



Episode 1,257: The Wreckage of Feminism

Guest: Janice Fiamengo

WOODS: I want to talk about your book, which we will get to in just a minute, but there's just no avoiding it, given the Brett Kavanaugh matter that's been in the news and they recently had the vote and all that. As we're recording this, it's a few days before they actually are having the vote on whether to confirm him or not. And I'm going to assume they're going to confirm him, but just to be honest with the audience, we don't actually know that. We'd be bluffing a little bit at this point.

But still, there's plenty to talk about in that situation. I did an episode a few days ago with our friend Dave Smith, and so now I'd like to ask Janice about this. You're in Canada. This does not affect you quite the way it affects Americans, but everybody follows the news coming out of the Empire. There's no avoiding it. So I'm curious about your thoughts here. I mean, there are people who say he seems to be, at the very least, fudging some embarrassing information from his college years. On the other hand, we now have friends of his confirming that in their day, they did have a drinking game called Devil's Triangle, and they did use other terms in the way that he claimed that they did. Now, who knows what the truth of all that is? But what in this huge array of facts and details do you consider significant? What do you walk away with this whole episode with?

FIAMENGO: Well, I haven't followed all of the details really closely, but from our perspective here in Canada, it seems that it's a very scary time when an unsubstantiated allegation, largely unsubstantiated, can potentially derail a nomination for the Supreme Court. The man was investigated how many times by the FBI? Six times? And now a seventh. And certainly the allegations of Blasey Ford don't seem to hold up under investigation. And yeah, to me, it highlights the problem that we're facing in the Me Too era, but it's certainly been ongoing for many, many more years than this. And the parallels, of course, to the Anita Hill and Clarence Thomas confirmation hearings are quite striking. So this is something that's been going on for decades, as far as I'm concerned: a tendency for women to come forward and to accuse powerful men, especially powerful conservative men, and to potentially be able to, if not derail something like a confirmation, at least to be able to put a stain on that man's life and career that really can never be erased. And I find that very disturbing. As you know, that's one of my big preoccupations at this time.

WOODS: What about this movement to quote "believe women"?

FIAMENGO: Mm hmm.

WOODS: They would say: what possible motivation would somebody have to come forward to make a deeply personal testimony like this? We generally have to believe that. Yeah, sure, there'll be outliers here and there, but we should believe them, especially since in a lot of these cases, there won't be the kind of physical evidence that you might want. And so what else can we do other than believe women, who, in our society, have been in a subordinate position, have been intimidated by men and exploited and taken advantage of by men? That's the perspective. What do you say to that?

FIAMENGO: Well, to that I say, first of all, I don't accept that the whole history of the human race has been the history of men exploiting women. If you really seriously look at the history of male-female relationships, at least in Western culture, there's a very long history of chivalric concern and protection of women by men. And there's been especially a concern — my specialty area is the 19th century, the late 19th century. And if you look at laws around rape and sexual harassment, there has always been a deep desire on the part of men to protect women from sexual assault.

And so the idea that women have never been believed, that they've been abused and assaulted and voices have never counted for anything is simply not true. We can go back as far as Potiphar's wife in the Book of Genesis, where a powerful woman accuses a man and is listened to. Now, I know a feminist would say, well, that's just a male story of a woman who shouldn't be believed. But obviously in that case, she was believed, and the fact that that is a story shows that men have always cared about what women say.

But even if it were true, that up until 10 years ago or 50 years ago or whatever one wants to say, that women were never listened to, that would not be a reason now to believe without evidence. That's simply a recipe for terrible injustice. And I believe that terrible injustice is going on all the time. Right now, it simply isn't true that there's no incentive for women to come forward. I don't believe that there is such a stigma around sharing a story of sexual assault. I don't believe that anybody would want to shame or certainly not anybody in a culturally influential position would shame a woman for telling a story about sexual assault.

If we look at what happened to Anita Hill in 1991, after she shared her story of sexual harassment — which even at the time I thought was extraordinarily trivial, the things that Clarence Thomas supposedly said about who put pubic hair on my Coke, etc. Her career was not harmed. Her reputation was not harmed. Quite the opposite. In fact, I would say that nothing she did in her entire career was as beneficial to her public profile as her statements before the Senate. She published books based on what she'd done. She was granted honorary awards. She's still the voice defending women, you know, consulted on committees and task forces about how to make workplaces safe places for women, etc. So I don't believe that there are all of these disincentives for women, disincentives against women coming forward.

In fact, I would say the opposite. I think there are now a lot of incentives for women. I believe that Christine Blasey Ford will be remembered now forever as a heroic figure who tried to prevent the Trumpian takeover of the Supreme Court. Certainly in the world that she operates in, there could be nothing more heroic than that. She's already had a proclamation by the city council in Palo Alto, I think, or Santa Clara County. I can't remember which it is. But, you know, honoring her for her courage and saying that, by her example, she has encouraged other survivors to come forward about their sexual assault experiences. And in all sorts of ways, she is being celebrated now, and will continue to be, and I wouldn't be surprised if she didn't write a book at some point about her experiences and all of these sorts

of things. So I don't accept that, that it's such a terrible trauma for a woman to speak about her experience.

And as for believing women, women lie about things just as men do. It's a ridiculous position on its face to take. And I know that feminist advocates will come forward and say that only 2 to 8% or something like that of allegations are proven false. But that's a very, very dubious statistic. What that means is that only 2 to 8% of allegations brought to the police are *proven* to be false. There's a massive number of those allegations that simply do not have enough evidence to go forward. We don't know what percentage of those allegations are actually fall. And I think it's a terrifying and very dangerous precedent to say that we should believe women.

WOODS: Well, certainly not to believe them uncritically, any more than you'd believe any other arbitrary group. You look at the plausibility; you look at the evidence; you draw some kind of conclusion. At the same time, I'm somebody who could not be less in sympathy with what these folks are saying, and yet, there's still a part of me — and I wonder if this is a way of looking at the world that I have now that I have five daughters. I do think there are a lot of men, a lot of men who, frankly, are pigs, who I think do disgusting things to women, and I think they do treat them as second-class citizens and as not their equals and treat them contemptuously. I don't think this is entirely in the feminist imagination. I think that still exists even now. So there are situations where I've said to myself: yeah, I think I understand sometimes why people say certain things about men. I get it.

FIAMENGO: Mm hmm.

WOODS: Now, am I just a left-wing lunatic here? I mean, there's some truth. There's got to be some truth to this.

FIAMENGO: Well, I don't know if there has to be some truth to it. I'm somebody who — I'm probably the worst person to ask for the female perspective on men as pigs. That has never been my experience. And I don't think I had a particularly privileged or sheltered life. I grew up in basically a working-class, lower-middle-class neighborhood. I went to kind of a rough school. There was a lot of sexual activity amongst very young people. As a girl, I wasn't very much protected in my community. But my experience of men, both young and old, was in general they were very decent.

Now, this is not to say — you know, I mean, we can get into a discussion of what percentage of men don't respect women or that sort of thing. I mean, there are an awful lot of women who exploit their sexual allure as well, you know, who use and abuse men sexually. As a culture, I think we're not inclined to see that as traumatizing or as damaging as the exploitation of women, especially young women, by men. I think it exists. Sex is a messy business. It's a dangerous thing. As a society, we've decided to accept the tenets of the sexual revolution of the late '60s, early '70s, and to say, you know, sex is something that shouldn't be restrained by community standards, that people should express themselves sexually as they wish, there should be no stigma attached to promiscuity, whatever.

Now, that doesn't seem to be working out very well for women, even though, as far as I understand it, a lot of women in the second wave feminist movement were very adamant about their claim to be just as sexually desiring as men and to desire all of the freedoms that men had traditionally had. Now, I think what we're hearing from a lot of women is that that

actually has some fairly bad consequences for women. But you can't have it both ways. You can't say that there should be absolutely no stigma against promiscuity on the one hand, but also say that any woman who comes forward to talk about how she's been badly treated should be listened to and believed, while her own behavior has to be somehow off limits for criticism.

So that's really my — I mean, I wouldn't argue with you that some women are badly treated by men, but I would also argue that many men are badly treated by women. And I would say that what we have now is a culture that has always cared about women, about harms to women, and now is sort of going into overdrive, saying that we have to care even more, pretending that we never have, and tarring all men with this really negative brush and insisting that men have to bear this burden of their supposed to abuse of women.

And I just — well, my experience and what I've heard from men is that it's not generally true that men exploit women. What I hear from men is that many of them want nothing more than to have a tender, loving, mutually respectful relationship with a woman, but that they don't know now what they're allowed to do. And that we have created a culture in which women can retroactively decide that they don't like something that happened to them, even though at the time they did not communicate clearly a "no," even at the time, they might have been joking and laughing and encouraging a certain type of sexual banter or sexual behavior, and then now the man has to be punished for it. So, yes, I agree that we need to have a conversation around how men and women are going to relate to one another in the workplace and in the public sphere, generally, and in intimate situations. But I don't think I agree with you that the problem is all men and male sexual brutality.

WOODS: Let's talk about your book *Sons of Feminism: Men Have Their Say*. There's quite a diversity of topics covered here, because at first you have a lot of personal testimonials about people in their own personal lives and what the tenets of feminism have translated into for them. But then also, later on we have things like a chapter on the invasion of feminism into the discipline of astronomy.

FIAMENGO: Mm hmm.

WOODS: You would think what in heavens — well, so to speak — heaven's name could feminism have to do with astronomy? Yeah, sure, I could see feminism in American history. You're going to focus on the history of women. At least I get what the connection is. But then you've got — so you've got a lot of chapters on craziness and so on. Now, these are all, of course, testimonies from men, so you put this together and wrote the introduction for it, but these are other people's testimonies. So I don't want to put you on the spot, asking you for details but other people's stories. So how would you sum up, based on these testimonials, what the effects of feminism have been? First of all, I guess we probably need to define what we mean by feminism here, because if by feminism, we simply mean that women also ought to have opportunities for fulfillment and not be held back simply because they're women, almost nobody disagrees with that. So how are we thinking about feminism here?

FIAMENGO: Right, yes, and I think that's a very important point to stress, and it was something that I was struck by in my conversations with men, and especially in my conversations with the men who wrote those personal essays for my book. I can't find men anywhere who don't agree that women and men deserve equal opportunities to contribute their talents and their skills to improve our society. So that notion of equal opportunity is one

that is generally agreed upon. Whether women and men are the same in all of their talents and abilities is perhaps a more contested issue, but equality of opportunity is not.

So I guess what we mean, what I mean by feminism when I talk about the culture that we're living in right now, is an ideology that believes that we live in an oppressive patriarchy, in which women as a class are oppressed by men as a class, that that has always been the case in Western societies, and that it continues to be the case, and that women are held in thrall to men, especially through sexualized violence, a culture of entrenched sexualized violence in which men exploit women sexually and keep them in a state of fear through their sexual violence, and in which all men in some way benefit from that culture, even if they themselves do not abuse or sexually assault women, but that they benefit by the position of dominance that they therefore occupy as a result of the fact of male violence.

So I think that is, if you ask feminist leaders whether that is generally true about our society, I think most feminist leaders would say yes, it is, and that we need to do a great deal in order to protect women from male predation and in order to change the whole structure of our society to put more women into positions of power. The implication often is that women are morally superior to men, I think, that women do not abuse other women or men, that women are more peaceful, women are more egalitarian, women are more empathetic, women work collaboratively together. You know, if women were in charge of all government, wars would end, sexual slavery would end, poverty would be done away with, and so on. So that is the kind of woman-valuing, man-blaming climate that the last 50 years of feminist advocacy has produced.

And a lot of men have accepted that, and a lot of men carry around a great burden of shame and guilt as a result. Many men feel that they have to do penance in some way for the presumed sins of their fathers, and other men feel resentful having to bear that burden. They're resentful at noticing all of the ways that women are advantaged in job competitions, even in just general conversations. And, you know, they're bewildered that their good intentions and their willingness to participate equally in society with women is being turned back upon them and that they're having to bear this burden of blame always.

So I guess that's the climate that — and of course, I would admit, and I did admit I think in my introduction, that this is not the experience of every man. If I had wanted to write a book in which I took testimonials, personal essays from men who were very strongly in favor of feminist culture and wanted to talk about how it has advantaged them as men to participate in feminist activism, I could have found men to write those kinds of essays. But I deliberately wanted to hear from men who feel injured in some way or who are puzzled or who are hurt by the stories of blame that circulate in our culture, or who have actually been literally damaged by a false accusation or by recognizing that they're not given equal opportunity in their workplace.

Such is the example of the essay by the astronomer, for instance, who's a talented young man, who's actually had to leave his home country in order to go to China, because he realized that there was simply no way he would ever be able to secure a tenure track position in astronomy, because that field, like many other STEM fields, right now is so interested in proving that it isn't discriminatory towards women, that it's hiring women who are less qualified into positions in order to be able to say that it advocates for gender equality.

So, yeah, I wanted to give these men a voice, because in my experience, their stories are not told, and when men try to speak out on behalf of themselves as men or on behalf of men generally, they're immediately told that they must be misogynistic, must hate women. And if they're angry, then that's used as evidence that they're not to be trusted, that they're dangerous haters. And I simply haven't been able to find these hateful men. I've found a lot of men who are, as I say, bewildered and hurt and confused and worried about their sons. And so those were the men I wanted to give a chance to tell their story.

WOODS: And let's also add that, if men try to say: look, I've been — I hate to use the word "victimized," because it's just such a terrible word. But let's just say: I've been harmed. That's a much more normal word. I've been harmed by either this set of ideas or this particular person or whatever it is, this social expectation that I wouldn't get custody of my children or whatever is. If they say that, they are made objects of ridicule. It's not: believe men, because we know that men are also truthful, and sometimes anybody can be a harmed and we should be sympathetic to all of them. They are ridiculed, because, of course, everybody knows that white men run the world, so the idea that they could ever be harmed is preposterous. But that's preposterous. I mean, really, there are men whose lives have been ruined by family courts, who can barely afford to get themselves a livable apartment while they're making payments and payments and payments, and then the apartment they can barely afford to live in is then determined to be not fit for the kids to visit them in. So then they lose that, and then they feel like they're just a distant uncle in the lives of their own kids. Yeah, you know, there is a possibility there's an injustice going on there, but you are laughed at if you so much as raise it.

FIAMENGO: Mm hmm, and that, of course, is one of the stories so effectively told in the book, about the fellow who details all the ways in which, as soon as you start in on this horrible path from divorce onwards, it's almost impossible to maintain one's role as a father, unless you happen to have an ex-wife who herself is extremely willing to enable that. If she doesn't want you to have a full role in your children's lives, then it's almost impossible for you to do so. And I really think that — I hope, anyway, that in the near future, we will look back on this period and see that as one of the greatest human rights abuses of the 21st century. It's almost inconceivable, the pain of some of these fathers who are denied the right to parent their own children. It's really quite astounding.

But yes, to go back to your question, you know, it is something best — I mean, I don't think we can even blame it on radical feminism or on anything. But it's true that I think there is something in the way we as human beings, men and women, the way we conceive of humanity, that we cannot feel for victimized men or men who have been harmed in some way. We just cannot feel the same way that we feel about women. So if a woman describes what's happened to her, there is a natural outpouring of sympathy on the part of both men and women. Whereas if a man describes the harm that he is experiencing, he's either not believed, or people in general just don't care very much, or he even is found to be repulsive.

And to this extent, I think the feminists have got it right, in a way, that we do have different conceptions about men and women. But the fact is that we care when women cry, we care when women tell stories of injustice and suffering. And in general, I don't understand this, because personally, I care about both. But as a cultural whole, we don't tend to care as much about men who suffer. And there are all sorts of issues that deserve societal compassion and concern, and certainly the treatment of men in divorce is one of the big ones.

But there's various other things. There's social issues like male suicide, for instance. Men commit suicide at something like four times the rate that women do. And yet often when you read about suicide as a social issue, the suffering of women is what is highlighted. Men suffer from mental illness at extraordinarily worrisome rates. There is unequal treatment of men under criminal law.

There's been a study done — a lot of studies, I think, but one in particular, a recent one by a woman named Sonja Starr out of the University of Michigan, if I'm remembering properly. But she talked about how the differential is, I think, 60%, and she looked at similar crimes, crimes almost identical, as far as that could be ascertained, and found that men are more likely to be arrested, more likely to be charged, far less likely to be able to work out a plea deal, more likely to go to trial — I mean, all the way through — and sentenced at a 60% higher rate. There are differences in treatment in terms of race as well, but they're far smaller than the differences in terms of treatment by gender. Data like that, which is pretty outrageous, and yet, when men's groups or individual men try to raise these issues they're — I don't bear — they are. They're mocked or they're dismissed or they're told they're misogynists who somehow want to take away from women's rightful place as the major victims of our society who deserve all the sympathy.

So yeah, and I know I started caring about these things, hard to say exactly how and why, but it was a gradual process. And when I started hearing from men about all of these issues and looking at the way in which their attempts to articulate their experience are dismissed and belittled, I thought I couldn't do anything better than maybe produce a book that I hope will touch some people's hearts. I don't have much hope that feminist ideologues — I mean, they're not even going to read the book, and they're just not interested. Really, I think the feminist grievance narrative is so successful in closing down hearts, that those people, I don't see how they can ever be touched. But there is a mass of people out there who are not hardened ideologues, and I really hope that maybe some of those people will read these stories and will start to listen to the voices of men when they object to their characterization as privileged elites who have always had it too good and should now step aside and let their sisters take over the reins of power, since they've obviously been benefiting from their firm control over those reins of power for so many decades.

WOODS: I'd like to, if I may, just read a quick passage from page to 26 of your book. This actually goes back to that astronomy chapter. Just for a moment. And this is what we read:

"At an important astronomy conference, we were lectured by a 'senior diversity officer' of the host university, who gave the opening plenary speech on what he called the white, heterosexual, Anglo, Christian, cisgender male privilege in astronomy. After reminding us" — and I love the sarcasm that's implicit here. "After reminding us how we male astronomers cannot even begin to understand the constant state of fear felt by women and people of color in astronomy departments every day, the diversity officer instructed the audience to pair up in male-female couples. Each couple was told to read, acknowledge, and discuss a list of 29 white male privileges. A few male astronomers randomly picked from the audience were then asked to stand up and publicly confess instances of their privilege. It all looked straight out of a Maoist textbook, and yet some male astronomers enjoyed being shamed like that. Nothing gives more pleasure to committed leftist academics than to openly proclaim their shame for their own gender, social class, religion, skin color, and nationality, because feeling ashamed is a sign of moral superiority."

I'd asked you to comment on that, but how could you?

FIAMENGO: I mean, it's perfect in itself, isn't it? And all I would add — I mean, I think it's beautifully written. And all I would add is that I have experienced what he is describing to a tee, and that what he is describing is going on in not only departments of astronomy, but in university departments, at conferences and committee meetings all across the Western world. And it certainly adds insult to injury to be a young man, or not even a particularly young man, trying to advance in a career where you know that your chances of securing a high-level position are significantly reduced, because you are one of these privileged heterosexual white men, and yet at the same time, having to confess your privilege. I mean, it's one thing to know that your chances of success in life are reduced because of factors beyond your control. That's frustrating enough. But then at the same time, to have to apologize for having it too good, it's really quite something.

And that whole notion of the moral superiority, the pleasure that some men certainly, women as well, white women, that some of these people take in confessing their privilege, especially when they already have a secure position. Well, then they can confess their privilege and they can declare that they are very much on the side of the marginalized, and they're going to make sure that no more whites are hired or no more men are hired. They themselves aren't willing, of course, to give up their positions, but they are quite willing to secure their own moral superiority on the backs of other people who are not going to be hired, even though they may be better qualified than the person who is going to be hired in order to make this wonderful statement about their moral righteousness. It's quite astounding, but I can testify that is going on as we speak.

WOODS: Let me ask you one more thing before we wrap up. I noticed in your recommended resources that you included Wendy McElroy's book on rape culture.

FIAMENGO: Mm hmm.

WOODS: And the other day, you may have read about what happened to Steven Crowder at TCU. He was at a university campus, and he put out a sign saying, "Rape culture is a myth." And what's his thing? It's not, "Prove me wrong." What are the words?

FIAMENGO: Yeah, prove me wrong, convince me otherwise.

WOODS: No, it's — I can't think of it. I'm so embarrassed. I can't think of it. "Change my mind."

FIAMENGO: "Change my mind," that's it. I've watched many of them. I haven't watched that one.

WOODS: I don't know where that went in my brain just now. Yeah, anyway, "Change my mind." Now, he's not saying sexual assault never happens, rape victims are all liars. He's not saying any crazy thing like that. All he's saying is the idea that rape is normalized, is considered a normal behavior in our society, well, that's a crazy idea that only a lunatic would believe. And the university denounced him and said that what he was saying was not in line with their values. So apparently, their values include the idea that all right-thinking people believe that rape is a normal, accepted activity in American society, because we're so perverse. I think this — it's so insane now that you don't even — you know, sometimes people

say we can't even have debates with these people, because they won't debate us and all they do is scream and try to shut our events down. But even if it were possible, like if you could somehow physically restrain them for an hour, it would be impossible to have a debate with somebody who thinks that most people consider rape to be okay, or whatever rape culture's supposed to mean. It does include the idea that rape is a normalized behavior in our society —

FIAMENGO: That we may excuse —

WOODS: Even though, up till recently —

FIAMENGO: Oh, sorry, go on.

WOODS: Right, that up until recently, it was a capital crime, up until recently. And then it was the left that wanted to not make it a capital crime. And then the left says we have a rape culture. I can't even keep up with them, when they switch from one thing to the other. I don't know what they're talking about. Can you explain to me what they're talking about?

FIAMENGO: Well, I mean, it is simply contradictory. And I've experienced that too. I remember once, a couple of years ago, there was a case at my university, the University of Ottawa, in which a young woman who was on the student council — in fact, I think she was the president of the student federation of the University of Ottawa. Somebody took a screenshot of a conversation that was taking place between a number of other members of student government, where they were making sexual remarks about her. And this is a private Facebook page, but somebody took a screenshot and showed it to her. And they were saying things like, "Oh, I'm going to punish her with my shaft," was one of the things. And it was sexual banter. And I agree it was derogatory and it was unacceptable, but it wasn't meant for her ears or for public consumption, and it was locker room talk. I would not want to discover that people were having that kind of conversation about me, but it was simply a private Facebook conversation.

She then took it public, forced apologies from all of the young men, who did apologize, and she made a federal case of it. It became cause célèbre at the university, that the president of the university denounced the actions of these young men as evidence of the rape culture at the University of Ottawa. And this became a theme. A task force was struck. Thousands of dollars of taxpayer money was put to bring in a whole bunch of experts, both within the university and in the wider community, to discuss rape culture at the University of Ottawa, to make various recommendations and so on. At the same time, we were sent a letter by the University of Ottawa professors faculty union denouncing the rape culture at the University of Ottawa.

And there was this one hilarious moment in which it said, you know, "We all join together. Students, staff, and faculty at the University of Ottawa all join together in uncompromisingly denouncing the rape culture at the University of Ottawa." But, you know, that's just a paradox. It's a self-canceling statement there cannot be a rape culture if everybody denounces it, since this whole idea of rape culture is that there was a widespread acceptance and normalizing of rape. So how can you get more ridiculous than that? If everybody denounces it, then obviously, we do not have a rape culture. Now, somebody would say: well, but there's a subculture amongst maybe male athletes or something like that. Even that is I think very questionable there. You cannot find anyone, anywhere who publicly proclaims that

rape is okay. And yet we're told over and over again and are supposed to accept that somehow we generally think it is.

WOODS: Tell us about the Fiamengo File and how people can follow it.

FIAMENGO: Oh, yes. Well, I certainly would love it if your viewers would turn to it. It's at Studio Brule. That's my producer, my friend Steve Brule, and it's called the Fiamengo File. We've got some I think 90 videos now, in which I look especially at academic feminism. My main focus is looking at how academic feminism has been so successful in, I would say, normalizing radical feminist ideas, that they are now clearly percolating out into the wider culture and affecting conversations about who should be nominated to the Supreme Court and about the status of women in society in general. And so I look at how ideas that were once confined to the hothouse atmosphere of the university, ideas about the male gaze, for instance, or about how women are made into docile bodies, various ideas from high theory that began in the humanities, especially in English departments, so that's why I'm so familiar with them — how they have been generally accepted in the wider society and are having a really profound impact on workplace sexual harassment law and on actually how the law adjudicate complaints of sexual harassment and sexual assault and so on.

And I also look at particular individuals who are being persecuted inside the academy, in particular, and I look at court cases and things like that and make my comments about them from an anti-feminist perspective. So I would love it if people would check that out, Fiamengo File.

WOODS: Okay, I'm going to link to that at TomWoods.com/1257, where I will also link to your book *Sons of Feminism*, which is very, very much worth reading. I mean, it's sad reading. Let's just be blunt about it. It's sad, because you're reading about, in many cases, completely broken men. And what was I think most compelling for me is how many of these men started off as full-blown feminists, and they were going to live their lives according to these ideas, and their lives are just a wreck.

FIAMENGO: Yeah.

WOODS: And they note that it's not in spite of their commitment to feminism; it's a direct result of it. And that more than all the social science studies in the world that you might do, it's these stories that ring so true when you read them that I think will have a really great impact. So congratulations on that, and we'll have to talk again sometime in the future. Thank you.

FIAMENGO: Thanks so much, Tom.