

The Richer Sex
Liz Mundy

She nails it, accurately observing this important trend, and attempting to put a happy face on it.

This is a wide-ranging book, anecdotes supported by statistics. Mundy, to her credit, interviewed very broadly, and cites anecdotes from Hispanic, black, middle-class and professional class families. Although the anecdotes she draws from these different demographics show differing degrees of acceptance of the woman as the dominant earner, she does not allow ethnic considerations to affect her overall thesis. She does, however, say that African American women probably presage the condition of all American women in two decades' time.

Mundy opens with an anecdote about Mister Mom. It can work. She then transitions into the telling of the Democratic graphic trends, which is certainly undeniable. In the 1970s only a very small percentage of women outearned their husbands. The figure is now 40% and rising. Mundy credits this to women's grit and the tearing down of discriminatory practices. Whatever the cause, she is certainly correct in her observation.

Mundy is correct to observe that men did not react well when women outperform them. "Men know that women are an overmatch for them, and therefore they choose the weakest and the most ignorant [as mates]" she quotes. But then she goes on to say that the statistics show that men are actually spending more time doing housework as women increase their work time. Then she claims that many men want to marry women who outearn them, in order to devote their time to hobbies leisure and children. She quotes Gary Becker again, saying that "when culture runs up against economic trends, the economic trends usually win out."

Mundy asks, can women do this? Do they want a laid-back guy? Some of the evidence says no. She says men have three options: resist, give up and stop trying; or accept things as they are and try to develop a more perfect union. Mundy calls this door number three. Behind this door, the future she claims is bright. She says it gives women bargaining power to get what they need from their men.

She predicts a world in which men are attracted to high earning, dynamic, successful women, and these women will increasingly accept men in a supporting role. She envisions a flowering of romance, as both sexes are relieved of traditional gender roles. Women will marry younger men. She says "men in Western nations will opt for mail-order brides, or move and settle in less developed countries with a wife who will take care of them - and their money." As a guy who lives in Ukraine with a loving, devoted and thrifty wife, I'll say that this is what many American women fervently want to believe. Many of the attractions are more basic: traditional values, piety and family.

She predicts women will look for men who are good at sex and also good at washing the dishes. Is that what women really want? And by the way, good luck! She also predicts that men in the "marriageable pool" will not be looking to extend their promiscuous days, but will belonging to settle down. She says,

without footnote, that studies indicate that men may have a greater desire than women for family life. However, the pool of Americans who are married will continue to shrink. I agree with this. But I as, what's in it for the guy? OK if he really wants kids, but otherwise, why bother? Traditional wisdom says that nobody works harder for his money than the man who marries for it. Still true.

Chapter 2: The Bargain

"It would be hard to overstate the historic nature of women's economic ascendancy." She quotes Virginia Woolf's assessment of women's situation in England, a rather short history of female emancipation since the Enlightenment. She sets up an artificial battle between Marx and Darwin, Marx stressing women's labor and man's sense of ownership, and Darwin stressing that it was a good deal for the perpetuation of the species unit provided women more protection than men.

However, women increasingly entered the workforce during the Depression and World War II. Men were out of work or off to the Army. She doesn't say it, but the changing nature of work favored this as well. There was more and more brain work to be done, as machines displaced brawn. Mundy riffs on the way women have always traded on their looks in order to marry up. She says that this is a theme of evolutionary psychology. True, and it is not going away anytime soon. She has read the literature. I invite her to also read Sarah Blaffer Hrdy on "Mother Nature." It isn't titled "Daddy Nature" for very good reasons, which I think Mundy would as soon overlook.

Chapter 3 - The Overtaking

We have arrived: women make up about half the US labor force, and 80% of college-educated women are in the labor force. The decrease in US competitiveness has forced families to depend on two wage earners. However, the number of working age men who are actually in the workforce has fallen because many no longer aspire to work at all.

Women have rapidly replaced men as the dominant presence on campus. She quotes Gary Becker - often - to the effect that women's temperaments are better suited to school than those of men. They are better organized. I added that schools are a female dominated institution, one which does not make accommodations for boys' differences in learning styles.

Mundy says, correctly, that "boys have not lost the industrial European breadwinning mindset; they want, many of them, to get out into the workforce as soon as they can." Trouble is, the world is not ready to accept them, especially without a college degree.

Mundy is brave to say that the wage gap between men and women is not entirely attributable to discrimination. It has shrunk, and its causes are not known. Discrimination notwithstanding, there are more and more localities and sectors among whom women already earn more than men. She observes that men have simply stopped entering certain sectors such as veterinary medicine because there are so many women. That is counterintuitive; these are high-paying fields. It probably has more to do with

general problems of young men getting oriented in life, which she goes into later in a section called "The Opt-Out Revolution - Among Men"

Just 66% of men 25 to 64 are working, down from 80% in 1970. More and more depend on their wives. This is the reverse Cinderella effect. Mundy claims that men have a greater incentive not to get married. That seems like a stretch. Men are not strictly economic animals. If they got married only for the sake of income, they wouldn't be happy, and it is hard to believe that their wives would be happy either.

Chapter 4 - New Rules Of Mating

What do women want? Increasingly, they realize that they don't need, and perhaps don't want a man. They no longer have the expectation of marrying up, because there's not much "up" out there.

Mundy muses that we may be returning to a Pleistocene (hunter gatherer) scenario in which women bring in more calories through their gathering and small-scale farming than men through their hunting. Agriculture brought a change that made women subservient, she claims, and education is now making them equal again. I will add, having spent some time among aboriginal and subsistence farming peoples, that traditional societies simply have very different roles for the sexes. And in both, the chest-pounding and communal decision making processes at least overtly belong to men, though everybody concedes that women exercise a lot of power behind the scenes. The differences are not as big as she would make you believe.

What is the future hold? One option is the African-American model, in which women don't marry at all. Another option is the gay model, who not having to work out gender issues, seem pretty good at sorting out who does what on the basis of interest and ability. The third option is for women to marry down, because they don't have much alternative. However, the number of people married in their 20s has fallen from 68% 50 years ago to 26% now.

Mundy is realistic: " When women enter the realm of earnings and prevail, there are bound to be reverberations. How will couples manage the potential for secret competition and overt one-upmanship? Will men give up? Retaliate? Will breadwomen carp and hector? Or will women mourn the freedom and flexibility they once enjoyed? I would say: yes, yes, yes, and yes." Mundy would like to continue to a conclusion that men will rise to the occasion and improve themselves. I don't see much evidence pointing this direction. The best evidence is among university educated. Psychometricians define IQ as the ability to figure things out and adapt. The smartest strata of society will cope best with women's dominance, but even here there will be significant problems.

Chapter 5 - Competition And Undermining.

Mundy starts with an anecdote about a Hispanic American couple driven apart by her superior earning ability. He started flirting with the younger woman and moved on. He just didn't want to be in second

place in the marriage. The statistics support this finding. A lot of men are fearful of being in a relationship in which the woman earns more money.

More powerful women are more inclined to cheat. It is no surprise here; not being dependent on her husband, she has less to lose. Economically dependent men also cheat. It doesn't make financial sense, but there it is. Of course! The guy feels superfluous. It may not be financially rational, but emotionally it is extremely rational. Money is pernicious because it is such a ready yardstick. Both members of a couple know the numbers, and it can grate on the man if he is earning less.

Mundy introduces the topic of undermining, one member of a couple working covertly to weaken the other one. She talks about men and women undermining one another in economic terms. In my experience, it happens in other ways as a retaliation. A wife may attempt to wrest power from her husband by undermining his relationship with the children. She may likewise make it difficult for him to travel or to accept responsible roles in the community. Of course, it could be him undermining her just as well.

We return to the theme. "Some men will just give up." "Of course, there is another way to escape the blow to the ego of self comparison: give up altogether... Ceding the field. It's over, babe: You win." Mundy may call it a big mistake, but it is absolutely what happens. A financial mistake it may be, but life is not all about money.

There is a flip side to this. Women's expectations of men are so low that they cannot accept a competent husband. They expect their husband to be easily pushed around. If they get a husband who has a pair, he will want his own way occasionally. Some women who have power in their professional life cannot deal with that.

Chapter 6 Let Go And Lexapro.

Congratulations, Mundy! You understand that women have as much problem with men letting go as the men themselves. It is going to be a wrenching change. Women envy husbands who don't have to work as hard as they do. There is a turnaround in workaholicism. Women increasingly use work as an excuse to avoid intimacy.

Part of letting go is allowing men to excel in the kitchen and at housework. A woman has to learn to be appreciative, and to say she is appreciative. More than that, she has to bite her lip if he does it his way instead of hers. Women have taken over men's space; they still find it difficult at times to cede their own space, and leave men someplace to go.

Women now have the same proprietary feeling about the money they earn as men used to. They may become resentful of what men spend. In my experience bicycles are often at the center of it. Husbands of successful women channel their time and money into becoming bicycle experts, and they want the

best equipment. Women wonder why, the same question men often ask about granite countertops in the homes of women who don't know beans about cooking.

The hardest role to give up is probably that of mother, and it is correspondingly difficult to watch her husband succeeding in the role she ceded in order to become a success in the workplace. Succeeding in the PTA, the kids' play groups, dealing knowingly with pediatrician: these are roles that women usually envision for themselves. Suppressing the instinct to dictate her opinion can be a difficult thing for the breadwinner.

Chapter 7 Stigma and Female Earning

Even though a role reversal may work within a marriage, family and society take a different view, expecting more traditional gender roles. In-laws can be a problem.

I will add from my own observation that it is more acceptable for a woman not to know about politics, business, and the world around her than it is for a man. The workplace gives a man something to talk about with other men. Being a "Mister mom" closes a man with a professional background off from the society of other men. To avoid that, he had better be pretty good as a stock market investor, real estate investor, academics or in some other pursuit that attracts successful men.

Mundy observes that churches have a good reason to preach traditional gender roles. If they don't, they will die out. People will abandon the religion, and more important, people who abandon traditional gender roles simply not reproduce themselves. The dynamic about which Mundy is reporting, women's increasing power in the workplace, has certainly affected churches as well. Even evangelicals find that there are fewer and fewer men who have the wherewithal to be the traditional breadwinner, the head of household. I note that Mormons are particularly good at this, and that Mormons are increasing in numbers and power. Maybe they know something.

Chapter 8. Sex and the Self Sufficient Girl

Mundy offers the thesis that women love sex just as much as men do. This is absolutely true, with a number of very important preconditions. The guy has to be right, the mood has to be right, the relationship has to be promising, the time of the month has to be good, she can't be frazzled from her demanding job, at the wrong phase of the pregnancy or dealing with a newborn... For guys none of this matters. We are generally ready.

Aside from the physical pleasure, sex is a social statement. For a man to complete the sex act one way or another is an indication of his success as a man. For women, success is attracting the man. They may both come to the culmination seeking physical pleasure, but they get there by different paths.

Mundy advances the Cosmo magazine argument that women desire sex more than men do. This may be somewhat true of single women in their fertile years, and partially true because of what feminism has

done to men. No longer the dominant sex, young men are unsure of themselves around women, increasingly hors de combat because they conveniently discover they are homosexual, or they find pornography or paid sex to be a whole lot less hassle. I will concede that there may be a population of women who want sex more than men, but it is an anomaly. To a Darwinist, it is an evolutionary dead-end. If we have to depend on the female libido for the survival of the species, we are doomed.

She reports that house husbands often don't feel like sex. Quite understandable: sex is a way of asserting one's masculinity, and the guy who doesn't feel very masculine won't feel like asserting it. The guy likes the challenge of the seduction. If she is the one who dominates every aspect of the relationship, and she is the one who says that tonight is the night, he just might not feel like it. If he can't do it like a real man, he'd probably rather not do it at all.

Communication is a crucial aspect of sexual intimacy, and open communication works best when men and women have more or less equivalent power within a marriage. A woman who is dominant in earnings has to learn how to prevent that fact from being threatening to her mate.

Chapter 9: Desirable Women

Mundy's thesis is that men will marry up, looking for successful women. Two generations of feminism have given us enough time to test this theory. I would say it hasn't happened. Thilo Sarrazin writes in "Deutschland Schafft Sich Ab" that each successive generation in Germany is one third smaller than the previous, and that university educated women are the least likely of all to be married and have children. The change in men's mindsets that Mundy would like to posit hasn't taken place in that timeframe. It is not taking place in the United States either. Large numbers of university educated women are not getting married, and these are the women who are least likely to want to raise children without the benefit of a husband. Our offspring are fewer and dumber.

She cites historical episodes and women have married down, such as after World War I, during which many of the most desirable men had been killed. She says it is likely to happen again. More than that, women will for man into the partners they want, supporting them as they go to college. This flies in the face of experience. Women have never had a great deal of success changing the man they happen to have married into the partner that they really want. It has happened, and it will happen, but it is hardly something to bet on.

Chapter 10 - The New World of Non-Marriage Choices

If the men are not marriageable, what are the alternatives? Live with them but don't marry them? Live with another woman in a nonsexual relationship? Here Mundy undermines her own thesis, veering dangerously close to the truth. She quotes "They are very highly prized women in their professions, really good lawyers, really good community leaders, and I've never known any of them to be married," remarked JoAnne.' That was certainly the case with my ex-wife's circle of friends in Bethesda, Maryland. Highly intelligent, capable professional women who had each other's company. They would infrequently

date, and never appeared to the vest much hope in romance. They managed complete lives without men, owning their own homes, keeping their own company, and succeeding in their jobs without men. Divorced or married women with children were an oddity on the periphery of their group.

I like to say that if progress depended on us men, we would all still live in caves. Women have historically been the driving force for finding better accommodations, looking to their husbands to provide them with a cozy nest. What is changing is that now the women are providing their own cozy nests, with single women buying twice as many homes as single men. Mundy warns us again that owning a home can drive men away. Of course. It is part of the male gestalt that we want to provide for a woman. If she can provide her own shelter, she doesn't need us.

Mundy hypothesizes that women will travel the world looking for suitable husbands. This would be a turnaround; American men have been marrying foreign women for generations, finding the domestic offerings offputting for exactly the reasons that Mundy gives. I do not hold out much hope for this hypothesis. Latin American men are born to expect a dominant position in a marriage, and it is hard to envision large numbers of them becoming docile househusbands for women with higher earnings. There are a handful of Western women here in Ukraine; I have yet to see a Ukrainian man who preferred them over their countrywomen. Conversely, a lot of Ukrainian women take quickly to American husbands. Feminism has knocked the rough edges off of us, and taught us how to treat a woman well. We delight in finding foreign women who appreciate the skills American women demanded that we cultivate, but didn't somehow learn to appreciate for themselves.

Chapter Eleven - The View from Abroad

Mundy reports on the marriage situation throughout the rest of the world, that the demographic trends seen in the United States are even more advanced in other countries such as Japan and Western Europe. Whereas she has not commented on the implications her observations have for childbearing in the United States, she remarks that fertility has fallen way below the replacement rate in Asia and Western Europe. Part of the problem, she reports, is exactly what she observes in the United States. She says that men want younger, subservient wives. About Japan, she observes that "For generations, the country adhered to a custom called omiai, in which men and women were introduced informally by a friend or relative or community matchmaker, liberating men from the need to develop real, actual dating skills." In other words, "the flip" has more thoroughly confused things in other societies than even our own.

Japanese and Korean men are increasingly importing Vietnamese, Thai and Filipina wives, whom they regard as simply better marriage material. Not just subservient, but appreciative and family-oriented. Also, sex selection among babies has meant that there are not as many girl babies grown to be potential brides. I live in Ukraine; there is a large business of introducing Ukrainian women to hopeful foreigners from Western Europe, Australia, the US and Canada. I talk to a lot of these guys as they come through Kiev. Most of them are pretty presentable sorts, with decent jobs, who despair of finding a mate in their home countries. They claim that their countrywomen simply do not need men. Mundy's quotes by expatriate American men on the attractions of foreign women are accurate, if not complete. It is more

than just money and supposed subservience. Woe betide the man who assumes that traditional women are subservient! He will experience many a rude surprise.

What makes Mundy's book so modern, and so depressing, is that she generally avoids the topic of children. Every society in history has seen children as the purpose of family. Mundy seems to look at financial well-being as the objective of marriage. I am sad to say I believe she is right as far as the developed societies of North America, Asia, and Western Europe are concerned. It is the logical extension of feminism - women are getting what they have always wanted, the opportunity to be independent, financially and intellectually. It is the triumph of individualism. In the bargain they have largely given up their traditional role of having children. A vast attraction of foreign women is that they still believe in family.

Chapter 12 - Our Female Future

Mundy says there is no turning back - we have to expect a world of female breadwinners. In that world there will be happy couples and fulfilled men.

Mundy says that this will take a change in men's image of themselves, one which has already taken place in the Scandinavian countries. Men will have to become more domesticated. Perhaps she is right. The Scandinavian countries are not replacing themselves, but with an average replacement rate of 1.7 (out of the 2.1 required to maintain a population) they are doing a better job than most of the rest of Europe. Maybe we will emulate them, but maybe not. The European Union once fondly hoped that other countries would learn from the Scandinavians and Germany how to manage their budgets. As the euro crisis shows, that has not been the case.

Mundy closes with a number of points of advice for women breadwinners, things to do to avoid driving their men away. All of them common sense, but nonetheless, very wise of her to have put them in print.

And finally, finally she talks about women breadwinners' babies. Children appear to be a total afterthought in the book, answering the question of what families are about in the first place. What she says is pabulum, the observation that men and women will have to raise their children to fit the brave new world she envisions. I am afraid she is right. That is what they need to do. I don't have great confidence that we will be able to do it.

The Richer Sex musings

The Richer Sex

A revolution is under way.

Within a generation, more households will be supported by women than by men. In *The Richer Sex*, Liza Mundy takes us to the exciting frontier of this new economic order: she shows us why this flip is inevitable, what painful adjustments will have to be made along the way, and how both men and women will feel surprisingly liberated in the end.

The bestselling author and Washington Post writer goes deep inside the lives of the couples on this cutting edge to paint a picture of how dating, marriage, and home life are changing. How does this new generation of breadwinners navigate paying for a night on the town? In whose interest is it to delay commitment? Are men for the first time thinking of marriage the way women used to—as a bet on the economic potential of a spouse? In this new world of men marrying up, are women learning to value new realms of male endeavor—like parenting, protection, and a margarita at the ready?

The future is here, with couples today debating who must assume the responsibility of primary earner and who gets the freedom of being the slow track partner. With more men choosing to stay home, Mundy shows how that lifestyle has achieved a higher status and all the ways males have found to recover their masculinity. And the revolution is global: Mundy takes us from Japan to Denmark to show how both sexes are adapting as the marriage market has turned into a giant free-for-all, with men and women at different stages of this transformation finding partners in other countries who match their expectations.

The Richer Sex is a wild ride into the future, grounded in Mundy's peerless journalism, and bound to cause women and men of all generations to rethink what this social upheaval will mean.

xxxxx this is it

Bestselling journalist Liza Mundy's smart, deeply reported analysis of the most important cultural shift since the rise of feminism: the coming era in which women will earn more than men, and how this will change work, love, and sex. A revolution is under way. Within a generation, more households will be supported by women than by men. In *The Richer Sex*, Liza Mundy shows how this reality will transform the sexual, dating, marriage, and work habits of men and women worldwide.

This flip in the economic order is inevitable, and Mundy demonstrates why it will also be a good thing for individuals and families. Both sexes will be free for the first time to make purely romantic choices—ones that have nothing to do with marriage as an economic partnership.

The Richer Sex demonstrates that a growing number of men will be attracted to women because of their success, and women are finding value in new realms of male endeavor, like supportiveness, parenting, protection, and help around the house. Women will behave more like men sexually, and men will yearn more for intimate connections with their partners. Couples will choose who in the partnership must assume the responsibility of primary earner, and who gets to have the freedom of being the slow-track partner. Kids of stay-at-home dads and female breadwinners will love the role reversal, and the global marriage market will become one enormous and wild merry-go-round as men and women try to match expectations.

The first in-depth examination of this cataclysmic social revolution, *The Richer Sex* is one of those rare nonfiction books that will cause men and women to rethink how they are living their lives and what the changes around them mean.

Mundy is on to something. Her observation of the social trend is quite keen. Her interpretation of what it means, and her optimism about how it will end up seem to be misplaced.

Women have successfully displaced men in workplaces throughout the Western world. This is natural as work has changed. We have become a society of mind workers, paper pushers. Women can do that as well as men. We have also become a society of managers. Management involves a number of people skills, both to manage them and to work one's way up the career ladder. Women do pretty well at this. They function in bureaucracies.

An interesting thing happens as women displaced men in previously all-male occupations such as teaching, policing and the military. Women change the workplace to suit themselves, and men, not wishing to appear on chivalrous, and bowing to the political winds, usually acquiesce. Physical strength is no longer considered an important criteria for soldiers, policeman or fireman. For teachers, compassion for the students has risen in importance and subject mastery has declined.

Surveying the business landscape, there are not very many women entrepreneurs on a par with say, Mark Zuckerberg, Jeff Bezos, Larry Ellison, Phil Knight, Warren Buffett or Bill Gates. Those who get their shot at top jobs usually ascend a career ladder, like Carly Fiorino and Meg Whitman. Mary Kay Ash and Mrs. Fields are still the exception.

There are gender differences between men and women. It is not often mentioned since Larry Summers got fired as president of Harvard for telling the truth. Wikipedia characterizes it as "Summers then began by identifying three hypotheses for the higher proportion of men in high-end science faculty positions:

- The high-powered job hypothesis
- Different availability of aptitude at the high end
- Different socialization and patterns of discrimination in a search

The second hypothesis, different availability of aptitude at the high end, caused the most controversy."

Summers may be politically maladroit, but he was scientifically correct. Psychometricians pretty much agree that men are overrepresented at both ends of the bell curve. While the woman of Harvard may have won the match in the political arena, men still dominate in the area of real-world performance as measured by things like Nobel prizes and billion-dollar startups.

Granted that what happens at the high end of the intelligence spectrum doesn't affect very many people. It is important because these people at the high-end create the companies that create the growth is going to keep us ahead of the world. If we stay there. However, these large organizations, whoever they're headed by, all involve vast bureaucracies and the positions in the bureaucracy can be well filled by women as well as men. This is Mundy's point. There can, and will be a lot of women in the bureaucracy however we slice it.

The question is really one of what happens to men. Men are increasingly feeling excluded. Women enter new areas which have been traditional male domains, establish their beachhead, and then finally take over. The men have been left to go someplace else. The problem is that we are running out of places for men to go. There is simply that not that much demand for the things that only men can provide such as physical strength. If by fiat we deny them any advantage in intelligence or singlemindedness, there is no special place for them in the workplace. Which brings into focus that area which always has been special for women, bearing and raising children. Needing a place to park superfluous men, Mundy has no option but to shove them into the nursery. Do they belong?

Mundy hypothesizes that men will simply change their nature and become nurturing, just like women. In other words, women having taken men's positions, men will turn around and be content to occupy the position in society formerly held by women. There is only slim precedent for this. There are examples of gay men functioning more or less successfully – all the media certainly tell us they're successful, whatever the truth may be – as parents. There are the couples that Mundy cites, in which the woman is the breadwinner and the man is the nurturing, stay-at-home spouse. Without doubt these have been the exceptions. Of course to any rule there will always be exceptions. I think we should applaud the instances in which this works, saying "good for you."

The question is whether or not this can be generalized to support a society. A society needs not one or two kids who have been successfully raised by gay parents, or households in which the woman is the major breadwinner, to reproduce itself.

Reproducing itself is a tremendous challenge, one which no Western society is meeting today. Success means producing 2.1 children for every adult woman, the so-called replacement rate. Not only must we give birth to these children, but they have to be fairly faithful replicas of ourselves. They should have the same intelligence, the same education, the same socialization as their parents. We have failed in this for several generations. Thilo Sarrazin makes this point about Germany in his 2009 book "Deutschland Schafft Sich Ab: Germany Undoes Itself". He says that German women have an average of one third fewer generation children each generation. That is, 1.4 kids per woman. It means that the number of grandchildren is one half the number of grandparents. If you draw this out, it's only a few hundred years until the last German on earth says auf Wiedersehen as he dies in an old folks home. Doesn't say who will be staffing that old folks home.

According to Sarah Blaffer Hrdy in "Mother Nature," women and babies of the human species have coevolved in a remarkable way over the past few million years. Human infants are incredibly helpless creatures. Ask any mother, and she will tell you that women are much more highly attuned to a baby's cries than her husband. Conversely, babies respond to their mother's high-pitched tones in a way that is quite different than they respond to fathers. In an ideal world, a baby has one of each... a mother to do the mothering, and the father to support mom in every way possible. The word "support" is key. I invite any reader to observe what happens when dad offers an opinion about what ought to be done with a young baby. Should you pick him up or let him cry? Is he dressed warmly enough? Do his clothes need to be ironed? These are Mom's decisions, and Dad will soon learn to shut up if he is too strident in his opinions.

Little boys are born with different hormones than the little girls. This isn't theory -- two generations of feminists have broken their pick attempting to get little boys to play with dolls, give up playing with guns, and stopped yelling like wild Indians and chasing each other around. There are little boys who enjoy playing with dolls, but they usually grow up not to be real men, the kind who would father a family.

One of the problems that Ms. Mundy is going to face is transition. Even if it were possible to socialize little boys to be good mothers, not too many mothers today are raising their sons to be mothers. The money raised him to be men, whether that's very bad. So for a long time, a period of transition, society will have traditional men, and men who are mothers. It's kind of an awkward awkward coexistence.

A lot of our conventions are built around the supposition that women are mothers. It's the foundation of the courtesies. Men open doors for women, especially women with children. Men carry things for women. I just cannot see that happening for men with children. I don't think that men or women will give them a break.

Back in the days when men maintained harems, they used to have men to guard the seraglio. Those old sultans weren't stupid -- they emasculated the men in charge. What's going to happen during the transition. With men and women together and play groups, playgrounds, and other such social settings? I would imagine it will be more or less what happened in the Army where the next men and women in combat groups. Group include a program thinks as they say. Whereas men don't worry about their wives getting together in the classes and playgroups, I should suggest to the woman really ought to be somewhat concerned that her husband is out with the little one around a group of other women all talking babies. It is any sort of the man at all, it might be attracted to those women.

That's another difference. Biologically, men are programmed to sow their seed rather widely. The biological assumption is that men don't invest as heavily in children as women do. That the evolutionary strategy for the survival of their genes has been said so they sow widely and let the women worry about the consequences of raising the children. That's not an easy thing to reverse. So when the woman is off in the workplace bringing home the bacon, the guide may well be out there showing his seed to make sure that the next generation is as well people visit can be with his progeny.

Let's look at another question -- that of male ego. Women have never suggested that men are without ego. They are right -- men do things for reasons of ego. Parenting is not a particularly competitive sport. It doesn't give much left for those testosterone-driven competitive urges. What's a guy get into to be a real man?

A lot of things happened to men who can't really be men. The failure to launch syndrome is widely recognized by men and women in America. Young men are not challenged to do much in this life. After they graduate from college, if they did not go into the business of raising a family, taking responsibility for a family, they often sent to do nothing. This is documented for the lower class in "coming apart", Charles Murray's most recent book. In other words, the man needs a burden of responsibility in order to make himself a real man. It's a very good question whether being a mother is the kind of responsibility that it takes.

Let's say a word about bicycles. Guys are usually fanatics about something or another. Guys who are under employed -- 50-year-old whose skills are no longer in demand, for example -- often develop a singular, obsessive focus on bicycles or cameras or scuba diving or some other than some other distraction. They needed channel for their competitive drive it and also something interesting. I would propose that this is what's going to happen to Mr. moms, especially as the kids go to school. He may have his moment when these changing diapers, but what happens next? I'm afraid that the world does not look terribly favorably upon men who take three or four years off in order to start a family. It is probably going to be quite a bit more difficult for them to reenter the workplace even than for women. Once again it's a matter of transition -- it will take several decades, generations perhaps, before Mrs. Mundy's paradise comes into being. Remember the golden rule -- he who has the gold, rules. Menus to have kind of a saying a real man takes no ship from a woman. Of course we all know better. Any intelligent man who's been married for a while knows if he should listen carefully to his wife, taking her suggestions quite seriously. So women that have been used to getting their way, ruling from a position of weakness. I don't think it's going to be terribly healthy when they are ruling from a position of strength and I don't think that the that the habits of many millennia are going to go away. Women are already the most verbal and more verbal sex, and the more socially aware. To give them the power of money and position within a marriage, there's not a whole that lot left for the guy. He can just squeak like a mouse. My guess is, once again, that there will not be long lines of men looking forward to squeak up in this fashion.

Rather than enlist for service in Mrs. Mundy's corps of the Mr. Mom, there are far more likely to do what they're already doing, and sit back and watch TV, figure out a way to make an income by scamming the system through disability or stacking crates at the local market, and simply give up on the whole matter of family. It doesn't sound like the idea of being a Mr. Mom is it going to be a terribly attractive proposition for most guys. Why not? Because there's nothing masculine whatsoever in the job.

How do you rate a well-written book with which you disagree? You can give it five stars for the writing and the composition of the ideas. However, I know full well that most of this Mundy's readers are going

to see this for what it is, an older white males diverging point of view, and pan my review. Therefore a good start out by giving the book a one star rating, which will least establish that you are that I am an appropriate object of hatred. But I don't really want to be an object of hatred. This should be a topic of discussion. It is one of the most important issues facing not only America but Western society over the coming couple of generations. If women and men regard each other as enemies, we are not the result any problems. If women continued on the march toward domination, the past year or a well along on, men will be reduced to nothing, but society will die out. Men, on the other hand, have to accept the radical changes that have taken place and come up with a constructive alternative. We haven't done that.

What gives meaning to life. Betty Friedan asked that question in "the feminine mystique" two generations ago. The American housewife, pampered with all sorts of labor saving appliances and a husband, found her life to be vaguely unsatisfying. Friedan said that women wanted more than just the humdrum routine of raising a family. Why would anybody suppose that men would trade but they have always had for the humdrum that many Friedan rejected? It really doesn't make sense.

Robert Fogel and Charles Murray talk about the things that make life meaningful. For Murray in "Coming Apart" they are family, church, vocation, and community. If a man had those four things in his life, you can be fairly sure that he was happy. Murray provides statistics to prove it. Okay, now let's look at Mr. mom. Which of these will he have? Vocation? Being a mother is hardly a vocation satisfactory for a woman these days. Hard to believe that most men will be satisfied with. Church? Gave it up a long time ago. It is not that the richer sex families are not going to go to church, it's just that they are unlikely to do so. Community? Once again, our Mr. mom is going to find probably a hard time fitting in to most community activities. He may be a cub scout leader, if the Cub Scouts still exist, or he may play some role in the PTA. But it is doubtful that he will be asked to serve on any school boards. He is truly a fish out of water.

Then there are those animal functions such as gestation, delivery, and lactation. Just about everybody agrees that a baby is healthier with mother's milk. It provides not only nutrition, the bonding between the baby in the mother. You can see it in the baby's eyes. He's happy when mom is there. Of course, he is happy also when dad is there. Babies like to soak up as much attention as they can. But when they cry for hunger, or when they hurt, it's much more natural to be satisfied by mommy than daddy. Some may argue that this is merely cultural conditioning, -- I invite those people to try it themselves and see. Children are pretty flexible, they may get used to dad being the one who does it, but it is a bit of an unnatural accommodation and is probably not as natural as when his mom. I doubt that anybody will have the temerity to face down the feminists and do a study on the subject, so it will remain in the realm of conjecture.

It is also true that women's hormones and their entire bodies change fairly dramatically through the process of pregnancy and lactation. They have morning sickness, bloating, anemia, dental problems and all sorts of other difficulties as their body's resources are reprogrammed to the baby. After the baby is born it takes a while for the body to go back to more or less where it was. You never get your girlish

figure quite back. You experience hair loss and more imbalances in your appetite. If you are nursing, the baby dictates your schedule. A woman's libido is typically fairly depressed through the whole process. Why shouldn't it be? Biologically, sex is done when it needs to do, and it is time to give time and effort to the baby.

Quite a few career women are tempted to short-circuit the entire process by adopting. This merits another entire essay, but the short story is that it is quite hard to locate adoptive kids with the genetic potential that your own would have. Middle-class American girls don't get pregnant by mistake anymore. No more Steve Jobs'. The countries such as China, Korea, Russia and Ukraine which used to provide them are getting richer and more finicky. Beyond all that, understanding any kid is a problem, but since they do inherit personality from their biological parents, it is easier for biological parents to understand them. Lastly, statistical studies show that biological fathers are significantly more likely to invest in their children. Put another way, they are statistically much less likely to beat and abused them.

There is a question of libido imbalance. It is no secret that guys are hornier than girls. It is also no secret that a grueling day at the office can take the edge off of anybody's libido. When the woman is in charge of the household, the chief breadwinner, the odds are she's going to get her say. If she's too tired for a little romance, there will be no romance. On the other hand, if her hubby has been home all day with the kid or kids, there's a fair chance that he will be looking forward to a little bit of adult company and a little bit of affirmation in the bedroom.

We can make two suppositions about the stay-at-home hubby. One is that he likes it, and has no further ambition. That would put him in the category of women who are "just a homemaker." They complain they don't get much respect, and they are right. Being a homemaker is not a full-time job in today's society, at least after the kids go to school.

The second supposition is that he is a go getter and wants to make something of himself. What will he do with his time? Probably the same thing that women have done. He will do some combination of (a) go back to college and extend his education or (b) work from home at a new business, or (c) pursue some sort of business with flexible hours, such as real estate sales. This means that he has escaped the 9 to 5 trap that his wife is in. Whereas the pace of her career progress will generally be somewhat constrained by the lethargy of the bureaucracy she is in, he may be able to use his extraordinary freedom to find something which is enjoyable and may be more remunerative.

It may well be that hubby will be extremely appreciative of his wife for giving him the freedom to do what he wants. Gratitude, however, is rare in the human animal. It is equally possible that he will survey his situation and decide he has other alternatives. Another of the laws of human development that has not been repealed is that both men and women are most attractive to each other during their fertile years, but that said fertile years end 20 or 30 years earlier for a woman than a man. Hubby, attaining the age of 40, kids safely in school and no longer really needing his time, having starting out on a productive career thanks to the freedom his wife has afforded him, will no doubt find himself constantly in the company of younger and attractive women. Meanwhile his wife, the successful manager, is carrying

over her management personality into the home. Can you imagine that he might ask himself, “do I need this?” The last sentence of this paragraph writes itself.

Amazon allows a reviewer to assign a single rating to a book, one to five stars. Puts me in a quandary. This book is a five-star exposition of a social issue, with five-star writing, with which I disagree. If I gave it the five star rating which it deserves, and then took issue with all of the author's points, women reading the review would savage it. Therefore I save you the effort by giving it a one star review. But that's not the point – the issue ought to be the discussion which it provokes. At this point in time, women, having succeeded in everything they put their hand to, should not be hypersensitive to criticism. I invite you to rise to the plane of impartial discussion rather than invective. Can you join me there? Post a comment.