

1-1-2005

His story/her story: A dialogue about including men and masculinities in the women's studies curriculum

B. Berila

J. Keller


C. Krone

Jason A. Laker

San Jose State University, jason.laker@sjsu.edu

O. Mayers

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/counselor_ed_pub

 Part of the [Adult and Continuing Education Administration Commons](#), [Civic and Community Engagement Commons](#), [Community-Based Learning Commons](#), [Community-Based Research Commons](#), [Educational Sociology Commons](#), [Education Policy Commons](#), [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#), [Higher Education Administration Commons](#), [International and Comparative Education Commons](#), [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#), [Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education Commons](#), [Sociology of Culture Commons](#), and the [Student Counseling and Personnel Services Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

B. Berila, J. Keller, C. Krone, Jason A. Laker, and O. Mayers. "His story/her story: A dialogue about including men and masculinities in the women's studies curriculum" *Feminist Teacher* (2005): 34-52.

His Story/Her Story: A Dialogue About Including Men and Masculinities in the Women's Studies Curriculum

BETH BERILA, JEAN KELLER, CAMILLA KRONE,
JASON LAKER, AND OZZIE MAYERS

In "Feminist Phase Theory: An Experience-Derived Evaluation Model," Mary Kay Thompson Tetreault proposes that Women's Studies programs evolve through five stages: the familiar absence of women at stage one; noting the absence of women at stage two; complementary but equal conceptualization of men's and women's spheres and personal qualities at stage three; reclaiming women at stage four by using women's activities, not men's, as the "measure of significance"; and the fifth stage, "multifocal, relational scholarship" that provides a "gender-balanced perspective [. . .] which serves to fuse women's and men's experiences into a holistic view of human experience" (372). Given that feminist scholarship is entering its fourth decade and that more Women's Studies programs are including the term "gender" in their program names, it is imperative that such programs take a step back and ask: has the field of Women's Studies developed to the point that we should move to stage five and explicitly embrace Men's Studies as an essential part of our programs?¹

Such an undertaking is fraught with possible difficulties. Women's Studies programs were started, after all, to correct for the male bias dominant in the academy. Women's Studies provided a forum where scholarship on women was produced and taken seriously, female students and faculty could

find their voice, and theoretical investigations necessary to advance the aims of the women's movement could take place.² If the academy as a whole does not yet sufficiently integrate Women's Studies into the curriculum, integrating Men's Studies into Women's Studies could end up further marginalizing Women's Studies by reducing the number of classroom hours students spend engaging women's lives and feminist scholarship. Such an integration may appear to be another form of male privilege, with men finagling their way into the only branch of scholarship that has consistently focused on women. If there's a sudden influx of male students into our courses, Women's Studies faculty may worry that female students who have experienced the classroom as a safe space for women will lose that space. On a more theoretical level, feminist scholars worry that a move from a Women's Studies program to a Gender Studies program will dilute the political aspect of women's programs. After all, Women's Studies has traditionally been seen as the academic arm of the women's movement, yet there is no gender movement to correspond with Gender Studies (Auslander 19).

While the concerns just cited certainly have merit, we three faculty members and two program directors in Women's/Gender/Men's Studies argue that when undertaken

intentionally and carefully, Men's Studies provides an important complement to Women's Studies programs and can help us achieve such feminist aims as acknowledging differences (both among women and among men), advancing an intersectional understanding of gender, encouraging men to take feminism seriously, addressing homophobia, and speaking more directly to the interests and concerns of our students. In section I of this article, Beth Berila, director of Women's Studies at Saint Cloud State University (SCSU), St. Cloud, Minnesota, provides a theoretical argument for incorporating Gender Studies into Women's Studies programs, drawing on recent analyses in feminist studies, queer theory, critical race theory, and transnational feminism. In section II, Jean Keller describes, from a program director's perspective, the process whereby the College of Saint Benedict/Saint John's University (CSB/SJU) evolved from a position in which many of the Women's Studies faculty were wary of Men's Studies to support of the incorporation of Men's Studies as an explicit requirement of the two required courses for their Gender and Women's Studies (GWST) minor. In section III, Ozzie Meyers and Camilla Krone, two long-time Gender and Women's Studies faculty members at CSB/SJU, describe the evolution of the introductory course from being focused on women to integrating men and men's concerns. They evaluate the related gains and losses from a faculty perspective. Finally, in section IV, Jason Laker, Dean of Students and a relatively new Men's Studies instructor, contemplates men's engagement in Men's Studies from these dual locations. We share our theoretical reflections and personal experiences as teachers and program directors in Gender and Women's Studies in the hope that they will be of assistance to other programs considering the transition to a Gender Studies model. We speak on this issue from differing institutional, theoretical, and social locations, maintaining our separate voices in the construction of this

essay so that differences in our perspectives will not be obscured.

I. Beth Berila. Deconstructing Gender at Its Core

The transformation of Women's Studies programs to some version of Gender and Women's Studies involves a significant change in identity and philosophy and raises concerns about the dangers of co-opting the valuable tenets for which Women's Studies has historically stood. As a professor and director of Women's Studies at Saint Cloud State University, a Midwestern four-year public institution, the question of the role of men in Women's Studies raises issues that I think are at the heart of the intersectional analysis we prioritize in our program and leads me to argue that, of course, men have a place in Women's Studies.

Because of widespread misperceptions, men are often "scared away" from Women's Studies, while women are often afraid that the inclusion of men will shift attention away from women's issues, an issue which Section IV will explore further. Women's Studies classrooms are often presumed to be safe spaces that must be protected from encroachment, but I am deeply skeptical of the notion that women-only spaces are inherently safe spaces or are necessarily safer spaces than ones that include men. As many feminist writers and activists have pointed out, queer women, women of color, working class women, Jewish women, and women living with disabilities (identities that are not mutually exclusive) do not necessarily feel "safe" in spaces that include women from different identity locations, particularly if those women do not challenge their own oppressive practices. Moreover, women in marginalized communities have a stake in bonding closely with men in those communities against heterosexist or racist oppression, at the same time that they might be actively challenging sexism within those communities.

Gender Studies, a field that some would suggest would be more successful in bringing in men than is Women's Studies, is often critiqued for obscuring the material nature of women's oppression because of its roots in a poststructuralist analysis of the shifting, fluid, and socially constructed nature of identity (Hyde and Bricker-Jenkins). Of course, the charge of ahistoricism and the erasure of material realities is an ongoing and sometimes valid critique of poststructuralism, particularly given the value placed on feminist praxis within Women's Studies, but Gender Studies needn't inevitably fall into these pitfalls (Bricker-Jenkins 1043). Indeed, a complex analysis of why identity formations shift at particular historical moments moves us beyond the notion that who takes out the trash and who cooks are socially constructed gender roles, to much more foundational analyses of the very core of what we understand male/female to be (Bornstein, Kessler). If the gender binary itself is socially constructed, then we can trouble the very foundations through which we understand all genders and develop a more well-rounded comprehension of the violence to which individuals are subjected if they do not neatly conform.

Indeed, the version of Gender Studies that I find particularly valuable for the inclusion of men in Women's Studies comes out of a combination of feminist studies, queer theory, critical race theory, and transnational feminism. Although queer theory has long been critiqued for its emphasis on poststructuralism, its overly elitist language, and its tendency to elide issues of race and queer formations in a global context, more recent work is positioned on the cutting edge of transnational, queer, critical race, and gender studies. As a recent dialogue in *GLQ* illustrates, some of the most provocative work considers how categories such as "heterosexual," "homosexual," "masculinity," and "femininity" are constructed through racial and ethnic formations" (Glick 124). Much

of this work addresses the impossibility of transferring identity categories neatly across nations and instead considers how identities themselves must be understood within the context of imperialism, global capitalism, and the formations of nation-states as they depend upon racial, ethnic, and gender formations (Glick 124). When we consider "how queer identity [and, we could also say, gender identity] is part of the history of imperialism," then we have to consider what social function those formations serve, who benefits, and what kinds of resistances have been possible (Glick 124).³ This model allows us to better theorize the complexity of oppression and resistance, of identity locations as intersectional, and thus better informs productive ways of including men in Women's Studies. Furthermore, it reveals the historical roots out of which some of these fields and theories grew, which often include multi-racial feminists and working class lesbian feminists (Garber 125). Thus, there doesn't have to be an either/or: Women's Studies or Gender Studies, a focus on women or a focus on men; something can be gained from complex considerations of relationality.

This type of Gender Studies thus offers a remedy for one of the stated reasons that few men enroll in Women's Studies courses: they don't see the connection to themselves. It is, after all, *Women's Studies*. Certain Gender Studies curricula would necessitate a form of discussing "men's issues" in order to focus on complex hierarchies of power and interlocking, interdependent systems of oppression and to model how to engage in critical reflection on these issues, which will be further explored in Section III.

In concrete terms, if a unit on rape culture, for example, is going to discuss violence against women, it has to be addressed in the context of institutionalized racism. Drawing on the work of Angela Davis, the course could explore how hegemonic constructions of black masculinity have historically been used to uphold racial hierarchies and to do

violence to both black men and black women. In order to fully understand that process, the course would also have to look at how hegemonic constructions of black women's sexuality and white women's sexuality have been developed in relation to each other, so that both have served the interests of white patriarchy, but have also created power dynamics between white women and African American men and women. Doing so involves addressing how men in marginalized communities have also experienced violence through institutionalized oppression. For instance, during one class discussion in which many white women were describing the ways they alter their behavior after dark in attempts to avoid sexual violence, a man of color in the class pointed out that he also alters his behavior because of the threat of racialized violence in the Midwestern town around the university. His analysis need not detract from the risk of sexual violence that women experience, but it can help us better understand the complex relationships between racial and gendered oppression. Women's Studies classes greatly benefit from these complexities of analysis, which require theorizing gendered formations of men and women along axes of race, class, ability, sexuality, and nation within a transnational context that understands gendered violence within international power hierarchies and global capitalism (Connell 249).

Moreover, when I teach about masculinity, I make it clear that masculinity is not just attached to men's bodies, and, even if it were, it plays out differently for men in different identity locations. Obviously, Women's Studies has a vested interest in deconstructing hegemonic masculinities. But masculinity is not singular: there are many forms of masculinity, not all of which receive all the benefits of patriarchy. Moreover, queer studies has shown us that it plays out differently for queer women. Queer theory illustrates how many women also perform variations of masculinity, and that the meaning of those

performances is very different, particularly in the context of queer communities, as Judith Halberstam and Eithne Luibheid discuss. As Halberstam argues, "masculinity . . . becomes intelligible where and when it leaves the white middle class male body" (2).

These specific examples make the point that an analysis of power, oppression, and resistance for different men parallel to those same issues for different women can better serve the goals and values of Women's Studies. Addressing the complexity of gender relations in broader terms helps us better understand how resistance works for and across marginalized groups. Done well, Gender Studies thus better prepare students—male, female, transgender, intersex—for the challenges and possibilities of building coalitions and working on activist projects that often involve diverse communities of both men and women. Although Women's Studies has forged new ground in our understandings of women's oppression and resistance, that understanding becomes more complete when we look at women in the larger social context, which necessarily entails having men in the picture. Indeed, as some more classic forms of Women's Studies suggests, if challenging patriarchy requires that men change some of their more oppressive behaviors, then it seems imperative that Women's Studies classes be talking with and to men, not just women. How such transformations are made depends a great deal on faculty dynamics and institutional history. The most effective forms of Gender Studies, however, enables the analysis of gendered power dynamics within national and transnational frameworks that understand gender to be shaped by, within, and between identity categories and nation states.

II: Ozzie Mayers and Jean Keller. Integrating Men's Studies into the Gender and Women's Studies (GWST) Curriculum at CSB/SJU

A. OZZIE MAYERS

Creating a curriculum that explicitly includes both Women's Studies and Men's Studies has been a goal of the GWST Program at CSB/SJU since August 2000. To understand the context out of which we developed this curriculum, we must first provide some historical background on our schools and their efforts to incorporate gender into the curriculum.

The College of Saint Benedict, founded in 1913 and currently enrolling 1970 FTE women, and Saint John's University, founded in 1857 and now enrolling 1850 FTE men, are private, liberal arts colleges located in Saint Joseph and Collegeville, Minnesota. Since the late 1960s, these Catholic, Benedictine institutions have engaged in a cooperative effort in which many of the resources and aspects of their programs are shared, including a common curriculum, joint academic departments, and a single provost. In spite of the fact that CSB and SJU have developed joint academic and administrative ventures, each has consciously maintained the positive qualities of single sex colleges: extensive opportunities for student leadership, separate student development programs geared to the particular gendered population of each campus, and separate presidents. One of the most significant developments of this conscious choice to maintain the gendered nature of our institutions was a three-year FIPSE grant, "Gender and the Curriculum" (1984-87). One key result of this project was the inclusion of courses stressing gender in the colleges' newly established Core Curriculum. The project also laid the groundwork for the eventual creation of our Gender and Women's Studies Program in 1994.

The attempt to retain the single sex nature while entering into a coordinate academic partnership helps explain why Women's Studies at CSB/SJU has always acknowledged the importance of Men's Studies, albeit sometimes somewhat grudgingly and to varying degrees. So essential is gender to these two institutions that it is explicitly stated in their missions. However, we are now in the process of more fully articulating in our public relations literature exactly how gender is lived out in the lives of our faculty and our students.

B. JEAN KELLER: THE GRADUAL INTEGRATION OF WOMEN'S STUDIES AND MEN'S STUDIES

I arrived on campus in 1996 and saw a program and faculty too often divided and immobilized by this question of Men's Studies and its role in our curriculum. Many female faculty members were still angry about how Men's Studies became part of our program. While prospective Women's Studies faculty members had done the research necessary to demonstrate that Women's Studies was a serious academic discipline and that we had the requisite number of academically rigorous courses to offer and staff a minor (without any new hires), Men's Studies was added to the Women's Studies Program proposal by voice vote at a faculty assembly meeting without any such scrutiny. This history, coupled with concerns about whether Men's Studies truly was a serious academic field of study in the early 1990s, were just two of the problems standing in the way of broad acceptance of a significant Men's Studies component in the CSB/SJU Gender and Women's Studies Program. Early on, there was frequent conflict with a male faculty member who seemed to feel that the predominantly female GWST faculty's central concern should be the state of Men's Studies at our institutions. These tensions, along with occasional rumors that Men's Studies wished to create its own, separate minor,

served to divide a faculty that needed to collaborate in order to overcome the typical Women's Studies problems of lack of funding and institutional support. Despite our institutions' mission commitment to gender, at the time our entire budget allocation was \$400 per year, with no reassigned time for a director, no support staff, and no faculty hired directly by GWST.

Clearly, we had a long way to go to achieve collaboration between Women's Studies and Men's Studies. It took several years of hard work to get to the point at which all GWST faculty felt that the name of our program, *Gender and Women's Studies*, was appropriate and that Men's Studies should be a mandatory component of our two required courses.

Some key moments in that journey include:

- Applying for and receiving an outside grant from the Bush Foundation, which brought us three years of funding for the position of director of GWST. This allowed the director to work with the faculty to envision and articulate the goals and objectives of the GWST Program and its two required courses, focusing in particular on the roles of Men's Studies and GLBT studies within the program. At the end of this grant period, the administration of CSB/SJU was convinced to fund the position of director of GWST on an ongoing basis.
- Providing the Men's Studies faculty with a forum in which their concerns could be heard by meeting with them separately and helping them identify strategies by which they could enhance the role of Men's Studies within GWST.
- Three workshops held by and for the GWST faculty, funded by internal grants.

- August 2000, GWST Pedagogy Workshop.

This workshop prepared the ground for collaboration by bringing together some thirty diverse, interdisciplinary faculty members, and providing us with opportunities to get to know each other and work together.

- March 2002, Integrating Men's Studies into Gender Studies.

Coordinated by the aforementioned Men's Studies faculty member, this informative workshop provided a comprehensive introduction to Men's Studies. It did much to erode resistance to Men's Studies and, together with the other two workshops, helped heal the remaining rifts between faculty members.

- August 2002 GWST Curriculum Development Workshop.

At this workshop, the GWST faculty directly addressed and resolved the question of the role of Men's Studies in our program. For the first time we committed ourselves to the name of our program, *Gender and Women's Studies*. We embraced this descriptor as emphasizing the importance of Women's Studies while acknowledging that our program does more than a traditionally conceived Women's Studies program. We also reconceived our two required courses, articulating for the first time as a faculty the common elements that we thought all sections of these courses should include and requiring that each of these courses address Women's Studies, Men's Studies, and Gay and Lesbian Studies in their readings/discussions. (See Appendices A and B.)

This abbreviated history of our program clearly provides confirmation to some long-standing feminist concerns regarding how masculine entitlement and lack of resources would play out in a collaboration between Women's Studies and Men's Studies. That is, Men's Studies seemed to have been taken more seriously as an academic discipline by our faculty than Women's Studies, despite the fact that Men's Studies was (and is) much less developed as a field. Relations between male and female faculty sometimes too closely mirrored the patriarchal relations we all purported to want to change. At the same time, our internal conflicts made it difficult for us to make a case for increased financial resources from our institution. Finally, integrating Men's Studies into our curriculum, as addressed in Section III, has meant there is less time within our courses to include some Women's Studies material we would like to include. Despite these concerns, I would argue, along with Berila, that teaching about men and masculinity has allowed us to advance a number of feminist ends.

Class readings and discussions that include men and masculinity demonstrate that gender is something about which both men and women need to be concerned. They also encourage the transformation of college-aged men. Teaching men and masculinities provides college males with opportunities to discuss with other males, students and faculty members, such important gender issues as men's violence against women, male abuse of alcohol, and men and sex. Integrating Men's Studies into our courses allows us to develop a more complicated account of masculinity. Rather than simply constructing men as the oppressors, it allows us to explore the varieties of masculine experience, both hegemonic and non-hegemonic. This more complicated view of men is in keeping with Women's Studies' attempt to account for the diversity of human experience. By thematizing the harms associated with both hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculin-

ity, both more and less privileged males can better see that they have a personal investment in addressing gender issues. I have found that these readings also provide a good route into discussing homophobia. Proving that one "isn't gay" is a ubiquitous and painful experience for adolescent and college-age males. Opening up this painful experience as a socially constructed male rite of passage helps straight students, male and female, better recognize their investment in addressing homophobia and understand why they should work in solidarity with gay men and lesbians. Finally, including Men's Studies as an explicit component of our curriculum helps to make our classes appealing to students who might not otherwise be attracted to the study of gender. Many of our female students at CSB/SJU want to understand their relationships with men and, for better or worse, seem to find the topic of understanding men equally as or more interesting than the topic of empowering women (to which they have had more exposure). Female students often flock to courses with a strong Men's Studies component. On the other hand, Men's Studies courses draw male students into feminism as allies when we address the range of experiences they have as men, both male privilege as well as limitations they may experience as males.

In sum, including Men's Studies in a Women's Studies curriculum is not without risks, but it does offer significant benefits for students and faculty when it is done well. In the case of GWST at CSB/SJU, we were able to move beyond our initial polarization because we created and took advantage of opportunities to sit down and talk and work together, outside of the always too brief meetings during the hectic academic year. Over the course of the three workshops, we got to know each other better, broadened the discussion to include more people, and developed more of a shared understanding of Gender Studies and the issues at stake in deciding both the name of our program and the role of Men's Studies within that program.

III. Cautionary Tales.

Ozzie Mayers and Camilla Krone

A. OZZIE MAYERS. PEDAGOGICAL PERSPECTIVES ON INCLUDING MEN'S STUDIES IN THE INTRODUCTORY COURSE, GWST 101

Over the past ten years, I taught a Men and Masculinities course three times, under three different guises. In my teaching I have seen that integrating Men's Studies into our Women's Studies Program helps us create a more complex sense of gender. For example, by pluralizing the concept of masculinity, Men's Studies can help show how power is a construction, not just of gender but also of race, class, ethnicity, and sexualities. A study of men as men destroys the notion that there is a single concept of manhood by which all else is defined. Men's Studies can help dislodge the simplistic notion that patriarchy is the domination of men over women, since many men are subservient in a patriarchal society. Integrating Men's Studies into Women's Studies can also ameliorate the homophobic fear that young college males may have about taking a course focusing only on men.

A particular challenge, however, comes with our introductory course to Gender Studies: how to create a course that is a result of the continuum that Tetreault describes while respecting our students' cognitive development. Most students at the entry level come with a highly dualistic concept of the world. They, of course, move to fewer absolutes as they mature over their college years. However, in integrating Men's and Women's Studies within our introductory course, are we pushing them into a more challenging mode of thinking than they may be able to accept and, therefore, running the risk of reinforcing their dualism? Should we instead have such an integrative course at the end of their Gender Studies program? Such a course would presumably come after they had taken a series of courses focus-

ing primarily on either women or men and would be more on par with their cognitive and emotional development.

There is also the reality that in creating a course that is truly multifocal and relational, we end up losing coverage of either Women's Studies or Men's Studies course content. In teaching our newest version of the introductory course to Gender Studies, I simply have had to cut out literary readings, films, and a significant examination of theory. There is also a conceptual danger: including Men's Studies in a Women's Studies course might reinforce the stereotypical notion that adding the male perspective makes any undertaking more objective. In fact, when I team-taught gender courses in the past, student evaluations suggest such a perspective: my male point of view appears to the students as a balance to our team's female point of view. Even when I teach the course alone, my students see a male teaching a Gender Studies course as providing a "more balanced" course. On the other hand, as a gay man, I have the dilemma of deciding to what extent to give my students any personal information about my own sexual orientation when I am teaching a course that, more so than most courses, demands a greater degree of personal disclosure. However, in revealing my sexual orientation to my students, am I reinscribing the bias that Gender Studies is really a female field? This bias, of course, is directly related to the homophobic misconception that male homosexuality is defined simplistically by feminine characteristics.

I certainly welcome the evolution of our GWST Program into a more complex one that substantially integrates Men's Studies into Women's Studies. We must acknowledge, however, that this integration comes with both gains and losses that need to be carefully weighed.

B. CAMILLA KRONE. ON THE EVOLUTION OF THE INTRODUCTORY SYLLABUS

It's been nearly twenty-five years since I became an undergraduate student of Women's Studies. A few years later, I was a graduate teaching assistant for an Introduction to Women's Studies course. In these early years, men figured into our courses as the holders of patriarchal power and the oppressors of women, but also as a group that needed to be rehabilitated in order to end sexism and violence against women. Clearly, we were not yet thinking in terms of men's own need to be liberated from harmful gender stereotypes or of Tetrault's fifth stage.

Few men enrolled in Women's Studies courses in those days, and the responses of those of us on the "inside" were mixed. On one hand, it was encouraging to see that at least some men wanted to learn about the issues addressed in Women's Studies classes. On the other hand, I did have some male students who seemed to want to fix things for women by dominating class discussions. But it wasn't until I was teaching my own GWST courses that I reached the conclusion, expressed by Berila, that woman-only space is not necessarily a safe space for the discussion of gender, privilege, oppression, difference, and feminism. Berila's point about the tensions created in the classroom by discussions of race, class, and sexualities is valid. I would add that many of our traditional-aged students at CSB/SJU feel uncomfortable expressing opinions about gender and related "hot" topics that might differ from those of their classmates. This makes safety and comfort concerns in any GWST classroom.

It is true that the presence of men in the GWST classroom can still have a silencing effect on women students. But the equation is not automatic. It depends on the students, the instructor, and the overall group dynamic. On the other hand, the simultaneous presence of women or men who possess varying levels of sophistication with respect

to understanding gender and feminist issues seems just as likely to pose a challenge to the students' sense of safety in the classroom. Men and women students who are less "in the know" on feminist issues, and who, while probably wanting to learn about gender (given that they elected to take the course), might be clinging rather defensively to the "truth" of their own social group, often express feelings of intimidation with respect to students who come into the course confident in their own feminist stance, more knowledgeable about the subject matter, and sometimes willing to dismiss the contributions of less advanced classmates.

At CSB/SJU I have taught GWST 101: Introduction to Gender and Women's Studies in each of its permutations as our program has evolved. After teaching "Introduction to Women's Studies" twice as a three-week intensive January Term course (before our administration would fund reassigned time in order to staff a semester-long course), in 1999 I had the privilege of being the first GWST faculty member to develop a full-semester GWST 101 course. In 2002, I was the first to teach this course after the program faculty had set new, broader parameters for the introductory curriculum.

There have been many changes in the field of Women's Studies since my student days. The development of Men's Studies and its inclusion in our introductory course at CSB/SJU is one of the most important and perplexing changes I have encountered in gender pedagogy. As Mayers asserts above, this development comes as both an advantage and a drawback for teaching at the introductory level. My observations have mainly to do with its effects on the syllabus and on the classroom experience in GWST 101 at CSB/SJU.

Before discussing how my syllabi evolved over nine years of teaching GWST 101, let me recall the image and the poem I chose for the cover of my reading packets (printed on lavender-colored cardstock) the first three times I taught the course. I no longer use the

image of an African poster urging women to join in political struggle and the beautiful poem by Olga Casanova-Sánchez in which the woman poet gives birth to herself. By 2002, there was no reading packet; instead, there was one text on masculinity and one on women's lives and issues. Students now sign up for a course that is not strictly about women and feminism. I suspect that in the very early twenty-first century, few of our students would enroll in a course trumpeting political struggle and the rebirth of the feminine, although I am not convinced that we have won most of the political and social battles of feminism.

Like the poster and the poem, my early versions of the GWST 101 syllabus, after an introduction to the concept of gender as it differs from biological sex, focused mainly on women. An early unit on "Women in Story" ranged from a guest lecture by a feminist theologian on the two versions of the creation of woman in *Genesis*, to ancient myth, European fairy tales, and a gender-informed "reading" of the Disney video *Pocahontas*. We read Virginia Woolf's *A Room of One's Own*, and students considered their experiences at two single-sex colleges in light of Woolf's observations about men's and women's education in 1928. We were able to do a fairly comprehensive overview of the first and second wave of feminism, reading and discussing excerpts from canonical feminist works. Later, I added two short pieces by "Third Wave" feminists. "Images of Women in the Media" (film, television, and advertising) was a major unit that was very successful in helping students to become critical thinkers about the media messages that surround them as well as about the implicit social norms they embrace and enforce. This new knowledge of the media's manipulation of the image of women informed a unit on violence against women and pornography. Kristin Luker's study *Abortion and the Politics of Motherhood* allowed us to put the endlessly politicized debate about abortion into a cultural and historical context. Through-

out the course in its early forms, we read poems, stories, and essays that presented women's experiences in patriarchal society and in feminism. I included units on "Men in Feminism" as well as essays that explored race, class, and sexuality as components of privilege and oppression that intersect and interact with gender.

Although I've always included men (both as students and as a topic of study) in my Introduction to Women's Studies and then in my Introduction to Gender and Women's Studies, the ways in which I do so have changed in recent years. By the time that I was designing GWST syllabi, my own feminism and intellectual knowledge of gender and feminism had evolved to the point that I understood the importance of constantly considering the relational aspects of gender rather than viewing social gender or even biological sex as strictly binary or as existing along a two-dimensional continuum. So while the texts and materials I used in my introductory course before 2002 asked students to consider ways that women are limited or empowered in Western societies, I encouraged them to think about ways in which limiting options for women also means limiting men, even as it gives certain men the greater part of economic and political power. In short, I tried to keep present in the various units of the course the notion that the hierarchical structure of patriarchy is inherently flawed in that, besides stifling difference and potential, it is necessarily grounded in oppression and violence. The master is violent in the master/slave relationship, according to Lévi-Strauss, because he lives in fear that the slave will steal his tools to rise up against him. And so the early versions of my GWST introductory course already extended the problems of gender and other oppressions to men who, while they might enjoy some aspects of patriarchal privilege, are also put into the position of defending the privilege for which they, as individuals, never asked.

At the same time, I was not at all keen to

include Men's Studies materials in the early versions of my 101 syllabus. I invited a colleague to speak to my students about his upcoming course on Men and Masculinities, but I bristled when another colleague suggested that my syllabus was lacking because it did not directly address Men's Studies. I found it a bit difficult to get past the fact that it was Robert Bly's much touted book *Iron John* that brought more men than ever to want to think and talk about the masculine in an academic setting.⁴ So, over the course of several years, I made gradual changes to expand the representation of men as well as considerations of race, class, and sexualities in GWST 101 without ever explicitly including Men's Studies as a part of my course.

Two things led me to include actual Men's Studies materials in my 101 syllabus. First of all, through grant funding CSB/SJU sponsors a Women's Lives and a Men's Lives speaker series on the campuses each year. Through the Men's Lives series, I read, met, and talked with strong feminist figures in Men's Studies such as Michael Kimmel, Chris Kilmartin, and Jonathan Katz. These feminist men and the colleagues who invited them helped me to see the value of addressing the experience of masculinity in culture in the interest of healing the wounds of sexism and heterosexism for women and men. Secondly, as Keller describes above, the GWST faculty decided to add a significant Men's Studies component to the introductory course. It was time for me to make some important changes in my syllabus.

I set aside Sheila Ruth's *Issues in Feminism*, although I still recommend it as a reference to my students. I instead adopted the reader *Women: Images and Realities: A Multicultural Anthology* edited by Amy Kesselman, Lily D. McNair, and Nancy Schniedewind, along with Chris Kilmartin's *The Masculine Self*. I kept several of my units that were usually successful in getting students to relate questions about gender to their own experiences, and used some of the same media. I added Jackson Katz's documentary

Tough Guise, which speaks very clearly to students about some ways in which sexism and heterosexism are directly harmful to boys and men.

My class of thirty students responded well to the new materials. There was less stress in the classroom about feminist issues in the course once they became more clearly identified as the issues of women and men. My work in the classroom was made a bit easier by the fact that students were now less apt to assume that this feminist woman teacher was there to encourage them to "discriminate" against white, middle-class men (i.e., many of their fathers), which is how the practice of naming privilege is often viewed by our students when they are new to GWST. In this sense, the inclusion of Men's Studies as a significant component in the introductory course seemed to offer my students a safer, more encouraging space in which to learn about gender. This is clearly a good thing if it encourages more men to study gender and if it makes some women and men students feel better represented in the class. But, like my colleagues, I am concerned about some of the possible implications of my students' increased comfort level.

It is difficult to teach Men's Studies in an introductory GWST class without implying to a relatively naïve audience that we have achieved all of our feminist goals in society and so are now free to take the focus off of women's experiences and their oppression. Or it might be understood that the GWST faculty, to improve the introductory course, made it more fair, reasonable, or objective by shifting a good part of the course's focus to the study of men, that is by re-inscribing the masculine in its traditional position of centrality.

I don't regret at all that my students now learn to think about gender in a broader perspective. And I would not advocate going back to an introductory course that does not give significant consideration to issues of masculinity. But I, along with some of my colleagues, do worry about students' interpreta-

tion of our new inclusiveness. Mostly, in light of the fact that there remains great progress to be made on every single one of the feminist concerns I studied a quarter century ago, I regret what has had to go missing from my introductory course in order to squeeze the men in alongside the women in a fifteen-week syllabus.

We must now content ourselves with a single chapter of *A Room of One's Own*, although this is a canonical work that all students of Women's Studies should know. "Professions for Women" has been relegated to the recommended readings list, creating the danger that the "Angel in (our) House" might well be flitting free about the classroom unnoticed. The history of the now three waves of feminism in the U.S. flies by in less than two weeks of class time, causing a minimum of discomfort for students who are uncomfortable with the "f-word." Several short stories and poems by women addressing their various ethnicities and sexualities have gone by the wayside. And, although the topic of violence against women is enhanced by the study of violence as an assumed part of masculinity in U.S. culture, my mostly conservative Catholic students are now entirely off the hook on the issue of abortion in GWST 101. There simply isn't time to include the unit. The students then are free to believe that one is very simply either with George W. Bush or against him on this issue, and that there is no room for understanding the issue in a non-polarized context or for practicing any kind of empathy across political and ethical lines. Perhaps they will learn more nuanced thinking about the subject in subsequent courses, but I know that the groundwork has not been laid in my course for the past several years, and I feel this is a serious lack in a course that proposes to introduce students to Women's Studies.

Would that I could conclude with clear solutions to the dilemma of needing to include Men's Studies in the Introduction to Gender and Women's Studies course while also needing to preserve the central tenets of

Women's Studies as an academic field that formed in response to women's oppression and the invisibility of women in university curricula. Setting budgetary realities aside for a moment, I will suggest some measures that might help us recover what has been lost in the new, more inclusive, and more palatable introductory course.

If the Introduction to Gender and Women's Studies course is to include a solid introduction to Men's Studies along with everything else that needs to be introduced on the topics of gender, difference, oppression, and liberation, then we truly need a second tier of courses between the introductory course and the 300-level topics courses. If students were required to take a solid general course in Women's Studies at the 200-level and had at least the option of a Men's Studies course that would follow 101, then we could feel quite good about the changes we've made in GWST 101 at CSB/SJU. Short of creating a new tier of lower division courses in GWST, we would simply need to offer a greater variety of specific advanced courses to address the topics not covered, or not covered sufficiently in our introductory course. The challenge then would be to find a way to require a reasonable selection of such courses for the minor or eventual major. This might mean increasing the number of required courses, as well as staffing those courses, which is probably not a realistic goal at this point for various reasons that are common to most colleges and universities.

The administration of CSB/SJU has recently proposed a new strategic plan that, if adopted, would commit our institutions to including a greater emphasis on gender in our academic programs. We might finally become two schools that will have our Men's Studies and teach our Women's Studies, too. But I think that we will be unusual in that respect if we indeed achieve the goal, just as we are unusual in remaining two single-sex institutions with a joint curriculum for men and women students. I cannot offer a solution to the Gender Studies/Women's Stud-

ies/Men's Studies dilemma that would work for most programs in these budgetary times. And even at CSB/SJU the funding to increase the number of GWST courses in order to make up for what has been lost in updating our introductory course is not yet in sight. As has been the case since the advent of Women's Studies, GWST faculty will probably continue to need to do more (Gender Studies, Women's Studies, Men's Studies, Queer Studies) with less time and money than these urgent topics merit.

IV. Jason Laker. Dances With Privilege

I come to this discussion from several social locations that shape my engagement and understanding of the questions we pose together. I am a Caucasian, Jewish man, who is a young (appointed at age thirty-two) Dean of Campus Life (e.g., Dean of Students) at SJU, one of the few colleges for men in the United States, which enrolls an overwhelmingly Caucasian, Christian (Catholic and Lutheran), upper-middle-class male population. I am also an adjunct faculty member at SCSU and have taught courses on Men and Masculinity in the Women's Studies Program, directed by Berila.

The men and women at CSB/SJU attend classes together on two campuses and then, in general, return to their respective single-sex residential environments each evening. I have established my particular niche in the field of student affairs as one who conducts ethnographic research about men's development, and I have actively shared this material via articles, video documentaries, and other presentations at professional conferences and on campuses.

I believe that my qualifications for this dean position at a young age, beyond any particular intellect or talent, have been cumulatively influenced in my favor by my race, gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic background, and perhaps other dimensions

of my identity. I have had other opportunities during my career to obtain recognition and responsibility that were unusual for my young age, and I have increasingly recognized that this intersection between ability and privilege has been instrumental in the process. These issues and experiences, in turn, have significantly informed how I entered Men's Studies as a teacher, especially in that it provides a venue for grappling with these very topics.

I have struggled to understand the question, "What does it mean to take responsibility for my privilege(s)?" Should I decline such an opportunity on principle? If I did so, would a person "more oppressed" than I (e.g., as a Jew, young person) get this opportunity? These social factors have been highly influential in my approach to my work. For instance, as Dean, I have a good deal of influence on policy formation, movement of money, and other organizational matters at the university. Since I am involved with different committees, I have on occasion noticed the stark contrasts between the ways "administrators" and "faculty" speak of certain resources and their respective understandings of and authority over these resources. I have found that this position and perspective has allowed me to enact more just movement of resources or to give people with less organizational authority information or suggestions that have that effect. There is a certain unease that I feel about this, most particularly because the people with "less organizational authority" are often women, people of color, or queer people. So while it may be nice (I say this wryly) that I do this, I am not sure how I contribute to changes in a system that elevates people who look like me while devaluing others.

One possible way has been through teaching a Men and Masculinities course at SCSU in the fall of 2003. Having taught this course has led me to address the question, "How do men and masculinity studies fit into Gender or Women's Studies?" I am most interested in women's answers to this question be-

cause I have a persistent insecurity about whether my teaching a Men and Masculinity course somehow detracts from women's space, time, or interests in some way, and this produces an unease similar to the one I described earlier relative to my role as a dean. It has left me wondering, beyond the questions about Men's Studies central to this article, what role men in general have, can have, or should have in the development of feminist theory, scholarship, and teaching. Berila's earlier questions about the implicit assumption that a classroom is safe, merely because it is populated exclusively by women, has deepened my appreciation for the complexity of this discussion. It has also liberated me from a heretofore un-interrogated internal voice that told me I couldn't be a part of (or facilitate) a safe space for women. Implicit in this newer iteration of my viewpoint is that men and women can share one "safe space." This isn't to suggest that having a woman-only space is not a good idea. I think it probably is. I do suggest here that it is not the only potential safe space, nor, as Berila asserts, is it an assuredly safe space.

Regarding the implications for Men's Studies, I tend to believe that men benefit from, and may be more willing to take a risk, by enrolling in Men's Studies courses. Indeed, my first section enrolled twelve men and thirteen women because the course title can potentially disarm their resistance to looking at gender or any notion that gender doesn't pertain to them. This, in turn, may make men more sensitive to their gender privilege and more willing to share space, power, and airtime. On the other hand, I am sensitive to questions about whether teaching Men's Studies courses, even from a pro-feminist location, may somehow re-center men since we now take time even in Women's Studies courses to focus on men. I also sit with a potentially provocative question of whether having men teach such courses might reduce, as my friend Tracy Davis says, "counter-transferentially critical" responses to men's gender performance, a fancy way of

wondering whether a male teacher would be more likely than a female one to meet a male student "where he is," and thus not shame him, while still challenging him. I am not sure that there is a single answer to my question, given the many contexts and identities that colleges and professors occupy. However, I can say that in my courses I have heard nineteen- and twenty-year-old white men speaking of hegemony, power, and their personal gender privilege in ways I have never experienced in other settings, and this gives me considerable belief in a net benefit.

In the March 21, 1990, issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Harry Brod wrote a compelling article entitled, "Scholarly Studies of Men: An Essential Complement to Women's Studies," in which he articulates an appreciation for the understandable trepidation or outright objections women in particular might have about the question of including Men's Studies in Women's Studies programs. He also talks about Men's Studies as a pro-feminist field and how it might serve both women and men to include it. However, there was also a letter to the editor a few weeks later (Stange) that rightly raised questions about whether Men's Studies would undermine funding for Women's Studies programs or somehow corrupt the validity of Women's Studies as an academic discipline. It might also further enable other disciplines to shirk an ethical responsibility to mainstream women's issues into their courses.

I offer some personal reflections of my experiences in hopes that it will inform broader discussions. In my course, "Guy Things: Men and Masculinity in the U.S.," there were twenty-five students, about half of whom were men. This was notable for the Women's Studies Program at SCSU because few men (if any) tend to enroll in the courses. On the first day, I asked, "What is your reason for taking this class? What do you hope to get out of it?" I was really stunned at first because a lot of the students said they were tired of or had taken several Women's Studies classes and thought this would be

something new. A few even used the word “Feminazi,” a word that offends me personally, but at the time I chose to continue the invitation brought about by the question rather than confronting it. The second thing that surprised me was that both men and women said similar things. I wanted to explore how having a male teacher, or how looking at men and masculinity as a subject, is seen as somehow different from doing/ taking Women’s Studies courses. I wanted to understand how my course was seen by these students as less threatening or more objective, and I considered how I was privileged by these conceptions. In the first class meeting, a number of the students were quite surprised to find that the language we were using to describe gender in men in an introductory reading was the same as that used to describe gender in women. This insight was their first inkling that the study of men and masculinities was not necessarily as different from Women’s Studies as they might have assumed. They seemed pleasantly surprised by this. I remember being quite excited to see and hear nineteen- and twenty-year-old white men who said they would not have taken a Women’s Studies course—meaning that they did not at first see my course as one—which focused on privilege and patriarchy, and how men have been complicit therein. Would this happen if the same young men took a Women’s Studies 101 course with a male instructor?

I am also grappling with the fact that I get a lot of strokes for teaching a Men and Masculinity course—from women in particular—as if I am somehow “one of the good ones.” What does this say about men in general, and what does it say when women who teach in Women’s Studies do not necessarily get the same strokes? On the other hand, would it be more reasonable to suggest that it is my responsibility as a man to teach such a course and work with men in the class to illuminate these things?

An analogous situation that helped advance my understanding of the correspon-

dence of privilege and oppression in my life happened around the same time as my first Men and Masculinity course. Through a variety of circumstances, I became the Board President for a local nonprofit organization whose mission is to assist Somali refugees with re-settlement needs. The organization’s Executive Director is a Somali man and the Assistant Executive Director is an African American woman. The insecurities I alluded to earlier were even more activated when I was asked to serve in this capacity. At a lunch with my two colleagues, I shared candidly that I felt awkward about being a white man and serving as Board President for this organization. It seemed to me that there should be Somalis, or at least members of the African diaspora, in the leadership of the Board. However, I also shared my understanding that the various privileges that I have might be useful to advancing the organization. Perhaps more than being white and male, my being a dean at a local college could open certain doors useful to the agency. Finally, I expressed my respect for their wisdom and experience. In sum, I understood it was my privilege, more than a particular talent, that might effect change, and I never wanted to diminish either of them personally or give an impression of arrogance on my part. They listened thoughtfully, and then the Assistant Executive Director leaned in, extended her hand, and said, “If you’ve got cards to play, you play ‘em, brother!” It was a moment of mutual liberation.

It is this point that I believe is terribly important to the questions we are discussing here: The current arrangements and demarcations existing in the world cause, through the acts of individuals and groups, the distribution of power to occur in many different privileging and oppressing ways. It thus seems to me that any hope for equity begins with honestly seeking to understand the particular ways this distribution influences our various truths and our respective access to power, utilizing opportunities to exchange these currencies openly and com-

munally when possible, and recognizing the imprecise and awkward dynamics that can arise. That may seem Pollyannaish, but with respect to men teaching in gender or Women's Studies, it is the best I can do with my current identities and my current understanding. I'm told it has been helpful, and I am grateful for that.

Conclusion

This dialogue has revealed several telling insights about the relationship between Men's Studies and Women's Studies programs, one of which is that there isn't a singular answer for whether Men's Studies should be institutionalized alongside Women's Studies programs. We each have different definitions of Men's Studies, Women's Studies, and Gender Studies programs and different perspectives on the degree to which Men's Studies can and should be effectively intertwined with Women's or Gender Studies. These different perspectives are partly the result of different institutional locations and histories, as it has become clear that a Men's Studies program makes much less sense at an institution such as SCSU than it does at SJU, which is a men's school. In the former case, the SCSU Women's Studies Program is expanding but is also claiming institutional space, so that adding a Men's Studies Program is likely to shift the focus back to the patriarchal center and submerge feminist studies, although a strong version of Gender Studies, such as the one described, could work well. In the case of CSB/SJU, there is already such a focus on Men's Studies that it is important for such a program to be part of a Women's and Gender Studies Program rather than to splinter off as a completely autonomous program. As Krone points out, this shift to Gender Studies often means losing some material that was featured in Women's Studies courses, but it also means that new critical questions arise. The integration of the two in the latter case allows for an analysis of the power dynamics of gender, race,

class, sexuality, and nation, which enriches the entire curriculum.

The preceding dialogue also reveals potential pitfalls in some ways of incorporating Men's Studies into or alongside Women's and Gender Studies programs. One of the better ways of doing so involves an analysis of the intersections of race, class, gender, sexuality, and nation, so that differential power dynamics are studied in complex ways. The most productive Gender Studies programs, the dialogue reveals, are the ones in which the very process of incorporating the differences allows for a reflection on the questions and issues that arise while doing so. As section III illustrates, male faculty can be critically reflective of both privilege and marginalization. Moreover, as Mayers and Laker point out, faculty can *model* the analytic process so that men aren't reinscribed at the center, but also so that the category of gender itself is interrogated through other identity locations. Our different experiences in Women's Studies, Men's Studies, and Gender Studies programs speak to the importance of considering the multiple dynamics of faculty, the institutional history, and the larger contexts of Men's Studies, Women's Studies, and Gender Studies movements as colleges and universities consider new directions in their curriculum. While we cannot return to a time before Men's Studies programs existed, nor is that a desirable goal, we can set more productive directions for integrating critical questions about gender in progressive and provocative ways that challenge patriarchy and the practices of sexism, heterosexism, and racism that it supports.

APPENDIX A: GOALS OF GWST 101: INTRODUCTION TO GENDER AND WOMEN'S STUDIES

The introductory course(s) in GWST will cultivate in its students skills of inquiry and analysis that will help them develop a critical

awareness of how gender functions in society and as a fundamental aspect of their own lives. This course will also prepare students academically for upper division courses in Gender Studies.

All GWST Intro course will address the gender concerns of both women and men, although the amount of course time devoted to one or the other may vary according to the title and description of the course (allowing for various courses to satisfy the introductory course requirement).

All introductory courses must satisfy the following student learning goals. Decisions about materials used and specific topics covered will depend upon the individual faculty member's interests and expertise.

Student Learning Goals

I. Skill Goals

Students in the GWST introductory course(s) will:

1. Develop an understanding that:
 - a) conceptions of gender and gender roles have changed over time; and
 - b) gender is always co-constituted by other aspects of identity, such as race, social class, sexuality, and ethnicity.
2. Become familiar with the distinctions between sex, gender, and sexuality.
3. Analyze how gender and sexual difference has often been translated into inequalities of social, political, religious, and economic power.
4. Consider the respective roles that biology and social construction may play in shaping gender identity and gender roles.
5. Understand that:
 - a) gender studies is an academic field of study with a theoretical basis; and
 - b) there is more than one theoretical approach to gender studies.
6. Learn to apply gender as a category of analysis both in academic work and in their personal lives.

Content Goals

The introductory course(s) will include:

1. an introduction to gender as a category of analysis;
2. information on the U.S. Women's movements, including those by women who are often marginalized in U.S. culture (e.g., women of color, women who are not heterosexual, rural women, women who live in poverty);
3. information on ways in which the men's movement and the GLBT movement are theoretically and historically related to the women's movement and specific information on these movements as they now exist separately from the women's movement;
4. diverse theoretical approaches to gender and sexual identity, as related to privilege, power, and oppression;
5. materials and activities that allow the students to connect the historical and theoretical aspect of the course to their own experiences and current social issues; and
6. topics that address gender inequality and oppression in an international context.

APPENDIX B: GOALS OF GWST 380: APPROACHES TO GENDER THEORY

The gender theory course will build on and further develop the understanding of gender studies introduced in GWST 101 by critically examining theoretical approaches to gender studies and analyzing key disputes within the field. It will add coherence to the GWST minor by developing a framework that will allow students to identify, examine, and see the relations among the diverse theoretical approaches to gender studies encountered in GWST courses. As the theory course for the Gender and Women's Studies Program

at CSB/SJU, this course will include feminist theory, gender theory, GLBT/queer theory, and theory of Men's Studies. Across the sections of Approaches to Gender Theory, one-third of course content will be common (see content goals below). Alongside the common core, faculty members may focus on topics/thinkers in the area of gender theory in keeping with their own interests and expertise. The Approaches to Gender Theory Course must satisfy the following student learning goals. Decisions about materials used and specific topics covered will depend upon the individual faculty member's interests and expertise.

Student Learning Goals

I. Skill Goals

Students who take Gender Theory will develop the critical thinking skills necessary for advanced work in gender studies, including:

1. strengthen and expand on skills and knowledge developed in the introductory course;
2. develop a framework for understanding approaches to gender studies that students encounter in their GWST courses;
3. critically examine multiple theoretical approaches to the field of gender studies;
4. understand and apply theories of gender to course materials and their life experience; and
5. evaluate theories in terms of their coherence and their relevance and application to contemporary issues.

II. Content Goals

The Approaches to Gender Theory course will address the following questions:

1. What is theory? How can you tell something is a theory? What makes a theory feminist, gender, men's, or queer? What do these theories share in common? Where do they diverge?

What kinds of questions/concerns does theory help one solve? How does one go about evaluating a theory? What problems arise when theorists try to make universal

claims about gender or sexuality? Can theory proceed without making universal claims? If so, how?

2. What does it mean to have a gender? What are the origins of gender? What is the relation between gender and sexuality?
3. Oppression and privilege: what do they mean? Are they useful categories of analysis?
4. What roles do power, oppression, and privilege play in the constitution of gender identity and sexual identity?
5. How do we theorize multiple oppressions? Multiple privileges? Being both privileged and oppressed?
6. How are political, economic, educational, social, religious, and/or cultural institutions gendered and how are these institutions embedded in systems of power, oppression, and privilege?
7. What do we mean by equality and what implications do different models of equality have for how men and women live their lives?

NOTES

1. This essay is based upon a roundtable discussion presented at the National Women's Studies Association Meeting, June 2004, Milwaukee, Wis.

2. Shirley Yee argues for retaining the name "Women's Studies" on precisely these grounds.

3. Glick is referencing the work of José Quiroga here.

4. It is perhaps the public and media response to *Iron John* that disturbed me more than the ideas set forth in the work itself. I would add that I admire Bly, a fellow Minnesotan, as a poet. One would hope that the success of *Iron John* has provided him with the room of his own that he needs to pursue his poetry on a full-time basis.

REFERENCES

- Auslander, Leora. "Do Women's Studies + Feminist + Men's + Lesbian and Gay + Queer Studies = Gender Studies?" *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 9.3 (1997): 1-30.
- Bornstein, Kate. *Gender Outlaw: On Men, Women, and The Rest of Us*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.

- Brod, Harry. "Scholarly Studies of Men: An Essential Complement to Women's Studies." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 21 March 1990. B2-B3.
- Bull, Chris. "Theoretical Battles: It's Popular on Campus, But Queer Studies Is Under Attack from Both the Right and the Left." *The Advocate* 769 (29 September 1998): 44.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. 2d ed. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Connell, R. W. "Masculinities, Change, and Conflict in Global Society: Thinking About the Future of Men's Studies." *Journal of Men's Studies* 11.3 (2003): 249.
- Davis, Angela Y. *Women, Race, and Class*. New York: Vintage Books, 1983.
- Espiritu, Yen Le. "All Men Are Not Created Equal: Asian Men in U.S. History." *Men's Lives*. Ed. Michael S. Kimmel and Michael A. Messner. 4th ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1998. 35-44.
- Garber, Linda. "One Step Global, Two Steps Back?: Race, Gender, and Queer Studies." *GLQ: A Journal of Gay and Lesbian Studies* 10.1 (2003): 125-28.
- Gardiner, Judith Kegan. "Gender and Masculinity Texts: Consensus and Concerns for Feminist Classrooms." *NWSA Journal* 15.1 (2003): 147.
- Glick, Elisa. "Introduction: Defining Queer Ethnicities." *GLQ: A Journal of Gay and Lesbian Studies* 10.1 (2003): 123-24.
- Halberstam, Judith. *Female Masculinity*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Hyde, Cheryl, and Mary Bricker-Jenkins. "Women's Studies or Gender Studies? A Feminist Discussion." *Journal of Social Work Education* 31.3 (1995): 310-21.
- Kesselman, Amy, et al., eds. *Women: Images and Realities, A Multicultural Anthology*. 2d ed. London: Mayfield, 1999.
- Kessler, Suzanne. "The Medical Construction of Gender." *Feminist Frontiers*. Ed. Laurel Richardson, Verta Taylor, and Nancy Whittier. 6th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2004. 51-65.
- Kilmartin, Christopher T. *The Masculine Self*. 2d ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2000.
- Luibheid, Eithne. *Entry Denied: Controlling Sexuality at the Border*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.
- Luker, Kristin. *Abortion and the Politics of Motherhood*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Nystrom, Derek. "The Perils of Masculinity Studies." *Iris* 44 (2002): 41.
- Reagon, Bernice Johnson. "Coalition Politics: Turning the Century." *Changing Our Power: An Introduction to Women's Studies*. Ed. Jo Whitehorse Cochran, Donna Langston, and Carolyn Woodward. 2d ed. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1991. 310-18.
- Ruth, Sheila, ed. *Issues in Feminism*. 5th ed. London: Mayfield, 2001.
- Sommer, Vicki. "Men's Studies and Women's Studies: Should They Be Wed?" *Journal of Men's Studies* 8.3 (2000): 395.
- Stange, Douglas. "Letter to the Editor: A Response to Harry Brod." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 11 April 1990: B2-B3.
- Tetreault, Mary Kay Thompson. "Feminist Phase Theory: An Experience-Derived Evaluation Model." *Journal of Higher Education*, 56.4 (1985): 35-47.
- Yee, Shirley. "The 'Women' in Women's Studies." *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 9 (1997): 46-64.
- Zinn, Maxine Baca. "Chicano Men and Masculinity." *Men's Lives*. Ed. Michael S. Kimmel and Michael A. Messner. 4th ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1998. 25-40.