**PATRIARCHY PARADOX (WSK): A TRANSCRIPT**

(The following is a transcript of WSK’s Patriarchy Paradox talk. Any mistakes in the transcript are mine and mine alone. The commentary in brackets describes what is on the video while he is speaking. The bullet points in red are my criticisms of his content.)

Patriarchy is a theory that says the differences between the sexes and their social roles are not the result of biology. Instead, they are socially constructed and they have resulted in the pervasiveness of male domination in women's lives. This idea of male domination has led the Good Lads Initiative to claim the tradition ideas of masculinity need to be reimagined, but it has also led according to Doris Lessing, the novelist and feminist icon, to an unthinking and automatic rubbishing of men, which is now so part of our culture that it is hardly even noticed. Despite this rubbishing of men however, the Marvel movies show that in popular culture, masculine archetypes such as Captain America, Thor and Iron Man, described by the philosopher Edward Feser as "a patriotic soldier", "the son of a heavenly father come to Earth" and "a strutting capitalist alpha male", retain their appeal. People are watching surprisingly traditional masculine archetypes - nobody wants to watch films about characters like this (shows a sexualised caricature of a non-binary superhero in video). And one of the best established findings of modern psychology is that greater gender equality in a society leads to greater gravitation towards traditional gender norms. In the literature on this topic, sex is the biological distinction between male and female, whereas gender is how the difference between male and female is shaped by culture. So researchers have termed this result "the patriarchy paradox". Shaping men and women culturally to be more similar actually exaggerates their differences. It is the opposite of what the social constructivist theory predicted - but it isn't paradoxical if patriarchy is, rather than being merely socially constructed, partly based in biology. Contrary to the claim that patriarchy is about male domination of women, it also at least partly results from women's choices, because it benefits them.

- As will become evident through the rest of the lecture, WSK has no consistent definition of patriarchy. Nor is this representative of most feminists, who conceive of patriarchy as saying that some differences in gender roles are social rather than biological.

- It is not immediately apparent to me how three comic book characters are the best representation of the popular cultural fabric. one might think that such a tenured teacher would have drawn on actual data or studies, instead of then taking a deliberately sexualised caricature of a non-binary person in order to make an unfounded assertion that such characters are not desired by audiences compared to those that exhibit traditional masculine characteristics.

- WSK's only citation here is a blogpost (http://edwardfeser.blogspot.com/2019/10/masculinity-and-marvel-movies.html), which is itself so ideologically driven that it describes comic book hero Captain Marvel as "a C-list character" who "is suddenly proclaimed the most powerful character" due to "feminist wish fulfillment", conveniently ignoring the fact that this is a character that has existed in comics since 1968, long described as one of the most powerful within the Marvel universe.

- But if WSK is correct in identifying this incredible demand for "masculine archetypes" (despite his complete lack of data), one wonders how he reconciles this with his view that the "automatic rubbishing of men ... is so part of our culture". He simply glances over this tension in the case he is attempting to make.

- He goes on to claim it is well-established that equal societies lead to greater gravitation towards traditional genders norms. He provides no reference that substantiates this, and the closest academic work I could find from his sources is a short 6-page summary of cognitive differences between men and women (https://www.ucd.ie/artspgs/langimp/genderbrain.pdf). This is problematic in three ways. Firstly, even the piece itself concedes that some of these biological differences may have appeared and been exacerbated by the "selection pressures" of "evolutionary history. That is, changing societal roles in the modern day could create new cognitive patterns - as such, these are not immutable characteristics inherent to the human condition.

- Secondly, as psychiatrist Scott Alexander puts it, we ought to "beware the man of one study" (https://slatestarcodex.com/2014/12/12/beware-the-man-of-one-study/). The natural randomness in experimental data means that simply citing one source is scarcely sufficient in demonstrating an effect - it may well be the outlier that has been measured rather than the norm. This is not to mention the possibility of statistical malpractice and p-hacking. I have no doubt WSK is aware that it would have been far more representative of reality had he looked at reviews of the academic literature or meta-analyses that aggregated many studies, and his failing to do so is an indictment against the quality of his evidence.

- Thirdly, a comprehensive review of 46 meta-analyses on the topic of psychological gender differences (https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16173891) showed that 78% of the studies revealed little to no differences, supporting the gender similarities hypothesis. To the extent to which statistically significant results were found, these related to very specific areas around linguistic skills, motor skills and temperament. This sort of paper would have provided the boys with a more accurate description of the research, rather than making it sound like it was beyond dispute that there were significant biological disparities.

Much of what follows might bruise the feelings of some people, so here from the philosopher Stephen Hicks is a reminder of the elements of the traditional arguments for freedom of speech. Reason is essential for knowing reality, it's a function of the individual, we need the freedom to think, to criticise and to debate, and this is also of value not just to ourselves but to other members of our society as well.

- This is perhaps the least controversial bit of the video, though even here he casually avoids recognising, as the Provost did in his recent letter, that there are limits on the freedom of speech. As I have expounded on this within the letter, it seems redundant to provide a more thorough rebuttal at this juncture.

In a cross-cultural study of manhood, David Gilmore, Professor of Anthropology, concluded that three moral injunctions come repeatedly into focus: one must impregnate women, protect dependents from danger and provision kith and kin. None of these three roles, procreate, protect, provide, is exclusively masculine - but the protector role is the least shared, making it the core of masculinity. It is the least shared, because it is the one most firmly rooted in anatomy and physiology. Even in lion prides, this is very clear - although lionesses do 90% of the providing, the males are responsible for protecting the pride. They only help kill the largest, most dangerous prey that would otherwise cost the lives of too many lionesses. Accordingly, in all cultures, war has usually been men's work. It is Gilmore's universal protector role. In mythology, this is embodied by Thor, who because of his physical strength, alone stood between Asgard and destruction. By contrast, women have very rarely fought, and no country has ever obliged women to fight. The advanced weaponry of the modern age hasn't made much difference. When the Russian army went to war in Chechnya in 1994-1995, its female officers, roughly 14% of the officer corp, simply refused to go. Knowing the outcry that would follow, the army did not force them to. Female Israeli soldiers, despite mandatory military service, do not join frontline combat infantry brigades. The equipment is often heavy, making it hard for women to carry around, and sometimes it goes wrong. Michael Fitzmaurice on the right there served for the US in Vietnam - a grenade hit the tank he was in with his fellow soldiers. He had to get two of them, wounded, out of the tank, and then another grenade broke his rifle. He killed an enemy soldier with his bare hands, took his rifle, and then managed to escape. War has usually been men's work because men, as a result of natural sex differences that aren't socially constructed, are physically adapted to fighting.

- WSK uses Gilmore's book as proof that there are certain societal expectations of men consistent across the world, arising from "anatomy and physiology". But as this New York Times review correctly notes (https://www.nytimes.com/1990/04/15/books/the-importance-of-being-macho.html), the book itself concedes that there are societies with "no pressure on men to appear in any significant way different from women or children", ruling out the biological explanation. And in fact, this "strengthens [the basic feminist] argument by refuting the sociobiological evocation of male aggressiveness as innate, for . . . men are innately not so very different from women".

- So perhaps WSK's confidence in his claim comes from the behaviour of lion prides, though he provides no justification for why such cross-species claims are plausible or justifiable. Yet another example he provides is that of Thor. I'm sure my previous criticisms have already disabused you of the notion that fictional mythology or literature are at all useful in this talk, and I have no doubt my supervisors at Cambridge would certainly be disappointed if I used Gaskell's North and South as the main premise for my essays on living standards in the Industrial Revolution.

- The only real world examples he brings up are cherrypicked cases of militaries refusing to allow women to serve, as well as a random story about a single soldier. The inability to extrapolate any information from this random war story notwithstanding, it is unfortunate that WSK has once again refused to acknowledge the fact that Israel is now sending women in front line positions (https://www.jpost.com/israel-news/female-combat-soldiers-to-cross-enemy-lines-face-hezbollah-in-idf-first-647511) and the plethora of women who have fought in past wars, such as Marina Raskova, Nina Lobkovskaya and Lyudmila Pavlichenko. I could keep listing names, but as I noted before, this game of example ping-pong is precisely why individual anecdotes or examples are not usually given much credibility.

Recognising that gender roles would be less fluid if sex differences are natural, some feminist theorists such as Judith Butler have argued that not only gender but sex itself is socially constructed, claiming that intersex people, or people with only an X chromosome or XXY chromosomes, show sex isn't binary or natural. The biologist Emma Hilton however, has described the idea that sex is a social construct as false at every conceivable scale of resolution. Sex isn't defined by chromosomes. In all species, even those with different or no chromosomes, females produce large gamete reproductive cells and males produce small ones. There is no third immediate gamete size. Intersex people are not exceptions, and the philosopher David Burn has pointed out that there would have been sexes in plants and animals even if there were no human societies, and therefore nothing socially constructed at all. Some philosophers pointed out that logically, considerations that support transgenderism would support transspeciesism, but we all recognise that there are limits to what we can identify as. Species for example aren't social constructs. People who identify as lizards aren't actually lizards. Similarly, if you are biologically male but identify as female, Hilton says, you still have small gametes. (picture of "We All Have Our Own Truth and "We All Have Our Own Laws of Physics")

- He does eventually get to his more scientific claim, which relates to the fact that men are "physically adapted to fighting". He does so by quoting scientists who believe that sex is binary. For one, it is somewhat disingenuous to argue that it is only "feminist theorists" who are questioning the views of scientists - in fact, his own source (https://www.wsj.com/articles/the-dangerous-denial-of-sex-11581638089) acknowledges the non-trivial proportion of scientists who disagree with the premise of binary sex, whether this is in the Scientific American (https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/voices/stop-using-phony-science-to-justify-transphobia/) or in Nature (https://www.nature.com/news/sex-redefined-1.16943).

- But additionally, he is unhelpfully inconsistent in his use of the word "sex". It may well be true that there is a binary set up of how gametes are produced and that could be what we define as sex, but this does not relate to the other claims he is making around physical adaptations. As he correctly identifies later, much of the disparity in physiology comes from hormones and chromosomes, where there is a lot of scientific evidence for the lack of a clear binary. In using one conception of sex to justify its existence while using another to confirm his preconceived notions around physical attributes, he has either deliberately misled his audience into thinking that binary nature of one carries on to the other, or he has failed to do the basic due diligence we would expect any educator to do.

- And to close this section off, he decides to make a comparison between transgenderism and transspeciesism, as though the ridiculousness of transspeciesism makes transgenderism similarly absurd. Of course, no one actually argues one implies the other, because species relate to biological definitions around reproduction, whereas gender is a socially defined idea. So all this really does is rely on the audience's prior beliefs on sex being biological (which he has failed to prove) in order to reassert that same claim. Instead of setting up a ridiculous false equivalency while putting up a picture with the phrases "we all have our own truth and "we all have our own laws of physics" in order to prove his point, it might behove a teacher to do so in an academically rigorous fashion, which presumably would be trivial if these were really such clear scientifically-verified claims.

So, what natural sex differences are relevant to the protector role? The shoulders of boys and girls are equally broad until adolescence. Then at puberty, the shoulder cartilage cells respond to testosterone, the male sex hormone newly produced by the testes, by growing. Pubertal girls by contrast get wider hips when their hip cartilage cells respond to estrogen, the female sex hormone. The sudden acceleration of shoulder width in boys is associated with relative enlargement of the upper arm muscles. The result is that men have far greater upper body muscle mass and strength than women. Men also have 4% faster nerve transmission speed. A major marine corp study found that women are at a significant disadvantage in combat compared to men - even untrained males outperform trained females. The Amazonian warrior women are merely a myth for a reason. And the adaptations are not merely physical - men are more violent by temperament, which Wrangham, Professor of Anthropology at Harvard, observes that the 5 million year long trail to our modern selves is lined along its full stretch by a male aggression that instructed our ancestor's social lives, technology and minds. Some scientists have argued that early humans first stood up to fight, and that fighting shaped the evolution of the hand. But aren't some women strong and don't some women also fight? Yes. But look at what Tamikka Brents said after her skull was fractured by the transgender MMA fighter Fallon Fox: "I am an abnormally strong women in my own right, but I have never felt strength I felt in a fight like that night. I don't think it's fair". If it's not fair to put men in the ring with women for sports, it's not fair to pit men against women on the battlefield either.

- WSK goes on to list a set of "biological facts", not all of which are sourced. But leaving aside the inability for him to substantiate the claim around nerve transmission, he omits to mention that the military study he focuses on had male participants from "combat units where they had previously served", while female volunteers "came directly from infantry schools or from noncombat jobs". Somehow I am not surprised one group performed better than the other. And nowhere in that is the idea of untrained males outperforming trained females mentioned. So we have yet another misrepresented or uncontextualised claim.

- I am somewhat bemused by WSK's realisation that the Amazonian warriors are a myth - I wonder why he did not apply this rigorous standard on rejecting ancient lore to Thor. And I won't reiterate the point I've made before in relation to his anecdote, which is that isolated cases such as with Tamikka Brents do not prove an argument.

War has also usually been men's work, because they can afford to treat their lives more cheaply. From a biological point of view, the female role is primary. A population can survive the loss of men more easily than that of women. In 2008, ecologists Rebecca Sear and Ruth Mace published a paper called "Who Keeps Children Alive?". Across 28 cultures, the answer was that many mothers do. A mother's death was more likely to lead to a child's death, especially among nursing infants. For the same reasons, physical strength, greater aggression, relative expandability, the protector role goes beyond warfare to include protection against the destructive forces of nature. In Charlotte Perkins Gilman's 1915 utopian novel Herland, in which all the men are killed by a volcanic eruption and the women discover a miraculous procedure for stimulating virgin birth, wild beasts are conveniently absent. But a world without men would be awful for women. Mining, oil extraction, heavy and chemical industry, long distance transportation, most forms of construction, many kinds of agriculture such as forestry and the herding of large domestic animals would all but cease. So would deep sea fishing. Under such conditions, over 90% of the world's present day population would die of starvation. The women that survive such a calamity would likely revert to a primitive life based on horticulture, dwelling in huts and suffering from a permanent shortage of animal protein. Judging by historical and pre-historical precedent, their life expectancy would be reduced to less than 40 years.

- The next thing he touches on is the idea that women were more important in keeping children alive, sparing them the horrors of war. That may well be true. But he attributes this to a "biological" explanation, whereas it could be the case that societal norms around female childrearing created this effect. There is exactly zero effort placed in conducting any sort of differential diagnosis to explain which cause is more likely. Instead, biology is simply asserted.

- Even if we ignore the strawman argument he has created based on a fictional story from over a century ago, he seems to be suggesting that only men could possibly engage in the necessary economic activity to support human existence, without which "90% of the world's present day population would die of starvation". The current day population is around 7.8 billion. That would mean only 780 million alive, a staggering claim given that the last time this occurred was sometime between 1700 and 1750 (https://ourworldindata.org/world-population-growth).

- Luckily, we can do some quick back-of-the-napkin maths to see if this is at all plausible. Between 1700 and now, wheat, barley and oat yields per hectare in the UK have increased 7.27 times, 10.49 times and 10.33 times respectively (https://ourworldindata.org/crop-yields). So agricultural output per hectare has gone up by around 10 times.

- Maybe this could be due to an increasing number of workers per hectare. Well, it's not. There were 9 million acres of arable land in 1700 (https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/economics/staff/sbroadberry/wp/britishgdplongrun.pdf). Per Wikipedia, there are now 7.6 million acres. The number of agricultural workers has gone from 1.5 million in 1700 (Floud and Johnson 2004) to a mere 109,000 today (https://www.statista.com/statistics/319325/number-of-farmers-in-the-uk/). So the labourer-per-acre ratio has gone from 0.16 to 0.01 – if we combine it with the agricultural output per hectare going up 10 times, the increase in agricultural output per hectare per worker must have gone up to the tune of 100 times.

- At the time, there were 1,065,000 male agricultural workers and 488,000 female agricultural workers producing enough food enough food to support around 7 million people, which is over 10% of modern day Britain’s population of 66 million (Floud and Johnson 2004). Let’s see if the same number of agricultural workers could have supported 7 million people if they were all female but had today’s agricultural productivity. If we have male productivity x and female productivity y, the output in the 1700s would be 1,065,000x + 488,000y. Nowadays, it would be 100\*(1,065,000 + 488,000)\*y. This is because the non-gender-related agricultural productivity has increased one hundred fold.

- To believe WSK’s claim, you have to believe that 1,065,000x + 488,000y > 155,300,000y. That is, y < 0.0069x. That means you need to think that men are more than 145 times more productive as men in farming for these results to occur.

- Now clearly this is very much a rough sketch rather than a detailed model of agricultural dynamics, especially since it only looks at the UK. But it demonstrates that WSK’s claims are based on patently absurd assumptions that are at least a few order of magnitudes off. And so I am left with the unenviable conclusion that WSK has plucked this 90% starvation statistic out of Martin van Creveld's The Privileged Sex without any critical consideration.

Throughout history, women have always been spared the worst work. Only male slaves were conscripted to die in the thousands for the pyramids, the canals in the ancient Middle East, the Great Wall of China and the roads, industrial scale cornmills and colosseum in Rome. Even in mythology, there is no female equivalent to Sisyphus. And men invented well over 90% of the inventions that have improved women's life expectancy and quality of life. Some common objections to this protector idea are the witch hunts, the coverture laws, the vote and rape. Marianne Hester for example claims the witchhunts were about men trying to suppress female sexuality, patriarchal power at its most tyrannical. But most accusers were women, Mary enacted the Scottish witchcraft laws and persecution reached its apex under Elizabeth, who reinstated all the penalties against witchcraft that Edward VI, 16 years earlier, had repealed acting on the advice of his all-male entourage. Furthermore, the fewer women involved in the trials, the fairer the treatment the witches were likely to receive. The coverture laws are claimed to show patriarchal oppression of women because they prevented women from owning property. But the married couple was regarded as one legal entity - the husband assumed responsibility for his wife's debts, including his pre-marital ones. He could even be imprisoned on her behalf, while she was immune to prosecution. Regarding the vote, women have always had it at the local level, in both parish and manor, and only 4% of the male population had the vote in ancient Athens, which remained a historical high until mid-19th century England. Even as the year 1918 began, it was still the case that well under 50% of adult men had a usable national vote. Unlike women, all these men shouldered some form of taxation without representation, and they could also be conscripted to bear arms. Lastly, rape is not a unique claim for male oppression of women, because male-on-male rape in jails dwarves male-on-female rape outside of them.

- Having lifted most of the previous paragraph verbatim from Martin van Creveld's The Privileged Sex, he uses it again to prove that "men invented well over 90% of the inventions" which actually mattered. Of course, the previous exercise has demonstrated that van Creveld is off by a couple of orders of magnitude. It is no surprise therefore that as with the previous claim, this claim around inventions has no academic citations or sources within van Creveld's book. It certainly does not seem like the most compelling source to be basing one's entire argument around. Nor does WSK endeavour to deal with the plausible explanation that women were not in a position to invent many things due to their historical exclusion from power – that is, even if this were an accurate description, it would not falsify either hypothesis.

- He proceeds to suggest that the inability for women to own property is fine, because "the husband assumed responsibility for his wife's debts". But it's not clear to me what the alternative arrangement is - if women couldn't own assets, they almost definitionally would not be able to take on or pay off debts. So this seems like a necessary result of the patriarchal system, not some sort of explanation as to why it is justified.

- He uses a similar sort of argument regarding voting, where he notes the struggles of men in paying taxes without the vote. For one, the disenfranchisement of unpropertied men is no justification for the disenfranchisement of women. But if he is trying to suggest that disenfranchisement was a socio-economic rather than patriarchal tool, one wonders why he neglects to mention that the Representation of the People Act 1918 he references let all men over 21 vote, while still disenfranchising 60% of women. Clearly there were still gender-based disparities, even if class was partly accountable too. And it is just a blatant lie to suggest that women did not face "some form of taxation without representation" - the entire purpose of the Women's Tax Resistance League in the UK was to use tax avoidance as a mechanism for protesting for suffrage. If women were not taxed, how was it possible for them to avoid tax?

- He ends with a one-liner asserting that "male-on-male rape in jails dwarves male-on-female rape outside" prison. In the comments section of the Youtube video, he attempts to provide some proof by saying that at least 250,000 men are "raped in US jails each year" while "around 238,436" women are raped worldwide every year.

- Perhaps an English teacher like WSK knows better, but I remember learning that "around" meant "approximately", so I'm a bit befuddled by how an exact figure of 238,436 could be found or be described as an approximation. But semantics aside, the source he lists in his comments (https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/rape-statistics-by-country) lists 119 countries and their rape numbers - if you sum those up, you get 323,203 cases. Insofar as there are 195 countries in the United Nations and rape is underreported, this is almost definitely an underestimate. So I struggle to see where he produced his 238,436 number from.

- His data for 250,000 cases of male-on-male rape in prisons is itself contradicted by his other source (https://www.hrw.org/legacy/reports/2001/prison/report7.html#\_1\_44), so it might have been helpful if he had acknowledged the difficulties of data collection and the inaccuracy of any data. Instead, he simply suggests that "men are far less likely to report rape than women", while also claiming that "only serious scientific studies ever done on the subject estimate that, based on the admissions of the accusers themselves, 40-60% of rape accusations are false".

- Let's examine his actual data for the claim that around half of rape allegations are false - he takes this evidence from a blog post (https://ncfm.org/2018/12/news/discrimination-news/discrimination-against-men-news/ncfm-member-john-davis-esq-how-many-rape-accusations-are-false/) which summarises a paper from the 1980s.

- As the National Center on Domestic and Sexual Violence notes (http://www.ncdsv.org/images/OCADVSA\_RapeAndFalseReports\_2010.pdf), the 60% number is an extrapolation based on similarities in the testimony of false accusers and other women. It looks at the testimony of women, and if they mention receiving obscene phone calls prior to the assault, they get 1 point. If they report being complimented by her assailant during the assault, they get 1 point. If they demand to be treated by a female physician or interviewed by a female police officer, they get 1 point. And after adding up all the points from a long checklist of debunked myths about rape, any woman with over 35 points is assumed to be making a false allegation.

- In terms of who actually admitted to making false accusations, which is how WSK decided to describe this study as, this is only 27% of cases. Except even the 27% number is an exaggeration, because the researcher had decided to ignore all the cases he could not verify either way, halving the sample size. So the actual number of his relatively small sample size is 14%, a far cry from the idea that 60% of rape accusers confessed to lying about it. As I've emphasised before, this is either shoddy scholarship or a deliberate attempt to peddle falsehoods from WSK.

- The final and perhaps most troubling claim he makes in the comments is that "I do personally think that male-on-female rape is morally worse than male-on-male rape for the same reason that I think male-on-female violence is worse than male-on-male violence. Men have a responsibility to protect women, and only female rape victims can get pregnant". Given recent events, it seems at best insensitive and at worst malicious for a teacher to be openly minimising the harms of the sexual assault of men by other men.

Not only do the most common objections to the idea that women are protected fail, but numerous recent studies provide strong evidence for it. Kary Mullis, chemistry Nobel Prize laureate, says "it doesn't take a lot of education to check things out. All it takes is access to resources and the feeling that people might be trying to put something over on you". So I did some truth-sleuthing and managed to uncover the following: people prefer to spare the lives of females over the lives of males, which sounds like male expendability. They are also less willing to harm females than males, and perceive male aggression as more unacceptable. This sounds like women are protected and privileged. Women are punished less than men for the same crime. That's odd in a patriarchy with oppressive laws. They are also more likely to be hired for STEM jobs than male applicants. And people want to support social action to correct female underrepresentation more than they do male underrepresentation.

In response to this evidence which puts the claim that society is characterised by male oppression of women into reasonable doubt, a desperate, bizarre objection is that chivalry itself is oppressive, that Chief Justice MC Chagla somehow oppressed women by ruling it lawful under the constitution of India to discriminate in favour of women against men, but not in favour of men against women. It is worth remembering here that the overwhelming majority of women don't describe themselves as feminists - as few as 8% in Germany. According to the Education Research Center, one of the characteristics of indoctrination is a closed system, meaning immunity to criticism (shows comic on students being told "white men are evil" in calculus class). All data must conform to the theory of patriarchal oppression. Women who don't feel oppressed have just been oppressed into believing they're free to keep them oppressed. To use Karl Popper's term, patriarchy is non-falsifiable. Suppose as GK Chesterton put it, "you have a theory that all ginger people are trying to kill you. When you ask them whether they are, they say they're not - but you're too clever for them. That's exactly what they would say". Your system is closed. There simply is sexism, patriarchal oppression and toxic masculinity everywhere, even in the structure of skyscrapers. As Elizabeth Anscombe pointed out however, "corrupt minds cannot be reasoned with".

- These two sections basically harp on the idea that women are treated nicer than men in society, and that this proves patriarchy doesn't exist. But if patriarchy is about the male domination of power, it would not be entirely surprising to see women be treated as needing protection and help, due to them being in fewer positions of power. So this by itself does nothing to disprove the existence of patriarchal structures.

- And as before, most of his claims are claims based off of one study. For example, he pushes for the idea that women are more likely to be hired for some jobs on the basis of a single study. But if we wanted to look at the way women are treated in society, it might be better to look across a range of jobs to examine if there is an aggregate effect against women in the labour market. He fails to do so, but having done so myself, the literature is more than clear in the existence of a gender wage gap and gender-based discrimination (https://tmychow.com/blog/2020/11/20/facts-dont-care-about-your-feelings).

- So instead of acknowledging the possibility that his interpretation is wrong, WSK simply moves on to arguing that ideas of patriarchy are forms of indoctrination, with a picture of students being told "white men are evil" in calculus class. Aside from being a grindingly unsubtle reference to alt-right sentiments around white people being oppressed, this isn't actually an argument. Nowhere does he explain how modern feminist critiques fall into this trap of non-falsifiability. He just mocks it as the work of "corrupt minds". It's almost like he's decided to ignore all the contradictory evidence to his claims, as someone trying to indoctrinate would.

The protector role is universal. What virtues does it require? Because he faces great risks and must therefore overcome fear, the protector requires courage. Beginning in infancy and across all different kinds of culture, men are less prone to fear than women are. Women self-report greater fear of crime, public speaking, accidents, darkness, cancer, heights and high-risk mutual funds. Lab studies back this up - women have a stronger reflex reaction to fearful scenes, they startle more violently, their hearts race faster and they sweat more. Although less prone to fear than women are, men are not however fearless. The average soldier on the battlefield regresses and acts passively under enemy fire. Commanding officers sometimes have to force men to fight at gunpoint. Phobos, or fear, was the god of the battlefield for the ancient Greeks. Worldwide, various masculine rites of passage therefore aim at the development of courage, tempering and toughening the initiates. They differ, but they all test a boy's ability to handle pain and fear. Feminists such as Eleanor Leacock have said the !Kung bushmen in Botswana represent an ideal of sexual equality, offering them as a model for the west. But even the boys there have to kill an antelope to become men, showing they are providers rather than mere consumers of meat. They are also subjected to a severe form of hazing involving grueling tests of masculine stamina. The boys must man up. "Tonight I have taken all that I was and strangled him that pale lily-white lad. I have choked him with these my hands these claws catching him as he lay a-dreaming in his bed. Then chuckling I dragged out his foolish brains that were full of pretty love-tales heighho the holly, and emptied them holus bolus to the drains those dreams of love, oh what ruinous folly. He is dead pale youth and he shall not rise on the third day or any other day, sloughed like a snakeskin there he lies and he shall not trouble me again for aye" (shows faces of soldiers while reading the poem).

- I'm honestly not sure what the point of this section is. He does not attempt to explain whether the societal disparities we see today can be completely explained by biological differences, or whether social ones might have had a role. Instead, he just lists a bunch of them and then reads a poem. This is not by any stretch of the imagination something that can be considered analysis. It's just pure rhetoric.

The Good Lads Initiative claims the phrase "man up" is meaningless. In procreating, providing and protecting, men can fail in a way women can't. In procreation, they can fail in a very visual and humiliating way by being impotent. On the island of Truk, women laugh at a man's sexual failure, telling him to take the breast like a baby. In providing, they can fail to kill the animal - unlike roots and berries traditionally gathered by women, large and dangerous animals fight back or run away. And in protecting, the urge to succumb to fear is almost overwhelming. The ground at the Hot Gates were slick with feces and urine. Men wet themselves in the boats on D-Day. Childbirth, it is true, demands great courage of women, but you can't lose childbirth by running away. Here we see in Hector's lines before he goes to face Achilles that it's a combination of biology and culture that goes to make up masculinity. "I've learned it" - it's something that is cultivated. This is his duty given his biological status as a man. His culture has shaped him to live up to the responsibilities that that entails. He has to overcome fear. We see the same idea in this clip from 300, when the soldiers talk about having to earn their shields, live up to the ideal (plays a clip from 300). The Good Lads Initiative claims that the phrase man up is meaningless. I wonder what King Leonidas would have thoughts of that idea.

- It is worth noting how this idea of the procreative role is implicitly homophobic, since it suggests that gay individuals are failing to be men by virtue of not procreating. And I'm not sure if he's aware, but miscarriages exist - so the fact that women can't run away doesn't mean they don’t get blamed for a failure to produce offspring.

- Then comes a weird concession that masculinity is "a combination of biology and culture" - presumably this is the interesting discussion, about the extent to which masculinity is biological vs cultural and how this compares with the way gender roles are constructed right now.

- But instead, he simply moves on to another rhetorical sleight of hand, appealing to the audience's prior beliefs around King Leonidas dismissing “man up”, without ever rebutting the idea of "man up" being meaningless. Incidentally, I would note that King Leonidas’s thoughts on this are both unverifiable and unfalsifiable. Wasn’t this sort of closed system a sign of a corrupt mind?

Closely related to courage is honour - the concern to protect one's reputation and that of one's family and lineage, pointing to the need to establish and defend boundaries. Only male honour is inseparable from strength and courage. Calling a woman a wimp isn't really an insult. And Campbell, in her studies of aggression in female adolescents, found that physical fights were rare, but they usually began with girls calling each other sluts, slags or whores. Season 3 Episode 6 of Sex In The City is called "Are We Sluts?". This is because women's honour is tied to ancient standards of sexual propriety. These insults advertise women's propensity to be unfaithful, and therefore make men less likely to consider her as a potential partner. Calling a man a slut would probably just provoke a confused look. Women mostly harm each other with words and behind the back, rather than face to face, using gossip to alienate and defame. You can't prove chastity in a fight (shows video of a man unwilling to get into a fight). Apart from fighting, sport and games are a public display of men's fitness to defend boundaries. Boys are around 50 times more likely than girls to engage in games involving direct head-to-head competition. Adult men are also more interested in competition, broadcasting who is stronger, fitter and abler to the community at large. Men compete harder and perform better when women are watching. And women often instigate the competition, as among the Mursi of Ethiopia, where they start stick-fighting contests among the young men and lavish their attention on the winners. Male athletes aren't motivated by dominating female athletes though - the dominance contests apparent between males of all species and females of some species are within, not across, sexes. Biologically speaking, the idea that men exert power over women is nonsense. Across species, females can exploit their power of sexual choice to get males to compete in ways that do things for them (shows video of collisions in American football).

- Here, WSK makes a rather assertive claim. He says that "calling a woman a wimp isn't really an insult", justified on the basis of male honour being "inseparable from strength and courage". Why is this the case? I don't know, because he gives no actual explanation. But he does suggest that female honour is "tied to ancient standards of sexual propriety", implicitly conceding that these are social rather than biologically constructed standards.

- But instead of acknowledging how this undermines his biological approach, he just carries on asserting cases of men being competitive or fighting. In doing so, he is engaging in a Humean is-ought fallacy, where he attempts to derive moral injuctions from empirical observations. The fact that men currently engage in more fighting is no reason to believe that they ought to, or that their value and honour is tied up in that.

In most species, the female could refuse the dominant male if they chose - but they don't. An elephant seal cow will cry out in protest if a low ranking male tries to mate with her, summoning all the males within earshot to fight over her. And human women prefer the smell of dominant males, more masculine male faces and men behaving more dominantly when at peak fertility than at other times in their menstrual cycle. This is because ovulation makes women desire a strong protector - pregnancy and childbirth make them vulnerable, and it is wishful thinking to believe that boundaries can be established and defended without violence and the values of strength, courage and honour that accompany it. George Orwell expressed this hard truth: "those who adjure violence can only do so because others are committing violence on their behalf". You might think that a real man prizes showing vulnerability and talking about his feelings, or wearing rainbow laces, but he can't do that if he's dead. In this clip from Goodfellas, this character's girlfriend has just been sexually assaulted by a neighbour, and here he is about to seek revenge on her behalf (shows clip of a man violently attacking a neighbour). Wasn't that violent? Wouldn't it be lovely if we could get rid of violence? Well, in attempting to vanquish violence and oppression from the earth, Marxists broke all records for mass slaughter, murdering over 100 million people. Male aggression is a biological fact that will be with us, whether we like it or not. Some people think that nowadays, we don't need violence because we have the law. But in fact the law itself ultimately depends on the threat of violence (shows comic book character Bane threatening someone's life). When Bane's hand touches his shoulder after he says he is in charge, he realises that he is not really in charge, because he can't back that up. And without violence, laws are ultimately just words.

- WSK tries to argue that violence is necessary, because you can't talk about your "feelings" or wear "rainbow laces" if you're "dead". This is true, but I'm not at all sure how this has anything to do with the patriarchy, since talking about feelings is not mutually exclusive with being able to fight. Certainly, there is no evidence of feminists or those opposing the patriarchy being against the role of violence in civilised society. Nor is it clear how "Marxists" causing "mass slaughter" has any relation.

- And the grindingly obvious allusion to LGBT symbolism with the phrase "rainbow laces" seems entirely unnecessary and adds no substantive content to his presentation, except that it draws upon the implicit assumption (which he makes explicit elsewhere) that being gay makes one less of a man. In fact, it makes the power of such coded homophobia more visceral within the school and among the boys, creating a more hostile learning environment for queer Etonians.

Now the traditional ideal of chivalry is the attempt to deal with the fact of biological aggression among men. The virtue of chivalry is the virtue of one who has internalised the ethos of the protector - courage, prowess in battle, mercy to the vanquished, courtesy towards women, gentleness towards children and piety towards elders. Machismo, by constrast, is the defamation of chivalry, for men who forget that their strength is to be put in the service of the weak. The feminist's horrified reaction to domestic violence acknowledges men's special duty towards women. It is far, far worse for a man to beat up a woman, than it is for him to beat up a weaker man. What's interesting here is that the idea of toxic masculinity, to the extent that it's true, isn't new - it was already there, in the concept of machismo versus chivalry. So what's true isn't new, and what's new isn't true. Anthropologists have never found a genuine matriarchy - as Wrangham explains, patriarchy is worldwide and history-wide, and its origins are detectable in the social lives of chimpanzees. It has its ultimate origins in male violence, but it doesn't come from man alone, and it has its sources in the evolutionary interests of both sexes. This study shows that these naughty women aren't conforming to what the theory of patriarchy demands of them - they still like guys with muscles and money. Remember those three injunctions that Gilmore pointed out were universal: procreate, protect, provide. In this Marie Claire article as well, we have a lady who has a husband who's smart and funny and likes to explain why the Sherlock Holmes tales are more colonialist than patriarchal. She also likes the idea of a stay-at-home husband, but the reality of living it broke her marriage. She says she had neutralised him as a sexual being - "I wanted to be overwhelmed by the sheer power of his masculinity in the bedroom, but I wasn't. Because I felt like the man in our relationship". As Tony Montana said, "first you gotta make the money, then when you get the money you get the power, then when you get the power then you get the women".

- It is somewhat telling that WSK thinks the "horrified reaction to domestic violence" is about "men's special duty towards women", rather than the belief that people shouldn't be physically assaulted. In doing so, he assumes away the existence of gay couples and goes on to dismiss a man beating up "a weaker man", disregarding those suffering male-on-male violence.

- I suppose “what’s true isn’t new, and what’s new isn’t true” exemplifies the broader issue with this lecture, which is that he never defines the concepts he is refuting. Instead, he uses nice-sounding phrases to suggest some sort of deep statement without ever making an actual claim on what is new about toxic masculinity that goes beyond “machismo”.

- He’s spent a lot of time on “evolutionary interests” within this lecture. Most feminists or those looking to smash the patriarchy talk about things such as the gender wage gap or domestic assault or female genital mutilation. So why do the biological needs of the past remain the moral demands of modern society in these areas? I am yet to hear a single explanation for why the division of labour that may well have prevailed in the past still make sense today.

Patriarchy will remain worldwide and history-wide until women start getting men to compete over being weak, cowardly, impotent and poor providers. So rather than oppressing them, the fact that women get men to compete over them gives them tremendous power. Shakespeare scholar Marilyn Simon, in her article "Feminism's Dependency Trap" reminds women that "men adore us, and almost all their efforts at work, or at home, or in a social setting, are made to win our approval, if not our admiration". James Watson for example, Nobel Laureate and author of the Double Helix, said that "almost everything I ever did, even as a scientist, was in the hope of meeting a pretty girl". As James Brown put it, "it's a man's world. But it would mean nothing, nothing without a woman or a girl". This is why chivalry is expected - look at this woman's face after the man she was on a date with suggested that they split the bill. Despite its universality however, cries of "smash the patriarchy" continue, even though this ultimately amounts to saying "smash human nature" and biological reality. And what is the alternative offered anyway?

- He goes on to give some random anecdotes of women who prefer more "traditionally masculine" men - I think that at this point, I'm beating a dead horse when it comes to noting the complete lack of analytical rigour in using these one-off examples.

- I will point out prearranged marriages and such exist, as does the entire female makeup industry. One might suspect that the existence of makeup and such suggests women too need to fight for male approval. WSK gives no account for that once again.

Andrea Dworkin, pictured, has been described in the Guardian as recently as 2019 as the "visionary feminist we need in our troubled times". This was her vision: men and women are fictions, caricatures, cultural constructs - unambiguous heterosexual behaviour is the worst betrayal of our common humanity. The destruction of the incest taboo is essential to the development of cooperative human community, based on the free flow of natural androgynous eroticism. The incest taboo can be destroyed only by destroying the nuclear family as the primary institution of culture. As people develop fluid androgynous identities, they will also develop the forms of community appropriate to it. Children are fully capable of participating in community and have every right to live out their own erotic impulses. The distinctions between children and adults, and the social institutions which enforce those distinctions would disappear as androgynous community develops". Attacking the nuclear family then, she advocates incest and pedophilia - not only are the sexes cultural constructs, but so is the distinction between children and adults. It is worth noting here that Simone de Beauvoir, author of "The Second Sex" and founder of modern feminism, signed a petition calling for pedophilia to be decriminalised.

By contrast, the core of masculinity, the protector role, makes it the antithesis of pedophilia. This is why in prison, child abusers are the most despised offenders. Dworkins wants to destroy patriarchal power at its source, the family, and destroy the structure of culture as we know it. But the family offers numerous benefits, not only to men, but to women and children. Children who live with their own two married parents enjoy better physical and mental health on average, than do children in other family forms. Married women live longer and enjoy better health and lower rates of injury and illness than unmarried women. They are substantially less likely to commit suicide and have lower rates of depression. They are also at lower risk of experiencing domestic violence or being the victim of crime. The Harvard sociologist Carl Zimmerman, in his master work "Family and Civilisation", described childbearing as the main stem of the family - only a man and a woman can bear children. And for as long as childbearing continues, the nuclear family will continue to bury its undertakers. When you look at this picture, what do you see? A woman imprisoned, or a woman provided for and protected?

- It is curious that when it comes to presenting the supposed feminist alternative, WSK resorts to taking a rather extreme example of someone who passed away 15 years ago, rather than the swathes of mainstream feminists who he could have referenced. In doing so, he plays on societal taboos against pedophilia, rather than engaging with what the vast majority of activists are fighting for. Just as I would not expect any feminist to solely critique male supremacists, it seems lazy and uncharitable for him to pick Dworkin as the feminist exemplar, and certainly doesn't appear to be the useful foundation of any meaningful discussion of the patriarchy.

- Weirdly, he also picks the first book Dworkins writes. But as the Wikipedia page can tell you, Dworkins goes on to say later in life that there were “a lot of things really wrong” with the section of the book about incest and pedophilia, frequently condemning it. Once again, is this benign ignorance or malicious deception?

- Another example of WSK's inability to do causal inference comes when he notes that married women face "better health" than unmarried women. This may well be true, but he makes no attempt to establish why this is. It seems more than likely, as his own source suggests, that there is a selection bias where the pooling of income allowing better access to healthcare and nutrition.

- And of course, the whole talk ends with yet another homophobic trope of "childbearing as the main stem of the family". Since "only a man and a woman can bear children", he effectively insinuates that homosexual couples are unable to form a fully meaningful "nuclear family". This would be at least intellectually interesting, even if bigoted, had he provided evidence - but the fact of the matter is the Zimmerman's book itself is a study of fertility, rather than an explanation of why that ought to be the case.