



WHAT IS A MAN?

*And Why Does
It Matter?*

Keith Martin-Smith

All right, here we are back at Integral Life and, uh, back to talk about some things that have a fair amount of complexity. Politics, polarization And I thought I would step right into one of the thornier ones, which is getting into sex and gender from a very particular angle.

The way that this talk is gonna work is, uh, I want to give a whole overview of this entire topic, because I really want to keep this conversation at a meta level and I don't want to get into the specifics until I get a chance to present the whole overview, sort of start to finish. Because part of the problem I think that we're having with gender and sex and the polarization around trans rights and men's activism, or men's rights, and women's rights, and all these things, is that we are having too narrow of a discussion, and we're not really taking the time to look at the complexity that's involved in these things.

My hope is that if you're on this call today, you're listening to this today, and you're on the far left of this issue of how we would define men or women, or you're on the far right. Of how he would define men or women, my hope is that this conversation that we have today will be irritating to you, and it might piss you off, both of you, on the left and the right. If that happens, I feel like I've done my job. Because there's a lot of truth in the positions that people have taken on these issues. So we'll get into what's true, and we'll get into what's really partial.

And so, I think with that sort of intro we can sort of step into things here. So again, I'm gonna ask that you hold your questions and you hold your call-ins until the very end of the call, then we can have a discussion about this.

So what is a man, and why does it matter? That's what I'm talking about today. That's what we are gonna talk about today. So what is a man? So this is a multipolar phenomenon. It is not a unipolar phenomenon, and this is probably the single most important part of this conversation. So multipolar phenomena mean that there are multiple things that we have to consider and look at if we're gonna have an intelligent, nuanced conversation that's gonna actually help us understand what's going on. So when we talk about men or women and how to define them, the multipolar phenomena involves three disparate things, like three legs of a stool. All three of these things are needed equally. All three are equally valid. And if you don't talk about and acknowledge all three, like a bar stool with two legs, or one leg, it doesn't really stand up.

So the multipolar phenomena of gender is of course, biology, which we'll get into first. Psychology, which we'll get into last, and sociology or culture, which we'll get into in the middle.

So there was a documentary recently called "What Is a Woman", and it was done by a sort of more right-leaning news organization and journalist, I forget his name off the top of my head. It was very funny, it was very, provocative. And if you've seen it, what you see that he does really well is that, you know, he sort of asked people on the left specifically that are really into sort of a more activist view around women, trans women rights, and he asked them a seemingly simple question, which is, "what is a woman?" And the sort of humor in the documentary is that, the conversations tend to digress into paradox or paralysis because people that are on the left advocating for trans rights, and that a trans woman is a woman, they actually sort of fall apart when they try to define a woman, cuz they end up generating paradox, or contradiction, and sort of undercutting their own position in a way that sort of can be amusing to watch. One of the reasons that that happens, the reason that they generate paradox, the reason that they don't really know how to define it in a way that's intelligible, is because they're trying to define a woman, in that case, in a unipolar sense. And when you do that, it's easy to create an argument that doesn't make any sense.

So we're in this, you know, political war around this stuff, and most of people that are worrying about this stuff and highly opinionated about this stuff, are deeply entrenched in one of those three multipolar camps: biology, psychology, or culture.

So before we get into the meat of the first multipolar factor, which is biology, I want to give a brief overview of something that I'll be using a lot in this talk, which is the idea of the bell curve. Okay? Bell curve's very simple, it depicts the mean, the mode, and the median of a data set. The only two numbers that really matter to us are the mean and the standard deviation. And if you think of a bell curve, right, it looks like a speed bump, the center is the mean and the wideness of the curve is the standard deviation. And these are really worth investigating, investigating how this is used to crunch data and how it can be really useful in parsing information in a way that's very helpful. So we'll be getting into, we'll be getting into the bell curves quite a bit, and I encourage anybody to sort of look that up and research those on their own, they're very, very useful.

Okay, first, multipolar factor: biology. Okay, so this is one leg of our three-legged stool. So biology is the single most deterministic factor in determining sex. So sex is male/female, gender is masculine/feminine. So we're gonna talk about sex right now. We're not gonna talk about gender, just sex, biological sex. So, men, of course, have an XY chromosome. Women of course have two X chromosomes. When humans, or any great ape, when you get that set of chromosomes, that leads to the development of all kinds of secondary sex characteristics, we'll get into in a minute.

But for now, I really want to stick with the idea that sex is binary. So there is an interesting sort of political fight going on with the data sets out there. So if you Google what is the occurrence of intersex marriage or you look at that, you will find very quickly that a lot of the numbers that come back are about 1.7% or 2%. And that number is, makes intersex birth about as common as red hair, about one in a hundred, roughly, births. So it's still very, very rare. But, moving it towards, you know, well, 2% redhead, oh gosh, I know a redhead. And, you know, that's sort of the idea of like, well, it's rare, but you know, we all know one.

The trouble with this data set is that, when you talk to geneticists, or if you look at places like a National Institute of Health, or the National Library of Medicine, I'm gonna read a quote from the NIH itself, and here's what they say. They say, "many reviewers are not aware that this figure of 1.7% includes conditions which most clinicians do not recognize as intersex such as, uh, Klinefelter Syndrome, Turner Syndrome, late onset adrenal hyperplasia. If the term intersex is to retain any meaning, the term should be restricted to those conditions in which chromosomal sex is inconsistent with phenotypic sex, or in which the phenotype is not classifiable as either male or female. Applying this more precise definition, the true prevalence of intersex is seen to be about 0.018%, almost a hundred times fewer or lower than the estimate of 1.7%."

So I don't want to get hung up in this argument. It doesn't really matter. it doesn't change the meta argument and the meta view that we're gonna be taking here. But the idea is that intra sex birth, from a chromosomal standpoint, is extraordinarily rare. So it's about one in 5,000 births. And even if we accept the number of 1.7, that still means that more than 98% of births are strictly binary male/female. So either way, whether it's 99.98% of births, or 98% of births, the idea here is that sex is a binary almost every single time. Almost every single time. And we see that of course in nature, cuz when we go to the pound to pick a dog or a cat out, you know, there are boy dogs and girl dogs, right? It's not like a really confusing thing that, oh gosh, there's, you know, do you want

the in intersex puppy? Very, very, very rare in nature. Very, very rare in nature.

Okay, so, first pole is genetics, of this multipolar analysis. The second part of this biological analysis is secondary sex characteristics. So when you get the XY combination, the male genetics, right, in the human animal, we end up with all kinds of secondary sex characteristics, which we all know, right? This is facial hair, obviously, male genitalia, penis, testicles, thicker bones, bigger muscles, stronger tendons, greater height. the most dimorphic bone in the human body is the pelvis, and male and female pelvises are quite, quite different. Interesting to look up. Of course, testosterone, right? Men have anywhere from 10 to a hundred times the level of testosterone than women have.

So these secondary sex characteristics, they do exist on a bell curve. And so we think, you know, if we put the average man and the average woman, the mean of their physicality and the expression of their secondary sex characteristics, we find that, you know, men on average are about 10% taller, they have bigger bone mass, bigger muscles, stronger tendons, wider rib cage, taller pelvis, facial hair, et cetera, et cetera.

Where this starts to get complicated is, because we're talking about a bell curve, if you go from that mean average masculine secondary sex traits, and you go out to the far right edge, that's where you're gonna see men that are extremely muscular, extremely tall, extremely fast, extremely athletic, extremely, extremely, extremely. These sorts of things. Basketball players, football players, Olympic athletes. And if you go to the other far side, you're gonna see men that are short in stature, maybe have, are very thin, maybe have very little facial hair, right. Now, they're both men. If you're on the far left side or you're on the far right side, you still have an x and a y chromosome, so you're still biologically male, but the expression of your secondary sex characteristics can be on this very, very, very wide spectrum. And that's really relevant when it comes to culture, but it's where we're gonna go next.

So the one thing that's really interesting, and and where you can sort of see the determinacy of genetics, and why sex can't be just reduced to sociology or psychology, is when you look at certain kinds of sports and who dominates in certain kinds of athletics, it's all men in a lot of it, right?

Boxing. MMA fighting, you know, anything that's highly competitive. Swimming, running, all these kinds of things, right? Weightlifting, things that require more muscle mass, more speed. When you go out to the far edge of the curve, if you take the world's best tennis player who's a man and put him against the world's best tennis player who's a woman, he will destroy her, absolutely destroy her. It won't even be a competition. If you take the world's fastest woman and put her against the world's fastest man, not a competition. In fact, the, the fastest women in the world compete at basically a high school level that young men compete at. This isn't patriarchy, this isn't bias, this isn't sexism, right? This is biological reality, because the secondary sex characteristics, when we go out to the far end of the bell curve, create extreme differences in gender, excuse me, in sex, right? Which have implications for gender, the implications for then how we view ourselves as men and for women.

And I wanna be really clear about this. So If you take the middle of the secondary sex characteristics, the middle of the bell curve, so if you take an average woman and an average man and have them box, or have them compete in downhill skiing, or have them run, the chances of it being a 50/50 chance of who might win are much, much, much higher. an average man and an average woman, the difference in secondary sex characteristics become less prevalent, because they're not at the far ends of the spectrum, of the bell curve.

And I have a brief story about that. So I'm a highly trained martial artist, right? I've been training my whole adult life. I used to fight in tournaments when I was a younger fella, and used to bartend at Philly and broke up lots of fist fights. And so like, I'm very comfortable using my body in a martial way. But as a martial artist, I use my legs, my hands, I grab, you know, I throw, I do all kinds of things. And I was challenged to a friendly boxing match by a very nice woman back in my Philadelphia days, who was much smaller than me, you know, I outweighed her by probably 30 pounds. And I was taller than her, and I thought, "oh, what the hell? You know, this will be fun, you know, I'll go easy on her. You know, like it'll be fine." You know?

So we start to box ,using boxing rules, and she completely, completely handed my ass to me. It wasn't even a fight. so even though I was bigger, stronger, more muscular and highly trained, you know, in the arena of boxing she decimated me. I'm not a boxer. If I can't use my feet I'm not a very good fighter.

So I say all that because all of this stuff is really nuanced, and whenever we're talking about secondary sex characteristics and we're talking about athletics or we're talking about things like this, we have to be really careful about our data sets. We have to be really careful about what we're actually talking about. We have to watch our biases, and we have to be careful not to make generalizations. Okay.

Okay, so the second multipolar factor in what is a man is gender, culture. Okay? So here things get a little bit messier. So there is a gender definition of what is a man, there's a gender definition of what is masculine. This is also on a bell curve. So, well, the far side of the bell curve in a culture in a time period might be, an Arnold Schwarzenegger type of muscular, or Clint Eastwood or Cary Grant, or the stoic, tough, emotionally quiet or shut down, guy who's, you know, too cool for school. Maybe that's sort of how we would define "men" on one side of the spectrum. And like over on the other side, maybe it would be this sort of Woody Allen, you know, neurotic, wiry framework, kind of complaining and uh, um, you know, clearly couldn't punch their way out of a paper bag. So there's, we're still inside of this phenomena of the bell curve. The definition of a man, what is a man and why does it matter, that is completely dependent on the culture. Whether it's a macroculture or a microculture.

So when I was traveling through Thailand, I can tell you that the definition of what a man is in Thailand is really different than Texas. Really fucking different. Okay? What's considered masculine in Thailand is not considered masculine in Texas, and vice versa. Cultural. And it gets even more confusing if you think about, you know, well, what's an ideal here, for us, in the West or modern times? Well, you know, is it Chris Hemsworth, this Thor with those big biceps, you know, the beautiful body, the deep voice, the great hair. You know, is that, is that something archetypal about what a man is, this warrior, tough, muscular, tall, handsome, you know? Well, I would always counter that with virtually every woman I know thinks that Prince was unbelievably, unbelievably attractive, and deeply masculine. Prince was 5' 2". He's 5' 2", wore purple, very metro and androgynous in his expression of his masculinity. Both Thor, Chris Hemsworth and Prince, are both men. Biologically speaking, they have very different secondary sex characteristics. Prince is very, very small physically, very small stature, 5' 2" is very, very small. I think Chris Hemsworth is 6' 4". You know, so, so these guys are sort of on, on the opposite sides in some ways of the secondary sex characteristics. Yet culturally, most people would agree that they're both pretty goddamn masculine, right?

So when we think of Benedict Cumberbatch versus say Clint Eastwood, right, there's a lot, lots of ways that we can see that our culture tends to hold pretty extreme definitions of what can be masculine, and what can be attractive in that, and what traits we might find physical, emotional, mental. Okay. So as a macro culture, if we step back and we take like a really brief historical view, for those of you that are integralists and sort of geek out on this stuff, you could also look at this idea that, in a power-based society, right, power-based society where might makes right, where there aren't any rules, the rules are basically, the most powerful person is in charge. And the rule is basically don't piss them off or you get killed. You know, you think of like a Genghis Khan, right? That's a great... Genghis Khan didn't build a elaborate rules and structures for governance, he ruled by might and by intimidation. So in that kind of culture, what's a man? What's masculine? Well, it's gonna be very much skewed towards valuing these secondary sex characteristics of speed, agility, power, strength, right? People who can fight, people who can kill. These are gonna be valued, these are gonna be considered the quintessential definition of what "masculine" is in a power-based society, you know, that kind of thing. Or the mafia, right?

In a rule-based society, we think of like when the Catholic Church ran much of the world or under feudal empires, or under monarchies, all these rules. And so when there's a bunch of rules, right, it's less important, physical strength is less valued. What's really valued are things like strategy, cunning, bravery, charisma, the ability to lead and control. Basically the ability to keep chaos at bay and keep things ordered, that's gonna be really valued in a rule-based society. And the men that have those capacities, who of course are going to be in charge, are going to be the ones that those secondary sex characteristics and those physical, emotional, and mental traits, are valued. The king isn't gonna be the biggest warrior in the room. The leader of the church, the Pope isn't gonna be able to bludgeon people with his fist, right? Their power comes from their ability to control something much more complicated. So it moves out of the realm of power, out of the realm of strength, and what becomes "masculine" and desirable become different and more around emotional and mental traits.

When we move to like, status-based culture, like the United States, status based culture, right? Obviously we value men that acquire wealth and status, right? Oh, Elon Musk, you know, wow, 300 billion. Jeff Bezos. Wow. You know, look at, look at the Bill Gates and George Soros, and you know, men that have a lot of money and have a lot of power because of that. There's admiration for that. And then we look at, well, what are the things that make those people successful? Well, they're hardworking, they're

disciplined. They're ruthless in some ways, they're uncompromising, they're brilliant. And so these psycho-emotional traits become something that helps to define what a "man" is, and a culture that is status based. And it can also be, you know, status based cultures can also admire and acknowledge things like logic and justice and brilliance and insight and innovation, right? We can be, things like an Einstein or a Freud or Carl Sagan or this idea of admirable masculine traits are this sort of discerning intellect, this capacity to be very rational, to parse apart reality, to help us understand the world in a better way. Those are desirable, quote unquote "masculine" traits.

We go into a pluralistic society where we're heading into, much of Europe is there already, there are pockets in the US. And in a pluralistic society, masculine traits are, they prefer men who are equitable, who don't worry about justice, but worry about fairness. Right? Fairness. Well, we wanna look at all the ways that maybe we're not being fair because we have to be fair. Fairness is more important than justice. We might in the pluralistic society admire men who are able and willing to sideline their secondary sex characteristics in favor of greater representation, or the representation of underrepresented people or groups. So I'm willing to not speak up, I'm willing to not stand up or raise my voice or do things that might make someone else uncomfortable. So those sorts of traits more admirable, more sought after in the masculine in a pluralistic society.

And we also could have something like an integrated society, and something that like, I feel like that I'm living in, here in my hometown and with the men that I do work with, and the men that I do deep, you know, psychological work, and support and challenge. And here I would say that we see the value of all of the above. We can see the value of how all these different definitions of masculine and what a man is, can have their time and their place, and can be worth defending and honoring, so long as one can hold that in a larger context and see that, um, it's part of this nested values that exist when it comes to secondary sex characteristics around the masculine.

Okay, so first multipolar factor, genetics. Second multipolar factor, culture or sociology. The third multipolar factor, psychology. Okay. This is also the realm of gender expression, and this one's pretty simple. This one, you don't need a PhD here to sort of track this one. All right, so sex is binary, gender is infinitely variable and culturally dependent, and it's not fixed to any platonic ideal, right? There is no platonic ideal of what is a man. It really depends on the culture. But from a psychological viewpoint, it's very simple. It's how I view myself. Do I consider myself a man? Do I consider myself a

woman? Do I consider myself neither? "I identify as a man", "I identify as a woman", "I identify as neither" is a completely true and valid subjective statement. There's no arguing with it. No arguing with it. It, it's great you see yourself as a woman. Great. You see yourself as a man. Great. You see yourself as something else that's neither of those two things. That's perfectly fine.

Now, where it gets really confusing is, depending on the culture in which we live, that psychological truth may or may not be honored in the greater culture. So if I live in a power-based or rule-based culture, if I'm in Iran or if I'm in China, or if I'm in Russia, I may identify as a different gender than my sex at birth, but I'm not gonna get that culturally validated. And in fact, I may actually get killed because of it. So I may have to hold that close to the chest. I may have to hide that, which is heartbreaking. In a pluralistic society, or really in achievement oriented societies too, generally, if you identify as a woman or man or neither, and that doesn't line up with your biological birth, um, it's okay. And it's more welcomed. More welcomed in pluralistic societies, more defended in pluralistic societies.

So the whole point of this, what is a man? Well, what is a man? It's three things. It's always three things, and you can never reduce any one of those three things to just that. It has to be all three coexisting all at once. What is a man? A man is genetic. Binary. XX, XY. A man is secondary sex characteristics, which exist on this wide spectrum, but most of us, the mean, tends to be most of us are, you know, pretty obviously masculine. I have to shave. I'm six feet tall, 185 pounds, you know, um, I'm kind of right in the middle, right?

There is a cultural view of what masculine is, or what a man is. Depends if it's a power-based culture, if it's a rule-based culture, if it is a status-based culture, if it is a pluralistic culture, or if it is an integrated culture. All of these different cultures, whether they're macro cultures, the country at large, the nation state at large, or microcultures, the community in which I live, that is gonna determine culturally what a man is. And that is also on a bell curve. Really, really, really masculine means this really, really not masculine means this, it's somewhat arbitrary, right? Somewhat arbitrary. Power-based societies are gonna want the big strong strapping men, but pluralistic societies, big, strong strapping men doesn't mean anything. There's no value in that. You don't gain anything. You're not gonna get a seat at the table with the chiefs because you're this huge six foot nine guy who can bash somebody's brains out with a club. Doesn't mean anything in a pluralistic society, it doesn't mean much in an achievement-oriented

society unless you're an athlete. It doesn't mean much in a rule-based society unless you're the enforcer of the rules like the military or the police or the inquisition. But it means a lot in a, in a power-based society where might makes Right.

Okay, so, where's the problem then? So the problem is that, what can happen sometimes, my real criticism of the right, the criticism of the right comes from the fact that they understand the primacy of biology. They get that. They see that bar stool, okay. Biology. And they have a really hard time when they say a trans woman is a woman, hard stop, because they then try to reduce everything to the biology, and their argument boils down to, look, if you have an XY chromosome, you ain't a woman. You know you're something else, but you're not a woman. And there's a truth in that, right? There's a truth in that. But on the right, they tend to ignore psychology and they tend to ignore culture. And they don't honor the fact that I may identify as a woman and I have a right to do that. And I may live in a culture that I'm trying to change so that I can feel that way, and the culture will honor how I am, and they will let me have the rights and responsibilities of that gender.

On the left, trans activists, they also make a huge mistake. They tend to negate biology, and so what their argument basically tends to be, well, 1.7% of births are intersex, which isn't actually really true. And so sex isn't a binary, sex is basically a social construct. Your sexual identity is assigned at birth, as if it's arbitrary. And what really matters, since the science of genetics is messy, and there's all these things we can talk about that muddy the waters, all that's left then is cultural and psychological definitions. And this is a very sloppy unscientific argument. It's akin to when the creationists, a couple generations ago, tried to bring creationism into public schools. And the way they did it was they said, well, evolutionary theory is just a theory, and because it's a theory and not a fact, you should be able to teach the controversy, quote unquote, "teach the controversy". So we're gonna wanna bring creationist views in as an equally valid other theory towards evolution. Which is completely bullshit, right? It's totally philosophically disingenuous, because as we all know, evolution, yes, it's a theory, that's being very honest. but it's a very, very, very well established, well tread on, well explored, and accepted theory of what's happening with the world as an explanation. And so digging under the word "theory" is very sneaky and undermining. And I would argue that the trans activists are doing the same thing. They're trying to undermine what's actually really settled science in the field of genetics, and trying to turn that over so that the person on the right can't make that argument around the leg of the stool.

So they're, it's sort of a dirty fight. They're trying to use that. And so when they do this, what do we have? We have all of the shit that we have to deal with, all of the vitriol and the hatred and the projection and, you know, trying to ban this and ban that. And, you know, red states are passing laws that are really problematic, they're trying to prevent the culture from acknowledging trans people's right to self-identify. That's a problem. I've got a real problem with that. But I also have a problem with the way a lot of the people on the left, on the trans side, are fighting back, because they're fighting back in a way that's disingenuous and actually doesn't hold onto this nuance. And so they're not gonna, you're not gonna win by making a bad argument.

And so you have two bad actors making bad arguments on both sides, and it's a fucking mess.

So why does it matter? I promise to answer that question. So what is a man? Well, what is a man is complex, but it matters because if we can't define what a man is lucidly, then we can't aspire to be that thing, if we are men, or we can't encourage our partners to be that if we are women and with men, and we can't help each other to be better at whatever this thing is. So, I've been in a men's group for, the same group of men, for more than 15 years. It is a men's group, means it's all men. We all have XY chromosomes. We exist on a wide spectrum of secondary sex characteristics and we support and challenge each other. And my personal definition of what is a man, me, Keith Martin-Smith, I define a man, a healthy man as someone who's courageous, humble, powerful, embodied, wise, strong, selfless, well boundaried, intelligent, caring, charismatic, independent, sure-footed, open-minded, gracious, kind in most situations, but clear and strong when necessary. That's my definition.

And this is my personal definition, right? That's mine. Might not be yours. You might disagree with me. You could make an argument that a lot of those could be wonderful traits for the feminine, for women, and I would agree. I think women should be humble, powerful, embodied wise, strong, selfless, well boundaried, intelligent, caring, charismatic, independent. You know, I wouldn't argue with any of that.

So Michelle asked, what is a woman compared to what is a man? Well, I would argue it's the exact same thing. So I could rewind this talk to the beginning, replace woman with man, and go through the exact same order of things. It's just some of the secondary characteristics, right? Breasts, ovulation, gestation. These things would be

different, and obviously, what's valued in these different kinds of cultures, power-based, rule-based, status based, pluralistic or integral, or integrated, what's valued in a woman, or the feminine, is gonna be different in each one of those cultural expressions, whether they're macro culture or microculture.

Also "What Is a Woman" was already taken, so that's, somebody already did that one. So I thought I would, since I do men's work, and uh, you know, I, I mean here's a sort of a funny story for me, little insight into my own personal psychology, but, when I was invited to this men's group, it was 15, 16 years ago, and my buddy Casey, you know, pulled me aside one day and he said, "Hey Keith, we're forming this men's group, and I'd like for you to join." And I thought about it and I said, "why would I wanna be in a group of men?" Because for me, at the time, being in a group of men, what I took that to mean is a bunch of sexist bullying, unintelligent, bad-smelling people that I had had nothing but mostly negative experiences with most of my life, and really didn't want much to do with men. I much preferred the company of women. And so his response was, well, why don't you give it a shot? And I said, well, I'll go to one. And I would say that maybe for the first five years, my attitude was, well, I'll go to one more. I'll go to one more. But I was deeply distrustful of men. I was deeply distrustful of the masculine. I wasn't sure that I really wanted to be in a group of dudes. And then the process of working on that shadow and reintegrating a healthy masculinity, for me and for all of us in the group, has been very powerful, very life-changing.

Judy asks, so basically we're looking at what are the characteristics of a healthy human? Correct. That's what I'm saying. So in, in the way that I defined a healthy man, you could just say healthy human. Courageous, humble, powerful, embodied, wise, strong, selfless, well boundaried, intelligent, caring, charismatic independence, short footed, open-minded, gracious, kind in most situations, but clear and strong when needed. Yeah, I think those are healthy human characteristics for sure. I think maybe you can make an argument that there's something archetypally about the man, the masculine, having a bit of a protective energy, maybe around their children or around their family, and the feminine or woman having more of a nurturing or open-ended loving relationship. That might be the only really gender differences that I would say, I've seen, expressed in ways that are really beautiful and really powerful for the children that are raised in those environments. But I would say it doesn't mean that the man has to hold that energy and the woman has to hold the other. I think same-sex couples can do that. I think the idea is that, there is somewhat of an archetypal caring and loving presence in the house that loves unconditionally, and there is, somewhat of an

archetypal protective energy, that protects the nest, protects the family. And I even could imagine where one person, uh, would be able to hold both of those poles.

Oh, Eric has a kid coming. Awesome. Awesome. Congratulations. That's wonderful. That's wonderful. I'll probably give a talk on the importance of men's work, and what we can learn from it, and how we can structure it, and how it can be beneficial to men in a few months, few weeks, few months, sometime. Probably before the end of the summer. I'll talk about that here, cause I think it'd be helpful. I know that for those of you that are on Integral Life, Jason Lange talks a bit about that, and I believe he hosts an online, men's group. That might be something you wanna explore on the Integral Life website. Jason Lange, he actually was in my men's group here in Boulder until he moved to Los Angeles.

All right, everybody. Well, thank you so much for showing up. It was as always an honor and a privilege to be here, and to share my ideas, such as they are. I hope you learned something. If you wanna learn more about what I'm doing, you can go to KeithMartinSmith.com, and I've got all kinds of stuff on there. I have about five books in print on various topics, and if you have a question, you think of something afterwards, feel free to reach out to me. You can contact me through my website, and I'd be happy to continue these conversations.

All right, everybody, thanks so much, and until the next time.