



IN THE

MAN

MAN

MAN

QUESTION

MAN

MAN

Male Subordination and Privilege

MAN

MAN

NANCY E. DOWD

The Man Question

Male Subordination and Privilege

Nancy E. Dowd



NEW YORK UNIVERSITY PRESS

New York and London

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY PRESS
New York and London
www.nyupress.org

© 2010 by New York University
All rights reserved

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Dowd, Nancy E., 1949–
The man question : male subordination and privilege / Nancy E. Dowd.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN-13: 978-0-8147-2005-9 (cl : alk. paper)
ISBN-10: 0-8147-2005-6 (cl : alk. paper)
ISBN-13: 978-0-8147-2094-3 (ebook)
ISBN-10: 0-8147-2094-3 (ebook)
1. Men—Legal status, laws, etc. 2. Sex and law. 3. Masculinity.
4. Fatherhood. 5. Feminist theory. I. Title.
K645.D69 2010
305.31—dc22 2010011998

New York University Press books are printed on acid-free paper,
and their binding materials are chosen for strength and durability.
We strive to use environmentally responsible suppliers and materials
to the greatest extent possible in publishing our books.

Manufactured in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Toward a New Theory of Feminist Jurisprudence

What does masculinities theory add to feminist theory? How is feminist theory advanced, enriched, solidified by adding the insights of this scholarship? There is no doubt that masculinities theory and applications enrich gender understanding, analysis, and strategizing. At the same time, there is the potential to obfuscate and hide a justified continued primary focus on women's inequality with false notions of symmetry. The greatest promise may lie in the more nuanced understanding of the replication of power amid an ideology of equality.

Insights from the Theoretical Work of Masculinities Scholars

Masculinities scholarship suggests a series of insights about men that are critical for gender analysis. I list them here as a distillation from the scholarship explored in chapter 3.

1. *Men are not universal or undifferentiated.* This is a very important insight, although it seems particularly simple and unremarkable. Much of feminist theory presumes universality, or that the benefit of manhood is universal enough to justify treating men as a class. It is important to see men as residing within another hierarchy, a hierarchy of men, as well as sometimes losing the "benefit" of being a man entirely. In order to dismantle male privilege it is critical to recognize that not all men are similarly situated and that gender privilege may even be trumped by another characteristic or by non-conformity to gender norms. It is also a core insight of masculinities theory that manhood is experienced by men as something constantly to be achieved, not something simply attained and lived. This instability is critically linked to hierarchy among men. It also is apparent from the research on boys that the transition in adolescence to manhood is particularly challenging and pushes

toward the most traditional, conservative, inegalitarian definition of manhood, yet at the same time young or younger men may generate new lived patterns of masculinity as they try to attain it. Differentiation, hierarchy, and even the negation of privilege may also suggest that gender is only a rough indicator of inequality, not an absolute.

Do differences among men open up opportunities for collaboration by revealing the hierarchy and destabilizing its power? Or will men close ranks in defense of gender privilege, even if they might not be the ones to enjoy it? Differences among men at a minimum suggest the need to calibrate policy and pay attention to men who might be differently situated so that they are not ignored or disproportionately burdened.

2. *Men pay a price for privilege.* Even the most privileged men exercise privilege at a cost. This insight means that we have simply ignored certain issues because clearing away privilege comes first. Yet uncovering the price paid might be a way to undermine privilege or to understand the appeal of seeking or having it. One example of the price paid for privilege is military service. Military service, in the form of registration for a potential draft and, more generally, the predominant sacrifice of men's bodies in war as epitomized by their exclusive role in ground combat and other forms of direct combat, reflects both the association of men with military service and the role of warrior/soldier/military leader, as well as more generally associating men and masculinity with violence, in this case, with the focused violence and destructiveness of war. Men's association with military service and war confers privilege, most notably, the notion of full citizenship because of the literal sacrifice of their bodies. Military service is prized as a qualification for political leadership and generates entitlement to benefits including educational and health benefits. The price paid, however, is significant. Most importantly, it is men that we sacrifice in times of war. Although women increasingly play an important role in the military, it is men that we expect to carry the burden. Women have not embraced this burden or responsibility as part of equality; it remains culturally normative to support equality but resist military service as necessary to achieve equality. The military remains "male" in culture and training, disadvantaging women but also limiting men and reinforcing a traditional male definition of masculinity by its continued discrimination against women and on the basis of sexual orientation. It thereby manifests very directly the traditional masculine command not to be like a girl or to be gay. It can represent hypermasculinity in what is rewarded and

taught. The example of the military also raises the question of what changes would constitute equality if we presume the military as essential but no longer want the military or the obligation of service to be gendered.

A second example of the price for privilege is the position of men in wage work. While men as a class benefit from a favored position in wage work, the price of that privilege is the unrelenting pressure to be a breadwinner, which as currently constructed exacts a price in the burdens of particular work, the burdens imposed on men who do not meet the masculinity standard, and the undermining of men's role as caregivers. Breadwinner expectations have translated into male work privilege but also into the structuring of work around a norm that separates the worker from his family and assumes that work comes first. Patterns of gender segregation at work are often linked to wage differentials that push strongly toward a pattern of men being the dominant or sole breadwinner. Men's absence from caregiving work, their secondary role, or their struggle to be an equal partner or the primary caregiver reflects the burden attached to the reinforcement given to perform wage work. The sacrifices men make are often viewed as heroic and necessary rather than tragic. A reimagination of men's work/family role would require massive structural and cultural changes in the wage workplace.

There are consequences associated with the demands of masculinity that are apparent in the demographics of men and boys. Men's health is clearly affected by the stresses and demands of masculinity and the refusal to seek out care, physical or mental, when care is needed. Boys' rate of injury as well as their higher rate of completed suicide, and their rate of victimization from crime as well as commission of crime, are all data that reflect the demands and burdens of masculinity norms. Perhaps the saddest example of the burdens of privilege is the consensus among researchers of men and boys that social and cultural masculinity norms reinforce emotional limitations that play out lifelong in a lack of empathy and difficulties with intimate relationships including both friendships and partnerships, whether heterosexual or homosexual. The emotional life of men is stunted and limited, as a group. This is a price that affects every aspect of their well-being. It also, I suggest, has an impact on their leadership and perspective.

That privilege would be embraced with such a price exposes the strength and attraction of male privilege. The price paid becomes justification and entitlement. Would exposing the price change the dynamic? Certainly, it is indefensible to ignore the disadvantages and burdens of men; to do so would undermine the powerful equality claim of feminist theory. But it is equally

indefensible to argue that men's priorities should come second because they are combined with privilege. In part this is because the price of masculinity is often intertwined with women's inequalities and the benefits conferred to the subordinate. This complex inequality dynamic is critical for feminists to explore, understand, and address. Simplistic either/or approaches (either women or men) or prioritizing inequalities (women are more unequal) move us away from comprehending that we need to understand the interactive nature of men's and women's inequalities and privileges.

3. *Intersections of manhood particularly with race, class, and sexual orientation are critical to the interplay of privilege and disadvantage, to hierarchies among men, and to factors that may entirely trump male gender privilege.* There are scholars who have urged us to pay attention to what happens at the intersections of critical characteristics, both when privilege is reinforced and when it is undermined (e.g., Ehrenreich 2002). Dismantling male privilege means understanding how it is constructed. Intersectionality suggests how men remain committed to and supportive of male privilege even when they do not benefit from the most favored male position. Hegemony importantly includes the concept that those who are subordinated may be complicit in the structure of hierarchy. Among men that pattern seems apparent at the intersections that create hierarchy among men. One of the most interesting patterns from men of color is the potential they open up for a different model or models of masculinity, while at the same time displaying a hypermasculinity in response to the denial of privilege. This might translate into a goal to achieve the power/privilege of a white man and only then turn to issues of gender equality with women. In the civil rights struggle, the sign claiming personhood reads "I Am a Man." It should not be read to suggest "give me the privileges of hegemonic masculinity, and then we can begin to talk about gender equality."

Just as significantly, the primacy of race in the masculinities hierarchy reinforces how patriarchy is racialized and how that plays out for men and women. The linkage across gender lines suggests that feminists should give greater attention to the place of race in the construction of gender and more generally embrace race as a feminist issue.

4. *Masculinity is a social construction, not a biological given.* This conclusion is widely held among masculinities scholars; it directly contradicts social mythology that reinforces gender essentialism and gender difference.

Masculinity is a set of practices that one constantly engages in or must perform; it is fluid, not fixed. This opens the hope that masculinity can change and that it is plural, not unitary. Historical analysis confirms that the concepts of masculinity have changed over time and thus can change again. But just as women experience their gender as powerful and fixed, so too do men experience their masculinity.

5. *Hegemonic masculinity recognizes that one masculinity norm dominates multiple masculinities.* Unlike the feminist norm of equality, albeit with much debate about what constitutes equality for women, hegemonic masculinity is a negative norm in relation to equality. The focus is on the negative mold rather than an alternative, egalitarian one. This may provide feminists with more ammunition to describe how this norm infuses cultural, social, and structural norms. It also suggests that there are alternative or subversive masculinities that might provide an alternative model or that would suggest opportunities for collaboration. As many masculinities scholars have pointed out, it is the rare man who meets the hegemonic masculinity standard. Indeed, it is part of the standard that the norm is one you must constantly demonstrate. This demanding, unstable position may open up opportunities even as it is depressingly strong, without as strong an egalitarian alternative. The dominance of this negative standard bears some similarity to the critique of the dominance of American or Western norms in feminist theory. To the extent that feminists have reflected on their own position and issues, there is a similar critique of the focus of masculinities on the concerns of the most privileged of men. So in identifying “problems,” masculinities and feminist theory both err in viewing problems from the vantage of the most favored and from a globally insular perspective. But in identifying egalitarian goals or models, masculinities scholarship has much to learn from feminist scholarship to imagine egalitarian masculinities.

6. *The patriarchal dividend is the benefit that all men have from the dominance of men in the overall gender order.* Identifying and naming this dividend, and showing how it operates, has been a key goal of feminist theory, particularly as facial discrimination has largely disappeared and deeper structural and cultural discrimination continues to perpetuate patriarchy. The patriarchal dividend is so pervasive that it goes largely unnoticed; it is taken-for-granted oppression. Patriarchy has not collapsed; only the idea or acceptance of it has; men’s predominance remains. While it is not equally enjoyed by all men, it is power that men as a group draw on. Even men who

reject this unearned benefit still have this advantage. Indeed, it is a challenge to articulate ways that the dividend can be rejected, as opposed to eliminating the dividend. One way of exploring the patriarchal dividend is to identify the daily examples of privilege.

7. *The two most common pieces defining masculinity are, at all costs, not to be like a woman and not to be gay.* A critical piece of masculinity is this negative definition, which is linked to issues of power and hierarchy (in addition to race and class). The rejection of things female, things associated with mothers, is lifelong. To admit weakness, to admit frailty or fragility, is to be seen as a wimp, a sissy, not a real man. The ultimate fear is to come up short in front of other men. There is much here connected to fear, shame, and emotional isolation. If these two pieces remain core to the definition of masculinity, then the ability to attack the hierarchy of men over women and of heterosexuals over homosexuals is fundamentally stalled. Subordination will be reworked but not destroyed. It seems critical to imagine or create a positive definition of what it means to be a man, but this simple goal seems strangely difficult and is largely ignored.

One of the most important potential places to look for alternatives is to explore in greater depth the masculinities of minority men and gay men. Minority men may provide a model, but it is a complicated one, since subversive masculinities are both resistant and complicit. That very complexity, however, may teach us much more than looking at hegemonic males. Focusing on males who are more at the margin of masculinities may be more revealing.

8. *Masculinity is as much about relation to other men as it is about relation to women.* The importance of this insight cannot be sufficiently underscored. Much of feminist theory has focused on women's relationship or comparison to men. Some feminists have pointed out that not all women are oppressed, or not all are oppressed equally, and also have identified examples of when women have oppressed other women. For example, the structure of work and family operates differently for women depending on where they work and their income; also women employ women to do domestic and care work and frequently overwork and underpay other women, as well as pay them insufficient benefits or neglect to ensure that they are able to balance work and family for their own families. Similarly, the relationship between white women and women of color has been a vexed one, less based on solidarity

than on distrust, which poses a challenge to collaborating to identify priorities and leads to the absence of race consciousness in the women's movement and feminist scholarship.

Masculinities scholarship points out similar dynamics, but there is also an underlying dynamic in masculinity that pits every man against every man. In addition to being challenged to meet a standard of masculinity that must continuously be performed, masculinity also is a process of comparison, of measuring, that puts each man against all others. This isolation and hierarchy is not, in general, a part of women's identity or collective action. To identify equality issues as solely focusing on male/female issues, then, misses this important piece of the equality puzzle. This is an important component of what makes men "male," especially in dominantly homosocial settings.

9. *Men, although powerful, feel powerless.* This insight of masculinities scholarship seems very strange and counterintuitive. Is this sense of powerlessness linked to denial of men's power? Or does it represent a form of backlash to women's gains? Or is it a central component to men's masculinity, linked to their constant measuring against other men and against the standard of masculinity, "The Big Impossible"? Whether false consciousness or real consciousness, this sense of powerlessness might explain the failure of men to be drawn by feminism or the difficulty of recruiting men to feminism, because feminism's core claim of male power does not ring true for men. It is a perception that is helpful for strategizing, although ultimately the data tend to undermine the reality of this view of things. But we have long recognized that irrationality sustains much of the unconscious as well as conscious thinking about inequalities of gender, as well as those of race, class, and sexual orientation. What may be most important is to understand that this conviction is real and stands in the way of changing consciousness of men about men and of women about men so that movement forward toward equality is possible.

10. *Masculinities study exposes how structures and cultures are gendered male.* Some of the most important work of masculinities scholarship is the strong support it provides for the feminist claim that structures, such as work, are gendered male. As Ann McGinley has suggested in the context of employment discrimination law (2004), the data and expertise of this scholarship may provide the expert testimony necessary to expose gendered cultures and structures of the workplace. In this area masculinities study has

the potential to supplement and support feminist theory in significant ways. Where this might lead is a richer debate over the vision of a truly egalitarian workplace, given that masculinities scholarship exposes not only the male imprint on work culture and structures but also the hierarchy among men within that male culture.

11. *The spaces and places that men and women daily inhabit and work within are remarkably different.* Related to the gendering of cultures and structures is the gendering of actual physical spaces. Masculinities scholars have explored a number of spaces that are male dominant, such as sports arenas and pubs. If you imagine the daily spaces where men and women function, they include a different range of spaces that we identify as male or female, as well as different spaces within locations that are gendered. Pediatrician's offices are female spaces, as are elementary school classrooms; sports fields and especially football stadiums are male spaces. Particular educational course areas and the work spaces for those areas, such as engineering and agriculture, are gendered male, while teaching and nursing are gendered female. If we followed the geography of daily life, and how spaces function, they are quite different for men and women as a whole. This different geography of life and places is important to explore, to determine how the environment (and thus areas such as zoning and planning) supports gender integration as well as gender separation and to determine the implications for equality. There are many places that are sex segregated, and we should identify them, as well as how segregation is carried out even within the appearance of integration. It would be a fascinating exercise to determine not only where men function and where women function but also how men and women interact within same-sex and mixed-sex environments.

12. *The role of men in achieving feminist goals is uncertain and unclear.* Can a man be a feminist? And if so, what would his goals be—to support feminism or to articulate goals for men that are distinctive as well as supportive of the equality project of feminism? This is a wonderful question to ask: why should men want to change? Judged from masculinities scholarship, men have little incentive to change because the pull of privilege is too great, while the pull of equality is solely moral and emotional. Changing men is far more difficult than changing women. One is opening up opportunities; the other is giving up power. The implication is that change will have to be pushed or taken; it is unlikely to be given or shared. As with the asymmetric position of masculinities to feminist theory, so too there is a difference in the relation-

ship of men and women to feminism. The most essential change for men is to imagine a different manhood, which has direct implications for the success of the feminist project. Men's most direct contribution to feminism is to focus on what masculinities scholarship exposes, while at the same time recognizing and supporting women's equality goals. There are parallels here to the relationship of whites to antiracism: their position should be one of support of the equality of people of color, while challenging the unearned skin privilege of whites. So too men can support, in the strongest possible way, women achieving equality while actively engaging in dismantling male privilege and exposing the harms of the gender hierarchy for men as well.

13. *The asymmetry of masculinities scholarship and feminist theory reflects the differences in the general position of men and women.* Masculinities scholarship is not, predominantly, about understanding and dismantling male power and privilege; instead, it is about understanding how male identity is constructed and sustained. Although this is not true of all scholars who study men, it does describe a great many, and dominant theory is much more descriptive than it is analytical or critical. At least one critic says this is not the right focus; instead of masculinity, scholars should refocus on men and men's dominance, not on the dominant form of masculinity. There are not many voices, however, talking about gender transformation or about how power is sustained. So what masculinities has to offer feminist theory, in general, is the enrichment, contextualization, and refinement of theory, as well as making men simply visible. What feminism has to offer masculinities theory, on the other hand, is a set of tools to address much more strongly inequality, subordination, and how to shift from power-over to power-with.

Implications for Feminist Theory

With these insights of masculinities scholarship in mind, the implications for feminist theory are a further refinement in analysis and methodology. I suggest how masculinities scholarship might be incorporated into feminist theory in the following series of questions and steps.

1. *Ask the "man question" in gender analysis.* Probably the most significant change in feminist theory suggested by masculinities scholarship is to include men in gender analysis by thinking about men differently. This would require asking the "man question" in gender analysis, just as the overarching question of feminist theory has been to ask questions about, and question on

behalf of, women. Asking the man question would include a number of more nuanced approaches to equality issues to benefit women, as well as making visible men's relationship to women's equality and men's unique issues of subordination, whether in relation to women or to one another.

Mari Matsuda is responsible in feminist theory and critical race theory for encouraging us to "ask the other question" (1993, 1189). When we tend to classify a particular situation or scenario as "a gender issue" or "a race issue," Matsuda encourages us to look for other forms of subordination that we might be missing, noting both how various inequalities reinforce each other and also that there is the opportunity in approaching things this way to open up opportunities for collaboration and a more robust strategy for equality. Angela Harris in a classic piece on race and gender (2000) used this same approach to ask how the Abner Louima case represented an issue not only of race subordination but also of gender subordination: how the means by which the police officers, all men, acted represented classic male subordination of another man, carried out in the hypermasculine world of police work as reinforced by a hypermasculine model of policing.

So, borrowing from Matsuda and Harris and building on their example, I suggest that asking the man question means asking the other (gender) question, the question about men, in any situation where we identify women's equality as the primary issue. We should ask, what about men or boys—are they also disadvantaged in this situation? For example, suppose that we focus on the issue of domestic violence, where women are the disproportionate victims and gender constructs play a role in the thinking of batterers. What happens when we ask the man question is that we expose situations in which men are victims but rarely report their victimization, the places where boys are direct victims or witness the victimization of others, and how boys frequently model as adults the very behavior that terrified them as children.

In addition, we might further refine the man question by asking whether all men or boys are similarly situated. We know from masculinities scholarship that frequently there are hierarchies among men and boys. So, in the domestic violence example, we might learn that men of color would be even more strongly dissuaded from using the available criminal justice remedies than would other men, and that gay men and gay youth are also likely to find the system unresponsive to their unique concerns.

A second way in which the man question should be asked is not asking the other question about potential victimization but rather asking the question of how male privilege actually functions in this situation. That is, rather

than asking how men also might be subordinated, focus more closely on the process of privilege and subordination. Would masculinities scholarship help to unravel the dynamic, and does it suggest that the dynamic is differentiated among the range of masculinities? Again, using the example of domestic violence, masculinities scholarship links it to the role of violence in constructing masculinity, the suppression of emotional learning among boys and men and its link to relationship problems, the combination of greater egalitarianism and hypermasculinity among minority men, and the core construction of masculinity as being *not* female and *not* gay. Masculinities scholarship may help construct more effective interventions with batterers, and even more effective strategies of prevention as opposed to reaction.

Finally, asking the man question also should include exploring what price men pay, both when men are privileged and when they are disadvantaged. It is clear that those who are privileged may nevertheless frequently pay a price and that privilege reinforces the price paid and ongoing subordination of others. Even when men are disadvantaged, it often plays itself out as privilege. All of this helps us to understand how dominance works, to keep the dominant tied to gender hierarchy even when it is unconscious and taken for granted. In the arena of domestic violence, men's gender privilege is directly connected to the use of violence. The price of privilege is the destruction of relationships, of families, and of self. The link between this form of violence and others is direct and significant. The gendered nature of violence has a massive impact on boys and men who are victimized along with women. We lose sight of the patterns of gender-specific violence by naming it in a way that identifies women victims, making them visible, but continuing to render invisible male-on-male violence.

2. *Including the man question does not mean shifting focus away from women; the reality is gender asymmetry.* Including men means situating women within a more realistic picture of gender subordination, while acknowledging men's subordination in that picture. It is critical to resist the notion of either/or, of choosing either women or men, of equating the position of women and men and thereby feeding into the backlash characteristic of a significant portion of the men's movement. This is the danger of "we're all harmed" feeding into "we need now to shift the focus to men/boys," when the reality is asymmetry. There is not enough focus in masculinities theory on inequality; the danger is very real because women often disappear when we look at men. For example, critics of the educational system focus on how schools fail to serve boys and how schools undermine and even damage boys'

emotional and intellectual development. The familiar claim of “boys are different” can reinforce traditional notions of gender difference and inequality. In addition, a justified focus on boys can too easily lead to a blaming of girls and to a belief that addressing the gender issues of girls is the culprit in failing to serve boys.

There is a very real difference in most gender areas in the position of women as a group and the position of men. Making men visible does not mean hiding women or claiming equal harm. This is simply a false dichotomy that must be resisted in favor of a comprehensive gender picture. Returning to the example of education, such a comprehensive picture would mean that both boys’ issues and girls’ issues should be considered, and imagining an educational system of gender equality would not necessarily be wedded to a singular model of success or assume that all boys and all girls learn in a particularly gendered way. It would also recognize how strongly schools are gendered, both formally and informally, and begin to address how that could be used positively to achieve gender equality.

3. *Gender specificity is critical in order to achieve gender equality.* If the man question in all its complexity is asked, and if the broader view of gender inequality is sustained rather than succumbing to simplistic gender prioritizing or balancing, then the next important piece is to incorporate the teaching of masculinities scholarship in strategies to achieve equality. Most importantly, there is considerable asymmetry in gender-specific goals. Although gender neutrality might be a useful goal in some situations, even neutrality might require specific strategies in order to achieve truly equal results. But to presume a single standard or a single and balanced strategy ignores the asymmetry revealed by adding masculinities scholarship to feminist theory. At the same time, and consistent with the argument that bringing men into gender analysis should not render women less important or visible, adopting gender-specific strategies requires connection between the gender-specific perspectives, rather than insularity.

An example of the importance of gender-specific strategies is balancing work and family, or our models of motherhood and fatherhood. For fathers, the dominance of the breadwinner role overshadows support for and the economic practicability of care. For mothers, social expectations and work expectations of family primacy undermine their role as workers and challenge the ability to parent in partnership or as a single caregiver

and also to stay economically afloat. The stresses of work and family affect all parents, but typically they do so differently for mothers and fathers. A linking of mothers and fathers is essential to prevent the replication of a fixed role of parenthood defined by gender and to create a vision of equality based on multiple models of parenting without reinforcing traditional gender roles.

4. *Masculinities theory reinforces central feminist positions, especially how patriarchy constructs and infuses institutions.* Masculinities theory helps to make concrete the claim that structures and culture are “male.” For example, an exploration of the juvenile justice system makes it clear that the system has assumed boys as the objects of the system and has assumed particular masculinities in understanding the predominance of boys in this system. This assumption affects boys to the extent that those constructions are inaccurate or grounded in hegemonic masculinities or stereotypes of the masculinities particularly of minority males. It also affects girls, because the system has not adjusted to the distinctive needs of girls.

Identifying how ideas of masculinity gender institutions or cultures may expose gender in the structure, but it does not necessarily provide a vision of an egalitarian structure or culture. Early feminist goals were geared toward allowing women to compete with men under the same rules. If those rules are biased toward socialization or skills identified as “male,” then only those women able to perform those masculinities and to be accepted in their performance as equal to men can achieve equality. If “female” rules are simply added to the mix, then a dual system emerges that effectively perpetuates male power by identifying it with the preferred male track. It is not easy to identify a liberatory structure that does not constrain either men or women as we try to move toward equality while being attentive to our unequal context. Nevertheless, making the case more explicitly of the “male” structures is a contribution that masculinities scholarship can make and that feminists should embrace.

5. *Masculinities scholarship reinforces the key principle of antiessentialism.* The naming of the field as plural, “masculinities,” is the simplest acknowledgment of antiessentialism. The critique of hegemonic masculinity as essentializing similarly reinforces the multiple natures of masculinities. At the same time, however, some work in the field is arguably even more essentialist than feminist theory. The struggle within both feminism and masculinities

scholarship to incorporate antiessentialism may be a way to reinforce the importance of antiessentialism to gender analysis. Antiessentialism makes attention to perspective and who is included critical. Antiessentialism also points to those at the margin as having the potential for alternative models, as well as exposing the interplay of systems of subordination and privilege. The perspective of minority men reinforces once more why race should be a core feminist issue linking men and women. By that I mean, feminist theory should embrace antiracism as a core goal, just as feminists ask men to embrace being a feminist as a core goal.

More than adding race in methodologically or considering race in the construction of priorities, as the critique of antiessentialism demands, *the insights of masculinities scholarship reinforce the need to confront and challenge racial inequality and imagine a world of racial justice at the core of the feminist agenda*. Feminists should take on race unmodified. Racial equality should be integral to sexual equality because of the interconnectedness of race and sex identities and the use of race to police gender.

Taking on race presents an opportunity for coalition with men. Doing so requires seeing connections between men and women rather than opposition, and seeing how racial patriarchy operates. It challenges strategies, whether chosen from within or imposed from without, that separate equalities instead of combining them. Equalities would be reinforced, rather than pitted against each other.

6. *Masculinities scholarship presents surprises or revelations about men that may have strategic or substantive implications*. First, privilege comes with a price. But exposing that price does not create a movement toward change in the same way that exposing women's inequalities begs solutions and strategies. Men are willing to pay the price, and women have no sympathy because male privilege remains so visible and rectifying women's inequality seems so daunting by comparison. Second, many men have a sense of powerlessness, despite their privilege, which suggests we need to refine our understanding of power and subordination, particularly how this sense of powerlessness reinforces and perpetuates male power when manhood is defined in terms of power and hierarchy.

Third, the research on boys suggests that intervening early is essential to gender change. Men's lack of empathy, and lack of emotional literacy, has been linked to childrearing patterns that are reinforced particularly by edu-

cational structures. This lack of empathy poses a significant barrier to men's relational engagement and collaboration. This seems to be so not only at an individual level but also in the drive to create stronger social commitments to equality. Changing our patterns of socialization and nurture is an extremely challenging task, yet the strong commitment of many fathers to involvement with their children presents an incredible opportunity to benefit children, fathers, and mothers.

7. *The need to create a new model of masculinity seems obvious, yet it is incredibly difficult to achieve.* The chance for collaboration between women and men, and the value of collaboration, seems obvious, and yet it also still seems unlikely. This conundrum demands more investigation and thought. It also demands good strategic thinking about what issues and strategies might generate the best possibility for collaboration.

With these insights in mind, how might a masculinities analysis actually work? In the following chapters, I consider how masculinities analysis might be applied to concrete issues. I look at boys and men in several contexts, though I do not mean to limit masculinities analysis to male subjects, just as feminist analysis has never been inherently limited to engaging only in the inequalities of women. My focus on boys and men instead is meant to suggest what we may have missed and how in each of these areas boys' and men's inequalities inevitably link back to girls and women. It exposes what masculinities scholarship can bring to feminist theory and, more importantly, to the pursuit of justice.