**The following is an article by Suzanne Venker on the war on men. Then, there is an article that includes an interview with the author in which she answers questions about her editorial. Please read both.**

**The War on Men**

By [Suzanne Venker](http://www.foxnews.com/archive/author/suzanne-venker/index.html), Published November 26, 2012, FoxNews.com

The battle of the sexes is alive and well. According to Pew Research Center, the share of women ages eighteen to thirty-four that say having a successful marriage is one of the most important things in their lives rose nine percentage points since 1997 – from 28 percent to 37 percent. For men, the opposite occurred. The share voicing this opinion dropped, from 35 percent to 29 percent.

Believe it or not, modern women want to get married. Trouble is, men don’t.

The so-called dearth of good men (read: marriageable men) has been a hot subject in the media as of late. Much of the coverage has been in response to the fact that for the first time in history, women have become the majority of the U.S. workforce. They’re also getting most of the college degrees. The problem? This new phenomenon has changed the dance between men and women.

But what if the dearth of good men, and ongoing battle of the sexes, is – hold on to your seats – women’s fault?

As the author of three books on the American family and its intersection with pop culture, I’ve spent thirteen years examining social agendas as they pertain to sex, parenting, and gender roles. During this time, I’ve spoken with hundreds, if not thousands, of men and women. And in doing so, I’ve accidentally stumbled upon a subculture of men who’ve told me, in no uncertain terms, that they’re never getting married. When I ask them why, the answer is always the same.

Women aren’t women anymore.

To say gender relations have changed dramatically is an understatement. Ever since the sexual revolution, there has been a profound overhaul in the way men and women interact. Men haven’t changed much – they had no revolution that demanded it – but women have changed dramatically.

In a nutshell, women are angry. They’re also defensive, though often unknowingly. That’s because they’ve been raised to think of men as the enemy. Armed with this new attitude, women pushed men off their pedestal (women had their own pedestal, but feminists convinced them otherwise) and climbed up to take what they were taught to believe was rightfully theirs.

Now the men have nowhere to go.

It is precisely this dynamic – women good/men bad – that has destroyed the relationship between the sexes. Yet somehow, men are still to blame when love goes awry. Heck, men have been to blame since feminists first took to the streets in the 1970s.

But what if the dearth of good men, and ongoing battle of the sexes, is – hold on to your seats – women’s fault?

You’ll never hear that in the media. All the articles and books (and television programs, for that matter) put women front and center, while men and children sit in the back seat. But after decades of browbeating the American male, men are tired. Tired of being told there’s something fundamentally wrong with them. Tired of being told that if women aren’t happy, it’s men’s fault.

Contrary to what feminists like Hanna Rosin, author of The End of Men, say, the so-called rise of women has not threatened men. It has pissed them off. It has also undermined their ability to become self-sufficient in the hopes of someday supporting a family. Men want to love women, not compete with them. They want to provide for and protect their families – it’s in their DNA. But modern women won’t let them.

It’s all so unfortunate – for women, not men. Feminism serves men very well: they can have sex at hello and even live with their girlfriends with no responsibilities whatsoever.

It’s the women who lose. Not only are they saddled with the consequences of sex, by dismissing male nature they’re forever seeking a balanced life. The fact is, women need men’s linear career goals – they need men to pick up the slack at the office – in order to live the balanced life they seek.

So if men today are slackers, and if they’re retreating from marriage en masse, women should look in the mirror and ask themselves what role they’ve played to bring about this transformation.

Fortunately, there is good news: women have the power to turn everything around. All they have to do is surrender to their nature – their femininity – and let men surrender to theirs.

If they do, marriageable men will come out of the woodwork

Read more: <http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/11/24/war-on-men/#ixzz2H179YXtw>

Suzanne Venker Prescribes a Detox From Feminism

* BY [KAT STOEFFEL](http://nymag.com/author/Kat%20Stoeffel)

By now, you’ve probably read “[The War on Men](http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/11/24/war-on-men/),” the recent Fox News op-ed that blamed the decline of marriageable males, noted in books like *The End of Men*, on feminists. Or you've at least seen your Facebook friends complain about it. It says that modern women have emasculated, repulsed, and “pissed off” men with their anger and defensiveness — and by rejecting their God-given, nurturing natures. *Gulp.*

Author Suzanne Venker's books, *7 Myths of Working Mothers*and*The Flipside of Feminism* (written with anti-feminist gadfly Phyllis Schlafly, who is her aunt), are part of a small but vocal school of anti-feminist conservative thought. It holds that feminism denigrates motherhood (Who *raised*you, [Hilary Rosen](http://nymag.com/daily/intel/2012/04/does-mitt-romney-think-his-wife-lacks-dignity.html)?), and it has a deep aversion to whining. And though *our*feminism loves moms and thinks we should leverage that uncontroversial feeling to get paid maternity leave, paternity leave, and fair wages and rights for domestic workers, Venker and her ilk merit investigation. After all, it was at the Democratic National Convention where Princeton-educated lawyer Michelle Obama said her most important title was “mom-in-chief.”

We reached Venker at home in St. Louis Tuesday morning to discuss the blowback on the op-ed, details on her forthcoming book, and gender essentialism.

**Your Fox News op-ed, “**[**The War on Men**](http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/11/24/war-on-men/)**,” has been shared more than a hundred thousand times on Facebook. How has the reaction been so far?**It’s ridiculously overwhelming; the people come out of the woodwork on social media. I’m disappointed that Fox doesn’t have comments. People were looking for a place to talk about it, and they found my [Facebook](https://www.facebook.com/suzannevenker) page. I’ve left it open for them to do their thing there — all the feminists who think I’m the devil — but I stopped reading it. What saddens me is that people get in touch with me privately because they see the conflict, and they don’t want to be involved with it. That’s the stuff the world doesn’t see. Basically I’m the fall guy. I didn’t set out to do that, but here I am.

**As the niece of Phyllis Schlafly,**[**the lawyer and activist who put the final nail in the coffin of the Equal Rights Amendment**](http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0%2C8599%2C1889757%2C00.html)**, surely you’re familiar with unhappy feminists. How has she influenced you?**I collaborated with her on the last book, [*The Flipside of Feminism*](http://www.amazon.com/Flipside-Feminism-What-Conservative-Women/dp/1935071270), kind of end of story. We’re not extremely close. She’s a workaholic — all work and no play — but she and I are on the same page about feminism. I thought it would be good to have a cross section of her work in the seventies in the book, comparing that to what’s going on today. She was the ringleader for an alternative viewpoint to feminism, which then was just starting up. I’m battling it after the “damage” has been done. Things have happened as a result of the sexual revolution which are not good, and the media ignores them. That’s where I come in.

**What kind of “damage” has feminism done?**The idea that equality means sameness. Women and men had specific roles, and there were reasons they were locked into those roles. The changes that have occurred since then have allowed or forced people out of those gender roles, mostly because of birth control. But the purpose of feminism is to yank the feminine out of the woman, to give you this *faux* sense of equality. Just because men and women are equal in worth or value doesn’t mean they’re interchangeable or the same. Feminism taught women to reject marriage and motherhood, go out into the workforce, and compete with men. That has been extremely destructive.

**How has women entering the workforce been destructive?**Because it’s going against what is naturally feminine. Feminists robbed you of what you naturally want: to be a wife, a mother, homebound. But that’s only half the pie. Feminism didn’t teach women to have it all; it taught them to have half of it all, the half of the pie that used to belong to men. As if men had it so great and they had better lives.

For example, when I was in college, I was always thinking,*What kind of work would work well with being a mother?*Everything I did was with the assumption that being a wife and a mother is my core, and I have to work everything in around that. Now women are groomed for the workforce. You don’t go to college to find a husband; you go to find your own single life and your career.

**If a woman only wants a career, is it possible that it’s just what she wants? Or has she definitely been indoctrinated by feminists?**It’s absolutely possible that it’s her true self, but it’s not the norm. I don’t have any issues with generalizations, but there are always exceptions to the rule. Obviously there’s a small portion of the world that’s homosexual, that means that 4 percent, 5 percent is not going to be like the rest.

Just this morning, in [*The Wall Street Journal*](http://stream.wsj.com/story/latest-headlines/SS-2-63399/SS-2-109020/)— I thought the timing was fascinating, in light of my article — Dr. Terri Orbuch, the author of *Finding Love Again*, says that “because relationships are so important to women, their identity as a wife and mother is central to their being.” It goes on: “Men, for the most part, don’t have this problem. Their identity as a father and a husband is often secondary to their identity as a provider.”

**That sounds terrible! If my primary identity were “so-and-so’s girlfriend” but so-and-so’s primary identity weren’t “Kat’s boyfriend,” I’d  feel so sad.**It’s not sad. This is what it is: What can women sit around talking about all day? Their relationships. Do you see men sitting around and talking about their girlfriends? No. They need to move their bodies around. That’s why sex, for them, is showing their love. You can’t reverse that. You are a relational person. You are made to love and connect.

What can women do that men can’t do? Have babies. So for men, their way of contributing is to provide for them. You need both to come together to have the complete pie. It’s the yin and yang. It’s a*good* thing. It’s not a bad thing. But it flies in the face of this*faux-*argument feminists made to scare women, to get them on their side to think the way they think.

**Speaking of men, you wrote this op-ed in promotion of your forthcoming book,**[***How to Choose a Husband***](http://howtochooseahusband.com/)**. Can you tell us a little bit about the book?**The first part analyzes what’s happened over the past 40 years. The second part is a detox from the feminist messages women have gotten. It’s a twelve-step program. I’m presenting a different road map. The feminist way sacrifices your femininity, the way you’re wired. But if you follow the feminist path — like the Sheryl Sandbergs, the Hanna Rosins — and do nothing from age 22 to 65 but work 65 hours a week, hire a nanny, start a two-income family … I don’t think it makes people happy. By the way, this book is very self-reflective. I myself have had to sort of adapt. That wasn’t because of feminism; my natural way of being was, as you can probably tell, to be strong-willed and opinionated and all that. So I’ve had to temper my own personality to meet my marriage.

**You were married once before.**

I wouldn’t say what we’re talking about here applies to my first marriage, although there is some connection. After college, I lived in and worked in New York, and I was married for four years, then I moved back to St. Louis, remarried, and had two children. Our issues were geographical. I didn’t want that crazy lifestyle. I wanted a simpler life, a one-income family. I didn’t want to live in New York. But that’s not the whole enchilada.

**You often say that families don't *need* two incomes.**You really have to step back and ask yourself: *Do I want this extra money or control over what goes on at home?* If you choose to do it the other way — day care, nannies from maternity leave on — you are going to lose control at home. You cannot have it all. If you don’t get as far as you wanted in your career, who gives a poop? Look at what you got.

**Is this arrangement fair for men? If parenting is so great, shouldn’t we let them in on the action?**It’s already happened! Enough already. I grew up with the hands-off father from a different generation. He was old school and didn’t show his love. I don’t see how people cannot see the huge change between him and fathers today, who are wearing Snuglis, and you’ll see them at Target on a Wednesday afternoon. I think male involvement at home is a wonderful thing, but understand that if you try to make them into women completely, you’re never going to be able to have that male provider. This goes back to the dearth of good men. Well, you told them we don’t need you. They heard you, and they stepped back, and when a man doesn’t feel needed, it’s not pretty. Let them be your prince. They want to be your prince. You can have crossover in gender roles, but not to the point that you take away the integral part of what makes us masculine and feminine.

**Are there any misconceptions about you or your article floating around out there?**The whole caricature that has been painted about me is just flat-out all wrong. You need to (a) actually have a conversation with me or (b) read my books. Every person that has spoken with me and read my works has said, “Well that sounds really reasonable.” You know Tracy McMillan, who wrote “[Why You’re Still Not Married](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/tracy-mcmillan/why-youre-still-not-married_b_1541011.html)”? It was a blog post that went viral and she then expanded into a book. The reasons were like, “You’re a bitch. You’re a slut.” When I asked her how she dealt with backlash, she said, “The truth shall set you free, but first it will piss you off.”

**So those of us saying rude things about your article will eat our tweets when our biological clocks start ticking?**I gave a speech at a college recently, and I was thinking, *Oh, you girls are so young.* All these 19-, 20-year-olds, they haven’t even lived yet. Just give yourself twenty years. Your life and your priorities will change dramatically when you become a wife and a mother. This baby boomer who was there, she was in her fifties or sixties, she apologized for all the messages she’d sent to young women that were all feminist.

**College is expensive. If my nature’s going to tell me to be a wife and mom one of these days, should I even bother going?**College is an education you have for life, if you plan and map out your life accordingly. You can have children right away and a career later. You have a lot of time — women live longer than ever. Look at the people who are in politics who raised their kids before running for office. It’s hard for young people to think that far ahead, but you have so much time. You don’t have to do it all at once.

**Questions: Please separate out all 5 questions. (4 quotes and responses and the answer to the last question).**

**1-4. Choose 4 quotes from these two articles and respond to them in at least a paragraph each. Separate them out by quote and response.**

**5. Do you think that feminism has been a destructive force for relationships and marriages? Why or why not?**