

**Episode 2,403: Feminism Triumphs, Women Miserable**

**Guest: Carrie Gress**

**WOODS:** Well, we talked about some, let's say, rather colorful personalities last time, and we'll no doubt have an opportunity to do a little bit more of that today. But I want to do something that has been done to me very often as an author. I'm going to read a passage to you and have you riff on a little bit.

Because this passage is really – page 94 jumps right off the page. So, it runs like this, *"Feminism offered us women's studies and women's health and women's rights, but they didn't tell anyone, even once solid data was in, that their goals leave women miserable, unhealthy, and wondering what we did wrong.*

*They didn't tell us that the life they want us to live serves those in power, not us. Their goal via the sexual revolution was to reject motherhood, monogamy, and marriage in favor of hookups, money, glamour. And it has left so many unfulfilled and deeply unhappy.*

*The mean girls are more powerful when we are enslaved, broken, dependent and alone, because then we need them more. We need their magazines, their health fixes, their counseling, their diets, their experts, their advice. And they take our outpouring of cash all the way to the bank.”*

That is a deeply and profoundly sinister – or, I beg your pardon. Oh, sinister too! I was going to say "cynical", but I'll take both of them – way of looking at things. So, I suppose it speaks for itself. But I still want you to comment on your own passage.

**GRESS:** Yeah, well, I think that summarizes so much. And it sounds cynical when it's taken out of context. But I think when you start really looking at all of the different ways in which women are – we're just really ignored.

All of the problems that women have, all of the issues that women have, our unhappiness, all those metrics, all of that is ignored. And you can really see just sort of the suffocating cultural milieu in which we live. And it's just so one sided.

And that was really what got me looking at the "why". Why is it that we are seeing so many broken people and what's the engine behind this? And of course, it does come back to money and power and control.

It really is cynical and sinister, but that's the truth of what's happening behind so much of the feminist movement.

**WOODS:** You know, it's interesting. The last time I had you on, I was so eager to get into the material that didn't ask you to reflect on the title of the book, a very provocative title, *The End of Woman*. What does that mean?

**GRESS:** Yeah. You know, actually the title itself – the subtitle was the part that came to me well before the book was anywhere near being published. :*How Smashing the Patriarchy Has Destroyed Us*, because it just seems so provocative, and yet the real reason why we're suffering so much.

I mean, this just seems like the constant refrain is: *Smash the patriarchy!* And: *The future is female!* And all of this. So, that was the easy part. And then, of course, we had to figure out what to do with the actual title.

And I wanted it to somehow convey this idea of women being erased and women sort of not – we're not destroying one woman. We're kind of destroying the idea of woman. And so, anyway, that really, I think, worked well.

There were a lot of other options, and so many of them were already taken. Like, *The Abolition of Women* and all kinds of different titles along those threads of other books that have been published already.

So, anyway, I think we were all really happy with what the title ended up being. And it really conveys something about, we're not killing women per se, but this concept of what womanhood is, is really on the chopping block.

**WOODS:** Let me try to play devil's advocate for a minute. And this is going to be hard. I'm going to do my best. So, you just got done saying that as a result of the various ideas and programs that the feminist movement has urged upon women, that women feel unfulfilled.

They feel like something's gone wrong. It wasn't supposed to be this way. I think we mentioned the last time you were on that surveys of levels of happiness among women have shown them to be more unhappy today, 50 years later, than they were when the whole thing got started.

Which was not supposed to be how it would turn out. But at the same time, though, couldn't it be said that Betty Friedan was nevertheless on to something with at least some women?

That perhaps some women did feel trapped as homemakers, and they felt like they were treated intellectually as second-class citizens, that they were treated as appendages of the kitchen, and that maybe there was a more fulfilling life for these women that they could have through feminism?

What's wrong with that way of thinking?

**GRESS:** Sure. Well, I think that's what's interesting about it, and why it makes it so challenging. Because some of that is authentically true. Even if you look at Post-Industrial revolution, you go back and you can see there's a totally different dynamic and makeup of the family.

I lived in Italy for several years and everybody still has a big lunch, and that family members come home, and people have lunch together. That's becoming less and less, but it's still something that that happens.

And I think we've lost that sense of how things were. That women were managing their households, and they were managing their homesteads, and there was so much more involvement with the husband and wife and the children and all of that. Even the sending our kids to school is new.

So, I think there's a much bigger context to look at things and to sort of say that women only needed to be in the home is not my point. My point is, we didn't have to destroy the culture in order for these things to happen.

And yet it's because these benchmarks of actually doing positive things, that's what's really driving feminism. And really, even how feminists are using guilt against us. Like, you can't criticize this because you have an advanced degree, or you are able to work outside the home.

Like, you have to be thankful to feminism because you have these opportunities and advantages. So, I think that's why it's such a difficult thing. Because we like – you know this well. Our minds like a good binary. Like, give me the bad and give me the good.

Don't make us sort of think through all of these different shades of gray – unless of course, you're talking about gender. But I think that's what is challenging, because it's very hard to sort of parse out. Like, these women are, on the face of it, promoting something that looks very positive.

But then when you actually see what it's doing to women, then you really start seeing the negative. And it's hard to absorb all of this and sort of parse out where the good and the bad is. And I know in my own life it's taken me a long time to even figure out – even to get to the point where I just realized feminism is the problem.

It's taken a very long time to wade through all of the details and figure that out, because it's certainly not apparent from the very outset.

**WOODS:** Back in the 1980s, there was a homeless advocate named Mitch Snyder. And I think most people don't realize when, in the 1980s, they would say to their friends: *What a shame, we have 3 million homeless people.*

That they were repeating a number that he made up and admitted it. That: *The number 3 million homeless, I just invented that because it seemed like a plausible figure. But more than that, it seemed like it would draw attention to the problem.*

And it seems like there's a pattern of people of a certain political persuasion. That if there's a problem they think is important, they'll just lie if need be, to get attention drawn to it. So, you have a couple examples in your book.

And I want to know if you think these are outliers or if this is part of just the modus operandi of these people. But you gave, for example, the figure of 100,000 botched abortions before *Roe v Wade*.

And that that was just – they later said: *We took all the women who died of whatever, and it was 100,000, and so we just used that figure.* But also, there's the figure that Gloria Steinem gave. And I don't think is in your book, but she was protesting the impossible standard of beauty that women have to live up to.

And she was saying that in trying to live up to that standard, 100,000 women a year were dying of anorexia – or 150,000 were dying of anorexia. It turned out the total number was 100. Not 100,000, but 100.

But the thinking is: *Well, even if I was wrong about the number, at least I'm drawing attention to a problem.* But you can draw attention to problems without lying about them. Is there a pattern to this, or am I just cherry picking?

**GRESS:** No, I think there really is a pattern to it. I think we see that all the time, because of course the feminist movement has been unmoored from reality. I mean, the idea of, how do you destroy the nuclear family?

How do you then get women to believe that their children are an obstacle to their happiness, that their husbands are an obstacle to their happiness? All of that has come from Marxism. And Marxism, we know, has no problem lying about anything.

It's all about the political ends. It's not about the means. And of course, Western civilization was built upon philosophy, that Western philosophy that came largely from Catholic thinkers and starting obviously, with the Greeks, who were not Catholic, the ancient Greeks.

But one of the main tenets is you cannot use a bad means for a good end, and that's just been completely obliterated by Marxism. And so, you have all of these people that just have – they're, again, seeing what the goal is, and they don't care about who it is that they're destroying.

And this is why the propaganda is so powerful and is so overinflated, as you mentioned. Because of the fact that they're trying to convince people of things that are really built on a lie or a falsehood or a half truth. And that's how they've been so successful.

**WOODS:** I might add, by the way, that Marx and Engels in their book, *The Condition of the Working Class in England* – that book, just page after page, there is a distortion of fact. There's a misquote, there's a made-up statistic. I mean, it is just page after page after page, so not super-surprising.

**GRESS:** I would also add, too, that one of the fascinating pieces is just to see how shallow the ideas are of feminism, and how there's really just no real roots there. some of the things that Gloria Steinem says are just laugh-out-loud funny, and yet there's nobody really sort of fact checking her.

And so, she just repeats these things over and over and over again. And I'm pretty convinced that this is where Kamala Harris has gotten a lot of her really great material is from this kind of vapid, empty ideology.

That's just another way in which they've been successful, is by taking shallow ideas and trying to make them appear as deep and having some intellectual roots deeper than Marxism.

**WOODS:** You've got a section in your book on what you call "mean girls". Let's talk a little bit about that. First of all, what do you mean by that designation?

**GRESS:** Well, I think it's that popular idea of, you know, we've all experienced mean girls. Some of us have been at the receiving end. Some of us have been the mean girls growing up. Some of us have been both.

But it's these girls that sort of gang up against other girls (or against boys) to sort of get whatever it is that they want. There's that movie called *Mean Girls*. It's just something that is within the culture. People have a basic idea of it.

But I don't think people realize how effective these women have been (the women that I call the mean girls) at sort of pushing out any other ideas. And making this sort of fiefdom of feminism such that any other narrative that might threaten them is either ignored or obliterated.

And I think we could look back at the way that conservative women are treated and see example after example of this kind of treatment. Again, it's silence or it's humiliation, are usually the two modes in which the mean girls take care of their enemies.

**WOODS:** And again, this is, I think, a very common stratagem of the left. Which is to make you feel isolated and alone, to make you feel like nobody agrees with you. All the fashionable people disagree with you.

Now that part may be true. But that you're alone and you're probably stupid, and you're not even worth acknowledging. So, when we have a TV show and we're having a panel about women's issues, not one person on that panel sounds like you. And nobody wants to be in that position.

Who wants to feel like: *I'm the outcast in my own society and nobody agrees with me?* It can wear anybody down. And that's the idea.

**GRESS:** Yeah. It's incredibly exhausting. And I think it's interesting, too, just how we've gotten so used to it, though. Because when I started asking women, like, what do you see when you're at the checkout stand?

Do you see anything that reflects your values as you're flipping through magazines? What about television shows? What about daytime TV? What about Hollywood? And suddenly then the light bulbs go on.

Like: *Yeah, I guess I've just gotten used to it. That that's just sort of the way things are, and it's very hard for me to imagine turning on a TV show and watching it from the beginning to the end, without having something that offends my sensibilities.*

Or does just that, exactly what you described, that kind of manipulation. So, it's sad that we've gotten to this point where we come to expect it, and then we're so suddenly surprised and excited when there's something that we find outside of that, that actually really speaks to us.

But I think we have a great opportunity as conservatives to start doing things that recognize those of us who have been really abandoned by the culture.

**WOODS:** You mentioned the television program *The View*, which is notorious. As soon as you hear that somebody said such and such on *The View*, you think: *Okay, incoming! Some ridiculously uninformed opinion on whatever it is.*

But you pointed out that, yeah, every now and then there's somebody who's like mildly right of center or something like that on, but they're never any good. And opposition voices are carefully selected for that program.

No Carrie Gress is ever going on that show. That's impossible. They'll have somebody who more or less accepts 58% of the premise of the show, and then they'll argue about trivialities.

And by the way, that's true of, I think, all cable news, pretty much. They make sure that the opposition is very, very mild, and we're not going to have any really fundamental conversations.

**GRESS:** Yeah. Or what they do is just make sure you're always outnumbered, too. So, I mean, this is what The View has done so beautifully strategically over the years, is to always make sure that the women on the left outnumber the women who are more conservative.

So, yeah, that's the frustrating thing, when of course, the population isn't reflected in those numbers at all.

**WOODS:** And not to mention, as you say in the book, you can't have a conversation where you say something like: I'm not sure that this particular promise of feminism has really been fulfilled. I mean, you would think that would be a legitimate thing: *Okay, well, let's investigate it.*

But instead, the response is: *Well, you just want to enslave women*. How can you have a conversation with somebody like this?

**GRESS:** You can't. Yeah. And I think that's the incredible struggle, is that it gets so wrapped up in emotions and knee-jerk reactions and their soundbites that it really is impenetrable.

**WOODS:**  All right. I've got a whole bunch of things I want to talk to you about. Okay, so I have another passage, okay? So, I like this one, too. And I bet there are a lot of people who can identify with this.

And you're talking about the way feminists have tried to protect their movement from close scrutiny. And one example is that: *We can't air our dirty laundry in public.* *So, if there are women who are themselves abusive, on the job or elsewhere, that's not a conversation we need to have on the open.*

And by the way, you see a lot of that in the Black community. Like, there will be "Black leaders" who will privately admit: *We have problems in our communities that we need to work on, but we cannot discuss this in front of White people.*

Which means they never discuss it. All right. So, here's this. This is from the *Atlantic*. We have an article in which the author is listening to the vitriol of one woman on the receiving end of vicious and unreasonable female bosses, *"Her screed against the female partner surprised me, since people don't usually rail against historically marginalized groups on the record.*

*When I reached out to other women to ask whether they'd had similar experiences, some were appalled by the question, as though I were Phyllis Schlafly calling from beyond the grave. But then they would say things like, 'Well, there was this one time...' and tales of female sabotage would spill forth.*

*As I went about my dozens of interviews, I began to feel like a priest to whom women were confessing their sins against feminism."*

So, we can't even admit that everybody has good and bad qualities now?

**GRESS:** Yeah. And it's remarkable, too, just how that kind of attitude has silenced everybody. And so, you sort of feel like, okay, there's the feminist in the room. You know, if she's a colleague, there's so much sensitivity – and usually a lot of anger and rage too.

That you just – again, there's no reason there. There's no rationality. But there's also simultaneously usually a lot of manipulation or sort of long-term sabotage that's going on. So, yeah, I think this is just such a common experience of so many of us.

Very few of us are able to talk about it in ways that are productive or fruitful, because we know we'll be fired, or we know that this person has capacity to come back and seek revenge in a different way. So, yeah, I think this is just incredibly common.

And men in particular, I feel like this is something that they are very careful not to say publicly, ever, because they just know they will never win the argument. Feminism in general has become sort of a kind of Kryptonite. Like: *Just don't talk about it. Put your head down and keep moving.*

**WOODS:** What do you say to people who say that gender and gender roles, because they (at least gender roles) have sometimes been different over the years, that therefore they're just social constructs. And you're urging us to conform to something that is actually fluid over time.

**GRESS:** Well, I think that's an incredibly new idea that's really built upon the ideas of Simone de Beauvoir and Jean-Paul Sartre and the existentialists.

They get the idea from Nietzsche, this idea of how we can reinvent ourselves to be anything that we want, and human nature is fluid and changeable and all of that.

And I think that that's where we come back to the hard reality that human nature is not changeable, that human nature is something much more static. And usually nature is the one that wins.

And we're seeing this certainly in those who are de-transitioning, who are sold this bill of goods about how great their life would be when they just lopped off body parts and took these different hormones.

And then suddenly that's where all the numbers of the suicides are actually higher than those who didn't transition. So, anyway, I think there's a lot of different ways to tackle it. That's certainly one of them.

But I think the other one is just even the historical record as far as looking at humanity, looking at male and female, looking at fertility, that basic element of, how does the species perpetuate itself. And we know that it does that through a father and mother, and they have different sets of gifts.

And no matter how much these things, we try to tinker with them, that fundamental reality of fertility doesn't change, even if we try to ignore it or suppress it or banish it.

So, anyway, it's much more incumbent, I think, upon those who say that it's a social construct to be able to prove evidence of it, because there's just so much more overwhelming evidence that it's a static reality than a construct.

**WOODS:** All right. I've got another passage here, because this gets to the heart of your thesis, and indeed of the title of the book, too. This is from page 128, *"For over 50 years, women have been clamoring to make themselves into men, mentally and now biologically.*

*But in the scramble, we have frittered away what it means to be a woman. The solid ground that used to be beneath our feet has eroded into the sea, leaving nothing to stand on. Our identity has been cobbled together with this grasping at manhood, while what it means to be a woman has dissolved and is now an unanswerable question.*

*There's no place left to see what womanhood is, so enshrined have we made the male model and the neutral notion of person, human being, or individual. In our envy, women have been erased.”*

Some people might think that's an exaggeration, that women have been erased. What does it mean to say that? Do you mean that when Betty Friedan complains about what it's like being stuck in the house all day, she's basically yearning to be a man like the rest of the men and go out and do interesting and exciting things?

Is that what you mean?

**GRESS:** No. I mean, I think what's really happened is that, I mean, obviously we can't define what a woman is, but we have also not said anything good about motherhood in 50 years. And I think this is a piece that's so largely missed, where we've actually denigrated motherhood.

We see it as something very tawdry. In fact, I was just talking with someone earlier today who is a stay-at-home wife, and she's done that for years. She's got an advanced degree. She's very intelligent. But when she tells people that she's just a mom, there's no engagement, no lights go on, no one's happy to hear that.

This is sort of what we've done to the culture, because we've made motherhood something that has no status. And I don't just mean biologically, I mean even psychologically and spiritually. I think those are just other key elements that women have that they can bring to the public square, to business, to religions, faith, et cetera.

And what I mean by "motherhood" really, is this idea of, how do we shelter, protect, nourish, and comfort those who are around us in such a way that they can then become who it is that they're meant to be?

And I think that piece of being able to help others become who they're meant to be – I mean, this is a fundamental role of a woman, and through motherhood. That's what's largely missing because we've been told to be Marxists.

We've been told to go out and work. We've been told to be productive. Because there's not very much productivity in being a mother, which is one of the arguments that Engels made. So, that's really what I mean by it, is we just have gotten so far from really understanding womanhood.

We've got these bizarre extremes from the working woman versus the oversexualized sensual woman, but we don't have authentic womanhood that is striving to live the virtues and to be a good woman. We can't even speak of those categories of, what does it mean to be a good woman, anymore.

We just know kind of this idealized woman who "has it all". And that's really what's been imposed upon us, is this artificial idea of womanhood instead of what we know womanhood really is.

**WOODS:** So, obviously this is a book intended for an adult audience, but at a fundamental level, much younger women need to understand what's in it.

So, you as a mother, let's say, or even just as an educator, how would you, if you were speaking to a young woman going through this very confusing world, how would you advise her?

And what are the ideas that you would want her to keep at the top of her mind and not let herself get confused by?

**GRESS:** Well, I mean, it's somewhat easy to answer because I have two teenage daughters, so I spend a lot of time talking with them about this issue. And someone was just asking me the other day if they're still on board with me or if they've changed their mind about my thoughts on it.

And thanks be to God, they haven't changed their minds yet. But part of that is because they know my work and they see the lies behind it, and they understand the role that Marxism has played. And they see the disfigurement.

And my 14-year-old daughter, in particular, is highly sensitive to all of the trans issue. Because she sees her generation of girls that are sterilizing themselves, that are destining themselves for very, very difficult lives because of the mutilation that they're undergoing.

And she can get very emotional about it sometimes because she just sees and hears the damage that's being done on that level. So, I think the important thing, really, is to just even start with the conversation. In fact, most of my work started with a conversation with this same daughter years ago when she asked me, what is better about being a woman than being a man?

And I just didn't feel like I had a good answer for her at all. And that really started me thinking, how do I start articulating this for her in a way that's compelling and beautiful, instead of just feels like it's kind of a knee jerk, silly reaction?

So, I think that's an important piece, is, how do we start filling in these blanks for girls to see that there's something really beautiful and wonderful and amazing and joyful about being a woman, instead of it just being kind of a means to an end of our own success.

That's probably maybe even where I would start, is that discussion. Like, what kind of woman do you want to be when you grow up? What kind of life do you think you want to have?

Start chipping away at some of the lies that feminism is presenting that will actually be an obstacle to some of those dreams that she has, instead of facilitating them.

**WOODS:** Now, somebody might say, if I look at the ledger for feminism, certainly in the pro column, they will say: When I look around society today, I notice, first of all, that there are more women than men going to college now.

Yes, it's true that some women wind up in jobs that are as miserable as any household Betty Friedan might dream up, so they've just substituted one kind of misery for another. But at the same time, women are able to go out and pursue their interests in ways that they couldn't otherwise.

And so, yes, it's true that in the kind of relationships they build, they might have their hearts broken. But this is the human condition. But the pros are very strong: opportunities for women. So, how do we therefore say that this has been a net negative?

**GRESS:** Yeah. Well all kinds of levels. Again, those happiness metrics say something very clearly when you were looking at depression, suicide, substance abuse, STDs, all kinds of things. I think we can also look at another area that's really fascinating, very new.

The whole pet craze is a strong indicator that women have this desire to mother something. And it's not being met or fulfilled by a family, and so it ends up all of our affection is poured out on animals. You know, the fur babies and dog moms, all of that is happening.

We spend $700 million on pet costumes for Halloween in the United States of America. So, I think on the one hand, it's sort of hopeful that women still have this capacity and interest in caring for others, but it's incredibly misplaced.

And so, by large measure, a lot of it is because of this animosity that's been created between the sexes, because of women's envy of men, and this telling men that they need to be different as well, this sort of bizarre dynamic that we've created. That can't create healthy, beautiful, flourishing families.

And I think that's really the key. Well, maybe the real key is to recognize that feminism has been articulating this idea of the independent woman really since Percy Shelley's articulation of it. But that's the big lie, because none of us really lives as an island, and none of us can really be fulfilled just in ourselves.

So, I think that those are all key pieces to really consider when we add up. Is this a net positive? Or is it just a net positive because it looks like women have more opportunities and more money? What are we really measuring here?

**WOODS:** Feminism, as you say in your book, has just swept the boards to the point where every cultural institution, every institution you can imagine takes its premises absolutely for granted. So, it provokes the question, how did this happen? And how did it happen so swiftly?

So, it's obviously not purely a state-driven phenomenon, because there are plenty of feminist ideas happening purely organically in the private world, private sector. But yet, nevertheless, there is some aspect of this in which the state does play a role in encouraging these ideas.

So, what exactly is the interaction between public and private in pushing forward the ideas of feminism?

**GRESS:** Well, I think you have to go back and look carefully at communism and the role of the Marxists, the role of the New Left. I mean, even Wilhelm Reich is the one that came up with the book he published in 1936 called *The Sexual Revolution*, which was really a New Left effort to disrupt American culture.

And the best way to do that is to make everybody sexual slaves, and really destroy the family unit in such ways that people are isolated. And back to those ideas that you were talking about before, people are isolated and are not making good decisions and become more dependent upon government because of the fact that they don't have a family unit with any kind of strength.

And I talk about this in the book, this idea of "bureaugamy", where a woman is married to the state because she doesn't have a husband, and by and large, most of her income and what sustains her life are those government checks.

So, that's one piece of it. But I think you also have the arrival of television. The use of media was so remarkably savvy, the use of attractive women, the use of articulate women, or the use of women that didn't have anybody pushing back against them.

Even someone like Phil Donahue was very complicit in trying to drive this narrative home in such a way that no one would dare question it. So, I think there were a lot of things happening simultaneously that really worked together, one hand washes the other kind of thing happening.

And that's just really where people realized there was a lot of power and control and money to be made by everybody being on the same page about feminism.

**WOODS:**  I can think of people who would describe themselves as "free market feminists", but I think in general they're few and far between. That's my instinct.

So, granting that you're going to have to engage in some generalization here, is there, like, an economics of feminism?

**GRESS:**  That's an interesting question. I actually haven't really thought about it per se in terms of the context of it. I mean, obviously there's dramatic repercussions economically because of this. In fact, that was one of the interesting things why Betty Friedan wrote her book, was because she was concerned about the power of purchase that women had.

I think at that point, 80% of all goods were purchased by women. Now, I think it's down to about 70%. But, it's interesting to think about. Like, did they not think that by having women get into the workplace and having their own income, that women would make more money, and they would have more discretionary income or more money at their disposal to spend?

So, that seems like there was a flaw in it.

**WOODS:** Well, let me jump in for a second. What I'm thinking about in particular would be – like, for example, early on – maybe not early on. But maybe back in the '80s or so, it was fashionable to talk about something called "comparable worth".

That it was taken for granted that the market economy will not value women's work appropriately. So, we have to decide, well, how many chemists is a secretary worth or all this crazy stuff? Or then the claim of the gender pay gap and whatever.

Now, whether these things are true or not – and they're not. But what I'm trying to get at is, what would they consider to be the appropriate economic policy response to widespread hostility that they perceive to exist in the marketplace.

**GRESS:** Well, I mean, I think in a certain respect we have to go back again to communism. I mean, this is one of the things that was fascinating about reading the book called *Century of Struggle*. That's sort of this look at first wave feminism and how the movement came about by Eleanor – oh, her last name escapes me. It'll come to me in a minute.

But in any event, this book is fascinating because this woman was a communist. And so, there's all these figures in it. Like, I couldn't figure out for the longest time, why are there all these details about money and income and how much they're making and whatnot?

And again, it goes back to this idea of these very Marxian or communist ideas of what people are worth, and the market and the oppressor and the oppressed and all of that. So, I think there's absolutely a trend in it.

And this is why this should be a red flag for all of us when we get back into these arguments, because it's been a winning argument for them. People still believe that there are these massive differences between what men are paid and what women are paid.

When, in fact, it actually shows that a woman who never had children, who kept the same track throughout all of her career, she actually makes more money than a man does in a comparable situation.

So, I think it's something of a red herring. I think it's been incredibly effective for them, and that's why they bring up numbers all the time. And I think that's what's motivating it versus sort of thinking about it more in very statistical terms.

**WOODS:** All right. I think I have what is probably the most difficult question of our whole conversation. It has to do with toward the end of your book.

The second to last chapter gets very grim because you're quoting one authority after another, saying that societies that go down this type of road with these types of ideas and practices and whatever else, don't come back. They don't come back from them.

But then – now, I'm not saying that you were pressured by your publisher. But I am saying that publishers want books to have happy endings, so they no doubt want you to try to figure out, how does a society claw its way out of this, especially after you just got done saying it doesn't happen?

But you do try to be helpful at the end. You say: *Well, we need to do this, we need to do this.* But is your heart really in that? I mean, do you really believe – you know what I mean? Let's just be honest here.

**GRESS:** Well, no, I mean, I did not get any pressure from my publisher. I actually get – the interesting places are other women that I know that they want – we want it to be hopeful. We want to have a sense of hope. And I always have a sense of hope.

I think we have to be realistic about looking at it. I think that it doesn't help us to not understand what's really at stake. I mean, this is one of the things that's sort of been swept under the carpet is just the stakes that we're dealing with, and what happens when cultures are decadent and destroyed.

I think that there is actually an opportunity for hope. I mean, I always feel that way. But we also know that these other civilizations didn't have that kind of data either. So, maybe there's something to be said for educating people and people having data.

But I think, also, even if the United States crumbles and falls, something else ultimately will have to come out of it. And that has to be something that people build and are working with.

So, I don't think it's a hopeless situation in terms of, if there's some kind of transition, anything that we can do to help people have better principles of understanding human nature and our relationship with God and how to function as a healthy society, then that's going to be a net win instead of just a hopeless dead end.

**WOODS:** Okay. Fair enough. That's a fair enough answer. Let me ask you one more thing. It's hinted at here and there in your book, but unless my memory is really failing me, there's no chapter on it per se. But the social media question is a vexed one.

I talked to somebody on my show who said that the studies that say that social media use leads to depression among young women, that the studies are all flawed and ridiculous. But yet you can at least see the plausibility of something like that, that whether or not it leads to depression among young women, it can lead to conformity.

And the interesting thing about the Internet is that it's so at odds with itself in some ways, in terms of the results that it's had. On the one hand, it elevates independent voices that would never have been featured before.

We would never have been able to listen to some of the people we are able to listen to now, and watch programs that we would never have been given the chance. But at the same time, it encourages – because you can see what people are doing all over the world.

You can see millions of people are posting things on Twitter. And you can see – like, for example, during Covid, everybody was repeating the same slogans. And so, people just understood: *Well, I suppose I am supposed to repeat this slogan.*

And so, I think in some ways, if anything, it has accelerated a trend toward mindless conformity, even though it opens up the possibility of being very individualistic and finding ideas that are very much out of the mainstream.

So, do you feel like, on balance, having – not just social media, but the internet in general. Do you think, given the Internet allows me to watch something other than *ABC, NBC, CBS*, and *Fox News*, get information from something other than those four sources.

That's been a good thing. But on the other hand, it's done a lot of bad. Like, how do you weigh it?

**GRESS:** Yeah. This is a question I haven't really thought that much about. But I think that it's fascinating to see, just, again, what we're seeing with gender dysphoria and young girls. I think that getting rid of cell phones from schools, I think, is probably a really key first step.

Because one of the things that we're seeing is the conformity is happening by those who are broken, and those who don't have confidence, don't know that they're loved. That's part of the ramifications of not having parents, and all these wounds that we have because we're now in the third or fourth generation of the destruction of the family.

So, I think that getting phones out of schools is probably a great place to start. My husband and I are pretty particular about what we allow our children to view on any kind of social media. But yeah, I think that in general, if I had to give percentages, I would say it's probably maybe 30% good, but 70% bad.

And the other factor, of course, is just the porn industry, which is a whole other – I talked about pets earlier. But the porn industry is absolutely, in so many respects, a reaction, really, on the masculine side, although, of course, women have porn addictions as well.

But in a way, because we don't have these close relationships, we don't have families, marriages are so broken. That's just sort of the quick fix for so many people. So, we see these surrogates sort of moving in that are providing a kind of comfort and solace in place of what we've destroyed in destroying the nuclear family.

So, yeah, I think in general, it's obviously something we all have to live with. But it's just a matter of figuring out how to do it in the best way, and really focus on the advantages and try to diminish the damage that it's doing.

But I don't know that I have great suggestions about how exactly that ought to be done, other than really helping our own children navigate that and not be awash in influencers and spending all of their free time online.

**WOODS:** Well, I have no simple answers either, but I'm interested in that topic just because I remember at the beginning of all this, when we had YouTube. And YouTube was a place you could post a video on anything, and it would stay up forever.

And you never heard of somebody having his video taken down from Youtube.

**GRESS:** Right, de-platformed.

**WOODS:**  Like this wasn't happening at the beginning. And so, I remember thinking: Well, okay, some crazy people will be able to spread their ideas. But also, I can spread my ideas in ways that are quite liberating, because I wouldn't have had the outlet that I have now.

And so, I was very excited about its potential. And I still think that, as you say, some good has come of it, but I'm disappointed that it's not more good. And I'm also disappointed in, frankly, my fellow human beings, that you now have at your fingertips virtually the sum total of all human knowledge.

So, up to now could have deceived myself, thinking: *Well, people don't have access to knowledge as readily as they might, and so you can't blame them.* Well, now they do. And now I do blame them. That they still believe destructive things when three mouse-clicks away, you can be liberated from these ideas, but you're not.

So, what can you do in this situation other than keep fighting for what's good? There's no other answer. Just keep fighting. And maybe you'll lose. But you've got to fight anyway.

**GRESS:** Yeah, well, and I think that has become my attitude about feminism. And I know that a lot of times I just feel like I'm shouting into the wind.

Because women have been so deeply indoctrinated and do believe it's sort of this maternal grandmother that's watching over them and helping to provide them this brighter future without really realizing the incredible damage that has been done to them and their relationships and their futures.

So, what I'm really doing is just planting seeds so that maybe at some point in someone's life they'll say: *Wow, I think that I understand what just happened and why I'm experiencing this, because I read that book.*

And I love it, actually. It's always great to see my reviews, because they're usually pretty extreme. People love it, or they hate it. And so, I think that that is also heartening.

That there are people that hopefully are reading it and hate it, but maybe in the future something will resonate, and it will really help change their life for the good.

**WOODS:** Not to mention, if good ideas can reach people before bad ideas have had a chance to corrupt them, that can also do some good. So, I'm also talking about people who haven't even been born yet.

**GRESS:** Yeah, absolutely.

**WOODS:** Well, the book once again is *The End of Woman: How Smashing the Patriarchy Has Destroyed Us.* I'll have it linked in the description of this video and also on our show notes page, which for today is TomWoods.com/2403. Well thanks again Carrie. I appreciate it.

**GRESS:** My pleasure. Thanks so much for having me on again.