masculinity encouraged in these magazines is of a prolonged adolescence which advocates hedonism, irresponsibility and heterosexual lubricity, particularly when faced with relationship demands from women. Absence of friendship possibilities with women is evident with the new men's magazines positioning females in stereotypical ways, as sexual objects and as essentially different from men (Nixon 1996).

The rise of the new lifestyle magazines for men became possible as a consequence of the 'gendering' of masculinity provoked by feminism and the growth of consumer culture in the 1970s and 1980s. However, while the new men images were recognised as cultural construction, the new laddish forms of masculinity, although also social constructions, were perceived as 'natural' and thus needed no defence of their expression (Jackson *et al.* 2001). Thus, despite significant sociological shifts in the 1980s and 1990s, hegemonic masculinity remains securely intact with the new men's magazines generally representing a white heterosexual male culture. With few exceptions, for example, *Attitude*, which explicitly appeals to both gay and heterosexual male readers, the men's lifestyle magazines all affirm male readers' heterosexuality (Edwards 1997; Nixon 1996). However, they also reveal the instabilities and ambivalences of dominant forms of masculinities (Jackson *et al.* 2001). It is through these ambiguities, which may disrupt hegemonic masculinity, that these magazines offer alternative ways of perceiving masculinity and provide access to multiple masculinities.

References and further reading

Chapman, R. (1988) 'The great pretender: variations on the new man theme', in R. Chapman and J. Rutherford (eds) *Male Order*, London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Cook, J. (2000) 'Men's magazines at the millennium', *Continuum*, 14 (2): 171–86.

Edwards, T. (1997) *Men in the Mirror*, London: Cassell.

Gilbert, P. and Taylor, S. (1991) *Fashioning the Feminine*, Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Jackson, P., Stevenson, N. and Brooks, K. (2001) *Making Sense of Men's Magazines*, Cambridge: Polity.

Mort, F. (1996) *Cultures of Consumption*, London: Routledge.

Nixon, S. (1996) *Hard Looks*, London: UCL Press.

Patterson, M. and Elliott, R. (2002) 'Negotiating masculinities', *Consumption, Markets and Culture*, 5 (3): 231–46.

Schirato, T. and Yell, S. (1999) 'The "new" men's magazines and the performance of masculinity', *Media International Australia*, 92: 81–90.

Tincknell, E., Chambers, D., Van Loon, J. and Hudson, N. (2003) 'Begging for it', *Feminist Media Studies*, 3 (1): 47–63.

See also: culture and representation

HELEN HATCHELL

MEN'S MOVEMENT

The men's movement is made up of networks of men self-consciously involved in activities related to men and gender. It emerged in the late 1960s and 1970s in Western countries, alongside and often in response to the women's movement and feminism. The men's movement, comprised of groups, networks, organisations and events, engages in a variety of activities from self-help and support to political lobbying and activism.

The men's movement is distinct from other mobilisations comprised largely of men, such as the gun lobby or early trade unions, by its self-conscious orientation towards gender issues. Twentieth-century men's movements have historical precedents such as organised male support for women's suffrage in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (John and Eustance 1997). While the term 'men's movement' is useful in capturing the array of activities and organisations through which men have explored and contested gender relations, the term is problematic in several ways. In contrast to most other social movements, the men's movement has had a largely therapeutic focus, is internally contradictory, and is composed of members of a privileged group.

The men's movement has been preoccupied with therapeutic goals, showing

stronger affinities with self-help movements than with movements centred on social change. Much men's movement activity, and that in men's groups in particular, is oriented towards personal growth and healing. This reflects the intertwined influences of therapy and counselling on the one hand and spiritual and 'New Age' cultures on the other. Common goals among men's movement participants include finding support and intimacy among other men in a community of men, healing from past hurts and injustices, and developing positive identities 'as men'. Some participants are also involved in or have come from twelve-step programmes, counselling groups and psychology, and some participate also in alternative spiritual events and communities.

However, recognition is growing that personal growth and the reconstruction of individual masculinities are useless without an accompanying shift in the social relations and ideologies that support or marginalise different ways of being men. One wing of the men's movement engages in increasingly politicised and often anti-feminist campaigns on such issues as family law and domestic violence. In some men, the men's movement has always been a tool for social and political change, whether through anti-violence activism or radical cross-dressing to confuse gender boundaries.

The men's movement shares with many other social movements a preoccupation with identity. The women's, black and gay and lesbian movements which erupted in the late twentieth century were characterised by 'identity politics', the articulation of social identities as the basis of collective mobilisation and resistance to oppression. The profound phrase 'the personal is political', coined by early second-wave feminists, embodied the recognition that women's everyday and personal lives are shaped by power relations, often unjust and oppressive, and therefore are a necessary part of the terrain of political activism (hooks 1997).

The men's movement's engagement with identity and personal experience has been less politicised than that of these other movements. For many participants, examining one's personal life is a means to personal growth and interpersonal intimacy rather than to radical political consciousness. At the same time, the more politicised wings of the men's movement, both pro- and anti-feminist, have taken up differing forms of identity politics. In the early 1970s, anti-sexist men's groups, inspired directly by the women's movement, adopted consciousness-raising in small all-male groups to reflect critically on their involvements in sexism and to build non- or anti-sexist identities (Hornacek 1977). Contemporary pro-feminist men's groups continue this tradition, using group discussion, education and social marketing. From a very different political direction, men's and fathers' rights groups draw on their members' experiences to articulate a public vision of men and/or fathers as the victims of a man-hating social and legal system.

Nor has the men's movement followed the same trajectory as other movements centred on identity politics, in which there has been an increasing questioning and destabilisation of the identities on which mobilisation was first based. Identity politics involves potentially contradictory impulses, essentialist and deconstructionist (West 1990). However, only the more feminist-informed strands of the men's movement have paid much attention to deconstructing male identities and masculinities. This draws on feminist scholarship on the social construction of gender, although less so on recent and more philosophical feminist debates regarding the category 'woman' and its deployment. Elsewhere, essentialist tendencies are more apparent, whether in Jungian-inspired accounts of transcultural masculine archetypes, ahistorical accounts of men's 'natural' place at the head of the family, or biologically determinist defences of male aggression. More widely, the crude stereotypes of male and female psychology offered by pop-psychological authors hold sway among many men's movement participants.

The men's movement's agendas and understandings can be understood in terms of five

overlapping strands: men's liberation, anti-sexist or profeminist, men's rights and fathers' rights, spiritual and mythopoetic, and Christian. The men's liberation strand argues that men are hurt by the male 'sex role' and that men's lives are alienating, unhealthy and impoverished. This perspective, perhaps the dominant one, focuses on the damage, isolation and suffering inflicted on boys and men through their socialisation into manhood. While the anti-sexist strand acknowledges men's pain, it gives greater emphasis to male privilege and gender inequalities. Clatterbaugh (1990) describes the first of these tendencies as 'liberal profeminism' and the second as 'radical profeminism'. Liberal profeminist men stress that both men and women are constricted by gender roles, and some say that men, like women, are 'oppressed'. And in saying this, some versions of men's liberation slide into men's rights.

Men's rights and fathers' rights advocates also argue that men's roles are damaging to men, but blame women or feminism for the harm done to men, deny any idea of men's power, and argue that men are now the real victims. For some advocates, feminism has largely achieved its goals and women have more choices, while men are still stuck in traditional masculine roles. For others, 'feminazis' are involved in a conspiracy to discriminate against men and cover up violence against them (Flood 2004).

Mythopoetic men derive their thinking from Jungian psychology, especially through the work of Bly (1990). Masculinity is seen as based on deep unconscious patterns and archetypes that are revealed through myths, stories and rituals. By exploring these, men can 'heal' and restore their psychospiritual health.

Another strand of men's movement activity with a spiritual focus is Christian, with the best-known example being the Promise Keepers. This network defines itself as a Christ-centred ministry dedicated to uniting men through vital relationships to become godly influences in their world (Claussen 2000). Such groups are primarily evangelical and fundamentalist and favour a return to traditional gender relations.

The most feminist and politically progressive wing of the men's movement is also the smallest. Profeminist men emphasise that men must take responsibility for their own sexist behaviours and attitudes and work to change those of men in general. Many advocates distance themselves from the men's movement, which they see as defending men's privilege. While they often work in all-male groups, they also build alliances and coalitions with other progressive movements such as feminism and anti-racism.

The most unusual aspect of the men's movement is that it represents a movement by members of a dominant or privileged group. It is more typical for people on the subordinate side of a set of power relations to generate social movements. The men's movement involves groups and activities aimed at both the defence of men's privilege and its abolition. The term 'men's movement' invites the misleading assumption that this movement is the male equivalent of the women's movement. Given the reality of pervasive gender inequalities which benefit men as a group, collective mobilisations among men cannot have the same meaning or trajectory as mobilisations among women.

The experience of personal crisis, and especially of separation and divorce, is a common path to men's participation in the men's movement. Having gone through deeply painful marriage break-ups, men join men's groups in search of solace, support or justice. Other men join out of realisations that they have no close male friends, they lack intimacy and community, their working lives are meaningless and soul-destroying, or the traditionally masculine lives they have tried to lead are hollow and corrupt. Some men find their way to the men's movement in dealing with substance abuse and addiction, violence, anger or sexuality. While the men's movement is largely heterosexual, small numbers of gay men participate.

Second-wave feminism tapped into a widespread frustration and resentment among women, speaking to the domestic isolation, dependency and abuse they suffered. Women continue to join the women's movement through realising the ways in which their lives are constrained by gender. While some men's paths to the men's movement are broadly similar, men's and women's contrasting social positions mean that these paths also are different. There are certainly areas of male suffering to which the men's movement speaks, but there is not the same potential for an explosion of consciousness or social catharsis among men. Many men experience their involvement in gender relations as normal, natural and invisible, and many experience privileges and benefits under the current gender order.

Because men in general are privileged in relation to gender, their collective mobilisation involves the danger of enhancing this privilege (Flood 2003). This is apparent in the energetic and masculinist activism being conducted by men's rights and fathers' rights groups. At the same time, men have other interests that can be mobilised in more egalitarian directions, such as their concerns for personal health and well-being, investments in their intimate, familial and social relations with women and girls, collective interests in community well-being, and their ethical, political or spiritual commitments.

Over the past decade, men's movements have undergone proliferation, professionalisation and institutionalisation. Men's groups and networks have spread across the globe. While their preoccupations are shaped by local and regional formations of gender, Western and especially US understandings have a global influence, reflecting patterns of Western political and intellectual hegemony in both publishing and internet communication.

Issues of men and gender have been taken up by community and social sectors and to a lesser extent articulated in government policy. This trend is most apparent in three areas: fathering, men's health and boys' education. For example, in Western countries since the late 1990s, policy interest has been growing concerning the need to promote fathers' involvement in families. In the US there is bipartisan support for new fatherhood initiatives promoting 'responsible fatherhood' through increasing fathers' contact and co-residence with their children and strengthening marriage. Nevertheless, compared with most other social movements, men's movements have had relatively little direct involvement in policy-making.

Community and social sectors also have taken up 'men's issues'. Men's movement activity, including men's groups and male practitioners within workplaces, has been influential in shaping overt attention to men among health and welfare agencies. However, in Australia and elsewhere, it is often women who have advocated for and initiated programmes on men's health, fathering, and so on. And there has been growing demand for such services from men and fathers themselves (Russell *et al.* 1999).

Considerable controversy surrounds the attention to men and gender being shown by governments and community sectors. Some initiatives are criticised for reinstating or reinforcing patterns of male advantage, treating males as an homogenous and disadvantaged group, or taking away fresources from women.

There is also growing professionalisation. Community courses, training programmes and university curricula focused on men's issues have proliferated, such as those concerning men's health or work with male perpetrators of violence. Such trends have both advantages and disadvantages. On the one hand, they signal the establishment of men's issues as legitimate areas of government and public concern, and they involve the development of 'best practice' standards in working with men. On the other, such trends can deradicalise and de-politicise men's movement activism (to the extent that this activity was radical to begin with), and their corporatist and entrepreneurial emphases diverge from

potential emphases on community development and grassroots mobilisation.

References and further reading

Bly, R. (1990) *Iron John*, Dorset: Addison-Wesley.
Clatterbaugh, K. (1990) *Contemporary Perspectives on Masculinity*, Boulder, CO and Oxford: Westview.
Claussen, D.S. (2000) *The Promise Keepers*, Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
Flood, M. (2003) 'Men's collective struggles for gender justice', in M. Kimmel, J. Hearn and R. Connell (eds) *The Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
—— (2004) 'Backlash', in S.E. Rossi (ed.) *The Battle and Backlash Rage on*, Philadelphia, PA: Xlibris Press, pp. 261–78.
hooks, b. (1997) 'Feminism,' in S. Kemp and J. Squires (eds) *Feminisms*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
Hornacek, P. (1977) 'Anti-sexist consciousness raising groups for men,' in J. Snodgrass (ed.) *A Book of Readings*, Albion, CA: Times Change.
John, A.V. and Eustance, C. (eds) (1997) *The Men's Share?* London: Routledge
Messner, M.A. (1997) *Politics of Masculinities*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Russell, G., Barclay, L., Edgecombe, G., Donovan, J., Habib, G., Callaghan, H. and Pawson, Q. (1999) *Fitting Fathers into Families*, Canberra: Commonwealth Dept of Family and Community Services.
West, D. (1990) *Authenticity and Empowerment*, London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

See also: masculinity politics; men's groups; men's rights; mythopoetic movement; profeminism

MICHAEL FLOOD

MEN'S PRACTICES, INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE

'Men's practices' includes the critical examination of men's actions and practices, both individually and as a gender political category.

While masculinity may not be real in any fixed, discernible form, its consequences as men's practices certainly are. The myths, illusions, stereotypes which surround masculinity – indeed, serve to invest it with meaning – are not in themselves grounded in any fundamental order, in which case we can recognise their transient state, their impermanence and contingency. However, masculinity's power lies in its potency as a male signifier thereby offering the masculine subject, man, a means of identification within the social world. Man cannot achieve this identification, it is a process, an expression of identity work which men must engage with constantly, albeit largely unknowingly, and within the social milieu. It is from such engagements that men's practices emerge. Put simply, from this perspective the search for identity informs, if not drives, the practice and not vice versa.

The critical study of men and masculinity arises from this concern with men's practices and how such practices, individually and collectively, inform or constitute a gender order, hegemonic condition (Connell 1995) or discursive framework (Whitehead 2002). So it is important to note that men's practices are political. That is, they are enacted by individuals who are themselves located in a political category, and not by choice but by gender. The implications for this in respect of understanding men are profound. For example, male violence can be seen as a dimension of masculinity, but at the same time it is a form of male practice with powerful political overtones. The history of men has many dimensions, but violence is arguably one of the most important, not least because male violence often sustains men's dominance. So men's individual violences connect directly and irrevocably to the gender category of men (see Hearn 1998). Individual men may not recognise this connection, but at a social level it is there. As individual men, we represent the male species or political category of men. So our practices as men are political and influential, whether such practices are positive or negative. For example, when individual or groups of men espouse non-violence and respond in such a way, that response, as practice, signals the potential for all men to be non-violent. In this way the practices of individual men connect directly or indirectly to political movements within the category of

men, thereby illustrating the potential for change or a rejection of change within men.

Men are always more than simply men. We cannot attach any clear meaning to an individual simply by identifying them as a man. We must go beyond that and into the realms of the social web from which, individuals come to be and represent 'themselves'. So dimensions of class, ethnicity, age, race, nationhood, religion, sexuality, health, are some of the key effects, which individually and together, conspire to produce the individual that is 'man'. Each of these areas has investment in and is given meaning through specific practices which in turn serve to reinforce their cultural significance and meaning. So the health, sexuality or religion of individual men manifests itself through the practices of those men. In this we can see the direct, if not seamless, connection between the individual and the collective. This connection is given added poignancy once we recognise the fragility of masculinity. For it can be argued that it is only through the practices of men that masculinity is made real.

This connection between men's practices and the collective that is 'men' offers us a glimpse of the circularity that continues to sustain gender. Men's practices emerge from the conditions of possibility that are offered to them through powerful ideological or discursive regimes (e.g. sexuality, ethnicity, class, work) and which are central to their life course and experience. In taking up these gendered practices individual men practise masculinity while simultaneously contributing to the identification of a collective that is men. There seems little chance of breaking this circularity, not least because arguably the key driver behind this process is the desire to be (a man). So all men's practices are, at base, related to some form of gender signification, or masculine identification, process. To be sure, there may well be the more instrumental pursuit of power, control, dominance or material accumulation, also driving these practices. However, to posit all men's practices as a drive for dominance is to slip back into a biological determinism which assumes all men have an inner urge to dominate women and other men. Self-evidently this is not the case, so we have to look beyond the pursuit of power to the pursuit of identity to understand how men's practices are sustained, while recognising that male power may well be reinforced through exactly these same practices. For to be sure, all men must have an identity, not least because such identities are not offered them through biology but through engagement with the social (see McNay 2000).

Recognising men's practices in this way takes us towards a recognition that men can change. There is nothing inevitable about men and their maleness which requires men to always behave and respond in a certain way. So men's practices should be seen as indicative of their possibilities, not indicative of their limits. This makes the critical study of men and masculinity all the more significant, not least because the sheer contingency of men and masculinity requires us to constantly examine and interrogate their actions and behaviours. In other words, there is no final answer to men, and indeed no finite, closed definition of them. As with their practices, all is open to possibility.

References and further reading

Connell, R. (1995) *Masculinities*, Cambridge: Polity.
Hearn, J. (1998) *The Violences of Men*, London: Sage.
McNay, L. (2000) *Gender and Agency*, Cambridge: Polity.
Whitehead, S.M. (2002) *Men and Masculinities: Key Themes and New Directions*, Cambridge: Polity.

See also: gender order; identity; masculinity/masculinities; masculinity politics; men

STEPHEN M. WHITEHEAD

MEN'S RELATIONS WITH MEN

Men's relations with men structure the practices, processes and cultures of a wide variety of social contexts. Homosocial bonds have a profound influence on men's friendships with