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I grew up as a male in America. As a boy and young man, I enjoyed all of the advantages of being male: a society that pays homage to male heroes, textbooks and media with positive images of males, and most importantly, an ideology that said that "males are better than females."

I profited from a male dominated society by having unrestrained ambition. I never considered nursing, secretarial work, being a telephone operator, or any other "feminine" occupation. I wished to be a doctor, a lawyer, a President.

I enjoyed the unequal status between men and women that assigned all of the "domestic" work to women. I didn't think twice about my wife cooking dinner every night, and thought it normal that she would do all of the other washing and cleaning.

Being male in America is great. I wouldn't have it any other way.

One day, a chilling thought occurred to me: in race relations, the concept of "White supremacy" may be seen as a mask for a deeper sense of "White inferiority." As Frances Cress Welsing, M.D., recently said, "In psychiatry, when someone says,
'I'm superior, I'm superior,' it means that person feels inferior."

Whites maintain their "superiority" over Blacks (and other people of color) on false premises. An objective look at the evidence better supports the superiority of Africans (and other "people of color"): the quality of skin (and resistance to skin cancer), the originators of civilization (and language, science, mathematics, medicine, horticulture, agriculture, architecture, etc.), moral leadership (e.g., Malcolm, Martin, Sojourner, Frederick, Gandhi, Jesus), and athletic prowess.

When males say that we are "superior" to women, does it hide a message that we really feel inferior? Could the premises on which we claim this superiority be false? Could women really be superior? Does it matter?

To no one's surprise, male-dominated research on gender differences favors males. But it's not too hard to put together a compelling argument for the superiority of women.

Females are more physiologically viable than males. Although slightly more males are conceived and born, more females survive through infancy. More females survive into adulthood. And more females survive into old age. Women outlive men by an average of nearly 10 years.

Part of this is due to the fact that women are a lot more civilized than men. Men kill each other in local and international arenas on an apparently continuous basis.
Another example of physical strength is in athletics. Who is the greatest athlete in the world today? I'd have to say Jackie Joyner-Kersee. After all, she specializes in the heptathlon, which includes seven events (sprints, hurdles, middle distance, javelin, shot put, high jump, long jump). Her world record in the heptathlon is light years away from the competition, and she has re-written the standards for athletic excellence. Jackie also has a mean basketball game.

The next best athlete would have to be Florence Griffith Joyner, who can outrun 99.9% of the men in the world, and if she had another 100 pounds of muscle (like male world class sprinters), I'd take FloJo against Carl Lewis and give odds. And no one can question the style, grace, and beauty that Florence Griffith Joyner displayed during the Seoul Olympics.

Although women are relatively new to the marathon, their best times are only 10 or 15 minutes behind the men's best times. You heard it hear first: women will, one day, consistently beat men in the marathon.

Females are less subject to hormonal influences than males. One of the marks of humanity is our "higher cognitive processes" and our "distance" from our animal ancestry. Animals are driven by hormones. We are driven by intellect. But whereas women face hormonal swings on a monthly (or so) basis, men are constantly buffeted by hormones as we produce sperm cells by the tens of millions every day. This hormonal influence probably has a lot
to do with our violent and warlike nature, and may account in part for our rapacious sexual appetite.

Male and female brains are organized differently, specifically, females' brains are less "specialized" with respect to hemispheric localization. In females, the left and right halves of the brain communicate well with each other. In males, functions are more or less limited to one hemisphere or the other. One interpretation is that the female brain has much more raw capacity for receiving, storing, manipulating and retrieving information. This may account for the very well known phenomenon of "women's intuition."

A case for the intellectual superiority of women also comes from the world of chess. Chess, of course, is a traditional male activity involving intense intellectual challenges. After all, it caters to our combative, competitive, and warlike natures. But here's a surprise: the greatest chess player in the world is a female.

OK, she's not world champion, yet, but at 13 years old, Judit Polgar from Hungary has set the world age record in international chess competition. This barely-a-teen is knocking off male grandmasters around the world!

Men run this world. We are the heads of state, the heads of corporations, and the heads of families.

But it's all a charade. Male dominance is based on false premises.
Just as Whites used force, trickery and deceit (and outright lying) in suggesting their inherent superiority, so too is the concept of male superiority a result of force and chicanery. The truth, in fact, is the opposite to the popular belief: Women are superior to men.

What are the practical implications of this?

First, we need to have a gender change in leadership. Men have run the political/military/industrial/domestic/economy in most of the world for the past few hundred years. Men have also waged two world wars, dozens of regional wars, and killed hundreds of millions of people. Male dominated multi-national corporations have raped the earth of irreplaceable raw resources, and polluted the environment with toxins that condemn future inhabitants of our planet for the next thousand years or more.

Let's give women a chance. Let's turn the reins of power over to women. Let's recognize that they make better leaders. Let's reverse traditional gender roles.

One way to do this in our private lives is for men to start doing the "women's work." That is, men should start doing the cooking, dishes, laundry, raising of children, and cleaning of house, that we have traditionally assigned to women. We should encourage female leadership in executive decision making in the home and elsewhere.

In my house, I strive to free Denise (my better half) from the mundane chores so that she can go on to more creative
endeavors. I try to arrange the household so that she doesn't even think about washing a dish. That's a beginning. My goal is to assume all of the household chores, specifically, those things traditionally considered "women's work."

When I tell people this, they always tell me, "But that isn't fair, why not share those duties fifty-fifty, and eliminate gender inequality altogether?"

My answer is simple: after hundreds of years of male oppression and domination, we males have the responsibility to consciously rebut sexism by adopting those duties we historically assigned to women. Only by this daily, almost ritualistic role reversal, will our consciousness merge attitude and behavior so that we can be ready for the next step: to hand over the heads of state, corporations, and families to our "better half."

Our plan should be to turn the running of the world—and everything in it—over to women of color. Instead of fighting this gender revolution, we should play a supportive role.

When women run things, there will be less war, billions saved in military spending, priority placed on the development of children and communities, a reframing of values, and improvement in our quality of life.