

Male Studies: A Consortium of Scholars - April 7, 2010 – Full Transcription

Welcome to five continents and participants from over 62 universities around innumerable time zones throughout the world. Welcome to Male Studies: A New Academic Discipline. I am Dr. Edward Stephens for the Foundation for Male Studies. The purpose of the Foundation for Male Studies is to create courses and resources for the genuine understanding of males of all ages across all countries and cultures.

Today, we are raising two major questions: First, what are the ethics of devoting 90 percent of academic resources to one gender? Second, what are the unintended consequences of the failure of our academic institutions to consider the twenty-first century needs of males? The Foundation for Male Studies is committed to creating the core course material for this new academic discipline of male studies. The Foundation for Male Studies is committed, with your help, to raising the funds necessary to support this academic initiative.

And now, I would like to turn the conference over to Professor Miles Groth, professor of Psychology here at Wagner University.

Professor Miles Groth: Good morning. Last spring on May 27th, the Steinhardt School of Culture, Education and Human Development at New York University hosted a panel on the future of men sponsored by the On Step Institute in New York. Today, Wagner College is pleased to host the second panel in the series. Today's teleconference is cosponsored by the newly constituted Foundation for Male Studies and the On Step Institute. Our topic is Male Studies: A New Academic Discipline.

I'm Dr. Miles Groth, professor of psychology and director of the Men's Project here at Wagner College. On behalf of Dr. Richard Guarasci, president of Wagner College, I welcome

our panelists and on-site guests here at Wagner as well as the web-air teleconferees joining us live by the Internet for the next two hours.

You just heard Dr. Stephens describe the formats and goals of today's symposium. Let me tell you something about the format. The format of this symposium is as follows: The moderators will provide a brief overview of the compelling need for male studies as an independent academic discipline. We will then hear four presentations of about ten minutes in length in which our other distinguished scholars provide a variety of perspectives on the discipline of male studies as it has taken form during the past several years.

About 12:15, in about hour and 15 minutes, the panel will begin taking calls from teleconferees. If you're interested, as a teleconferee, in speaking with the panel, please follow the directions provided by the online site host. We will take as many questions as possible. A summary wrap-up of the conference will be followed by an important announcement of interest to today's conferees. The conference will end promptly at 1:00 P.M.

Now, let me introduce the moderators and members of our panel. The co-moderators of the panel are Lionel Tiger and Christina Hoff Sommers. Dr. Tiger is Charles Darwin Professor of Anthropology at Rutgers University and the author of the classic Men in Groups and more recently The Decline of Males. His next book, coauthored with Michael McGuire, is God's Brain to be released later this year.

Dr. Sommers is a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute in Washington. Before joining the institute, she was a professor of Philosophy at Clark University where she specialized in moral theory. For academic articles that appeared in publications such as the *Journal of Philosophy* and the *New England Journal of Medicine* and those on social and political subjects in *The Wall Street Journal*, *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *The*

New Republic, The Weekly Standard, The Atlantic, and The American.

Dr. Sommers is the editor of Vice and Virtue in Everyday Life, still a leading college ethics textbook, and she is the author of two well-known books, Who Stole Feminism? and The War Against Boys. The latter, *The New York Times* Notable Book of the Year for 2000. Her most recent book, co-authored with the institute colleague Sally Satel, is One Nation Under Therapy. She has lectured and taken part in debates on more than 100 college campuses.

Now, to our panel. Our panel is made up of four eminent scholars and educators from the United States and Canada. To my far left, Dr. Dennis Gouws. Dr. Dennis Gouws is an associate professor of English at Springfield College, Springfield, Massachusetts and a lecturer at the University of Connecticut-Storrs. He was educated at the University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, South Africa and at the University of Connecticut, where he earned his Ph.D. He has designed one of three pilot curricula for male studies as an academic discipline that we now have in hand. Dr. Gouws' research and teaching interests include masculinities and the male-positive education of men and boys. He has published essays on men's issues and is writing a book on masculinities in George Elliot's novels.

To his right, Professor Chip Capraro. Professor Capraro holds a Ph.D. in history from Washington University in St. Louis. He teaches courses on men's studies at Hobart and William Smith Colleges in Geneva, New York, where he was the founding coordinator of the college's mens studies academic minor, the only such minor in the country. He oversees Men's Lives, co-circular program for men, featuring the series of workshops on gender relations, men's health and wellness, careers, and diversity among men. His principal research interest is college men.

To my immediate left, Dr. Katherine Young and Dr. Paul Nathanson. Dr. Katherine

Young is James McGill Professor in the Faculty of Religious Studies at McGill University.

Professor Young's areas of expertise are Eastern religions and gender. Her colleague Dr.

Paul Nathanson is a senior researcher at McGill. His areas of scholarly interest are Western religions, secularity, and gender.

As colleagues, their case study has been groups in conflict. They've chosen men and women to be this focus. Their research has led to a "Trilogy on Misandry : The Sexist Counterpart of Misogyny." The first volume Spreading Misandry: The Teaching of Contempt for Men in Popular Culture was published in 2001. Second, Legalizing Misandry: From Public Shame to Systemic Discrimination Against Men was published in 2006. The third volume, Sanctifying Misandry: Goddess Ideology and the Fall of Man was published earlier this year. Together, Young and Nathanson will reopen the topics of maleness and masculinity to both historical and cross-cultural points of view in a fourth volume, Transcending Misandry: From Feminist Ideology to Intersexual Dialogue, which will be published next year. I now turn the conference over to Dr. Sommers and Professor Tiger.

Dr. Sommers: Thank you, Dr. Groth and good morning everyone. It's delightful to be here. I'll begin with a quick story about my son. When he was a senior in high school, his entire graduating class went on a camping trip in the desert. And a creative writing sensitivity educator visited the camp and led the group through an exercise. I think it was designed to improve their writing skills and their emotional intelligence, some such thing. Anyway, at dusk they were all told to take a pen, a notebook, a candle and matches and walk into the desert, sit down alone, and discover themselves. They were supposed to write about the discovery in their notebooks and share it with the group later on. The girls did that exactly as told, they recorded their perceptions, they wrote about the stark loneliness of the desert, that sort of

thing.

The boys were baffled by the assignment. Instead of doing as they were told, they all got together, threw the notebooks into a pile, lit them with the matches and made a little bonfire. The creativity facilitator was horrified and reacted as if they were sociopaths or incipient maniacs, proto-arsonists, or I don't know. They were none of those things. They were just boys.

Well, I welcome this conference because I am concerned that the male-averse attitude witnessed by the creative facilitator is widespread in the United States. I mean, somewhere along the line, conventional masculinity became politically incorrect. In some circles, it's treated as a pathology in need of a cure. I mean, there are gender experts in our universities who teach that the masculinity and femininity are social constructs, and masculinity, in particular, is a discredited construct. They treat it like the earth being flat or the sun revolving around the earth, discredited. Well, I think before we set about changing men, rescuing them from their toxic masculinity, I think it's better understand them first and take the true measure of their impact on society.

I am delighted to be here today. I am grateful to Wagner College for sponsoring this conference, to Miles and Dr. Stephens for organizing it, and for all of you making it possible. Thank you.

Dr. Lionel Tiger: Well, what we see is that these males are in deficit. Females don't choose them, for obvious reasons. They're liabilities rather than virtues and males become, as I put in The Decline of Male's book, outlaws, not in-laws. The result is that the nature of the family system has changed profoundly and so now in the United States and Canada, all through Europe, 40 percent of babies are born to women who are not married. Many of them have

associated males and the situation is not as dire as the statistic would suggest, but in fact, there are consequences of using the funnel through which people have to go. For example, education to prosper in a way which is antidotal, or rather hostile, to the interests of men.

And this is an economic issue now, for example, in the current or last waning recession -- whatever one wants to call it, delicately -- 82 percent of the jobs lost were male jobs. And most of those jobs will not return.

In any case, we're here today to try to take a naive, innocent, but hopefully useful look at the fact that males are as they are. They are not just fallen females and that there is an entire apparatus of explanation and understanding which skilled academics, many of whom are in this room, are prepared to offer. So that's basically all that I have to say, except to again reemphasize that we're talking about the rediscovery of the obvious and the question is, why should grown ups have to do this? Well, we're doing it. And let's now move on to the next commentator, Dennis Gouws.

Dr. Dennis Gouws: Thank you very much. I was thrilled to be asked to join this panel. And I thought it might be useful for me to pose three questions and try to answer them for you.

So here are my three questions. Do we really need male studies? That's the first one. The second one is what opportunities might exist for promoting male studies in the humanities and finally, what might teaching a male-positive humanities course involve?

So do we really need male studies? Education serves men and boys selectively and poorly in the United States. What results is the alienation from learning and even their untimely death. Recent data from the United States suggests that boys and men are more likely than girls or women to be diagnosed as having learning disabilities or behavioral problems, to fail, or to drop out of school.

Most boys will graduate being unable to read proficiently. In addition, men are increasingly underrepresented in higher education. (Illegible) reports that in 2005, 57.2 percent of the undergraduates enrolled in American colleges and universities were women, that women are now better educated than men, and that at least at present, 33 percent of women between 25 to 29 years of age hold a four-year degree compared to 26 percent of men. A 2008 American Association of University Women report on girls' performance in education notes that women have earned more bachelors' degrees than men since 1982, and women earned 58 percent of all the bachelors' degrees conferred in 2005 and 2006.

Failing any significant male attentive intervention, this trend of men being underrepresented in higher education degree programs is projected to continue for the next ten years at least, according to data from a 2009 report from the U.S. Department of Education. This report finds that 583,000 women will be awarded associates' degrees and only 319,000 men; one million women will be awarded bachelors' degrees and only 700,000 men; 480,000 masters' degrees will be awarded to women and only 293,000 will be awarded to men; 50,000 doctorate degrees will be awarded to women and only 41,000 to men. These data suggest that our education system is not supporting boys and men sufficiently, often with tragic consequences.

Suicide attempts and completion rates among secondary- and tertiary-aged boys and men in the United States far outstrip those of girls and women. In addition, men are significantly underrepresented in earning advance degrees in the social sciences and the humanities and most notably so in earning doctorates in fields that introduce literacy and interpersonal skills essential for personal and professional success in the twenty-first century. In my field, for example, English, only 42 percent of men are Ph.D. students in most programs.

In short, male studies courses and curricula could work to ensure gender equality in these disciplines; that is, provide men with same access to resources and the same opportunities as women. Moreover, these courses and curricula could play a positive role in assuring gender equity in the classroom which would guarantee men appropriate academic support. The humanities, along with the social sciences, will provide a crucial means to ensure that boys and men obtain social justice in education through adopting methodologies that promote gender equity and gender equality.

The second question, What opportunities might exist for promoting male studies in the humanities? The study of culture and ideas is essential to the humanities, providing an important opportunity to attend carefully to the indifference of even the hostility to masculinities in our culture which is fostered by many of our institutions. Such an acute attentiveness to these discourses about men, boys, and masculinities and how they are inscribed in our culture as the unquestioned, often acknowledged "given" of a culture is timely and auspicious.

In addition to sharpening literacy skills, humanities educators play an important role in this process of identity inscription and have a critical opportunity to intervene positively in these discourses to ensure that males succeed as productive and comfortable students, partners, parents, and citizens. One effect of male attentive intervention into current educational practices I have explored, involve accommodating male-oriented approaches to learning and literacy using a male-positive methodology, one which encourages a celebratory, ongoing dialogue about masculinities.

A male-positive methodology critically celebrates both embedded masculinity and men's literacy, and attentively resists male pathology and misandry. To celebrate masculinities means recognizing that boys or men are not just limbic-brained, brawn, and

balls. They are skilled holistic readers and learners.

Boys and men are often literate in areas outside of traditional learning and intuit the centrality of the body to the readings of social texts. To celebrate embodied masculinities means to be critical, but not hateful. To resist assumptions about essentially your typical pathological male subject. And to insist that irony and strategy do not justify misandry. This approach has proven effective in assignments whose goals include (unintelligible) analysis, creative writing, lesson planning, and the service learning. It therefore might successfully integrate (unintelligible) from various disciplines into an innovative and useful curriculum for humanities and education students.

In sum, the critical spirit of this male-positive approach to male studies in the humanities encourages an acute attentiveness to discourses about boys' and men's masculinities and how they are inscribed in various manifestations of our cultures and acknowledged. Moreover, as the methodological means of effective male studies, it offers a male-positive alternative to the (unintelligible) of gynocentric male feminism on the one hand, and backlash masculism on the other.

My final question, What might a more positive humanities course involve? I've designed two English courses that demonstrate the appropriateness of flexible and flexibility of male studies. First, a Men in Literature course, and the second a service learning-oriented Shakespeare course.

Both courses required a challenging, but accommodating often embodied approach to reading and writing by the broad variety of texts, than those usually offered in an academic advisement. This promoted literacy and learning requiring an attentive examination of how boys understand what it's like to be a boy or a man.

In my courses, a male-positive approach to literacy intervenes and provides

alternatives to persistent stereotypical and negative constructions and representations of boys and men. What Kehler and Greig call familiar stories of old in which boy meets book, boy rejects book, boy finds car, boy becomes a mechanic. In the familiar narrative the boy becomes a mechanic by default by failing to achieve academically rather than by choice. A male-positive experience of literacy occasioned by studies in the humanities will enable him to make an informed choice for a dignified and meaningful life, and this choice would include the option of becoming a mechanic, an academic, or whatever else he chooses while augmenting his confidence, complimentary, and embodied literacy.

Both male and female students in my classes have learned valuable lessons about men's literacy and cultural constructions of masculinities. Some students, moreover, will incorporate male-positive literacy into their lives. Justin, a freshman student, observed the following: "This class made me realize that men have been given a less reputable stereotype which they are expected to follow. (Illegible) in my entire life I have learned to accept defenses against my gender. I am glad that I don't need to accept defenses against men. I'm glad that knowing this has made me stronger in that I do not accept what society has said about me." Christopher learned the importance of gender equity -- in his service learning assignment by saying that this was as enlightening as it was scary, having been a product of the same educational institution that he researched in this paper. "I never thought how narrow-minded our culture really is. While I don't think that females get too much attention, I do feel that males do not get enough."

These students resolve to live responsibly as male-positive members of our society. In addition, some determined to work and attain social justice for men. I am pleased to share a learning community with them and offer their experiences as an example of what male studies courses in the humanities can achieve.

In conclusion, I hope that male studies as an academic discipline will similarly foster male-positive communities, not only in the humanities, but in all educational and social environments. We should all benefit from the success of male studies. Thank you.

Dr. Sommers: Perfect timing.

Dr. Tiger: Our next speaker is Chip Capraro of Hobart Williams Smith College.

Dr. Chip Capraro: Thank you. I've been sitting in a precarious position so close to the timekeeper and I've been trying to get some extra time here all morning.

I'm very happy to be here. As I understand that we are here today to engage in a conversation about the merits of launching a new academic discipline, male studies. What was puzzling for me initially was that -- such a discipline or a highly credible version of it, which I know as Men's studies, already exists.

Since the 1980s, if not earlier, a robust interdisciplinary field of study which goes by that name has been thriving with its various practitioners engaged in research and teaching about men's lives typically with an eye towards social change. So, for me, this may be a question of audience or awareness or emphasis and I hope finding common ground among colleagues in the field.

Back in 2004, I was asked to write an entry on men's studies for the Encyclopedia of Men and Masculinity which was kind of a daunting task given a few hundred words to describe an entire field, but I took it on and I offered an overview of the history and theory of men's studies. Which was then, and I would say now, is still an emerging interdisciplinary field concerned with men's identity and experience in the present, over time, across space,

and among various demographic destinations race, sexuality, ethnicity, commonly referred to as masculinities as we heard in our previous speaker.

Some scholars, for instance, David Savrin, prefer the term masculinities studies to signal their interest in men, not so much as biological beings but as socially-constructed subjects in the cultural context in which men exist. So, for me, I'd prefer the term men's studies.

In his classic 1980s article which made the case for men studies, Harry Brod articulated the essence and rationale of the knowledge remained that was then being surveyed and mapped out. Men's studies was not to be about men as representatives of a generic humanity, but about men as gendered beings. In other words, prior to the emergence of men's studies, men had indeed been studied, but not as men, only as human beings or generic human beings and -- recall the days when man was meant to encompass, the word man was meant to encompass all human beings. Women's experience may not have even been included in the information presented.

As much becoming organized and validated in the academy with the usual questions about the legitimacy of an emerging field, Michael Kimmel, in a ground-breaking anthology Changing Men, captured the activist aspects of the field describing its values orientation toward just that, changing men. In the same way that women's studies, as it came to be defined, was to be concerned with both getting at the truth of women's experience and bringing about change for the better of men's lives. Men's studies was to be about making a difference in men's lives with positive outcomes for men themselves and society in general.

So, over the past 25 years, really there's been a vast array of scholarly articles, books and so on, I'm not going to get into those here, but I do want to acknowledge the work of folks

sitting here today. I would include all of them in this notion of men's studies.

At my own institution, Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Geneva, New York, truly upstate, we have been offering co-curricular and curricular learning experiences in men's studies since the mid-1980s. We do have an interdisciplinary academic minor in Men's Studies, for which I was the founding director. I think that's how I got invited to this panel. The minor includes work in theories of masculinity, the history and sociology of men's experience, feminist and other gender theory, and work on sexual minorities and the concepts of gender itself.

We also offer workshops for men on sexual assault prevention and gender relations, men's health and wellness, career and family, and diversity among men, that's in a workshop series we call "Men's Lives" which is required for all first-year men at Hobart College and there's roughly 250 men and it's a very successful program.

In my theory course I teach conservative mythopoetic and feminist theories of masculinity, but overall the approach in the academic minor and the workshops is "pro-feminist," which is to say it's broadly supportive of feminist perspectives and concern with ending sexism. Our men's studies co-curricular workshops and curricular coursework are well received by men and women. The workshops are for men only. They're required, but participant evaluations are consistently high. The academic courses are for men and women, typically with more women than men enrolled, but they're in high demand and they consistently receive positive evaluations, which brings me back to today's session.

Whether men are worthy of study, ought to be studied or in fact, are being studied seems to me is not the real issue. Rather, it's the question, what, if any ideological perspective ought to inform a men's studies and also what is it and how is it we ought to teach about men and boys? In other words, we're not to be the ideological curricular and pedagogic

approaches to research and teaching about men and masculinity.

In this regard, Blythe Clinchy's notion of connective knowing is a useful formulation. Connective knowing refers to an epistemology and pedagogy by which the known, or that to be known, is connected to the experience of the knower. While associated with women, I believe it applies, as well, to men. As I reflect on my 25 years of teaching about gender, it appears that some version of connected knowing, intended or unintended, is inevitable. We intuit that our subject is ultimately about us, ourselves, or in relation to us and we attach ourselves to what we are studying, often with powerful emotions.

Now, among men, I would say, broadly speaking, the conservative approaches to masculinity, particularly men's rights' activists and so on, there is the sense of anger or a sense of grievance. I think as a dominant feeling for mythopoetic men, I would signal Robert Bly and his followers. There's a sense of loss or grief that is foregrounded and for feminists or pro-feminist men, it's some version of compassionate empathy or maybe even guilt. In other words, we all bring our experience and our feelings to the subject and we may infuse the subject with an ideological perspective. The emotional cross currents of this sort of connective knowing flow towards the paradoxical nature of masculinity. I think this really is the point I came to emphasize. Conservative perspectives frame masculinity essentially as a theory of labor which emphasizes reciprocity. Men do certain tasks, woman do certain tasks and that is a rightful order of society.

Mythopoetic perspectives emphasize masculinity as a theory of the self and talks about men's need for healing. Feminist theory stresses power and equality., but I think Joseph Pleck's original formulation of the paradox of masculinity is critical here; namely, that men are both powerful and powerless. Yes, men as a group possess social power over women as a group, but individual men in a discourse, of individual men is not a discourse of power. Men

do not feel powerful in today's society and I think you heard a lot of testimony to that effect already today. Consider, for example, the production and consumption of pornography. For women and especially feminist women, pornography is about men's pleasure derived ultimately from the oppression of women, the eroticization of male power. Yet men's discourse about their own experiences of pornography is not about power at all, it's about sexual scarcity, rejection, and most of all shame. So while pornography is, for many women and pro-feminist men, emblematic of men's power, for many men themselves porn falls into a larger construction of masculinity as a shame-based experience. Again, the paradoxical nature of masculinity is my point here. Thank you.

These are complex matters. In recent years, much of the debate about the ideological aspects of gender has centered on boys. How ought we as a society to raise our boys? Many scholars and teachers identifying with the field of men's studies understand that field to encompass the study of boys as well. Often accessed under broader categories such as men's socialization, life course theories of masculinity, and developmental theories of masculinity either that many books and articles written on boy culture, boy code, battles against boys, and so on. Leonard Sax has argued that boys today are "adrift," they're not doing well in school, for example. And certainly not as well as girls, but as he points out not as well as boys 30 years ago. Okay? So there's two aspects to this question about boys. How are boys doing in comparison to girls and how are boys doing today versus boys 30 years ago? For example, reading. Historically, girls have always read more than boys, going back a hundred years. One of the problems today is not so much that girls are reading more than boys, it's boys aren't reading at all compared to their counterparts 30 years ago.

In a paper some years ago, I argued that while we as a society very much want to change outcomes for boys we're conflicted about implementing change in a way that disturbs

what I then called sentimental boyhood. In short, some attacked boys and others came to boys' defense and still others that argued that feminism had steered games for girls at the expense of boys. No one -- while girl had -- girlhood had been reimagined to be more inclusive, no one successfully reenvisioned boyhood. We want our boys to change, but we do not want to change boyhood. That's the dilemma.

As the father of two sons now both out of college and into their careers, I challenge myself to think and rethink what I just said, what I just wrote. Over the holidays we hosted a little reunion dinner for them and some of their boyhood friends from their -- now in their mid-20s. Their most vivid reminiscences at the table centered on Little League baseball, missed fly balls, abusive coaches, and heroes that won the big game. Rationally, I know the feminist critique of sport and the role of sport in reproducing male gender stereotypes, I even teach it. And I've experienced firsthand the harm that sport can do to some boys, yet somehow sentimentally, I perceived that my boys' lives and my own life as a parent was enriched by that experience, or at least I cannot imagine boyhood in upstate New York without Little League. As a Little League coach, I didn't allow bullying, gay bashing, and the like, and I made the boys clean up the gum wrappers in the dugout. So I was progressive in my approach, I like to think. But I don't believe any of that fundamentally altered the experience.

Drawing heavily on the insights of Victor Seidler, I've argued that pedagogically we must put aside ideology and agree on a language to talk about men and boys. The language ought to be neither male bashing, nor masculinist -- a reassertion of male privilege -- but simply evoking a sense of responsibility. We as a society, as parents, as educators and for boys and men themselves to take responsibility for their identity and experiences. Thanks very much.

Dr. Sommers: Thank you very much. On now to --

Dr. Tiger: I think, Paul, you're going to go first?

Dr. Nathanson: Yeah, Paul Nathanson of McGill University, a fine university -- I went there. Okay, you know, I would like very much to give a very upbeat talk, but the subject that Katherine Young and I have worked on for the past 20 years is a manifestly depressing one, namely, misandry: hatred of men. And by the way, when you say hatred of men we're referring not to an emotion just like a personal emotion, but rather to something that is culturally propagated. A way of thinking, a mentality, a world view. So that's our topic, misandry.

Now, a few years ago I was -- I met somebody who told me that at his university he had tried to establish a men's studies program, or maybe it was a men's studies course. But he got a letter from one member of the faculty saying that to study men would be the equivalent of studying Nazis. In other words, a men's studies program would be equivalent to Nazi studies. Now, that was about ten years ago. I doubt very much if that mentality has changed. It might not be put so bluntly, but I don't think it's changed all that much.

So that brings me to the topic that Katherine and I have been studying. And that is, I guess we'll do it -- say the institutionalization of misandry. Though we're not just dealing with personal opinions, people who've had bad experiences with men. We're talking about the institutionalization of a way of thinking which basically teaches contempt for men. So I, you know, I have a just a vague sense of what some of the earlier speakers have been saying. I think that from my point of view I have to say that one of the problems that any discipline of men's studies or male studies or whatever it's called, has to deal with is not only that we don't

know enough about men, and it's not only that we don't have resources, and it's not only that, you know, there's social and economic problems to be dealt with if men become an underclass.

One of the factors that we really must look at, no matter how unpleasant or unpopular, is the fact that much of this misandry is being generated by feminists. Not all feminists. We, Katherine and I, distinguish between, and this is from the point of view of men we would say, nevermind the the point of view of women for the time being, from the point of view of men there are two kinds of feminism. One of them is egalitarian, which we regard as a noble ideal and certainly worth striving for. There is one problem with egalitarian feminism and that is that it unwittingly, by saying that men and women should be equal with the implication that they should be the same, it denies men the possibility of establishing a healthy collective identity. And by a healthy collective identity we mean something that is based on at least one contribution that you can make, either as a person or as a group, to society which is A) distinctive, B) necessary, and C) publicly valued.

So egalitarian feminism presents us with that problem, unwittingly, I think. And we're prepared to deal with that. But the other kind of feminism that we have written most about is what we call ideological feminism and we use the word *ideology* for a reason. I'm not sure if we're using it in the same sense that our previous speakers have used it. But we outline nine distinctive characteristic features of ideological thinking on both the left and the right. And one of the reasons we chose the word ideology is just to make that link between left and right. This is not something that's confined to feminism, it's not something that's confined to gender. It can be an ideological mentality. It can be expressed as nationalism, for example, or some kinds of Marxism. So the features, the characteristic features of ideology in this sense would be -- would include the following: The most important, I think, is dualism. And dualism is a

way of thinking that has a long, long history in Western thought going right back to the Manichaeism, but coming from Zoroastrianism into Judaism and Christianity. It's the idea that the world and history is divided and polarized between two forces, one good force and one evil force. And we, in quotation marks, are always associated with the good force and they are always associated with the evil force. So that kind of thinking has been -- has appeared over and over again throughout Western history. It appears in nationalism, it appears in racism, it appears in a whole lot *isms*. And it takes a particular form in what we call ideological feminism. So that men are defined as the other, the evil other.

And associated with dualism is the other side of the coin; namely, that we are associated with everything that is good and true and beautiful and caring, sharing, and loving and all the rest of it. So that's what we would call essentialism. And then by definition those two things come together as a kind of hierarchy; we are better than they are.

Then there is a Utopian string in ideology. It's the idea that if we can possibly do it, we will create a perfect society and those who stand in our way must somehow be pushed aside.

Another aspect of ideology would be what we call consequentialism, which is to say that the notion that the end justifies the mean. So if the end, a perfect society, is morally legitimate then you could also legitimate the various ways you have of attaining that. Other features we would include, what we call selective cynicism so that you are cynical about everybody else's motivation except of course for the people within your own group.

Now, we've already mentioned the name Michael Kimmel once and I guess I'll have to mention him again. But in his book Guyland one of the things he keeps doing is he'll look at some aspect of masculine behavior and he will attribute it to something as unworthy and uncharitable as possible. In other words, his primary motivation would be what he calls the culture of entitlement by which he means entitlement to arbitrary privileges just by virtue of

being male. So that's how he explains the behavior of boys and men. Now, when it comes to the behavior of women he characteristically gives a very either naive or generous explanation. Women do this and this and this because they're really afraid or because they're, you know -- but it's never a cynical explanation. So this kind of double standard is characteristic of ideological thinking.

So that, I guess, I would have to say that if we were going to have a new form of men's studies, a new version, we have to -- frankly, we have to call a spade, a spade. We simply have to say that there is some critique of feminism that's going to be involved. It's inevitable. I don't see how you can get around that. And just saying well, you know, we're all feminists if we just look like this excess or look like that exaggeration. There are some fundamental features of ideological feminist thought over the past 30 or 40 years that we need to question and we need to do it overtly.

Now, having said that, I will have an upbeat ending, at least preliminarily upbeat. And that is to say that the ultimate goal of our project on misandry -- on the topic that will conclude our final volume is what we call intersexual dialogue. Now, intersexual dialogue is -- we based it on our experience and knowledge of inter-religious dialogue, but it's one big difference and that is the inter-religious dialogue is, basically it's not a necessity in a democratic society. Religious groups do not depend on the goodwill of their neighbors; they depend on a Constitution, depend on a Bill of Rights.

We're -- as in the case of men and women we really do have to have some kind of dialogue. We do need each other. I think for the time being. So this, this form of dialogue we're going to define very rigorously, and basically what we do is if you look at the continuum of communication between either individuals or groups at one end of the continuum you would have something like war or overt hostility. At the other end you would have something

like peace, but in a very rich sense, meaning something like communion or intimacy and then in between those two ends of continuums are debate on one and which is formalized war and it's very useful in some situations. It's very useful in courts. For example, we have an adversarial court system. It's good and scholarly debate, but it's not necessarily the best kind of communication in terms of how to bring two segments of the population together in a more fruitful way and that's what we call dialogue and that is at the other end of the continuum or closer to the other end of the continuum or closer to the -- so we are not ready at the moment for dialogue, but my -- our hope is that by encouraging a new kind of men's studies we will get to the point where we are ready for dialogue. I can't see any other way of doing it. We can't continue the way we are. We have to find some way of actually listening to each other.

And we prepared what we call a decalogue of dialogue. Ten principles that people must be able to absorb in order to enter into dialogue and the most important one being that we have to listen, not just in an abstract sense, but we have to be willing to learn something new about the people that we think we already know, you know, we know about them, but we don't know about them. There are things that they can teach us. Okay so that's --

Dr. Tiger: Just before we continue I'd like to remark that any of you that have had the either the fortune or misfortune of hanging around universities know that for an academic a sentence is 50 minutes long and I must say I admire the speakers so far for keeping to time very well and so we'll proceed with due process.

Dr. Young: I feel like I've come full circle because in 1973 when I was a student at Harvard, a colleague -- fellow student actually at the time -- and I, developed one of the, probably the first course on Women and World Religions which we gave at the Cambridge Center for Adult

Education. Now, this was before they were any courses, nobody had created bibliographies for that particular topic and we spent a lot of time trying to bring up that together. Eventually we published that course outline as a booklet and a bibliography as another booklet and we know what happened after that. This huge, huge literature developed and a lot of research was done and it built into this phenomenon that we now call women's studies which is fully institutionalized in most universities.

Now, at another stage of my career which was in the mid-'80s, Paul was my graduate student at that time, and after talking about his thesis, we began to talk about gender and realized that you really can't understand women unless you understand men and the old public understanding of the -- men as the universal man or the colorful man was not enough to do justice to the complexity of men's situation, both biologically and culturally which of course varies across many, many different societies. So that began our collaboration in the mid-'80s. Now, how ever many years later again, we're beginning to talk about male studies. And we're beginning to think well, what would such a program look like? What should the courses be?

The first point I'd like to mention here is that the topic is now very timely. And I think it's timely for two reasons. One is that there is a crisis of masculinity, a crisis of men in education, in higher education, but also lower education. And that needs to be addressed. But it's also a timely moment because we're starting to see more and more research being done on men. When I started there was very little done. We had to get out there and try to do a lot of it ourselves. Which meant we were really stretching into different disciplines and beyond our own training and we learned an enormous amount doing that. But now we find excellent research being done in biology and the relation of primates studies, to early humans around what, you know, male chimpanzees do as opposed to other primates. We have good

anthropological studies that are cross-cultural. You know, we have more study in education. It's getting to be a quantum level now. That we can move forward, and as Paul said a few minutes ago, do something new.

The moment is timely, but to make those resources effective, we have to bring greater communication among researchers. Which means you need centers, you need support for postdocs, you need not only undergraduate curricula, you need publishing houses that are willing to look at men's studies. It's an enormous thing to do and I think we are on the cusp of that, but we need the energy coming from both the researchers and the institutions and the media to bring it all together to be effective and to look at something perhaps differently.

Now, my own discipline taught two basic principles which was very important as I did a lot of cross-cultural research -- my main field of study -- and it's called epoché which means temporarily bracketing out your own presuppositions to the degree that your subconscious about them -- and that takes a lot of work -- in order to open up and be able to listen effectively and with empathy to another person. In my case, it was another religion. How do we posit these enormous cultural barriers of our own ethnocentrism? So epoché and empathy were the two key concepts that guided my own academic career.

Paul and I put this in a slightly different way by talking about the importance of stereoscopic vision. In other words, for stereoscopic vision you need your two eyes of equal strength working together and that gives a depth perception. Okay, so you've gone to see the film "Avatar," you know that you put on your special glasses and you're starting to get a different vision because of that. In the beginning women did not have enough public awareness, they didn't have enough education to be able to have a strong eye to be part of the dialogue. Now, because the reverse problem that men and all their particularities, but also what it means to be a man vis-à-vis male biology and the class of men has not been

studied sufficiently although as I said there's a lot of good work coming online. So we need both eyes, to extend the metaphor, of equal strength, equal academic sophistication, equal access to the resources, equal institutional base so that the communication and the research can come together.

Now, I think this is important not only for addressing the issues of gender and the problems that men are facing, but I think it's extremely important for general education. In other words, we're all as educators interested in teaching critical skills. If we just take the received wisdom and prebend it over and over again, we will miss the symptoms of something else that may be going on in our society. We need critical skills. As an academic that's been involved in both the women's studies and the men's studies, I would say that this kind of research is extremely exciting. For me it's been a quest for truth, but that word truth is terribly unpopular in an age of deconstruction, but it's a process. It's a quest. For me this has also been a quest for justice and although Paul has mentioned some of the problems even with egalitarian feminism, it's still something I think that we move forward to as an ideal.

And if we have concerns for future -- the future, a future that men are invested in as well as women, if we have a concern for society, for boys, for women, for democracy, then this intellectual quest to see things in a different way, I think will bode well for the future. And as Paul said which brings us to the issue of dialogue as a key element of communication, but it also means not only do we gain insights from each other, but we will have to be mutually corrective. And I think there may be some corrections with some forms of feminism, but maybe as we go on in male studies there's going to need to be corrections that come from women watching what's going on and the thinking about what is being said. And that will therefore be at the heart of dialogue.

Dr. Sommers: Excellent timing. Thank you and it's --

Dr. Groth: Are we ready to go live to questions or do we want to wait until exactly 12:15?

Dr. Tiger: Let's wait.

Dr. Groth: Okay, so we have ten minutes for response from the panel moderators before we begin the online questions.

Dr. Sommers: Well, I'll just make a few comments. I greatly enjoyed hearing all the presentations. When you are writing on men's issues, it's a lonely world and it's remarkable to find colleagues at -- and this brings me to first point I want to make. It's about the structural asymmetry in the study of men and women. There are approximately 112 leading, you know, important centers for studying women. You have, I think, the Wellesley Center for Research on Women and the Radcliffe Institute and the American Association of University Women, the The National Women's Law Center and these have organized into -- called the Council for Research on Women and you can go to the website and it's just a very, very elaborate empire of knowledge and activism and they, you know, each of these institutes have staff and are producing volumes and volumes of research and some of it's very good. Much of it is ideological rather than objective effort to understand women, I'm not including all of it, but it's problematic.

Now, this wouldn't be such a serious problem if there were some institutes looking at the world from the point of view of men. There, so we have like 112 leading institutes that produce this research that are listened to by members of Congress that produce -- the

journalists call them when they want to write stories and if they're sending any social policy practice that has a disparate impact on women they're right there to make it known and to correct it. Nothing on the side for men, almost nothing. I don't want to say there aren't some fledgling organizations, but there can be outrageous injustices against men and these go just almost unnoticed.

It was a fairly long time -- just to give one notorious example -- the Duke Lacrosse case where there was this persecution, like a witch trial, and it took a very long time and there wasn't a lot of institutional support for those young men. Imagine if it had been reversed. This is the first thing we have to correct we have to have -- I will say this it wouldn't be as urgent to correct it if these organizations, these 112 that are organized in the council -- if the majority of the women as researchers were fair minded, but what you find is that many of them hold a principle that if there's a disparity that favors men, that's an injustice which must be corrected. If there's a disparity that favors women, they celebrate that as a triumph of equity. It's not as if the American Association of University Women will stop and say okay, well there's, you know, initially our goal was to cite parity in higher education, we have achieved that so now let's move on to, you know -- they never admit victory. They're constantly trying to knock down doors that are already open and again it's young men that pay the price.

The final thing I'll say about -- that makes it problematic with these organizations, and to be more specific I'm talking about the National Women's Law Center and the American Association of University Women, is that they often -- and I would include most women studies' departments, not all because some of them you just have fine scholars doing research on women, but you have the ideologues. I think this is clearly delineated, outlined. You have professors of women's studies who teach that women live in a state of siege,

American women, and they have a set of statistics they would routinely present which cannot be corrected. Many of them are wrong, outrageously either out of date or were always false or exaggeration, hyperbole. They can't be corrected. I've tried a few times with textbooks, I found outrageous misinformation and tried to correct it. So you have that ideological feminism and it has its own propaganda.

The ideological feminism also has this sacred dogma that's essentially the same and that gender is a social construction. And I'll give an example of a colleague in -- a feminist philosophy who is a hard-line ideological feminist in my view and she defines, she says that the sex-gender system, we're all trapped in this systemic and oppressive system. But she says that we're all born bisexual and then we're transformed into male and female gendered beings, one destined to command; the other to obey. I once read that definition to my husband and he said now, which one commands and which obeys? But this happens to be Sandra Lee Bartky at the University of Illinois who gave this definition. So it's just a first principle that gender is a social construction. The fact that there might be something genuine about masculinity and femininity, it's just ruled out of order. So whenever these ideological feminists find a statistical disparity, it has to be because of some kind of social practice. If we change it we'll get justice, many boys and young women and young men in engineering programs or in sports and so forth, so they could never admit that there might be some different biological -- there might be a biological explanation for the different choices.

So that's the battle we face -- we are -- so, I think articulated in various ways by members of the panel. And even if you didn't believe that there's -- that we have to battle the feminists, I agree. Not the feminists at-large as you've made the distinction, but the ideological hardliners that will combat any efforts made to have a male studies program because they see it as part of a backlash. And what I would argue is that, as most of you

have said, it's not a zero-sum game. We're all in this together. Thank you.

Dr. Groth: Before we begin the call-ins from the teleconferees, I've asked Dr. Tiger to comment briefly on the fellow's(?) presentation.

Dr. Tiger: Very briefly. Just following on what Christina has noted and everybody else is an implacable lack of connection between biology and law. And, for example, the efforts to normalize, that is to say, make statistical equity in sports programs, in science programs, and so on derives from an avoidance and as Christina just said of the notion that male and female organisms really are different. If you want to galvanize a discussion, ask a serious ideological feminist why men live 7, 8 years shorter lives than women. You'll get a lot of oatmeal in response because it's very difficult to say why except that males are simply more fragile and all series of other potential reasons. But if you look as I have, at the behavior of other primates, it's inconceivable that these animals, many of which are like us, are not driven by forces that are not celebrated by a lot of statistical parity. And so the abyss between the natural sciences and the social sciences is in part responsible for what we're talking about today. I am constantly provoked by the fact that universities almost invariably have two faculties; natural science and social science, as if somehow social science, social behavior, was not natural. That is completely absurd and yet we produce institution after institution based on this enormous misreading of the relationship between an animal's biology, a person's biology and their behavior. And so unless we're prepared to be reductionist about this, we will continue to make the same errors and to have the same confusion, all well meaning, about why boys and girls, men and women act differently. So I think we're beautifully-timed here. We have to commend the moderators, that's Christina and me. I think

we've --

Dr. Sommers: we've come to --

Dr. Tiger: We have our -- We have our machine. Are we ready for the call-ins?

Dr. Groth: Yes, but I ask the call-in individuals to identify themselves by name and indicate whether they would be directing their question to the panel as a whole or to an individual on the panel at the beginning. Okay?

>> We had an issue with the dial-in system to hear live voices. So instead we're going to grab some of the questions that were asked and we're going to read it to the panel and then anyone who feels they can answer can just take it from there.

Dr. Groth: Will you be able to identify the person who called in the question? Okay, let's go then.

Megan Carbon: The first question was from Bradley Janee and they were wondering if there are any plans to establish a male studies academic journal.

>> There are. The --

>> What?

Dr. Groth: Well, the -- there are several journals now of men's studies. About five years ago I launched a journal of boyhood studies which is still the only journal of its kind. The two major journals coming out with men's studies tradition that Chip spoke about are now in, I believe their 11th and 18th year, produced 800 articles. What we hope will come from the ongoing development of this discipline is an outlet for proceedings of events such as this, but also a journal -- perhaps a quarterly journal, perhaps we'll start out three times yearly -- a journal of male studies that would invite contributors to have a representation from as wide a range of disciplines as possible, to be peer-reviewed and take its place among the top journals that are out there. So, yes, to the questioner. There is a plan for such a journal and we would hope to launch it within a year or so. These things do take time, but it's very much on the horizon and at the end of this -- at the wrap-up, I'll mention something that is germane to that. Perhaps, move on to the next question. Unless there's someone who has to say something else?

Dr. Capraro: Yeah, I think we've all one way or another been saying the same thing albeit we probably don't agree on the point of view, but there is this vast body of research and teaching already underway including the men's studies I talked about, but including the work of people on this panel. I think the question -- including journals and autograph series and, you know, if it were a more academic conference we might get into the structure of publication in the field and so on, but again, I think there's a sense that a lot of what's out there is dominated by feminist perspectives or what some are calling ideological feminism and that's why I felt that that's really the core issue., not that does men's studies exist. Do we need more journals? But is there an imbalance. Now, I don't happen to see it that way as you heard from my remarks. I think feminist perspectives are necessary in any scholarly enterprise, perhaps not sufficient to explain the totality of boys and men's experience, but so that then the question

about, you know, are there going to be more journals. I don't think that's really what people want to know I think what people want to know is what is the perspective of those journals and what it's going to be.

Dr. Groth: If I might make one comment in response to that before --

Dr. Stephens: I'd like to come to the title of this conference: Male studies. We are not mentioning men's studies, we're saying male studies. When I was at the Center for Foundations in New York City the other day I put in male studies into the computer for the topics that were part of the library of the foundation. And there was 78 pages of articles on male studies and I sampled them page after page up to 50, up to 70, and I could find out anything and everything about male dingoes, male flatworms, male roundworms, but there were no papers, there were no studies on male human beings.

Now, in the course of the presentations, there's something very interesting happened there was the word masculist was mentioned. A masculist was equated with privilege. And, you know, we've been talking about feminists, feminism as if it were, you know, it just goes trilling off our tongues, but if we're going to speak of feminists, then we have to begin to be able to speak of masculists. But that's not the point of male studies. The point of male studies, as I believe we have envisioned it here, is a true academic -- development of an academic understanding of males as we move forward so that we can maximize human potential. At this particular point in our own culture and around the world, there's an enormous loss in education, in health. In eastern Europe, men die on average 15 years sooner than women are. Here, all right, so it's seven, oh, big deal. Well, wait a minute these -- we need initiatives that stem from an understanding of men that will bring us into the

twenty-first century. And I have one more piece because in a paper that's on the website for the foundation, there is a document called "Male Studies: A New Academic Discipline" and in it there's a citation from the *Financial Times* of a few years ago which describes the creation of jobs worldwide over the last 10 to 15 years. And there's been something like a billion jobs, in other words -- well, that's almost 18 percent of the population -- there's been jobs created and 80 percent of these jobs have been created for women. I have no objection to taking our girls to work. At the same time, what is happening is that there is an enormous economic disruption. So much so that the World Bank, not a particularly (unintelligible) organization, not a particularly political organization, but a concerned organization published a book in 2007 called the Other Half of Gender. They didn't say male studies they said the other half of gender. And they detail what was taking place around the world with the funding of one gender without the -- taking into account the unintended consequences on the other gender, and basically what they conclude was that funding of one gender and the advancement of one gender without taking into connection -- into consideration, the other gender was destructive. Not just to the gender that wasn't being funded, but also to the gender that was being funded because it disrupted social, cultural systems that the community relied on.

So again, I am coming back to the core name of this. We're not talking about men's studies. We're not talking about feminism. We're not talking about masculism. We're talking about male studies, the study of males. Male human beings that will take us into the twenty-first century. I'm sorry for getting on my soapbox, but, you know, I think we've got a few soapboxes here, thank goodness. I'm learning. Next. Lionel.

Dr. Groth: Do we want to go, I think, perhaps to the next question from the teleconferees?The panelist and moderators will have a wrap-up at 12:45 so let's make use of

this time to hear from the callers. Do you have the person's name and the question?

Megan Carbon: Okay. Gordon Finley has said, first, we need to focus on changing negative social oddities towards men and boys. For example, boys are stupid; throw rocks at them. He also says that in order to move forward as a society we need to focus on empirical, social, and biological science research and eliminate ideology. And lastly he says that male studies should be pragmatically-, rather than ideologically-oriented.

>> And lastly, lastly, referring to the Hoff Sommers' comment that feminists are never willing to admit victory. The reason is that there are feminists to -- in order for that -- were feminists to admit victory, they would lose their eternal status as victims. Those were his comments.

Dr. Groth: Okay. Could we go to another question?

Dr. Stephens: Yes, yes, go to some more questions.

Megan Carbon: From Ryan Sweeney, if we accept that research and theory around men in today's world, what do we do? What are the emerging best practices or theoretical practices for overcoming barriers that men face in education or society?

Dr. Groth: I think any of the panelists who would like to should answer that.

Dr. Tiger: At my university, at Rutgers, the first thing that students get when they leave their homes for the first time as bright-eyed bushy-tailed freshman is go to a rape seminar. Where,

because the lawyers want the university to cover its legal acts, the students are told about rape as a chronic problem which it is, please don't turn this into a criticism of me for advocating rape, of course not at all, but the issue is that the male students are informed right at the outset that they are predatory, dangerous organisms. And the females are advised that they are the potential victims of this class of young drippy young guys that are sitting in the same room with them.

And that's, in fact, a human reality and I've raised this with my colleagues at the university and they're constrained by the lawyers. If they don't have this seminar, they fear that some hapless unfortunate student will get raped that the university will be sued. I'm overextending the metaphor, but I don't think that it's trivial. An attitudinal matter of considerable importance.

One final other thing, at the beginning of every semester I, as an instructor, get a postcard from some organization on campus saying, "Have to cancel a class? Don't. Let us come in and teach your class for you." And it's from the Violence Against Women's Center and they will -- they have a team coming in with Powerpoints and the whole lot about violence against women. So I called the woman who runs it and said by the way, what are your data on violence against men, for example and why just focus on women? And she said -- as if I were some sort of retarded maniac -- she said well, that's what we do. There's federal mandated budget for that of hundreds of millions of dollars. It's not fair. It's not agreeable. And it's a blight on the nature of a civilized (unintelligible) society and what many of us have been concerned about is the excoriation(?) of males as the prime movers of all evil in this manichaeian notion that you earlier described so there is -- there is a real set of measures that are being taken by people which have the effect of disenfranchising boys, making girls feel that boys are dangerous. I needn't go on with obvious -- but there are real things happening

that are kind of a moral slum (unintelligible).

Dr. Groth: As we prepare for the next question, Dr. Sommers?

Dr. Sommers: Yeah, I'll just say that a more general answer to your question about what is to be done. The problem's become so severe that we are finally getting a reaction. When I wrote the War Against Boys almost ten years ago, it sort of came out of -- I mean, I was building on the work of other people, but the work wasn't that well known and everyone found it sort of paradoxical. Boys? And over the years there's been far more publicity. There are no institutions to do anything with that knowledge. That remains a problem. However, there is much more awareness and I just want to draw attention to two books, one which is out, one which coming out -- one which is not out yet, but it should be in a few months. It's by psychologist Roy Baumeister. He's at University of Santa Barbara right now, but I think he's at -- permanently at the University of Florida -- Florida State University. He's an excellent research psychologist. He almost single-handedly debunked the more fanciful, excesses of the self-esteem movement. A very tough-minded, no nonsense, nonideological -- he doesn't really care about feminism. He isn't an anti-feminist. He's just not interested. But he cares about good research.

And he gave a talk at the American Psychological Association a few years ago that just -- it was published on the web. And it was just, it went viral. Everyone wanted to read Roy Baumeister's paper entitled "Is There Anything Good about Men?" Because he had just noticed that you can't, you know, everywhere, even in his field you'll find denigrations of all things masculine. On the other hand, a colleague of his had identified the -- what she called the WAW factor, women are wonderful and that was everywhere in the literature, in popular

culture. So his book Is There Anything Good About Men is coming out soon and he just goes through and with an -- in this no nonsense grown-up way. And it's -- some of its sensitive and brash, I will say. I told him -- I wrote a little blurb about it. And I said it's as if Indiana Jones, you know, walks into this Wellesley Center for Research on Women and just creates havoc. But it's going to be fun. It's exciting and I think there is going to be more and more books like that and it's going to change the world.

Second one I'll mention more quickly is a book by two Cornell University professors. Wendy Williams and her husband Steve Ceci and it's called the Mathematics of Sex. And again, they aren't ideological, in fact, they have two daughters I think, who are, scientists and they're you know, they began this research into why are there so -- this paucity of women in the high echelons of academic science. They began with a sort of prejudice in the favor of the bias thesis because of discrimination and invisible barriers. They go through the most meticulous review I have ever seen of the studies on male-female differences and especially in cognition and in culmination(?) what interests men and women. And just one by one they just destroy these fashionable arguments that are bandied about by the -- in the feminist research centers. Particularly the -- this movement about women in science. And this book has to be reckoned with. It is now there and it's not going to go away.

So my hope is that we're going to be -- just begin to have a kind of renaissance of research that's honest and sort of go back to the time where it was less ideological and people were really seeking the truth. I do think that there is that standard in academia and these scholars Baumeister, Ceci, and Williams exemplify to a high degree.

Dr. Groth: Given the constraints of time we will have two more comments on that item and then one final call-in. Believe it or not we're getting close to the wrap-up so Dr. Young and

Dr. Capraro, would you please respond and then we'll go to our last question.

Dr. Young: So just a very briefly -- although we can plan for centers and institutions and chairs and all of the big ticket items, in the meantime I think we can use the Internet much more effectively as women have done. So what are the good reading lists? What are the critical reviews of the number of these books? Where can we post course proposals? How can they be discussed on academic blogs? How can they be brought into our existing academic organizations? In other words, a lot of the networking these days goes by the Internet and that is a first step that we can take immediately.

Dr. Groth: Chip?

Dr. Capraro: Sorry. It was a question about best practices and I just want to say again, what we all have in common on this panel is our concern about the well-being of boys. The question is what do we do about?

Now, my particular area of interest is college men. And, you know, what in terms of best practices, what we do on our campus is we do a lot of peer education. We have small group, all male, workshops led by trained upper class college men as facilitators. We tried to put it -- whether it's talking about men's health and wellness, best practices, keeping doctor's appointments, nutrition, whether it be about diversity among men and acknowledging the different ways of being a man in today's world. And, you know, to a great extent that what happens in these conversations is all ideologies are put aside. And these 18-, 19-, 20-year old men begin to have authentic conversations with each other and in the end it's men, college men teaching each other about the reality of their own lives.

So in terms of best practices, back to the question, I would advocate opportunities for men to get together in educational settings, in the classroom that's a little bit more in terms of pedagogy. But I think sometimes there's a sense that if we would just leave the boys alone they would be okay. And I just don't think that's the case. As a father of two sons, I never felt that way, but if you listened to the discourse of parents, parents are worried about what's happening to boys. Educators are worried and the idea is something should be done and the question about best practices is the what? And I don't think the answer is just let boys be boys. Let boys, you know, be alone and they'll kind of work this out for themselves. So I think the question -- we need a lot more work in the field about what those best practices are.

Dr. Sommers: I just wanted to reinforce your last point. We need more work because it's a kind of an unknown, unexplored continent and we've all been saying that in one way or the other. So we're not yet ready to put forward too many best practices. We have some hints about what might work, what seems to work, but there isn't good empirical research. There are a lot of projects to be done by graduate students so that's means it might get done because they need subjects to write about.

Dr. Groth: I lied. Dennis has a brief comment and then the last question is from Sweden. So we'll hear the question to the panel after Dennis's comment and then we'll begin the wrap-up with Professor Tiger and Professor Sommers at 12:45.

Dr. Gouws: All right, Chip, this is brief. What I've done thus forth, how does the present state of scholarship positively inflect on what men can do in a classroom? So I've been looking at literacy, which a lot of men have been looking at. I've also been looking at

psychological fears of embodiment. My most recent work has been on service learning. So the best practice idea for me is look for the opportunities in the current state of scholarship to enable men to achieve in those disciplines. And it's a fascinating thing to do. And there's not much research out there. Okay.

Dr. Groth: Okay. We'll go to the last question. The last question and Megan will you please read it.

Megan Carbon: All right. The last question is from Michael McDermott who's from Sweden. He asks, do you see male studies evolving into an international academic subject and what will the defining differences between male studies and men's studies be?

Dr. Groth: Dr. Young?

Dr. Young: There is a huge conference about to take place in Singapore bringing together all the Asian countries on the topic of men. So if it's going to go international? It is going international.

>> And in regard to male studies vs. men's studies, I don't want to replicate women's studies. I think we want to have the next generation of studies. And that is as Dennis here has pointed out, he's created courses in literature and using literature that develop male-positive attitudes toward men and male-positive experiences for the men themselves. And when I cited the foundation research and I said there were articles on every type of species, but human species, male studies as I envision it will be the creation of a critical body of information. And I say critical and academic in history, anthropology, literature, sociology, family law, biology,

medicine, and I could go on and on. And so while it has been said that there have been men's studies, I think that the intent here is to go beyond the paradigm of women's studies or men's studies, to go into the study of this, the phenomenon of the male in our species. And I don't think this is a zero-sum game.

And I want one last piece now because from the time I've been a young professional, I've heard about the glass ceiling. And my, my own daughter I tried to make sure she got beyond the glass ceiling by -- her name is Jared -- a name that when she calls up or leaves her name for an interview, Jared, well, she could get a call back they wouldn't quite know what gender she was. Well, I feel there's a new phenomenon and I refer to it as the lace ceiling, L-A-C-E. The lace ceiling. We as males can see through it, but we can't get through it. And then there's the lace curtain. And this lace curtain is dominated by policies that command resources that drive an industry, a gendered industry that does not see -- that does not see the -- that there are two -- two of us out there. And so, I feel that again, in terms of male studies we need policy to redirect resources to get beyond this phenomenon of the lace ceiling and the lace curtain which every member of our panel has described.

Dr. Groth: One brief further comment from Dr. Nathanson on the caller and then we'll proceed to the wrap-up by Christina.

Dr. Nathanson: Okay. I'll try to be brief. I think that one of the questions that was asked and both having unbiased scholarly research and this subject had come up several times on the panel. And I agree with that would certainly be my goal. One of the problems though is that the current fashion in the academic world being post-modernism which basically denies that you can have objective research. And that could be -- there could be a conference or a book

on that subject alone. I guess my answer to that is that it's true that there's probably no such thing as 100 percent perfect objectivity. On the other hand, I see no reason to let that stop us from trying. You know, scholarship it is not an all or nothing game. You have to try and if you can't achieve perfection then you just keep trying.

Dr. Groth: Okay.

Dr. Sommers: I'll go first. Some years ago the New York Times ran a story about Hispanic Girls: Most Likely to Drop Out. It was a headline, and it was in fact very alarming high rates of dropping out and every conceivable academic problem. But buried in paragraph six I read this line: "The only group more likely to drop out are Hispanic boys." And considerably more of those boys -- I was so astonished I called up the reporter and I said, you know, it was sort of comical that you would say -- and she said well, I didn't write the headline. But I said well, still you did write -- she said well, it was because the American Association of University Women had come out with a study on Hispanic girls. And she said I'm sure there'll be something on boys and then we'll do something on the boys. Well, that was a few years back, there haven't been any studies anywhere that, of the caliber of what they had done on Hispanic girls or not with the resources. The studies just have not been done. That has to be fixed. Now, many of my comments I've been somewhat critical of the feminist establishment, but I want to conclude by saying that there's a lot that can be learned. It's true that girls at one time had serious deficits in math, in spacial reasoning, in particular, and through efforts by the women's organizations and lobbying. There was a bit of a national that just galvanized around this problem and young women have been strengthened. And they are, you know, as we know, very, very strong in showing now in almost every academic discipline great

improvement. The only problem is at the time that we discovered girls' deficits in math and science, we should have been doing it for young men and reading and writing and well, just about everything else as well. But we should have started with that sort of parity. So what I say is that where the women's groups have done a good job and they have strengthened young women, let's figure out what they did and imitate it. And we can do that, but we don't have to imitate the ideological extremes they went to in denigrating the opposite sex, but I think we can learn a lot and improve the condition of young men in this country.

Dr. Tiger: Ed Stephens has done a very valuable service in reminding us of male dingoes and shrimp and all of that other maleness business because in fact as Darwin understood, the context between male and female animates the universe. And we have to have a (unintelligible) position on what those males are and how they interact with those females. And so there's a natural science component here, I've already complained about the gap between natural and social science at universities, which I think is punishing to everybody. But I think if we want to -- Christina has nobly suggested benefit from what has worked as she's talked about what feminist activity has yielded in the positive sense. We can look at the environmental movement, for example, as one way of reviewing the issue of what has to be done.

About 30, 40 years ago maybe it was in the 50s, Rachel Carson wrote a book The Sea Around Us which as we know now was sort of flawed and amateur and whatever, but she told us that the sea could be polluted, the huge sea, so big and yet you could ruin it and the air that, the huge air, you could ruin the air. And so we've very recently paid attention to the environment and have an environmental movement which has had its successes and it has to be watched constantly and it will be, you can be certain. But I think that's to deal with the

outer environment, what we need now as a community of scholars and citizens and following on Ed's very lucid, straightforward concern about male studies is an inner environmental movement.

We are far more likely to study the impact the impact of copra on fish in the Pacific than we are to look at the impact of, for example, seats in classes on the behavior of males. Males don't like to sit still. They are constantly moving. You can go to any primate community in the world and you will see the males jumping around, the females will be sitting grooming, playing with kids. And so enormous differences. We standardize these differences in schools because we haven't paid attention to the inner environment of the students. We paid attention to the outer environment of the school.

So if we are to reconfigure our approach to this we have to do it both humbly and with considerable amount of ambition which is to create an inner environmental movement in which we begin looking at not only at nature, but at human nature. Because human nature is essentially our instrument, it's our being, and it's the both fruit of and victim of what we decide to do.

So it seems to me that we've had a set of varied convictions on this, but all focused on the notion that we're not comfortable with things as they are and it may be that the time has arrived to take a sense of innocence and rediscover the obvious.

Dr. Groth: We end this teleconference with the announcement that the first annual conference on male studies which will be held on October 1st and 2nd. Thank you. On October 1st and 2nd. The first annual conference on Male Studies, October 1st and 2nd at the New York Academy of Medicine here in New York. Teleconferees are asked to consult the conference web page where they can -- where they registered for instructions on submitting

proposals for that conference. Those proposals will be reviewed by members of today's panel and other scholars. We invite contributions from anthropology, biology, economics, education, the fine arts, history, law, medicine, psychology, public policy, and sociology.

Some words of thanks and recognition of those who have made this conference possible. First and foremost, my friend Edward Stephens, M.D., co-founder and chair of the On Step Institute and now director of the newly founded -- Foundation for Male Studies. His vision and guidance are at the heart of today's initiatives.

Next my thanks to our conference moderators and panelists. Chip Capraro, Dennis Gouws, Paul Nathanson, Christina Hoff Sommers, Lionel Tiger, and Katherine Young. Our special online respondents, one of whom we heard, unfortunately some communication flaws prevented us from hearing from Lauren Farrel(SP?), Judith Kleinfeld, Geo Tromble(SP?). And those who submitted questions for the panelists during the course of the colloquium whom we heard. Other questions to the panel may be submitted online at the website where you registered and certainly that holds true for those of us, those of you who are here today.

Special thanks are extended to Richard Elton Byne who coordinated the outreach to media that brought to our session today representatives of *Newsweek* magazine, *Cosmopolitan*, *Canada's National Post*, and our own local *Staten Island Advance*. Special recognition is due to Notovitz Communication, Joseph Notovitz, Director of Staff of the Media Services and Information Technology Department at Wagner College here. Andy Gruda, Michael Brillante and their colleagues -- whom I've known for many years -- who working together with Joe made today's web-air teleconference the remarkable international event it has been. And I want to thank Megan Carbon, a graduate senior in psychology at Wagner, who has served as liaison between the Foundation for Men's Studies and Wagner College in collaboration with Mrs. Minnie Elton Byne, her work on our project has been indispensable.

I want to also thank our special guests who made an effort to attend today. We wish there were time to have heard from all of you. Roy Den Hollander, Esq., Malina Saval, the author of The Secret Lives of Boys who's here from California for this visit. David Green, Joyce Beckwith, Roy Norman, Dr. Robert Morris, Michelle Morris, Robyn Munford and Alexander Corder(SP?).

Finally, I want to recognize and thank the young men here, representing the Men's Project at Wagner College. They're my students. I learn from them. They're my friends. And especially for them and for other young men and boys across the globe that male studies will be of single importance. I dedicate our conference to them. To their young lives and prospects. Kevin Burke, Billy Jock, Jonathan, Kyle Glover, Andy Hager, J.D. Messina.

On behalf of all here today, participants and guests, teleconferees and those whose financial support has made the event possible, we thank you for taking part in today's colloquium on Male Studies: A New Academic Discipline and look forward to seeing you in the fall. Bye bye.