for a decade but Carly Fiorina was the only candidate for the Hewlett-Packard job without direct experience in the computer bus-iness. She got the job anyway, confirming her belief that there is no glass ceiling.^{xlviii}

In fact, it sounds suspiciously like a Glass Escalator to me.

Being female certainly helped rather than hindered Fiorina’s rise to the top of a “male dominated” arena. By all accounts Fiorina was confrontational, unpopular, reluctant to delegate authority, and with her at the helm, Hewlett-Packard stock dropped 18.2 percent. “The company’s board opted to let her go, albeit with a severance package worth a reported \$21.1 million.”^{xlix} With the news of Fiorina’s departure HP stock prices immediately jumped 6.9 to 10.5 percent. “The stock is up a bit on the fact that nobody liked Carly’s leadership all that much,” said Robert Cihra, an analyst with Fulcrum Global Partners. “The Street had lost all faith in her and the market’s hope is that anyone will be better.”^l

Even so, all too predictable cries of “sexism” and “glass ceiling” ensued. Sally Pipes:

By all appearances, the Fiorina case has caused the gender mavens to alter the very definition of the glass ceiling. It used to mean that women should have top jobs in proportion to their numbers in the pop-ulation, a politically correct view that discounts personal differences, effort, and the choices that women make. In addition to the quota concept, the glass ceiling now apparently means that women are to be kept in top positions whatever their record as a leader, and regardless of whether, on their watch, the performance of the company suffers.^{li}

“And as for Fiorina, despite a lack of experience in banking, she is now in the running to be the next president of the World Bank.”ⁱⁱⁱ There’s that Glass Escalator again. And, against incumbent Barbara Boxer, I see that Fiorina recently ran for a seat in the U.S. Senate.

Laura Ingraham, a lawyer on the advisory board of the Independent Women’s Forum, writes, “True, there are still far fewer women than men in senior management positions, but feminists don’t acknowledge that this disparity is at least partly the result of women’s choices. . . . The idea that women are constantly thwarted by invisible barriers of sexism relegates women to permanent victim status . . . Instead of whining about an imaginary glass ceiling, why don’t feminists celebrate the fact that women in the work force are at long last pushing against a wide open door?”ⁱⁱⁱⁱ Why? Because the day feminists celebrate their victory is the day they become irrelevant.

As seen from the politicized male perspective, Man dominates, but Woman pulls the strings. Man disowns his gender truths accepting feminist truths as if they were his own.

Women are rising and men are in decline. Young, never-married women now well out earn their male counterparts. But it’s all right feminism assures Man; we’re just headed toward equality. The sexes are identical and interchangeable, we’re told, so it will all just flip round. Women will be the breadwinners and men will be desired in the same way women have always been desired. Great, I hear men say; *let* women bring home the bacon! No need to climb success ladders. With the bar lowered so, men will be on easy street. So, what is there to worry about? It will all just flip around.

It needs saying that, to an extent—for some—feminist assurances have rung true. But, in the big picture: “To put it simply, the less a guy earns nowadays, the less likely they are to have ever been hitched.”^{liv}

I see, especially in the poorer quarters, marriages plummeting both in numbers and in longevity. Recently, throughout the media, I see marriage described as being or becoming a “luxury good” reserved for the rich. I see fatherlessness accepted as the New Normal and I think . . . something here is not working.

In summation: the “wage gap,” as commonly understood, is a myth, a myth used to justify anti-male discrimination and misandry—a myth created and sustained out of *female power* (female power to *choose* her level of involvement both in the homeplace and workplace, and female power to make us believe women are paid only 74 cents on the dollar). In actuality, what we think of as the “wage gap” is a measure of how much more intrinsically valued women are as lovers, spouses, and parents. To be as valued, men must present themselves as a package deal that includes themselves *plus* extrinsic values—resources, wages, status, and so on. David M. Buss comments:

Women’s desire for status shows up in everyday occurrences. A colleague overheard a conversation among four women at a restaurant. They were all complaining that there were no eligible men around. Yet these women were surrounded by male waiters, none of whom was wearing a wedding ring. Waiters, who do not have a high-status occupation, were apparently not even considered by these women.^{lv}

Which is why none of these waiters was wearing a wedding ring. If these men who surrounded them were not deemed “eligible,” it’s only because “eligible” is really a euphemism for successful—i.e., *at least* as successful as the women evaluating them. And so, *in general*, the higher women rise, the *higher* the bar is set.

No matter what beauty or brilliance he may bring to the table, a waiter could never hope to top a “most eligible bachelors” list. Such men must rise higher or risk either getting shut out of marriage altogether or only grudgingly “settled for” and treated accordingly.

Historically, and currently, men out-earn women as a direct result of extra sacrifices, efforts, and risk taking, fueled in large measure by female-imposed necessity. The *intrinsic-value gap*, born of women’s relatively lesser sexual/matrimonial desires toward the *intrinsic* values of their opposite sex, is a driving force behind men’s extra determination to perform, achieve, and succeed their way into having what women are empowered to demand of them.

Concurrently, women's "ownership" of the domestic realm rewards wives with options relatively unavailable to their husbands, i.e., fulltime, high wage demanding work (husbands will not experience this as an option as much they will experience it as an obligation); fulltime, low stress, low wage work; part-time work; volunteer work; fulltime parenting. To the degree that women still marry men and men still fulfill their role as Providers (of options), women are privileged to choose low wage options more often than men.

Men earning more out of a greater need to compensate/women earning less out of a lesser need to compensate—*that's* the wage gap *reality*. But, once again, feminism defines the terms. So the only "wage gap" commonly known is the Wage Gap *myth* in which women are paid 26% less simply for being women. It seems clear, however, that what little actually remains of the Wage Gap, it is rapidly being outdone by Glass Escalators and *Reverse* Wage Gap.

According to author Tom James, many men "measure their value in terms of how well they can provide for a woman and/or children. They may not show it, but inside they do not believe that they have any inherent value or worth in and of themselves."^{vi} According to author Jane Young, women are "very suspicious of men who want, say, to be househusbands or who end up that way because they're unemployed or underemployed."^{vii} Could it be that men's sense of self-worth is what Tom James says it is because many women measure men's value in terms of how well they can provide for a woman and/or children; and, they may not show it but, inside, women do not believe that men have inherent value or worth in and of themselves?

Socially, an unsuccessful man is a "bum," a "loser." Sexually, an unsuccessful man is, if not rejected outright, probably a temporary fling. Matrimonially, an unsuccessful man is a "barrel scraping." Parentally, an unsuccessful man is a "failure" who can't afford top-flight education and/or medical care for his children. And so, tradition-ally, it has primarily been men who would do just about *anything*, endure any hardship, take any risk, make any sacrifice for the acquisition of money, because only *men* are made to feel so socially, sexually, matrimonially, and parentally inadequate without it.

If women want to put an end to the "wage gap," they need only grant "waiters" the same sexual, matrimonial, and parental value men grant "waitresses." Ambition would equalize accordingly and the "wage gap" would be no more.

Feminism, however, proffers an alternate solution: Pay women *at least* as much as men *no matter what*. If women are generally less motivated to struggle and sacrifice all the way to the top, Glass Escalator them to the top. Up next, we'll examine cultural efforts to slander and disparage men as husbands and as fathers, driving a heterophobic wedge between men and women. Feminism watches as defamed men, deprived of their role, sink into emotional isolation/apathy, and then watches as flattered and supported ("you go, girl!"), educationally and economically advantaged, highly motivated single women/mothers out-earn men. Doubtless, if sufficiently indulged, feminism's strategy will soon put an end to the "wage gap;" but at what cost?

Is the "wage gap" all that stands against Man becoming Woman's *insignificant* other? Is what's happening in the black community a portent of things to come for all races of men? These are questions I will explore at length in book 4, *Love and Respect in the Future*.

The so-called "wage gap" is a *men's* issue because: 1) The myth of it is used to apply societal pressures that result in a *true* reverse wage gap and 2) To the extent that men still feel the *need* to earn enough money to achieve "eligibility" in the eyes of women, the Wage Gap is really nothing more than the *Intrinsic-Value Gap* in disguise.

ⁱ Farrell, Warren, Ph.D., *Why Men Earn More: The Startling Truth Behind the Pay Gap—and What Women Can Do About It* (N.Y.: AMACOM, 2005) pp.xv-xvii

ⁱⁱ Furchtgott-Roth, Diana and Stolba, Christine, *Women's Figures: An Illustrated Guide to the Economic Progress of Women in America* (Washington, D.C.: The AEI Press and Arlington, Virginia: Independent Women's Forum, 1999) p.4.

ⁱⁱⁱ *Ibid.*, pp.11-12.

-
- iv Farrell, Warren, Ph.D., *Why Men Earn More: The Startling Truth Behind the Pay Gap—and What Women Can Do About It* (New York: AMACOM, 2005) p.74.
- v Ibid., p.75.
- vi Ibid., p.79.
- vii Sowell, Thomas, *Economic Facts and Fallacies* (New York: Basic Books A Member of the Perseus Books Group, 2008) p.70.
- viii Furchtgott-Roth, Diana and Stolba, Christine, *Women's Figures: An Illustrated Guide to the Economic Progress of Women in America* (Washington, D.C.: The AEI Press and Arlington, Virginia: Independent Women's Forum, 1999) pp.11-21.
- ix Stossel, John, "Is the Wage Gap Women's Choice? Research Suggests Career Decisions, Not Sex Bias, Are at Root of Pay Disparity," ABC News' *Give Me a Break*, May 27, 2005.
- x http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/President-Obama-Announces-White-House-Council-on-Women-and-Girls/ (retrieved 03/12/09)
- xi Finley, Gordon E., Ph.D., "Gender pay gap myths and 2008," Op-Ed published in the Forum section of *The Washington Times* on Sunday November 18, 2007. <http://www.washingtontimes.com/article/20071118/COMMENTARY/111180005/1012>
- xii Roberts, Sam, "Young women in big cities earn more," *Chicago Tribune*, August 03, 2007, http://www.chicagotribune.com/services/newspaper/premium/printedition/Friday/chi-pay_friaug03,0,3469147.story
- xiii Ibid.
- xiv Gavin, Robert, "Losing jobs in unequal numbers," *Boston Globe*, December 05, 2008. http://www.boston.com/business/articles/2008/12/05/losing_jobs_in_unequal_numbers/?page=full
- xv Ibid.
- xvi Callahan, Maureen, "Men Worried They're Falling Behind in a 'He-cession'—They're Right," http://www.nypost.com/php/pfriendly/print.php?url=http://www.nypost.com/seven/07182009/postopinion/opedcolumnists/men_worry_theyre_falling_behind_in_a_he__179998.htm, July 18, 2009
- xvii Warner, Fara, *The Power of the Purse: How Smart Businesses Are Adapting to the World's Most Important Consumers—Women* (Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2006) p.xx.
- xviii Kanner, Bernice, *Pocketbook Power: How to Reach the Hearts and Minds of Today's Most Coveted Consumers—Women* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2004) p.1.
- xix Ibid., p.5.
- xx Ibid., pp.5-6.
- xxi Farrell, Warren, Ph.D., *Why Men Are the Way They Are: The Male-Female Dynamic* (New York: Berkley Books, 1986) p.57. Source: *Romantic Times*, New York Office estimate, February 12, 1985. This estimate is also the agreed-upon figure of the publishing industry in New York.
- xxii Kammer, Jack, *Good Will Toward Men: Women Talk Candidly About the Balance of Power Between the Sexes* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994) p.35.
- xxiii Cose, Ellis, *Newsweek*, March 3, 2003, pp.48-49
- xxiv Ibid., p.49.
- xxv Baskerville, Stephen, *Taken Into Custody: The War Against Fathers, Marriage, and the Family* (Nashville, TN: Cumberland House Publishing, Inc., 2007) p.11.
- xxvi Ibid., p.11.
- xxvii Popenoe, David, *Life Without Father: Compelling new evidence that fatherhood and marriage are indispensable for the good of children and society* (New York: Martin Kessler Books/The Free Press, 1996) p.26.
- xxviii Warner, Fara, *The Power of the Purse: How Smart Businesses Are Adapting to the World's Most Important Consumers—Women* (Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2006) p. 68 & p. 76.
- xxix Farrell, Warren, Ph.D., *Women Can't Hear What Men Don't Say: Destroying Myths, Creating Love* (New York: Tarcher/Putnam, 1999) pp.269-270.
- xxx Farrell, Warren Ph.D., "Men as Success Objects", *Ume Reader*, May/June 1991, p.81.
- xxxi Moir, Anne and Jessel, David, *Brain Sex: The Real Difference Between Men and Women* (New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1991) p.85.
- xxxii http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/facts_for_features_special_editions/002265.html, July 19, 2004.
- xxxiii "America's Families and Living Arrangements: 2007," <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/hh-fam/cps2007.html>, see table A1, "All Races."
- xxxiv National Center for Health Statistics, part of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, "Out-of-Wedlock Birthrates Are Soaring, U.S. Reports," *The New York Times*, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/13/health/13mothers.html?_r=19&ref=health
- xxxv Buss, David M., *The Evolution of Desire: Strategies of Human Mating* (Revised Edition 4, Basic Books, 2003) p 178.
- xxxvi Ibid.

-
- xxxvii Friday, Nancy, *The Power Of Beauty: A Cultural Memoir of Beauty and Desire* (New York: HarperCollins, 1996) p.432.
- xxxviii Etcoff, Nancy, *Survival of the Prettiest: The Science of Beauty* (New York: First Anchor Books Edition, 2000) p.80.
- xxxix Ibid., p.79.
- xl Ibid., p.79.
- xli Farrell, Warren, Ph.D., *Why Men Are the Way They Are: The Male-Female Dynamic* (New York: Berkley Books, 1986) p.27.
- xlii Buss, David M., *The Evolution of Desire: Strategies of Human Mating* (Revised Edition 4, Basic Books, 2003) p.21.
- xliii Roiphe, Katie, "The Independent Woman (and other lies)," *Esquire*, February 1997.
- xliv Farrell, Warren, Ph.D., *The Myth of Male Power: Why Men Are the Disposable Sex* (New York: Berkley Books, 1993) p.33.
- xlv Kanner, Bernice, *Pocketbook Power: How to Reach the Hearts and Minds of Today's Most Coveted Consumers—Women* (N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 2004), back cover.
- xlvi Farrell, Warren, Ph.D., *The Myth of Male Power: Why Men Are the Disposable Sex* (New York: Berkley Books, 1993) p.34. Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics, "IPEDS Completions Study," 1989, 1990.
- xlvii Ibid., p.34. In the late 1980's, a female engineer's starting salary exceeded her male counterpart's by \$571 per year. See the Engineering Manpower Commission's *Women in Engineering* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Engineering Society, EMC Bulletin no. 99, December 1989, table 5.
- xlviii Pipes, Sally, "There's No Glass Floor," *The Contrarian: News and Comments on Women's Issues, Vol. 9, No. 3, March 07, 2005*.
- xlix Ibid.
- l La Monica, Paul R., CNN/Money senior writer, "Fiorina out, HP stock soars," money.cnn.com, February 10, 2005.
- li Pipes, Sally, "There's No Glass Floor," *The Contrarian: News and Comments on Women's Issues, Vol. 9, No. 3, March 07, 2005*.
- lii Ibid.
- liii Ingraham, Laura, *New York Times*, April 19, 1995, p.A23.
- liv Weissman, Jordan, "Sorry, Marriage Is a 'Luxury Good'", October 30th, 2013, <http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2013/10/sorry-marriage-is-a-luxury-good/281016/>
- lv Buss, David M., *The Evolution of Desire: Strategies of Human Mating* (Revised Edition 4, Basic Books, 2003) p.27.
- lvi James, Thomas B., *Domestic Violence: The 12 Things You Aren't Supposed to Know* (Chula Vista, CA: Aventine Press, 2003) pp.65-66.
- lvii Kammer, Jack, *Good Will Toward Men: Women Talk Candidly About the Balance of Power Between the Sexes* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994) p.145.