

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the Munk Debates. My name is Rudyard Griffiths, and it is my privilege to act as the organizer of this debate series and to once again serve as your moderator. I want to start by welcoming the North America-wide radio and television audience tuning into this debate, everywhere from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to CPAC, Canada's cable public affairs channel, and throughout the continental United States on C-SPAN. A warm hello also to our online viewing audience tuning into this debate from around the world on munkdebates.com and CBC.ca. It's terrific to have you here as virtual participants in tonight's proceedings. And a warm hello to you, the over 3,000 people who've filled Roy Thomson Hall to capacity for yet another Munk Debate.

All of us associated with this project just want to thank you for your enthusiasm for the simple goal to which this series is dedicated: more and better public debate — something, alas, that has not been evident in Toronto in the last seven days, but it will be evident here tonight.

And tonight, ladies and gentlemen, we want to expand the focus of this debate for the first time beyond geo-politics, beyond international economics, to consider one of the big sociological questions of our time, that being the decline of the performance of men, relative to women, in the family, in the workplace, in schools and universities, and in once all-male bastions such as politics and business.

Is this a broad and permanent trend in post-industrial societies such as Canada, one that will fundamentally reshape family life, gender relations, our workplace, and society at large? Or, and it's a big or, are the millennial-old power structures — economic, political, cultural — created by men *for* men, still firmly embedded in our society, suggesting that men and maleness is anything but a spent, civilizational force? These are the fault-lines of tonight's debate, and we've assembled what we think are two pairs of truly outstanding thinkers for your enjoyment and edification.

Their presence on this stage tonight, following some forty-two other debaters since 2008, would not be possible without the generosity and public spiritedness of our hosts tonight. So please join me in an appreciation of the Aurea Foundation and its co-founders, Peter and Melanie Munk. Thank you, guys. You know, it's weeks like this that the civil and substantive conversation that we are going to have tonight takes on added importance, so again, bravo. Bravo, Peter and Melanie, for reminding us what Toronto can and should be all about.

Enough *ad hominem* on my part.

Now for the moment we've all been waiting for. Let's get our debaters out here on centre stage and our debate underway. Speaking first, for the motion "Be it resolved: men are obsolete," is the senior editor of *The Atlantic* magazine, the author of the definitive international bestseller on tonight's topic, *The End of Men*. Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome, Hanna Rosin.

Joining Ms. Rosin on the pro side of the debate is a Pulitzer Prize–winning journalist, the author of her own big book on this subject, *Are Men Necessary?* and as we know her so well, a celebrated *New York Times* columnist. Please welcome — her first time to Toronto — Maureen Dowd.

Now, let's get our second team of presenters right out here on centre stage. Rightly lauded as one of the world's top public intellectuals, she's the author of a string of iconic books on gender and culture, and she writes regularly everywhere from the *New York Times* to the *Hollywood Reporter*. We know her well. Ladies and gentlemen, Camille Paglia.

Ms. Paglia's debating partner is a cultural phenom in her own right. She is a cultural critic, a TV critic at the *Times of London*, the author of a big, global bestseller and new feminist anthem, *How to Be a Woman*. Direct from London, England, Caitlin Moran.

We have a fabulous panel of debaters, and before we get to them and their opening remarks, three simple house rules: number one — and we don't often say this at Roy Thomson Hall — power up your smartphones. You can join in the debate tonight by Twittering to our hashtag #MunkDebate — and Caitlin, with over half a million Twitter followers, I hope you'll join in. Second, take part in a rolling survey of public opinion of your fellow audience members here in the hall and watching online. You can scan the QR code in your brochure or just pop open your mobile browser and enter the URL that is on the screen, www.munkdebates.com/vote. The third is very important because you are going to help me here. When you see the countdown clock appear on the projection screens at the end of the allotted time for opening and closing statements — six minutes and three minutes each — please join me in a round of applause. This is going to keep our speakers on their toes, and more importantly, our debate on schedule.

Finally, and I think this is what our debaters want to know, because they've been asking me about it all day long, let's find out how this audience, the 3,000 people in this room, voted coming into tonight's debate on the motion, Be it resolved: men are obsolete." Let's have the "yes/no" results, and for you the debaters we'll put them up on the screen here on the floor. There we have it: 18 percent pro to 82 percent con. Now our second question — and this is important — how many of you would be open to changing your mind depending on what you heard in the next hour and half? Let's have those results ... 77 percent to 23 percent. Wow! This is interesting because remember, Munk Debates are not about one side winning a majority vote either way. It's about who can swing public opinion, and public opinion is very much in play tonight.

So it's now time for our debate to formally get underway with opening statements. Our speakers, as I mentioned, have six minutes each, and as is customary the pro side will speak first. Hanna Rosin, you're up.

HANNA ROSIN: Wow, there's a surprising number of men out there. That's really not good for us. But we'll try.

How do we know men are finished? I'll read you a quote that says it all. "Yeah, there've been times when I've been in a drunken stupor." Shhh! I need my time [to audience as they are

laughing and applauding so long]. Your mayor is a shining example of modern manhood, and is what I would call the canary in the coalmine, only he is not quite as delicate as a canary because, as he also shared with us, he's got more than enough to eat at home.

Are men literally obsolete? Of course not. If we had to prove that, we could never win this debate. For one thing, we haven't figured out how to harvest their sperm, without, you know, keeping them alive. But we do have to prove that "men" as we have historically come to define them — that is, entitled to power, destined for leadership, arrogant, and confused by anything that isn't them, as in "I don't understand; is it a guy dressed up like a girl, or a girl dressed up like a guy" — they are obsolete. And that is my last Rob Ford joke. You would do the same if you were me. It's really, really tempting. But I'm going to stop. I'm going to be totally serious now.

It's the end of men because men are failing in the workplace. Over the last few decades, men's incomes have been slowly declining as women's incomes slowly rise. Last year, only one in five men were not working, something that economists call the greatest social crisis we might face, partly this is because the global economy has been changing rapidly and men are failing to adjust. Meanwhile, women are moving in the opposite direction. In 2009 they became the majority of the American workforce for the first time in history. And now in every part of America, young single women have a higher median income than single men, which is incredibly important, because that is the age when men and women are sizing each other up and deciding what their futures are going to look like. As one sorority girl I talked to about her boyfriend put it to me — and remember, sorority girl, not the president of the Women's Studies Centre — "men are the new ball and chain."

It's the end of men because men are failing in schools and women are succeeding. In nearly every country on all but one continent, women are getting about 60 percent of college degrees, which is what you need to succeed these days. And boys start to fall behind as early as first grade and many of them can just never catch up. It's the end of men because the traditional household propped up by the man as breadwinner is quickly vanishing. Women and men learn their social roles at home — man hunter, woman gatherer; man breadwinner, woman homemaker. But that whole hierarchy has completely broken down.

Now we have a new global type called the alpha wife, the woman who earns more money than her husband. In the seventies this was a totally rare breed; you could rarely find her. And now it makes up about 40 percent of married couples. Women are occupying business positions of power that were once totally closed off to them. The premiers of Canada's four biggest provinces, the head of Harvard, the COO of Facebook, the newly appointed chairwoman of the Fed, Janet Yellen, who got her job basically because Larry Summers said that women were not that good at math.

But it's not just among the elites. The end of men is even more prominent in the working class. When I speak to working-class communities the women in the audience look at me like what I'm saying is totally, completely obvious, like the sky is blue or Miley Cyrus is whacked. The working class is where men are losing their jobs and losing their roles and their families, and

women are doing almost everything, creating virtual matriarchies in the parts of the country that used to be our bastions of macho, traditional values. And when I ask these women, “Why don’t you live with the father of your children?” they say to me, shrugging, “Because he would be just another mouth to feed.” I heard that many, many times when I was reporting.

It is the end of men because men have lost their monopoly on violence and aggression. Women are becoming more sexually confident and — something Camille might appreciate — more aggressive in both good ways and bad, going to war, going to jail, playing sports and, in the case of *The Real Housewives of New Jersey*, beating up anyone who knocks a drink out of their hand.

It’s the end of men because men, too, are now obsessed with their body hair. In her super-hilarious book, Caitlin catalogues the travails of being a modern woman, one of them being the unacceptability of hair anywhere on the body. If that’s the lingering sign of patriarchal oppression, then I counter it with “Exhibit A”: this is, of course, the chest of Anthony Weiner, who Camille memorably called “a jabbering cartoon weasel,” one of my favourite phrases ever. Now as you can see, that landscape is meticulously tended. There is not a hair anywhere on that body and, as you can imagine, that really, really hurt. And if you were to ask him, “Why are you so shorn, Mr. Weiner?” do you think he would say, “The matriarchy made me do it”? No, he would not, and neither should we.

We don’t want to castrate men. We don’t want to turn them into eunuchs. We don’t even want to feminize them that much. We just want to keep whatever we love about manhood and adjust the parts that are holding men back. I dedicated my book to my son, because he’s one of those boys who does get in trouble at school all the time and who thinks that the institutions are rigged against him. I see my job as his mother not as changing him but as accepting him as who he is and teaching him how to adapt to the world as it exists.

So when I think of the world after the end of men, I try to imagine my son in a playground on a Tuesday afternoon [audience begins applause] ... You get the point.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Wow, what a fabulous start to the debate, Hanna. Camille Paglia, you’re up next.

CAMILLE PAGLIA: Good evening. If men are obsolete, then women will soon be extinct, unless we rush down that ominous brave-new-world path where females will clone themselves by parthenogenesis as famously do komodo dragons, hammerhead sharks, and pit vipers. A peevish, grudging rancour against men has been one of the most unpalatable and unjust features of second- and third-wave feminism. Men’s faults, failings, and foibles have been seized on and magnified into gruesome bills of indictment. Ideologue professors at our leading universities indoctrinate impressionable undergraduates with perilously fact-free theories alleging that gender is an arbitrary, oppressive fiction with no basis in biology.

Is it any wonder that so many high-achieving young women, despite all the happy talk about their academic success, find themselves, in the early stages of their careers, in chronic uncertainty or anxiety about their prospects for an emotionally fulfilled private life? When an educated culture routinely denigrates masculinity and manhood, then women will be perpetually

stuck with boys, who have no incentive to mature or to honour their commitments. And without strong men as models to either embrace — or for dissident lesbians to resist — women will never attain a centred and profound sense of themselves as women.

From my long observation, which predates the sexual revolution, this remains a serious problem afflicting Anglo-American society, with its puritan residue. In France, Italy, Spain, Latin America, and Brazil, in contrast, many ambitious professional women seem to have found a formula for asserting power and authority in the workplace while still projecting sexual allure and even glamour. This is the true feminine mystique, which cannot be taught but flows from an instinctive recognition of sexual differences. In today's punitive atmosphere of sentimental propaganda about gender, the sexual imagination has understandably fled into the alternate world of online pornography, where the rude but exhilarating forces of primitive nature rollic unconstrained by religious or feminist moralism.

It was always the proper mission of feminism to attack and reconstruct the ossified social practices that had led to wide-ranging discrimination against women. But surely it was, and is possible for a progressive reform movement to achieve that without stereotyping, belittling or demonizing men. History must be seen clearly and fairly. Obstructive traditions arose not from men's hatred or enslavement of women but from the natural division of labour that had developed over thousands of years during the agrarian period and at once immensely benefitted and protected women, permitting them to remain at the hearth to care for helpless infants and children.

Over the past century it was labour-saving appliances invented by men and spread by capitalism that liberated women from daily drudgery. What is troubling about too many books and articles by feminist journalists in the U.S., despite their putative leftism, is an implicit privileging of bourgeois values and culture. The particular focused, clerical, and managerial skills of the upper middle-class elite are presented as the highest desideratum, the ultimate evolutionary point of humanity.

Yes, there has been a gradual transition. [. . .] But Rosin's triumphalism about women's gains seems startlingly premature, when she says of the sagging fortunes of today's working-class couples, that they and we had "reached the end of a hundred thousand years of human history and the beginning of a new era and there was no going back." This sweeping appeal to history somehow overlooks history's far darker lessons about the cyclic rise and fall of civilizations, which as they become more complex and interconnected also become more vulnerable to collapse.

The earth is littered with the ruins of empires that believed they were eternal. After the next inevitable apocalypse, men will be desperately needed again. Oh sure, there will be the odd gun-toting Amazonian survivalist gal who can rustle game out of the bush and feed her flock, but most women and children will reach out to men to scrounge for food and water and defend the home turf. Indeed, men are absolutely indispensable right now, invisible as it might seem to most feminists, who seem blind to the infrastructure that makes their own work lives possible. It is overwhelmingly men who do the dirty, dangerous work of building roads, pouring concrete,

laying bricks, tarring roofs, hanging electric wires, excavating natural gas and sewage lines, cutting and clearing trees, and bulldozing the landscape for housing developments.

It is men who heft and weld the giant steel beams that frame our office buildings. It is men who do the hair-raising work of inspecting and sealing the finely tempered plate glass windows of skyscrapers thirty stories tall. Every day along the Delaware River one can watch the passage of vast oil tankers and towering cargo ships arriving from all over the world. These stately colossi are loaded and steered and offloaded by men. The modern economy, with its vast production and distribution network, is a male epic in which women have found a productive role. But women were not its author. Surely, modern women are strong enough now to give credit where credit is due.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: That is the Camille Paglia we know and love. Thank you. Vintage Camille. Maureen Dowd, you are up for your opening statement, please.

MAUREEN DOWD: I've never debated before and I am so screwed.

Even though I grew up in the shadow of the Washington Monument, the jutting, Freudian symbol of the capital under male dominion for centuries, I always knew that men were doomed. That's because I was raised on a steady diet of *femme fatales*. I love *film noir* and *film noir* has one inviolable rule: deadly is the female. Guys who could be framed easier than Whistler's mother tangle with women who are trouble, and the guys always end up looking like they took a hay ride with Dracula. *Film noir* is about lady-killers and women who aren't ladies. And the women who aren't ladies wind up killing the lady-killers. The men seem under a dark spell, as though they know their futures are all used up and that *femme fatales* have the right to pursue happiness in all directions.

A classic *film noir* exchange is: — Man: "You're never around when I need you." — Woman: "You never need me when I'm around."

These mesmerizing black widows make love to their prey and then consume them, which is actually a fairly common practice in nature. Since we're coming up on Valentine's Day, I'll mention that there are more than eighty species that features leech babes that devour their male lovers before, during, and after mating. Preying mantises, green spoon worms, and there's a tiny female midge who plunges her proboscis into the male midge's head during procreation, her spittle turning his insides to soup, which she then enjoys as an après-sex snack. Beats a cigarette.

The male orb-weaving spider kills himself before the female has a chance to kill him, turning himself into a plug to prevent other males from copulating, thus ensuring his genes are more likely to live on. Even more ingenious, gene-wise, are the whip-tail lizards in the Rio Grande Valley in Texas, who procreate on a purely female basis. No males required. Oh, what a tangled gender-web we weave.

As the great Ida Lupino said in *Road House*, "Doesn't it ever enter a man's head that a woman can do without him?"

Women have finally clicked their ruby stilettos three times and realized they have the power. The world is not flat, Tom Friedman. The world is curvy. Norman Mailer used to be terrified that women were going to take over the world as punishment for being bad to them over the centuries. All women needed, he said, were about a hundred semen slaves that they could milk every day to keep the race going, and have the earth all to themselves. Dream on, Norman! All women need is a few cells in the freezer next to the cherry-flavoured vodka and we're all set.

Men are so "last-century." They seem to have stopped evolving, sulking like Achilles in his tent. The mahogany-panelled, McLelland's scotch and rum and *Mad Men* world is disappearing, and the guys are moving into the new androgynous universe more tentatively than women, as they struggle to figure out the altered parameters of manliness and resist becoming house-dudes. Even male genes are refusing to evolve. The once mighty Y chromosome, the demon that yanks us into war and empire-building, was shedding genes for millions of years and is now a mere remnant of itself and a fraction of the size of its partner, the X chromosome. As Keith Richards told Caitlin, belittling Mick Jagger, whom Keith calls "Brenda," size matters.

Evolutionary biologists were predicting that in the next 100,000 to ten million years men could disappear, taking video games, *Game of Thrones* on a continuous loop, and cold pizza in the morning with them. The Y chromosome, as renowned evolutionary biologist David Page told me, fell asleep at the wheel 200 million years ago and was headed toward the cliff. But Page and others have now learned that suddenly, about 20 million years ago, the Y chromosome woke up and veered away from the cliff, repairing itself with duplicates of its own genes. Page deduced that the Y said to itself, "I don't have a lot left, but what I have left I'm going to keep." While the Y was shrinking, the X, formerly considered a staid, pristine relic, was growing larger and stronger, acquiring new bunches of genes, some of which play roles in producing sperm.

So all those centuries, when you guys were asleep at the wheel, we were tinkering under the hood.

When I wrote *Are Men Necessary?* my mom told me to change the title to *Men are Necessary*, period. "You'll hurt their feelings," she said. So I want to end with a truism the comedian Sarah Silverman tweeted recently: "Dear Men, just because we don't need you anymore doesn't mean we don't want you. Love forever, Women."

RG: One second left, and you said you never debated before. That was absolutely perfect. Well look, it's time to get into our exchange, because —

Caitlin Moran: Can I say something?

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Oh my God, what have I done? I've totally jumped ahead of you! I was so blown away by Maureen's remarks. But considering you've come all the way from England, I think I should let you speak! So my apologies. Caitlin, you're up.

CAITLIN MORAN: I'd like to think that a woman would have remembered to include everyone!

Are men obsolete? If men are obsolete, then I personally aspire to this level of obsolescence — holding 99 percent of the world's wealth, holding sixty-six of the spots on Forbes's seventy-one

“Most Powerful People in the World” list, being every single pope, American president, and secretary-general of the UN, and in charge of every military force on earth. If this is men becoming obsolete, I’m intrigued to see what they will be able to achieve once they’ve downloaded some manner of software update.

I mean, men recorded “Get Lucky” this year, and that is one hell of a catchy record. Men are doing quite well, all things considered. Of course, I understand the general argument here. We basically have got a shifting global labour market that increasingly favours someone who can spend ten hours a day wearing a headset, eating Reese’s Pieces and making emotionally intelligent chitty-chat. We favour them over someone who can break a pig in half with their bare hands.

Whilst men might not currently be obsolescent, the future does look 100 percent female. Except, if true, that would suck as much as when the past was 100 percent male. I don’t have many rules in life other than, do not eat feta cheese that tastes fizzy, but my big one is, be polite. All harm and wrong in the world occurs when people forget to be polite. Ladies, remember how annoyed we were when men said that women were obsolete? How all those millennia of men treating women as second-class citizens seemed impolite? And we took all that valium and committed self-harm by getting massive perms?

Well, now we’ve got a lesbian Icelandic kick-ass president, Cheryl Sandberg in Spanx, let’s not now do the same thing back to men. Not least because the statistics that suggest that men are becoming obsolete aren’t about the kind of men that I *wish* would become obsolete — ass-hats in private jets furthering the various and sundry causes of evil — but essentially working-class men. Given that my feminism is: a) strident, b) fuelled by cocktails, and c) Marxist, I’m kind of not really up for women with soaring prospects dumping on working-class men who are essentially just standing around and going, “Where have all the low-paid jobs in pig-halving gone?” and, “Why is my wife making her hair so huge, dry and curly? I’m confused and unhappy.”

Look, my feminism is neither pro-women nor anti-men but thumbs up for the seven billion. Thumbs up for everyone on this little blue-green planet trying to get through the day. In a world of infinite trouble, the idea of equality isn’t some fabulous luxury that we can gift ourselves when we are feeling morally flush. Equality is not humanity’s cashmere bed socks. It’s not a present like champagne. Absolute human equality is a necessity like water, because if we look at a map of the world where every nation struggling with poverty, child mortality, and political instability is marked in red, it’s notable that the bright red shaming rash coincides almost identically with the most unequal countries in the world.

In the twenty-first century, humanity’s greatest resource isn’t oil or titanium or gold. It’s brains. And any time we make a choice as a society to offline a section of society, we waste these billions of tons of brains. There are a million ways for the world to be better, and this is equally true when men said for 100,000 years, women will never happen, as it would be now for women to say for the next 100,000 years, men are obsolete.

If feminism is the simple, truthful observation that women should be equal to men, then the future is that we must do everything to achieve that, whether in some cases it's men helping women achieve equality or in other cases women helping men achieve equality. We need with urgency to stop terming things in terms of problems of men and problems of women, and start seeing all problems for what they are — the problems of humanity. Women cannot win if men are losing and vice-versa, because we all live quite near to each other; we keep having sex with each other and giving birth to each other, and being related to each other.

When half of us fall, the other half staggers. If working-class men are struggling, the first people it will impact are working-class women. It's easy to forget this but we are the same species. Women are not from Venus and men are not from Mars. I know because I shared a bunk-bed with my brother and, unfortunately for him at the time, I discovered masturbation. He was not 34.8 million miles away.

Anyway, if men do become obsolete, then, as anyone who studies popular culture will tell you, it won't be for long. They'll be a fade-out for ten years and then they'll disappear and then some hipster will find one in a thrift store and go, "Oh my God, do you remember when we had men? It would be, like, so ironic and amusing if I had one of these back in my house." And suddenly men will be fashionable again and you'll have to pay £900 for them on eBay, and people will start making them on Etsy out of bits of wire and beads. Do we want that? No.

Think about it. Do women gain anything from men becoming obsolete? If we are the only ones triumphing in work and education, and the economy and politics and business, but yet we still retain our old kingdoms of homemaking and child-raising, do we win? No. Because if that happens, then we will be doing everything! And I don't know about you, but I'm quite knackered. The question is, are men obsolete? And my conclusion to this question is: "No, I won't let you be, you fuckers! We are going 50/50 in this world, goddammit, or I'll never have the chance to watch the *Breaking Bad* boxset!"

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Great opening comment, Caitlin, and I think it's about three in the morning for you, so the profanity suits the time. Absolutely.

Hanna, I've seen you diligently taking notes through these opening statements, and because you spoke first I want to give you the first chance to rebut something that you've heard on the other side. What jumps out at you as saying, "Look, you've got it wrong"?

HANNA ROSIN: Well, just this idea that somehow this is being mean to men. If it were up to me, we would just put all the damn factories back in all the places where the men have lost their jobs. Talking about what the truth is is not the same as being mean. There is this thing about men where you're never supposed to say that they need any help, or you are never supposed to say that they are suffering in any way because that is mean or that is degrading them. It's just the truth. We just have to face the truth that a certain kind of men are disappearing from the face of the earth and you've got to try and help them. And you can't help them unless you tell the truth, so —

CAMILLE PAGLIA: This is very interesting; there is none of the rancour that I think that I spoke of in your book. But there does seem to me to be an unfairness insofar as the only men who gain voice in your book are those who are willing to confess their victim status. And I felt that there was an absence of the very strong voices of men that I hear as I listen to sports radio, which I do around the clock —

HANNA ROSIN: You listen to sports radio?

CAMILLE PAGLIA: Yes. That is the only place where working-class men can be heard in our culture. Men are calling from trucks, from highways, from construction spots — men who have not graduated from high school but who can analyze in incredible detail exactly what was wrong with the defensive line of the Philadelphia Eagles on Sunday, okay?

HANNA ROSIN: Do you hang out at construction sites?

CAMILLE PAGLIA: Since my first book, *Sexual Personae*, I have sung the praises of construction as a sublime male poetry, and I think that the indifference of upper-middle-class feminists to the actual labour that is going on all around us by these men who are very gallant in their silent service, is a distortion —

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Okay, Caitlin, let's have you come into this. You are a self-described Marxist, so surely you have a classical Marxist analysis here.

CAITLIN MORAN: Well first of all, I just want to say that although construction is amazing, I did get ripped off on my double-glazing by the last guys who came and did my windows. You do get recommendations, but not all men are trustworthy builders!

I just want to point out the irony of the fact that it has taken four women to discuss the end of men. Why aren't *men* discussing this and working on what they are going to do next? You know, a world where —

HANNA ROSIN: You know why they're not discussing it? Because they're just pretending it's not happening. They just sort of crawl off and pretend it's not happening. It drives me nuts.

CAITLIN MORAN: It's just quite funny, though, because we're multi-tasking anyway. We're already doing everything *and* we're also trying to help them out here. It's like — "Come on, you're kind of ending. Come on, get your act together! We want to help you out here!"

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: But Caitlin, address what is happening in the UK as much as in North America. There is now — line it up — education, work participation, family life. There is a type of man out there who is falling behind in a pretty profound way. What's driving that in society?

CAITLIN MORAN: Oh well, it must be capitalism, obviously. I mean, the thing that I think is very important — and I've learned more about feminism as I've gone along — it's very important, as I said in my opening speech, that we should stop talking about problems of men and problems of women, and start talking about problems of humanity. This isn't a question of women overtaking men; it's a question of the economy changing. The global economy is changing, and it's a kind

of massive diversionary tactic that we phrase it as men against women, whereas it's the underclasses and the peasants that need to revolt against the oppressive —

HANNA ROSIN: I will say I'm fairly neutral on whether the end of men is good or bad. I don't think the end of men is totally awesome and women win and "yay, yay, yay." Some parts of the stuff I describe in my book are terrible, like that there are no dads around or that, women have to do absolutely everything. I'm just saying it's happening. I'm not saying it's awesome. I'm just saying it is.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: But Maureen, let's go to your expertise, which is politics, because look, we've got Janet Yellen running the Fed, Christine Lagarde running the IMF, Merkel astride Europe, and Hillary Clinton sizing up the White House in 2016. It looks like we have a bumper crop for women in the world of politics.

MAUREEN DOWD: Bumper crop? Yes, well, I think after what Washington has been through in the last thirteen years, where we just seem to be falling ever deeper into the abyss — and if Ted Cruz had his way, dystopia — that the only thing people in Washington are talking about is not even Hillary running against Chris Christie, it's Hillary running against Elizabeth Warren. You know, in politics there's a theory of opposites — that you want the opposite of what you had. Bill Clinton was an emo boy running all over the White House like the teenagers from the *Titanic* with Monica Lewinsky, so then they wanted something different; they wanted the macho cowboy in W. And then he and Dick Cheney smashed the Bush family station wagon into the globe, and that wasn't good. So then they wanted this cerebral constitutional lawyer and he's supposed to be a tech geek. And then he introduces the technological program that defines his presidency, and it's more *Pong* than *Call of Duty*. So I think now the opposite thing is, let's get the opposite gender and see what they can do.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Camille, you come in on that. You follow U.S. politics carefully. Have men somehow lost public trust as leaders in the public sphere, because people seem to be voting with their feet, and they seem to be voting and supporting women.

CAMILLE PAGLIA: Well yes, I think people are getting fed up with the endless philandering and sex scandals that keep arising, and I think there's a sense that somehow woman candidates are not going to be mired down in such things.

But can I just make a point about this dark view of men fading on the world economic landscape? I just don't accept it. Part of my opening statement that I didn't have time to read is that I've been calling for twenty years for a revalorization of the trades in modern education. I feel that there is a very banal, compulsory college track these days, starting in primary schools, funnelling smart students along to a university curriculum that is *extremely* vapid, and that what is needed is something much more like what is going on in Germany, which is a cooperation between primary schools and industry, and a real vocational technical training. I think that the upper middle class has to get over its social snobbery about manual labour, because I've been teaching in an arts —

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Yes. Camille, let's have the other side to this.

HANNA ROSIN: I would say I couldn't agree more. I mean, that is why I talk about this stuff. It collides perfectly with the huge problem of income inequality, which is the biggest sin that is going on right now all over the world. You keep saying, these guys are hurting, these guys are hurting, these guys are hurting, and then maybe someday someone will do something about it. I always talk about Germany because Germany has this great respect for the dudes who can make the perfect excellent refrigerator or whatever. I wish we had such great respect for those dudes.

CAITLIN MORAN: Well, I do understand that we keep repeating the same economic cycle over and over again, based on debt and the idea of an infinitely expanding economy, which logically, cannot be. But we have this belief that progress is always in a straight line, that once we've done something we just carry on in that way. But it often isn't. If there is a decline in manufacturing in this country and my country, that could all change in five years' time and we could go round in circles. And I suspect we might realize we need to start making things again rather than just trading invisible debts on the stock exchange. You know, everything that we're talking about could change in the course of two or three years quite easily.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Camille, you want to jump in on that.

CAMILLE PAGLIA: Well, I am just saying that I have been teaching for forty years at arts schools, where people work with their hands, and I come out of an Italian-American culture, where to work with your hands, to make beautiful things, not just art objects, but things with fabric and metal, basket-weaving, and leather, and so on [is valued]. And I think that what we need to do is to raise up the cultural status of manual labour.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Good point, Camille.

CAMILLE PAGLIA: To me this is one of the central points. The low esteem in which working-class men are held is partly due to this shift to a very snobbish, white upper-middle-class elite sensibility.

HANNA ROSIN: But Camille, you are always thinking that feminists are putting this out there. This is not [because of] feminists. It's just the reality. The manufacturing era is over. Feminists didn't create some fiction about the working-class man. The working-class man is screwed right now.

CAITLIN MORAN: Can I just stick up for the idea of middle-class elitist, academic feminists — of which I am not one; I never even went to school. Can we not have both? The idea that we could revive both men and women? If men have created something, we can keep that, we can preserve that, we can keep that going. And then women can go off and create something new and the two can run side by side. It's not like one system has to win over the other.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Like a theme park for men — where we visit them, working on construction sites, watching them.

Maureen, let's have you come in on this point. Manliness today, that iconic image of the construction worker, it's not really as much of the male identity now as it was a generation ago.

MAUREEN DOWD: No, I think we just need to reassure men that they can lie back and relax and relinquish some of the burdens of responsibility that you have carried so sturdily for millennia.

Try on a frilly apron over your wife-beater t-shirt. See how fetching it looks while you fetch. Rather than being a boring old necessity, you are now a luxury like ice-cream.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Now Camille, this is what you rally against, this kind of ornamentalization of men. You think men are quite different in terms of the trajectory of civilization.

CAMILLE PAGLIA: Yes. In fact, one of the things that rankled me in Hanna's book is the point where she says that men have so receded that pick-up trucks are now mere accessories. That really bothered me because it is simply not true of the contractors who arrive at my suburban house to do the lawn and the roof and whatever they do. Pick-up trucks are not accessories for working-class men.

HANNA ROSIN: Yeah, but I'm talking about Brooklyn where you walk into a shop and — and no doubt in Toronto — in that shop there is that sort of ornamentalized masculinity. You know, they have a beard, they buy a flask, and a *Playboy*. That is all that these shops sell. They sell lumberjack shirts, flasks and *Playboys*. There, it is ornamental.

CAITLIN MORAN: Thank you, because Christmas is coming up and I do need to buy gifts. Where are these places?

HANNA ROSIN: Nineteen sixty-two *Playboy*, yours for the asking.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Perfect segue. Let's go to our first video commentator clip. Let's internationalize this debate a bit. We've been talking about North America, but there's an entire world out there. We caught up with third-wave feminist, big author of *The Beauty Myth*, among other books. Let's have a listen to Naomi Wolf.

NAOMI WOLF: Thank you, Rudyard. Definitely in some ways, we in the West are in a time when women are making tremendous advances and it is worth noticing. Hanna Rosin's book, *The End of Men*, pointed out that in some professions like the law more women are graduating than men, I mean, even more than their proportionate number as the majority, 53 percent of the population. Also recently with the economic downturn in North America, in some sectors like working-class women or lower middle-class women, because of economic setbacks that their husbands or male partners are experiencing, they are increasingly out-earning men. And there are huge leaps forward in a lot of ways in the West.

But that said, let's take a step back and look at the big picture. We are a fraction of the world's population. And if you look overall at women's status globally, things are still appalling. We have so far to go. In Pakistan and India recently, the routine gang-rapes of women with no recourse to justice have been shockingly documented. In places like Thailand and Central Europe, women are trafficked, girls are trafficked, as sex workers with no rights. In places like Saudi Arabia, women can't drive; they don't have full legal rights. And all over the world globally, women own a fraction of the wealth that men do.

What I'd rather do than pit east versus west or men versus women is recognize that the policies that are good for families, good for girls and boys, good for the environment, good for peace and social justice are policies that raise the status of women and girls, and educate and invest in

women and girls. And that when that happens, everybody benefits. Communities benefit, the environment benefits, social life benefits. And so I'd rather say, let's move ahead with supporting the equality of girls and women because it's good for everyone, including men.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Caitlin, let me go to you, because that is very much your message. But focus on the international dimension because, if you look abroad, to parts of the Middle East and elsewhere, the patriarchy looks alive and well.

CAITLIN MORAN: Yes, well, in the Middle East my book was banned and apparently they had parties where they would smuggle it in and read stories about masturbation to each other — hopefully whilst drinking illegal alcohol that they'd smuggled in as well!

This is one of the reasons why I love the Internet. To me, the Internet is female. I think it takes so much time and energy to break into something that has already been constructed, such as breaking into male constructs, and the great thing about the Internet is that it just opens up this entire new-found land, this entire continent that women can go into and find infinite space and communicate with each other and join up very quickly.

The rocketing of feminism, like out of the U.K. over the last couple of months, has joined up with organizations all over the world, because it just takes one teenage activist to start blogging about what's happening and she can connect with girls all around the world in a way that you never would before. Previously, if you were the only feminist in your village, you probably wouldn't know any other feminists, but now you can join up and find all the other lonely feminists around the world and start talking about different tactics and ways to activate and things that worked, and sharing inspiring stories. And now no girl has to be alone in the world. And you know, this is why I think the Internet is one of the best things to happen to women. Because also on the Internet you are not your physicality, no one can see what you look like, you just are simply your thoughts, and the cleverest person on the Internet wins. And that to me is a brilliant step in evolution as well.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: But Hanna, you made an argument in your book that there is a rise of the woman phenomenon in the developing world also, so why don't you share that with us?

HANNA ROSIN: Yes, but the difference — I mean it's not like every problem has been eradicated, not in the U.S., not in India, not anywhere — but the difference now is that unlike India even ten years ago, those men are brought to justice. Unlike Saudi Arabia of ten years ago, there is an actual active protest against women not driving. Unlike a world of ten years ago, these global bodies like the U.N. have this idea that they have to put quotas on women because women will fix everything. Now I don't know that women will fix everything; sometimes, in war-torn countries like Liberia and Rwanda, they just pull women in with this idea that they are going to fix things. So I think we have it in our heads that it is time for a feminine fix for some of these things in some of these countries. But that's very different than before, when the patriarchy would have just shut down that court case straight away.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Camille, do you want to come in on this, on the international dimension?

CAMILLE PAGLIA: Well, as a student of history, I just have a sense of foreboding about processes that are at work in the world. I just think it is incredibly — pardon me, with all due respect — naive, to think that we are moving toward some sort of an economic paradise, and women are going to gain control. I think that women’s advance is one of the many things in the West that jihadists consider decadent. I think it is one of the targets of jihadism. And you know, for my entire life I’ve studied the fate of Rome and how Rome thought it would last forever, but there were these determined bands of Vandals, very fast-moving, who were able to bring that culture down.

But I’m concerned about anything which undermines the identity or prestige of men, because I do believe there are going to be political consequences to a culture where women, who tend, in general, in a non-militaristic direction, [are in charge]. I think that we are heading toward a nanny-state mentality where we are just going to cater to social needs, and that we believe there is no necessity for us to remain vigilant about the future. I’m very concerned.

HANNA ROSIN: So what would you have us do? Just plug the men’s ears and pretend it’s not happening? Just be like, “It’s okay, it’s okay, you’re okay?”

CAMILLE PAGLIA: No, I want to build up men’s sense of masculine identity again. I want to liberate education. I think that our primary school system is constructed like a prison and that it teaches absolutely nothing except socially approved and trendy thoughts, and that is all.

HANNA ROSIN: Yes, and it totally favours girls, and so until you are actually honest about the boy crisis, until you actually allow people to hear the word that boys are seriously suffering —

CAMILLE PAGLIA: Right.

HANNA ROSIN: You know, in America people have been talking about the boy crisis since 1990 and we still pretend it’s not happening because we can’t accept this idea that boys might need help, that boys are suffering. So we’re just like, “It’s okay, everything is okay.”

CAMILLE PAGLIA: Yes.

HANNA ROSIN: It’s not okay.

CAMILLE PAGLIA: As you point out, when Christina Hoff Summers raised these issues many people said, “Oh, this is not true,” and now it’s become absolutely conventional wisdom that yes, boys are in crisis. As far as I’m concerned, the way to do it is to really look at our educational system. I think that it is toxic; it is toxic for creativity, it produces clones, it produces people who have been deprived of energy and thought, and we have an extremely mediocre education system right now that is whittling down male initiative and is compounding this problem. And I totally acknowledge Hanna’s overall point about this long transition between the old manufacturing base and the white-collar —

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: But you’re agreeing with Hanna. So what I am trying to understand is, do you think this is a moment, a phase that will pass, and that qualities of maleness and male identity will reassert themselves, and so things will be therefore better in the future?

CAMILLE PAGLIA: No, I'm saying maleness is not going to reassert itself until we revolutionize the educational system. And another thing I've been calling for is for us to be looking at the way young women are put onto a male track in terms of their own college and graduate and post-graduate education. That there is no room in there, no wiggle room, for an ambitious, smart and talented young woman to decide she would like to have children early. So I've been calling for colleges and universities who profess to endorse women's rights to be much more flexible.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: That's a very good point, and let's have Maureen come in on this, because luckily we're not the United States where — what do you get? — three, four weeks of maternity leave? I mean, there are a lot of structural barriers in American society and Western society that prevent women from being as successful as they would like to be. So, doesn't that suggest that men aren't obsolete?

MAUREEN DOWD: Yes, well obviously we should be more like France in that respect in terms of health care for women. But I just wanted to tell a funny story when you guys were talking about the international situation, because I've spent a lot of time in Saudi Arabia, and the last time I was there I was doing a feature for *Vanity Fair* and travelling around. I had read that the grave of Eve, the original Eve, was in Saudi Arabia, so I asked my guide to take me there. And he just looked at me like I was crazy and said, "You can't go there; you're a woman." For a second I tried to reason with him and explain why a woman should be allowed to see Eve's grave. But Saudi Arabia is at least still more modern than the Catholic Church, so there's a lot of work to be done there.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Ouch. Hanna, I can tell you want to come in on this point.

HANNA ROSIN: Which one?

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: The structural barriers, maternity leave, how the workplace is set up so that the very structure of modern professional life often is antithetical to a lot of the things that women want to do and how they want to live.

HANNA ROSIN: We're actually the worst. We actually don't have any maternity leave that is paid at all, and we're maybe one of three countries that doesn't, so that is actually very pathetic. The American workplace actually doesn't recognize the person as a whole human being who might have other needs. But if I had my druthers, I actually wouldn't do the Swedish system where you have a year of maternity leave, because that puts all sorts of pressures on women to behave in a certain way and they actually have a more gender-unequal workplace than we do.

I think what you have to do is actually Sweden 2.0: consider it a kind of gender-neutral proposition that allows men and women to take time off, which is, I think, what Canada just did. Or you do what France does and focus on childcare rather than just maternity leave; you create something so that the employer is not looking only at women and saying, "Oh, they are the ones who are going to screw me and take a year off." It is everybody's job to take care of the children, not just the women's job, even though women do it more.

CATLIN MORAN: I would say that the education system appears to be bad for men and for women. I am someone who was taught at home by my parents, and we just sat around and watched

musicals all day and that worked really well for us. So I would encourage everyone to drop out of formal education and just watch *Easter Parade*.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: I want to be conscious of our time because I want to touch on the cultural dimension of this debate. Let's do that by going to the second of our two video contributors. She's an influential curator of what we all think about gender, culture and politics — former editor of *Vanity Fair*, *The New Yorker*, and *Newsweek*. Let's listen to Tina Brown.

TINA BROWN: Thank you, Rudyard. Well, I think Miley Cyrus and all of her ilk, right now, are doing a lousy service to women because they are really just advertising lack of dignity, lack of self-possession, that kind of gaudy and vulgar way of looking at themselves, which, frankly, just encourages everyone else to look at them that way, too. And it seems to me that women have come so far on the one hand, but also at the same time are allowing themselves to be dialled back by the wrong kind of pop culture role models right now.

One of the things that we do right now at our Women in the World Summit is to showcase these incredible women who are doing the most amazing things for other women, who are so cool in their own right, who are actually fighting for their rights, in education and in health, and in marriage to someone you want. And then, you know, you see so much in America right now of these role models who are just so dismal, of young women who are just really the wrong women to emulate.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Maureen, let me come to you. I know you guys are going to weigh in on this, too, but Maureen, you write about popular culture a lot. Why isn't Miley Cyrus, her ilk, why isn't that proof positive of a very male — some would say regressive — way of looking at women that a lot of women feel that they have to conform to in order to succeed as Miley Cyrus has succeeded brilliantly with this new album?

MAUREEN DOWD: Well, Miley Cyrus is obviously a great marketer. But I would just say that she doesn't really have a good grasp of what is sexy at all times and, as Caitlin said, I would advise her to watch some old movies, maybe thirties and forties movies, because she doesn't understand that less is more sometimes with sexiness, and if she could learn that lesson, she would be a lot more appealing — if she had a little mystery and a little holding something in reserve.

HANNA ROSIN: But maybe it's like a big "screw you." Maybe she doesn't want to be sexy. She doesn't seem to be like she wants to be — she is not being like a girl trying to be really sexy to men.

CAITLIN MORAN: She's not *Pride and Prejudice*, is she? She is not fighting over Mr. Darcy, is she?

HANNA ROSIN: No. No mistake about that.

CAITLIN MORAN: The big thing about popular music is, I'm pro Miley Cyrus just gonking about with her whack out. That is fine for me because pop music is always going to be about sexiness. It just looks like Madonna to me. She is just out there having a good time, and pop will always be about sex and desire and all these kind of things.

The problem I have with the wider Miley Cyrus thing is the narrowness of the lexicon. It's just that every woman is doing that right now, you know. The only two people who have been allowed to keep their clothes on in the last five years who are female are Florence and the Machine, and Adele. They have been allowed to wear sleeves! It's quite extraordinary. And you know, I was trying to explain to a male friend why it is so weird to me that every time I put on MTV — and not just with female but also with male performers — when they have all the females there as decoration, twerking and having champagne spread over their asses. I was going, "You have to understand how weird it is for me as a woman that every woman has no clothes on and every woman is sexy. It's as if every male pop star you saw on the telly was obsessed with farming and they all, every single male pop star you saw, every video, they were on a tractor and they were handling livestock, and they were covered in straw for ten years, every single one you saw."

HANNA ROSIN: But I think there is a male version of that. They don't have to be farmers, they just have to be thugs. If you're Macklemore, you have to be a thug. If you're Robin Thicke you have to be a thug. Like, if there is an ornamental femininity, there is an ornamental masculinity where you just have to be —

CAITLIN MORAN: But they are allowed to be fat, they are allowed to be ugly, they are allowed to wear their clothes in a way a woman wouldn't. I mean, there is that small little bonus round that they have got down there. But you know, Macklemore, he is not going to be there with the Botox and the capped teeth, is he?

HANNA ROSIN: He's not ugly though, either, is he?

CAITLIN MORAN: No, but he's not having to worry. I mean, I know the mons of nearly every single female pop star in the world more intimately than I know my own. I have seen that in extreme close-up and detail on MTV. There is a lot of upkeep going on there; these are women who could be fomenting some manner of revolution if they weren't carefully picking out every single piece of stubble with a pair of tweezers before they shoot their new video. It's a simple matter of time that I worry about. I think they could be spending more time —

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Okay, Camille, come in on this.

CAMILLE PAGLIA: [In older movies] there were limits set for what could be shown. In fact, those were the movies that formed my own sensibility about sex; that is why I find Miley Cyrus very boring, because she is not sexy at all. I mean, I think that she thinks it is sexy. She is going through the motions of sexy. But you know, nothing can compare to the scene in *Butterfield 8* where Elizabeth Taylor and Lawrence Harvey are fighting in a bar and she is grinding her stiletto heel into the top of his foot, and there is just this intensity in a public place. And also, the old movies accepted sexual differences — that great moment in *Gone with the Wind* where all of a sudden there is Rhett Butler leaning on the bannister and just looking, looking at Scarlett O'Hara up the stairs. The entire theatre still gasps at that one moment, that one glance, which contains all of male sexuality. It's the best sex scene. So unfortunately our problem today is that there is no sizzle left in our films —

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: But there is no sizzle amongst guys because —

CAMILLE PAGLIA: And here's the thing — and I talk about this a lot in my classes at the University of the Arts — our male actors today don't know how to be men. Why? Because they are imitating the whole line of men ahead of them in film, going back to Brando, right? So they are just watching films and trying to pretend to be the man they see on film. But those old stars, a lot of them, including Clark Gable, Robert Mitchum, Charlton Heston, they began working with their hands, working in factories, and someone said, "Hey, John Wayne. Hey you, come and let's see if. . . ." So they were real men with real masculine experience that came onto the screen. Gary Cooper was another example.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: We're up against time, but I want to give you guys the last word before we go into closing statements. You talked about men and grooming, men looking more like women. Isn't that somehow symbolic of your argument?

HANNA ROSIN: Men have to take care of themselves now. Their hair is a big, huge deal. It's like your beard is a big thing and you can't have hair in certain places. I mean, that used to be exclusively our problem and now it is everybody's problem — what is going on with your hair? So there is a kind of equal-opportunity hair oppression, which is, either good or bad, I don't know. It just is.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Maureen, last word to you.

MAUREEN DOWD: Also in this political cycle we are spending more time talking about Chris Christie's looks than Hillary Clinton's, which is a switch.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Okay, we are going to go into closing statements. That was a great discussion, and as we agreed beforehand, we're going to have the closing statements in the opposite order. And this time, I most certainly am not going to forget that Caitlin Moran is going first. You're up — three minutes.

CAITLIN MORAN: Thank you very much. Just when we were talking about that, I realized that maybe the problem is that my sexual template is the bit where Bugs Bunny dresses up like a girl and seduces Elmer Fudd. That's essentially what I've based all of my sexual relationships on.

Anyway, two things: (1) Life on earth is an experiment; we are a blue-green petri dish. And (2) If you add up all the oppressed minorities of the world — that's all the women, all the LGBT people, all the disabled and all the people of colour — that's about eighty to ninety percent of the world. Straight white men, the patriarchy, have shaped and ruled our world for 100,000 years on what is basically a skeleton staff. They are a tiny proportion of the world. They are basically the night shift, the holiday cover, and in their time they have raised the pyramids and put Stonehenge in the middle of the Salisbury plains and invented the gods and the car and New York and Twitter and John Frieda Frizz-Ease Serum and Lycra. Yada, yada, yada, oppression, yes. But you can't deny they got shit done.

So, back to life on earth being an experiment. The most fascinating experiment that we have the potential to run right now is: (a) see what women turn out to be when they're not afraid and they

are empowered and they're *not* impoverished and they have achieved equality, and then: (b) see what is the consequence? What will men turn out to be when they have women as their equals and they can finally debate these things together? What will men turn into? How will the triumphing of feminism make us all evolve?

I'm so excited to see what little boys will be like when they grow up in a world filled with female presidents and female sports stars and a band that they call the New Beatles, which is all female, and *his* friends scream at *that* band in the way girls used to scream at the Beatles. And then, how in turn girls will change when they see boys reacting like that. The kaleidoscopic dizzying wonder of everything that can happen makes me so excited. We are so early on in the experiment of what it is to be a human on earth and we have so much to look forward to if we hold our nerve.

We are on the brink of being able to turn into a whole new species, and when we merge physically, the old-fashioned way, we make that most astonishing and precious and awe-inspiring thing, a baby, a new human, a small infinite future. Imagine what we will make when we merge on every level, by merging our intellectual and emotional chemistry into the first ever society which is equally male and female, when we collaborate on humanity 2.0 — how this will change our fundamental ideas of gender and sexuality, of what is normal and natural, or what is actually female and male. Basically, I'm imagining a world full of moon-walking pan-sexual David Bowies and Janelle Monaes, and I've generally never heard of any better plan for the future than that.

So if you vote against this motion, that is scientifically what we are guaranteed to get. Guaranteed. Literally cash back if you don't, although bear in mind I do get on a plane at 6 a.m. tomorrow and my cellphone goes straight to answer phone. Thank you.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Well done, Caitlin. Up next, Maureen Dowd, with your final three-minute statement.

MAUREEN DOWD: I didn't want to mention this the first time around, given that you are my hosts, but in order to prove definitively that men are not necessary, I only need two words: Ted Cruz. I come here seeking refuge from the apocalyptic terror of Ted Cruz's thunderdome. How on earth did a Canadian almost destroy America? Canadians are usually so nice.

For centuries it was widely thought that women were biologically unsuited to hold leadership positions. It was felt that power was best wielded by men because men were impersonal, unemotional, forthright and reasonable. Now it is the highly unstable male temperament that is causing alarm. Male politicians are engaging in sneaky, catty, weepy, ditzy, shrewish behaviour that is anything but reasonable and impersonal. We can't even count on men to be effective tech geeks, given the situation with Obama's roll-out on healthcare.

Women are affected by lunar tides only once a month; men have raging hormones every day, as we noticed when Dick Cheney rampaged around the globe like Godzilla. Rob Ford, your hot mess of a mayor, has had many wild outbursts that, if he were a woman, would certainly be labelled "hysteria," from the Greek for "womb." Who but a hysteric excuses himself for smoking

crack by saying he was in a drunken stupor? And then talks to reporters about his adventures with lady-parts?

I do want one of those bobble-heads, though.

Ted Cruz is a scary mean girl. He threw a hissy-fit over Obamacare that shut down the government for sixteen days and cost the American economy \$24 billion. Rand Paul, the libertarian senator from Kentucky, grew sulky and needed a fainting couch when Rachel Maddow blasted out that he was a kleptomaniac with Wikipedia. The most emotional member of congress is Speaker John Boehner, who starts blubbering into his Merlot at the slightest sentimental provocation. Unlike his macho Democratic counterpart, Nancy Pelosi, he's not adept at math and counting; he keeps acting ditzy and bringing Tea Party bills to the floor of the house that do not have the votes to pass.

If you want to talk about catty behaviour, consider this: Ken Cuccinelli refused to call Terry McAuliffe after the Virginia governor's race to congratulate him. Men played so rough and heedlessly with the globe they almost broke it. So we're going in a different direction. Heck, they wouldn't even ask for directions. And no, Sarah Palin, that still does not mean you.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: So, you had eight seconds left; let's pass that over to you, Hanna, for a moment of grace when you speak last. Up next, though, is Camille Paglia. Camille, your three minutes, please.

CAMILLE PAGLIA: I was raised in the 1950s when it was unheard of for women to be ambitious for a career, and with the arrival of the women's movement in the late 1960s, now young women feel that every career path is open to them. What I am concerned about is that feminism has painted itself into a corner and is now completely invisible, really. There are sites on the web that attract committed feminists, but they are completely invisible, and feminism has absolutely no important profile right now in the U.S. I feel that feminism has drifted from any sense of what most people are looking for — for value in life.

A career is extremely important, but ultimately, other things become more important as you age. I often walk on the New Jersey shore in a very working-class area, the Wildwoods, and I'm very moved by seeing these working-class families, multi-generations, vacationing together — something that the upper middle class ceases to do as it becomes more affluent and people can take their own separate vacations. And I see there the joy that elderly people take in what they have wrought. You have multiple generations vacationing together, and these old people that can barely get to the shore or the edge of the water, are sitting in deck chairs and watching as their grandchildren and great-grandchildren are running around.

No matter what you have done in life, no matter what your status, no matter how much power you've achieved, how much wealth, a point comes where it is all meaningless. There is nothing left but a sense of what you've contributed to life itself. I am very concerned that the Western obsession with career success, and with status and wealth, is actually perverting and distorting our sense of the spiritual dimension, of the meaning of life itself. I think that feminism needs a major correction back, toward looking, first of all, at lifting the value of children. There's all this

talk about childcare and maternity leave and so on, but in point of fact, the feminist movement, second-wave feminism, has acted in a way that has tended to denigrate the stay-at-home mom and in fact, in its obsession with abortion has made it seem as if it is anti-life.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Thank you, Camille. Hanna Rosin, you get the very last word tonight.

HANNA ROSEN: Alright, I'll take it. So, I think that there is some confusion out there about what you are voting for if you vote for us. When we say men are obsolete, that doesn't mean they are worthless, or that we want to stomp on them or we hate them. It means something different. I'm trying to think about it as being outmoded. So let's say, the twin combustion engine technically makes the bicycle obsolete, but that doesn't mean that we hate the bicycle or that we want to throw the bicycle away. It just means that you want to use the bicycle exactly how you want to, while recognizing that there is some need for efficiency and change. I think the same is true for men. So, you are allowed to preserve the parts of manhood that you love and value — whether that is craftsmanship, or macho-ness, or eating nachos and playing video games — whatever it is about manhood that you love you should preserve, at the same time as recognizing that there need to be some adjustments if men, and particularly certain men, are going to survive in the modern world.

Secondly, I think you think that by voting for us you are voting for some kind of crazy, triumphalist feminism, and that women won, and we stomp on your car part jackets and we steal your pick-up trucks and we are really happy about it. But that's not true. It's neither good nor bad, you are just voting and acknowledging a reality. So, when Camille said that we don't recognize these things as valuable anymore, and we don't have vocational programs to respect men, I totally agree with that. But that means that you should vote for our side, because then you are just recognizing the reality of what is going on.

Thirdly, I think that *you* think that if you are voting for us you are somehow blinded to the fact that men are the majority of CEOs or popes and so forth. Yes, they are. That is absolutely true, but that is just a moment in time, and if you look at the trends it is completely obvious that that world is not going to last. I mean, what did Caitlin say about this? "The patriarchy must be knackered by now," she said. "It's been 100,000 years without so much as a tea-break; let the ladies take over the world for a while." What did Camille say about this? "It is woman's destiny to rule men. Woman is the dominatrix of the universe." Yes! That's true. The energy and the momentum is obviously with women, which doesn't mean that we are crazy, harridan feminists. It just means that we are recognizing the truth.

And finally I would say you should just be brave enough to tell the truth about this, especially you men out there. Don't pretend it's not happening. I mean, I have a husband who totally still speaks to me, even after a year of me talking about the end of men. I have one son who still speaks to me — and another son who doesn't, but that's beside the fact. But, I would just say that hiding our heads in the sand and pretending that there is no boy crisis, there is no crisis in working-class men, that there isn't a crisis in masculinity, is not the way to go. I would urge you all to acknowledge the truth and vote for us.

RUDYARD GRIFFITHS: Wow! That was a terrific debate. Thank you. The four of you approached this issue with a great combination of wit, insight, and substance. And on behalf of the 3,000 people here and all of you watching online, a big thank you.

And again, a big thank you to the Aurea Foundation. The last hour and a half reminded me that yes, Toronto actually is city of sophistication and substance. So bravo, again, Peter and Melanie, for making this possible.

And now, a crucial part of tonight's proceedings. Which one of these teams has been able to sway public opinion in this room? Before you vote for a second time, let's just remind everyone of where the numbers stood at the beginning of the evening, "Be it resolved: men are obsolete." We had 18 percent in favour and 82 percent opposed. And then when we asked how many of you were open to changing your vote, look at that number, fully 77 percent. A big number. This debate is very much in play.

For those of you watching online, the debate is not over. Our post-debate Town Hall begins now with Christina Hoff Summers and Stephanie Kootz. Stay tuned for that online. For those of you at Roy Thomson Hall, you all have a ballot — and no, you can't use it to kick the mayor off city council, but you can use it tonight for our motion. So please vote wisely and respect the democratic process; vote once. We will announce the results shortly before 9 p.m. on the Internet, Facebook, and Twitter, but more importantly for you here tonight in the south lobby of Roy Thomson Hall.

Let's everyone pick up some books by the debaters, which are on sale from Ben McNally, great bookseller. Everyone, thank you for a lovely night. Let's head to the reception. Let's head to the south lobby.