

# mtp250

📅 Thu, 5/6 11:30AM ⌚ 45:28

## SUMMARY KEYWORDS

people, life, men, women, ideologies, birth rates, mountaintop, idea, scott, marriage, family, sex, problem, talked, book, babies, feminism, procreation, america, boise state university

## SPEAKERS

Edroy Odem, Scot McKay, Scott Yenor



Scot McKay 00:01

Okay, gentlemen, Monday, May 10 is the big day As you already know, we're launching our brand new clubhouse room dogs and cats living together, dating and relating for men and women who actually like each other. My co host is none other than Cindy Olin. She's bringing her group of like minded women to the party here we're going to discuss all things dating and relating have a lot of fun doing it. Monday, May 10. At 8:30pm Eastern Standard Time, that's 5:30pm Pacific. If you do not yet have an invite to clubhouse, you can get one or just join the club in general by going to mountaintop podcast calm front slash clubhouse. And now here comes big milestone episode number 250. With my brand new friend Scott yanar, from Boise State University, batten down the hatches This is not only going to be a thought provoking episode, it's going to be a controversial one for many as well. Here we go.



Edroy Odem 01:00

From the mist and shrouded mountaintop fortress that is x&y Communications Headquarters. You're listening to the World famous mountaintop podcast. And now your host, Scott McKay.



Scot McKay 01:13

Howdy Gentlemen, welcome again to yet another episode of the world famous mountaintop podcast. My name is Scot McKay at Scot McKay on both Twitter and clubhouse. You can find us on Instagram at real Scot McKay Scot McKay on YouTube, the URL where all things mountain top podcast can be found is mountain top podcast calm. And you can also join our Facebook group, which I hope you will, at the mountain top summit on Facebook With me today is a new friend of mine. He's a great guy. And he's going to cover with you and i a topic that I've been, you know, kind of jonesing to cover here for darn near a year now, ever since it came up briefly on another episode. And I discovered this guy's work in all places. The Tucker Carlson show during prime time there, he was talking to Tucker Carlson about what he calls family pressure. And my interest was piqued immediately. He's the author of a book called the recovery of family life exposing the limits of modern ideologies. He's a pretty smart guy. As a matter of fact, he's a professor of political science over at Boise State University home of the blue football field, by the way, Washington fellow of the Claremont Institute, as well. And the main focus of his work is indeed on the family and political thoughts without anything further, Scott yener. Welcome to the show, man.



Scott Yenor 02:29

Thanks for having me on. Scott, I appreciate it.



Scot McKay 02:31

Yeah, you know, if you are giving most of your thought, and your work, not all of it, of course, I mean, professors are always multifaceted. That's what people with brains do in this life is they think about a lot of different things. But if the main focus of your work is indeed the family and political thought, and you're talking about something called family pressure, then I would love to just have you riff on basically what that idea entails, what is it we're talking about here? Let's wrap our heads around it.



Scott Yenor 03:00

Yeah, I mean, my my argument is that there are just some powerful ideologies that are out there in the world, that are prominent in our political environment. And they're hostile to the formation of solid relationships between men and women and during relationships between men and women, and also hostile to having children. And these powerful ideologies I identify as three. One is modern feminism. The second is contemporary liberalism. And the third is sexual liberation theory. And each of these ideologies has an idea of where it wants to take individuals and what those individuals should look like.

Feminism wants to take society itself beyond the idea of gender, as it calls it, and really imagines an androgynous future for all people, where we wouldn't even recognize men and women and, and they wouldn't have any different kinds of characters. sexual liberation theory, wants to take men and women beyond what they call repression, so that people will be sexually expressive, and in practice all kinds of sexual preferences over the course of their lives. And the purpose of these ideologies is to really point people away from family life, so that they think of themselves really only as individuals, so that they inflate the importance of sex in their lives, and they won't have children and they won't bear heavy responsibilities that belong to family life. So, and these ideologies are really powerful all over the world. But they're especially powerful here in America. And that is really like led to some implications like fewer babies being born, fewer marriages being established. There's even kind of a sexual recession, as I understand. That is there's more people who are having a lot less sex than they used to both married and unmarried. These are the logical outgrowth of these really powerful ideologies that are dominating our political life.



Scot McKay 05:08

Now, that's all very important. And I'm sure everybody's interest is already piqued, especially since I've been known to talk about some of the issues you've already mentioned. And I've indeed been criticized publicly for By the way, this is a very polarizing set of views you're talking about. But to a lot of people, it just seems kind of obvious that this has been going on. I mean, on one hand, hey, we're all being told that we need to affect these changes. And that is important to society at large for some reason. But on the other hand, when we ask why we're rebuffed, and called all sorts of names for even challenging it. So why don't I ask you Since you're here, and you're apparently open minded to answering all these questions on this topic, Scott, what's your opinion on why these issues and these changes in particular, are so important to enact to what you're calling the political realm?



Scott Yenor 05:57

Yeah, I mean, the these are really crucial ideologies of, I would say, the American ruling elite, the American ruling elite is really committed to the idea that there shouldn't be differences between men and women, and they stigmatize you know, people who say that there are differences and that those differences lead to, you know, great things in human life, like fruitful relationships, and complimentary relationships, and even sometimes, men and women arranging their lives so that they lose their own individual identities. These, these ideologies are hostile to deep abiding love between men and women. And, you know, I think the the reason they're so crucial to the modern ruling elite, is that we've

bought into some of these principles of modern life like individualism, that, that celebrate our individual expression, or celebrate our individual successes, or celebrate our individuals pursuing their own interest at the expense of these other deep and meaningful human experiences that happen only between a man and a woman and the children that they produce. So, you know, it's a little, it's a little bit sewn into the nature of America, we always have emphasized individual rights, but we used to, like qualify or compromise our commitment to individual rights, with a recognition that forming enduring bonds between men and women, is what makes life worth living are one of the things that makes life worth living. And it allows us to pursue happiness and achieve a lot of happiness and fulfillment in life. But when we stop compromising our commitment to individual rights and individual lives, we, you know, end up being more free, but less happy. And that's, that's really one of the great paradoxes, I think, of our time, is that we're freer than we've ever been. But we're also less happy.



Scot McKay 07:58

Now, that strikes me as a paradox, and D, because as you were talking, I was thinking, this idea of us losing our individuality and becoming more uniform, in so many ways, sounds a lot like Chairman Mao's Great Society. I mean, we're all gonna wear white shirts, black slacks, and do the same things believe the same things talk the same way, look the same way. And you had a lot of people trying to flee that culture to come to places like America, where we had free expression. So to hear you say something like, hey, the more freedom we enjoy, the less happy we tend to be sounds a lot like people having the freedom to not realize how good we have it. In other words, because I have freedom of thought, freedom of speech, I'm gonna bitch and complain about everything, even though I have the freedom to do what I want, enjoy the hobbies, I want dressed the way I want, color my hair the way I want, etc. So it is indeed a paradox on many levels, first of all, socially, second of all, politically and even kind of, kind of descends almost of the human soul level, doesn't it?



Scott Yenor 08:55

Yeah, I mean, it's, in some ways, the freedom that we have is a question. So feminism promises, for instance, that women will be free to choose whatever they would like in their world, you know, they can choose a career, they can choose a path of motherhood, they can become nuns, you know, people are supposed to be able to pursue be free to be calm, whatever that they want to be. But, you know, on the other hand, feminism really has an idea of what a woman should choose. That really women should choose to honor their career, over their marriage and over motherhood. And we spent a lot of time

preparing young girls to do exactly that. So, you know, I think there's always an ideal, a social ideal, something that we honor a kind of man or a kind of woman that we as a society honor, and we honor a particular kind of woman today. She's athletic, she's more independent. She's career oriented, and the paradox The way I think this runs into human life for us is that that particular life course, isn't what, like three out of four women want. But nevertheless, many of them are really caught in the grip of the social pressure, and their social ideal to pursue that kind of life. So I think in some ways, the freedom that we are sold is a little bit of a disguise, and that we have social ideals, and those social ideals that we have, or what really compromise our ability to be happy.



Scot McKay 10:37

Such an interesting point, you know, my wife, Emily, and I, about a year ago had this very discussion. They were talking about the economy of the United States, and how, although ostensibly, it seemed to be going well, there were fewer women in the workforce, which Oh, my goodness was such a red flag. And my wife who in case you haven't guessed yet, is female. It's a woman, right? So this is a first person assessment on her part, she's like, wait a minute, what if the better economy allowed more women to stay home and be moms and raise their kids and not be in the workforce? And I'm like, Yeah, what a what a concept as if that wasn't even an option, according to these people who are gauging our economy on these different metrics, right?



Scott Yenor 11:19

Yeah, no, I totally agree with that, you know, it's kind of an interesting thing that as societies become more prosperous, really what it does is it allows more women to actually choose out of the career rat race. So what you have, especially in the upper class in America, is actually very few women who, when they have children under the age of 18, are working full time in the upper classes, because they can afford it. And when they can afford it, they can actually start pursuing the things that are most important to them. And it's harder for people down the economic ladder to do that. And that's one of the things that I tried to do in the book is just say like, this is something we as a society should try to prioritize. Many women want to have more children than they do have. Many women want to spend more time with their children than they're allowed to. And then they have time to. And one of the ways we can try to ease that burden is to allow our honor, part time work instead of full time work. motherhood instead of careerism. So yeah, I mean, feminism claims to be about choice, as long as people choose the way they want to. And the problem is that most women don't want to choose the way feminists want them to choose.



Scot McKay 12:35

Well, that seems to sum up politics. In general, nowadays, your freedom to think whatever you want, the First Amendment is still there, as long as you agree with me. If not, well, you know, we got to somehow either re educate you or flat out cancel you, right.



Scott Yenor 12:48

Yeah, I mean, this, these ideologies of feminism and sexual liberation, especially, I mean, they're, they're part of a larger, you know, collection of ideologies, you know, that I think, make up the modern left, or the America's ruling elite. And, you know, I'm I'm really concerned about the effects of those on family life. I'm also really concerned about the effects of those powerful ideologies on our modern universities. I think there's, you know, great ways in which universities and their mission has been compromised, because of their commitment to these powerful ideologies. But you know, one of the easiest ways to see the power of these ideologies is in the falling birth rates all across the western world. I mean, feminism says that women should be independent, independent of the family, independent of men, independent their children. And the best way to actually accomplish such independence is never to have children. And the birth rates in every country in the Western world, every country, really where feminism has sunk its roots deeply in our way under replacement rates. In some countries, it's under one. In America, it looks to be about 1.6 1.7 births per woman. And in only one country, Israel has a birth rate above replacement, the replacement rate is 2.1 children per woman. So you know, I think this ideology has a easily measured effect when we look at birth rates. And so it's one way in which I can contribute to showing how the modern ideologies are having a real life effect on the ground. Feminism compromises birth rights, period.



Scot McKay 14:34

That's really an interesting thought. And it's one that I ruminate upon constantly. Because if you look at a nation like Japan, they're sounding the alarm over there, Scott, it's like, Hey, y'all need to you know, meet procreate get laid a little bit, make some babies because we don't have any new ones coming in Japan is going to cease to have any population unless you get started with this and get going. And yet, you know, you have the otaku culture over there where guys have become technical They have a whole cultural surround for that lifestyle for men relative to being men who are attractive to women and nobody's getting together, they're almost saying, Hey, we're better off not doing it. So on one hand, they're kind of like playing this sort of kayfabe charade, where it's like, oh, my goodness, we really wish that the birth rate would go higher, because this is so dangerous to our culture. And yet, on the other side of their mouth, this social

pressure is actively lowering the birth rate. And I've been trying to wrap my head around that for quite some time. All the things you talked about in terms of trying to make us a little bit more uniform, to kind of keep us from doing those things, which we want to do sound a lot like mind control, you know, we're all going to be more alike, we're going to just say no to gender identity, gender roles, nuclear family stuff, is that what's going on here is it's about the so called liberal elites being in control and being able to manipulate the people who are their constituents.



**Scott Yenor** 16:02

Yeah, I mean, I think partly, you know, let's think of it like this, you know, there are a lot of things that we used to take for granted. And, you know, and I think some of the work that you do on this podcast, God is really about some of these things that we used to take for granted. For instance, we used to take for granted that men and women would be interested in one another, and want to get together not only for physical contact, that is having sex, but also they would marry that they would want to marry. And that we really thought that if we could remove all of the cultural props that lead people toward marriage, that led them to want to be with one another, that they still would want to be with one another, and that they still would want to marry, and that they still would want to have children. We just have a lot of cultural supports that lead people that to help them do these things. We've removed those cultural supports. And now what are we finding and think East Asia is a great example of this, we're finding that actually, we can't take these things for granted, we cannot take these things for granted. That is men and women will not simply be interested in one another. They need to be in a certain kind of lane of manliness and femaleness in order to be interested in one another, they won't necessarily marry, they have to have reasons to marry. And that even if they have sex, they won't necessarily have children. These things can all be stopped now. So the great cultural project of bringing men and women together in marriage and to have children has been kind of dismantled. And it's been dismantled, I think in the name of individual freedom may be in the name of some sort of high ideals. Maybe we took for granted that these things would just continue on through a kind of inertia. But we learning that it doesn't continue on through a kind of inertia. And that's why I think some of the things that you do in your podcast here and and your website are important because you're actually trying to, in many cases, teach people the manners and mores about why they should want to be together, and how to bring them you know how to make something together? And because we can't take it, we can't take it for granted anymore.



**Scot McKay** 18:21

Yeah, well, obviously, I agree with you. It's sort of my life purpose, right. But thank you for

your kind words. You know, as you're talking, a lot of times, I think people think of this whole idea of, I don't know what overarching title you would give it but it's to me kind of a three legged stool, okay, you have sex, sexual attraction, family, marriage, parenting, etc. And then procreation, which is furthering the human race. I think we see those things as a monolith. And perhaps we shouldn't. But I will agree with you that there is definitely a pressure being placed not only on the family unit, but also on sexual attraction, and on making babies. Now, it's time for me I guess, to throw my grand and in my opinion, fun conspiracy theory on the table here just to see what you think. First of all, they can try to keep men and women from being horny for each other, but they're fighting a tsunami. That is perhaps the greatest force in the universe, which is sex. People are just not going to stop screwing Scott. We're so horny, okay? I mean, trying to stop people from having sex. I mean, you can try you can use all kinds of mind control and threats of eternal damnation and being ostracized from the community all you want. But all of us know from Catholic school, we're all going to still screw each other's brains out. Anyway. So there's the first one. Second one is this whole idea that, you know, the family is irrelevant anymore. You know, it started with Hillary Clinton, you know, at least blatantly So writing a book saying, it takes a village to raise a child. I mean, there was the first blatant admission Hey, you know what, as a family, you don't matter. Now you have the BLM folks saying, Hey, you know what, black dads don't matter, the family unit doesn't matter. It's become almost mainstream, popular thinking and sweat all the cool kids think that, hey, you know what, if you're a family unit, you're old school, you're probably some sort of republican and you're a repressive and probably racist and terrorist to God help you, you know. And then the third thing that comes up is this whole idea of making babies. Now, here's what I think. I think, first of all, we're overpopulated on this planet. And I have this sneaking suspicion, they've already figured out how to dramatically slow the aging process, or perhaps Stop it. And I think the elites already know this. It's coming. And what are we going to do if people keep living, living, living, and only accidents, kill them or whatever. As technology increases, people are going to live longer, at the very least, and we just got to stop babies from being born. The rest of it is just for show, Oh, my gosh, the following birth rate, whatever we're going to do, wherever Shall we go? Like I said, it's all kayfabe. The reality is, we need fewer babies. At least, that's what I think I'm gonna go ahead and let you riff on that. Before we get into the intricacies of some of the ways reproduction and family is pressured. But I'd love to hear your thoughts on all that crazy stuff. I just spat out.

S

Scott Yenor 21:17

Well, yeah, so let's talk about the first and the third thing. First, will sex continue. Now, I'm inclined to think that human beings will still want to have sex with one another. But I think that we can underestimate the extent to which sex with actual others requires manners, mores a kind of resistance from from one or the other in order to encourage it to happen.



There was a recent study out by the Institute for family studies that suggested that a historic high number of people have not had sex over the last year. And the number I think, is 25% of the population in the United States, it's different for men and women, it's a little higher for men than it is for women. In some of these East Asian countries, the sexless rate is even higher, it seems like it's about 40% for men. And and, you know, people are starting to write about this particular problem of involuntary celibacy, a lot of men are more interested in pornography than they are in actual women. There's now like a little little side industry of sex robots that's available. So I think it's true that people will always be interested in sex to some ways, but that doesn't mean that they're going to be interested in one another. And, and I think that's, you know, something we've taken for granted. But that we probably need to, you know, encourage people to want to be with one another in ways that we, we used to, I would say, as I say before, take for granted. Now, the second thing, you know, I haven't seen all the genetic stuff that you're talking about. And, and here's what I would say about it, though, my impression is that life expectancy is going to go up, but that it's not going to be matched with an increase in human productivity. In the ages, I would say after 80. That is, I think they have found ways to slow the aging process already, people are living longer lives, people who survive to age 20, are probably going to live almost to age 90 now. And we'll probably make that a little higher. But that doesn't mean that those late years are going to be greatly productive. And in fact, the long term problem is that there's gonna be too few workers to sustain too many people who are on, you know, government programs for old people all across the western world. So the birth dearth, as it's called the decline in birth rates, is really going to compromise all of the welfare approaches that we have now, because there's just gonna be too few workers to sustain way too many people who aren't productive in their old age. So there's a real need for people and the way the Western world has been reacting to it is to import new populations, import young populations, in order to be the workers that will sustain their welfare states. And that causes a whole host of other problems that, you know, are not exactly in my lane. But that's one way that they've approached the problem of birth rates. So I think that we shouldn't overestimate the extent to which civilization really always will depend on rejuvenating itself through the arrival of the new generation.



Scot McKay 24:36

Man, there's a whole season of podcasts we could record on this. It's one total, total total standalone topic after another. You know, my kids were watching the Pixar movie Wally the other night, they never watched it before it's the first time since it came out. I had seen it. I can't believe it's already 12 years old, but you watch this movie and you realize, oh my god, this was so precious. People are sitting around in front of their smart screens, getting fatter and doing nothing. And depending on some robot or some other, you know, automated system to do this for them, and you briefly and perhaps just barely skirt upon

this idea of us importing a whole new generation of people to do the dirty work for us. Cough, immigration, illegal immigration, right. And yet, I mean, how can that be sustainable to so I guess what you're trying to say is, this is going to ultimately backfire on the people who thought this was some sort of grand New World design that was gonna save us all, especially those who are in a position of authority or political power. I think everybody with a brain in their head already realizes that this is about the people in powerful positions getting more powerful. And although we do have a racism problem, although we have people not being tolerant of one another, and we all could do better in that regard. All of that is conveniently talked about at length, to the exclusion of how people who are richer, are getting more powerful, and they're the ones pulling the strings. And yet, here we are back talking about family, the family unit family pressure. And just to kind of let you know, one of the things you said when we were chatting before we start is you and I might not agree on everything. So far, I'm right with you, Scott, you've said everything that I completely agree with, I just think it's common sense. I have come up with no fewer than 14 ways that reproduction, sexual attraction family, whatever leg of the stool you want to focus on, I think all of them are conspiring to pressure it. And I would love to get your thoughts on some of these, you've already talked about porn and the advent of sex robots, which, you know, it's so free and easy, and everybody's so hot, and everything feels so good, you know, when you are in control of it yourself, that, you know, this whole idea of having free and available broadband porn of any kind of woman you want. And being able to shift, literally from one woman to the next, on a whim, has almost made having real life sex obsolete. Now, I would argue that there's a big difference between getting one's rocks off and intimacy. And I think that's the tragic collateral damage here. But again, that's probably another show, right? You talked about the sexual revolution. I mean, you know, you can get the milk without buying the cow nowadays. You talked about COVID, briefly, man, we've had a whole year where we're not even allowed to see each other's faces and public, let alone hang out with each other, you're supposed to quarantine. And we're not seeing each other. And we're forgetting how to be social, by the way. And we've talked about that. You talked about secular humanist culture, not by name. But you know, you talk about the idea of free love. And you know, there aren't a whole lot of mores surrounding just going around screaming like rabbits anymore. So it's really kind of cheap. And other things that I would add, that we haven't perhaps talked about yet, are the advent of easy, cheap, effective birth control. I mean, if you don't want to have babies, you don't have to the prolonging of adolescence to advanced education and keeping kids out of the workforce, therefore, they can't afford to be a family, man, or have a family or start a family and have kids who can afford it when you don't even have a job yet. And indeed, when kids get out of school with a whole lot of debt, you talked about the way university education are changing. First of all, one of the things to consider there is that it's gotten a whole lot more expensive, and kids have to pay it back. rising costs of life in general, you know, keeps us from feeling like we can afford kids. You talked

about to some degree the D normalization of heterosexuality. I mean, if you don't want to be heterosexual anymore, you can be gay, you can be bi you can be LGBTQIA. And I think it's wonderful that society has stopped vilifying each other for differences in sexual orientation. But then it all happens so fast. Like I was listening to something from about 13 years ago, and they made fun of gay people freely. And then all of a sudden, about nine years ago, that was completely verboten. It just seems like that changed almost overnight. discord sewn between men and women, even through mainstream dang advice. You know, all men are jerks. They only want one thing. Now you have also what you refer to briefly again, the insell movement, guys were in voluntarily celibate and they're upset about it. And that's given away to the hashtag men going their own way, who think women are all selfish, and they're just going to trade up for a taller, richer guy. And you know, it becomes a bunch of echo chambers where everybody's decided is, it's normal, not even the new normal, but perfectly normal for lots of years now, to just hate on the other gender we're supposed to be in partnership with. You talked about trivialization vilification or even flat out denial of masculinity and femininity, sexual polarity itself as a social construct. I mean, you know, what are masculinity and femininity, they're just a way to keep women down, you know, the patriarchy, not the actual catalysts of sexual polarity themselves. abortion, if you don't want to have this baby, even after the birth control didn't do its job or wasn't there to begin with, you can get rid of that baby. And that cheap and children, in my opinion, in general are cheap and family life in general. And other little things like there's no need to have children as farmworkers anymore, you don't need a family of 10. Either five of them get called by disease or whatever, back in the old days, which, of course, was tragic, because you just don't need them in the fields to work. And then you got divorce stats, which makes everybody scared to death. I don't want to lose half of my personal wealth and my net worth because I got married to some chick I should never have been married to to begin with all of these pressures. Almost none of them were here. 7080 years ago, Scott, get there now all here in full force. It's crazy, isn't it?



Scott Yenor 30:48

Yeah, I mean, I think I mean, what it does, that shows that we can't take for granted many of the things that we used to take for granted. Now, I'm going to talk like a snob here for a second, but I promise that has a payoff. And the snob thing is that you know, that marriage used to be an institution. And the way and what I mean by that is just used to buckle things together used to make things stick together, like sex, procreation and marriage.



Scot McKay 31:12

It used to make sense.



Scott Yenor 31:14

Yeah. And many of the things that you just talked about are really about things that, like, unbuckle those things that make marriage less of an institution less of a norm. So for instance, contraception gets in between sex and procreation, celebrating alternative lifestyles, gets in between sex and procreation. Having alternative forms of marriage, that is cohabitation being treated equally to marriage gets in between sex procreation on the one hand, and marriage on the other. And, you know, so the story, I would say, of our lives, I'm 50. Now the story of our lives is the unbuckling, of things that used to be buckled together. And, and that makes marriage last seven institution. Now the great irony here. The great irony is that among the upper classes in America, marriage is pretty healthy. That is, divorce rates are, where they are now, where they were in 1980, about 85% of kids who were born in the upper class as the upper 20% of America will live their whole life has children with their biological parents 85%, that number was 95%, you know, in 1960, I mean, it's declined 10%. But here's the kicker among the lower class in 1960, the number was exactly the same as the upper class 95%. Now, that number is 30%. That is, the lower classes, anyone in the lower 80% of America has really borne the brunt of this unbuckling of sex marriage and procreation and family life. And so when you drive through urban, you know, the South Side of Chicago, when you drive through the rural parts of Idaho, where I live, you know, you see very few people who can learn to live together, who have the character who have the economic prospects for the kind of sacrificial life that will be marriage. So in a very strange way, marriage has reinforced the class divide in America, the ruling elite don't practice what they preach. They practice a kind of quasi conservative family life, but they don't set an example or try to impose social roles on anyone underneath them. And that's led to kind of the degradation of life for children all across America, especially in rural and urban areas. So, you know, all the examples that things you just gave there, Scott are really examples of the unbuckling of sex, procreation and marriage, and, and the downstream effect of that is really seen in rural and urban America. I think it's made us to Americas in a way that makes it kind of difficult to sew it back together.



Scot McKay 34:11

Yeah, I agree with you. 1,000%. That's incredibly intuitive. And as you were talking, I thought of yet another one. And that's the rise of me first culture, I mean, sacrifice for family, for your kids, for even the community used to be a no brainer, just about everywhere. But nowadays, we've become very selfish and the term narcissism is bandied about, like it's commonplace, you know, either correctly or incorrectly. But the whole idea

of being self serving, kind of has become the new God. You know what I mean?

S

Scott Yenor 34:44

Yeah, I mean, I, my take on that is that, you know, I think that the old social roles of men and women, women, mothers, homemakers, men, as providers, really helped limit our self absorption. It pointed us beyond ourselves toward a community towards something fulfilling that we will build in our lives, it's not easy to build over the course of our life. And, and when you explode those social roles, you're, you're thrown back on yourself. And so I think the me first culture is much of an effect of destroying family roles and family ideals, as it is a cause of it. And I talked about this in my book a little bit. But you know, the idea that men who provide for a family are really tyrants, who were trying to lord it over their wives and try to get their way. I mean, that's what feminists say about men who want to provide for their family, you know, it's just that that's the most loving expression of male, you know, male responsibility that there is in life are one of the most I mean, there's also sacrifice for the country and sacrifice Republic order and things. But it's one of the things that's available to most men, but it's a stigmatized role. And, and very few people actually say that they want to provide or as a husband, and but that's actually one of the things that really gives direction and meaning to a man's life. So the destruction of that role, I think, is led to more self absorption. And also, you know, kind of meaningless lies for a lot of men because they don't have any place to point their ambition.



Scot McKay 36:22

Yeah, that being a provider, as we've talked about time and again, on this show is also one of the primal catalysts for sexual attraction of femininity on the part of masculinity. I'll tell you what's got such a powerful group of thoughts. And I'd never really thought about the idea of the me first culture being an effect of the disintegration of family. But I sense that you're right on about that. And, by way of closing the show, I have a couple quick questions for you. First of all, you have a section of your book called The new problem with no name that I find fascinating and intriguing. What is the new problem with no name?

S

Scott Yenor 36:57

Yeah. So Betty for Dan wrote a book in 1963, called the feminine mystique. And the feminine mystique was based on this idea, the problem was no name. And the problem with no name, then it was a problem that sociologists and psychologists and doctors were not identifying. For her, it was the idea that women were dissatisfied, living in the home.

And, and in fact, they were taking drugs, they were suffering from mental diseases, all because they were in the home. So there was this problem, but it hadn't been given a name. And I thought I would kind of use her phrase, the problem with no name and my book. And the problem with no name that I use in my book is the decline of marital character. And what that means is that we no longer really prepare men and women to live together in a family. It comes out in a lot of different ways. In the upper classes insofar as we have this problem, it's emphasizing career over the home for women and destroying the idea that men should be providers among men. But really, this problem also affects the lower classes, because the men don't rise to the level of being able to be responsible to own their future, and live family life. And women assert their own independence, but aren't ready for family life. So the new problem with no name, the one that no one talks about, but it's really at the root of our problems, is the decline of characters that can be trusting and sacrificing for a family, in both men and women. So it comes out differently in men and women.



Scot McKay 38:36

Yeah, just a cheapening of character, purpose, faith and belief, relationship and responsibility. It seems like everything's become cheap when everything's become automated. And no, life itself is even cheap and fascinating. What would you say to men, Scott, who are scared to death to become husbands, let alone fathers. I mean, I know I've been there. Part of that is kind of normal butterflies. But, I mean, there's guys who are swearing it off? What do you say to those guys?



Scott Yenor 39:04

Well, I would ask you to think about what life is going to be like when you're 70. Now marriage is a risk. And you know, women are less stable than they used to be. And men are less stable than they used to be. And, you know, it really is a decision that you make to just stick together over the course of time. But like, what is life going to be like when you're 70? Are you going to be surrounded by people who you have given something to? and risk four? Or are you going to be alone? You know, I've been around grandparents when they die, and they've been surrounded by family and I can't imagine what it would be like to be, you know, childless spouse less and facing the end of your life and looking back and asking what you've accomplished over the course of it. And I think really, one of the great accomplishments that's available to most people is a risk, but it's getting married and having children and raising them to honorable adulthood. It's hard. There's a lot of obstacles, do it, it's a great challenge to your character, your patience, your intelligence, your judgment. But, you know, it's one of the only things that that unites us across generations and is worth the great sacrifice that we put in for it. I've done all these crazy

things. Over the course of my life, I've had five kids, and I've gone to Portland for basketball games, and I've gone to Las Vegas for basketball games, and I've gone and hikes with my kids. And none of these things are strictly speaking, productive. They don't make me richer in a material sense. But they're going to be the things that I think, make me happy as I age. And as I continue to have those great relationships. So I think they're unreplaceable relationships, and worth the risk. You know, I'm



Scot McKay 40:51

reminded of one of the most poignant points you made during your interview that I heard that introduced me to your work, which is, you know, they do these, I don't I guess who come surveys or polls of younger people who say, I don't want to get married? I certainly don't want any kids. It's too burdensome. I want to live a freer life. I don't have time for that. I don't want that in my life. And then almost invariably, as we hit age 45, age 50. We wish we did have kids, we wish we did have a family, but by then it's too late for most right? It's very, very poignant. Indeed.



Scott Yenor 41:26

Yeah, I mean, that's and that seems to be kind of our future, it looks like it's gonna be about 40% of the people in the current generation z, I think is that what they're called, the people who have been born after 2000 are going to end up childless. If current trends continue. And, you know, I just think that that's going to be a recipe for very unhappy, older people. And it's gonna cause great problems for us as a society to try to figure out not just the technical things about how to care for them, but really also how to deal with their disappointments. And I just, I'm, I'm thankful I won't be in that position. And I pray that many of you won't be in that position, because it's just one of the things that gives life meaning. There are other things that give life meaning, you know, you can pursue wisdom, you can have great artistic accomplishments, you can build a business, you can, you know, live a life of piety. All of these things are within the reach of many people. But you know, marriage and family life is also within the reach of many people. It checks a lot of boxes, and on the on the road to happiness.



Scot McKay 42:34

You know, Scott, like you I'm grateful I got over myself, and we're on kid number four now.



Scott Yenor 42:38



Oh, good. What's a good start? Good start. Yeah,



Scot McKay 42:40

I got four years on you. I'm 54. And I got a nine year old daughter and boy, she keeps me young. She's up and down the hills in the neighborhood on bicycles for sure. Good stuff, we wouldn't trade her for the world. His name is Scott Yener. And he is from Boise State University. He's also a Washington fellow at the Claremont Institute. The name of his book is the recovery of family life, exposing the limits of modern ideologies. And when you go to mountaintop podcast.com front slash Amazon, you will see Scott Youngers book right there at the top of the queue on my Amazon influencer page, and I also invite you to go to mountain top podcast calm front slash yener. And that's why he N o r it's like tenor or Senor, if you will, only with a why on the front. And there you'll be able to get a copy of Scott enters book as well. Scott, thank you so much for this long overdue conversation. I mean, it's been so long in the making. And man, I think you pretty much hit it out of the park. Thanks again.



Scott Yener 43:37

Thanks for having me on, Scott. I appreciate it.



Scot McKay 43:39

Yeah, guys, and if you haven't visited mountain top podcast comm just yet, be sure to head there, click on the button in the upper right hand corner talk to me about Hey, how you can get a real actual red blooded woman in your life not some robot, right? And also how we can make sure you're the right man to get the right woman in your life. It's all about identity and purpose first and then that way when you know who you are, you know who to attract in your life and I can also give you the skills empower you to be able to do that, that and so much more is there for you at mountaintop podcast.com along that along with our two sponsors origin and main and heroes soap you can visit both of those sites with links that are conveniently there for you on mountaintop podcast.com and when you do business with either of those fine organizations, please use Mountain 10 as your coupon code and with that and so I talked to you again real soon on the next episode of the mountaintop podcast This is Scott McKay from x&y communications in San Antonio Texas be good out there.



Edroy Odem 44:44



mountaintop podcast is produced by x&y communications All rights reserved worldwide, be sure to visit WWW dot mountaintop podcast.com for show notes. And while you're there sign up for the free at Why communications newsletter for men? This is Ed royal. Speaking for the mouth