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Notes from the Co-Chair

We are pleased to offer this special edition of BROTHER to announce the 26th National Conference on Men & Masculinity and to show prospective members a sample of our quarterly journal which is just one of the benefits of membership in NOMAS. The contents of this issue were originally published in the Winter 2000 edition of BROTHER and closed our Silver Anniversary Year on a high note. With M&M25 NOMAS celebrated 25 years of commitment to its principles of pro-feminism, gay-affirmation, anti-racism and dedication to enhancing men’s lives. We capped this milestone conference with a full-day re-visioning during which NOMAS re-established its mandate to be a leading voice for the pro-feminist men’s movement and to renew our commitment to growth and promotion of our mission through increased membership, local chapters and a broad range of activism.

We are pleased to note that at the beginning of 2001 our membership had grown considerably and we started the year with four active and growing chapters in California, Colorado, Massachusetts and New York State. The Colorado chapter evolved from the M&M25 planning committee and they agreed to host the M&M26 in July in Denver. They have chosen MANifesting Global Justice: Creating Inclusive Communities as the theme for M&M26 to re-emphasize NOMAS’s commitment to focusing on Men and Masculinity and ways in which men can positively impact society both in the United States and around the globe.

M&M25 – 25 Years of Changing Men: History, Progress and Opportunities was an exciting conference that drew over 275 people from the Rocky Mountain states and the rest of the US and Canada to the campus of Colorado College in Colorado Springs. NOMAS received a warm welcome from the organizations and communities throughout Colorado and we are grateful to everyone who participated, especially the Gill Foundation’s Gay & Lesbian Fund for Colorado and the Women’s Foundation of Colorado for helping to fund the conference and to Curtis Hart of 2cth.com who did the design and development of our new website in time to help us promote M&M25.

NOMAS promises to be bigger and even more exciting with over 40 workshops, keynote addresses, entertainment and more including nationally known authors and speakers involved in the pro-feminist men’s movement and other activist groups. We invite your participation and welcome sponsorship from individuals, corporations and non-profit organizations who wish to help us promote equality for all people. We hope you will join us at M&M26 and consider a membership in NOMAS as a further way of demonstrating your commitment to enhancing men’s lives and the lives of all people. Please visit www.nomas.org for on-line conference updates and registration forms.

From the Editor

This special issue of BROTHER is essentially a reprint of the Winter 2000 issue which was distributed to the membership at the end of last year. The Spring issue will be published by the middle of March 2001. BROTHER is a benefit of membership of the National Conference on Men & Masculinity as well as provide a sample of the publication to a wide audience in hopes that many new voices will be included in our membership to become members of NOMAS.

We have modified this issue to fit this tabloid format to facilitate printing and mailing. We plan to mail several thousand copies of this special edition and are using a professional printer mailing house to manage this size production. As our membership and distribution of BROTHER grows we will probably move to this format for general publication issues as well.

Another version of this content will soon be published on the website at www.nomas.org/publications. We plan to post older versions shortly after each new issue has been printed and distributed. In this way, members have the benefit of receiving the publication first in hard copy format before it is made available to the general public.

So, if this is the first time you are reading a copy of BROTHER, I hope you find it interesting and enlightening. Please join us in July for the 26th National Men & Masculinity Conference in Denver, and be sure to use the membership application on page 11 to demonstrate your support of the NOMAS principles and commitment to equality for all people and to continue receiving BROTHER on a regular basis.

Become a Conference Sponsor – Advertise

NOMAS is a 501(c)3 non-profit organization dedicated to gender equality and social justice. NOMAS is seeking sponsorship and advertising for its 26th Annual Men & Masculinity Conference described at the back of this issue. We anticipate 300 full time attendees and many more who will participate in single day events. Additionally the M&M Conference is advertised nationally and locally and featured at our Internet Web site www.nomas.org. There are several types of sponsorship available including Contributor – $500; Sponsor – $1000; Benefactor – $2000; and Underwriter – over $2000. Sponsorships entitle organizations and companies to varying levels of publicity in our conference materials as well as free registrations. Advertising is available at $150 – full page; $125 – half page; $60 – quarter page and $35 for business card size. Non-profit sponsors that cannot afford a financial contribution are welcome for “in kind” arrangements. For more detail please see our website at www.nomas.org, email us at info@nomas.org or call Moshe Rozdzial at 303-666-7043.
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Corben, Allen – a graduate student of theology, multi-culturalism, and gender, works at Fuller Theological Seminary in Pasadena California. He sings in an a cappella ensemble, is husband to Margery (a pastor) and father to Mallory. He has been on the NOMAS leadership collective for four years.

David, Martin A – a long-standing member of NOMAS, Martin has published a wide variety of non-fiction including The Dancer’s Audition Book (Sterling – NY, London) and hundreds of articles for publications such as the Los Angeles Times. His short stories and poetry appear in magazines and electronically. Karpstein Was Hiding is his first published novel.

Johnson, Don, PhD – is a psychotherapist and a national lecturer on the developmental issues of gay and lesbian youth. He was a founder of the Boulder County AIDS project and a member of governor's advisory council on AIDS.

Kimmel, Michael S., PhD – is a sociologist and author who has received international recognition for his work on men and masculinity. His innovative course, “Sociology of Masculinity,” examines men’s lives from a pro-feminist perspective. He is an educator and lecturer on sexual assault and harassment, gender equality and more.

Klocke, Brian – is a PhD candidate at CU-Boulder. His area of focus is social resistance and corporate domination of culture. He teaches a course titled, "Men and Masculinities" and has experience in anti-racist, and anti-sexist peer education. Brian served on the M&M25 Planning Committee and presented three workshops at the conference.

Rozdzial, Moshe, PhD – Current Co-Chair of the NOMAS National Council, Moshe is a Psychotherapist and counselor and former research scientist with the University Health Sciences Center, Denver, CO; Advisory Board Member of Voices of Faith at Equality Colorado, and past board member of the Speakers Project to End Discrimination (SPED).
Anti-Violence
Manhood and Violence: The Deadliest Equation
Michael Kimmel, PhD

In the days and months following the tragedy at Columbine, the nation stared at the pictures of Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold trying to understand the unfathomable - how these two young boys could arm themselves with guns and open fire on their classmates and teachers. We continued to stare at those pictures as the explanations began to pour in from the experts and the pundits alike.

We heard from psychologists who drew elaborate profiles of misfits and loners, of adolescent depression and acting out. Cultural critics on the right threw some blame on Goth music, Marilyn Manson, violent video games, the Internet. More liberal critics told us it was guns. President Clinton chimed in about violence in the media. We even heard about fatherlessness and the disappearance of modesty. The Denver school board banned the wearing of black trench coats and some lawmakers called for the posting of the Ten Commandments in schools.

All the while we continued to miss the point - even though it was staring right back at us: the killers were middle class white boys who lived in gun states.

Skeptical? Try a little thought experiment: Imagine that the killers in Littleton and in Pearl, Mississippi, Paducah, Kentucky, Springfield, Oregon and Jonesboro, Arkansas - were all black girls from poor families who lived in New Haven, Conicut, Newark, New Jersey, or Providence, Rhode Island.

I believe we would have had a national debate about inner-city poor black girls. The entire focus would have been on race, class, and gender. The media would have invented a new term for their behavior, as they did with "wilding" a decade ago after the attack on the Central Park jogger. We’d have heard about the cultural issues about how living in the city breeds crime and violence; about some putative natural tendency among blacks towards violence. Someone would even have blamed feminism for causing girls to become violent in vain imitation of boys.

Yet the obvious fact that these school killers were all middle class white boys seems to have escaped everyone’s notice.

In these cases, actually, it’s unclear that class or race played any part in the shootings, although the killers in Colorado did target some black students. But that’s the point: imagine the national reaction if black boys had targeted whites in school shootings. We would have assumed that race alone explained the tragedy (some would, of course, have blamed rap music and violent movies). Or if poor boys had targeted those with the fancy cars we’d have assumed that class-based resentment caused the boys’ rage (that Dylan Klebold drove a BMW did not prompt the Denver school board to consider banning those cars, did it?).

That young boys with guns committed all these murders raised not a ripple. We continued to call them "teens," "youths," or "children" rather than what they really were - boys.

Yet gender is the single most obvious and intractable difference when it comes to violence in America. Men and boys are responsible for 95% of all violent crimes in this country. Every day twelve boys and young men commit suicide - seven times the number of girls. Every day eighteen boys and young men die from homicide – ten times the number of girls.

From an early age, boys learn that violence is not only an acceptable form of conflict resolution, but one that is admired. Four times more teenage boys than teenage girls think fighting is appropriate when someone cuts into the front of the line. Half of all teenage boys get into a physical fight each year.

The belief that violence is manly is not a trait carried on any chromosome. It is not soldered into the wiring of the right or left hemisphere. It is not juiced by testosterone (half of all boys don’t fight, most don’t carry weapons, and very few actually kill). It is, unfortunately, taught to our boys.

It is taught by their fathers, nearly half of whom own a gun. It is taught by a media that glorifies it, by sports heroes who commit felonies and get big contracts, by a culture saturated in images of heroic and redemptive violence. It is taught and reinforced by their peers.

And this horrible education is made more lethal in states where gun control laws are most lax, where gun-lobbyists are most powerful because all available evidence suggests that all the increases in the deadliness of school violence is attributable to guns. Boys have resorted to violence for a long time, but sticks and fists and even the occasional switchblade do not create the bloodbaths of the past few years. Nearly 90% of all homicides among boys aged 15 to 19 are firearms related, and 80% of the victims are boys. If the rumble in West Side Story were to take place today, the death toll would not be just Riff and Bernardo, but all the Sharks and all the Jets – and probably several dozen bystanders.

Some will throw up their hands and sigh that “boys will be boys.” In the face of these tragic killings, such resignation is unacceptable. And it doesn’t answer the policy question; it begs the question: if boys have a natural propensity towards violence and aggression, do we organize society to maximize that tendency, or to minimize it? Perhaps the most sensible reform that could come from these tragedies is stricter gun control laws, at least on assault weapons and handguns. Far more sweeping and necessary – is a national meditation on how our ideals of manhood became so entangled with violence.

Make no mistake: Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold were real boys. In a sense, they weren’t deviants, but over-conformists to norms of masculinity that prescribe violence as a solution. Like real men, they didn’t just get mad, they got even. Until we transform that definition of manhood, this terrible equation of masculinity and violence will add up to an increasing death toll at our nation’s schools.

COLUMBINE AND MALE ENTITLEMENT
Moshe Rozdzial, PhD

Much has been written over the last year and a half about the violence at Columbine. The issues of ‘not fitting in,” bullying, and the “cult” masculinity that seem to permeate many American schools have been discussed, examined and reexamined by sociologists, psychologists and the popular press. A common conclusion appears to be that America is a violent society and by common definition violence and manhood go hand-in-hand. What is also true, for me, is that the picture is not yet complete.

Male violence has been a part of the social fabric since the beginning of patriarchy, so why the extraordinary, and apparently escalating, violence from middle class white boys, now, at the beginning of the 21st century. A partial answer may be that we are at a cultural crossroads, a time when white male entitlement is finally colliding with a generation of women and minorities who have grown up in a time when racial and gender civil rights are the norm – by law, if not by societal desire. The generations of minorities enslaved to do the white man’s bidding are dying out and the new generation, that did not know this slavery (or at least its most vile aspects), is grown or growing up.

Nevertheless, the cultural messages to our young white males are still ambiguous and the ambiguity is probably more intense in the gun states than elsewhere in the US. While the media and society, schools and sports fans still glorify white male dominance, white males have increasingly come up against barriers to their entitlements in every aspect of their lives. Title 9 advances, civil rights protections, and the feminist and sexual revolutions have all taken their toll on traditional white male privilege.
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(continued →)
The response has been the proverbial backlash as white men by the thousands have joined white supremacy groups and recidivist religious organizations, such as Promise Keepers, in order to regain a sense of the power they perceive they have lost to women and minorities. The reason that so many white boys, like Harris and Klebold, connect with Hitler and Nazism is that these represent archetypal powerful white men: outcasts who regained power through force and coercion and punished all whom they perceived as having stood in their way.

What of men is not so much the quantity of their acts of violence, but whether they grew up in traditional, authoritarian, male-dominated households. Were their fathers such examples to their sons that it had led them to expect a future of male power when their turn came? That expectation was ultimately thwarted when they finally arrived at manhood (high school) and discovered how powerless they were.

In high school the jocks maintain the patriarchal domination, set the standard for masculinity, get all the dates and live a privileged existence. But what about the outcasts? Read the words of Harris as reported in the press. In his diatribes of anger you read the struggle of a white male dealing with the loss of power and control. Unfortunately, the only recourse he and Dylan Klebold could find for asserting their will was the use of a gun. Fundamentalism, as practiced by these boys, may well have been the result of the incapacity to deal with the inconsistencies offered them by our ever-evolving pluralistic society.

And, unfortunately, once again violence has been the recourse of the dominant group in response to losing power and control in society. Historical privilege continues to crash into historical reality of progressive social movements with violent outcomes.

---

### In Memoriam

**Saviz Shafai**

1950 - 2000

Saviz Shafai, a long time member of NOMAS and a member of the National Council died from cancer on September 18, 2000. His life companion, Jim Ford, was with him at the time and notified NOMAS of Saviz’s passing. A life-long activist in support of gay rights for Iranians, Saviz’s National Council entry read: ‘Health food store manager and grass-roots activist, Winter Park, FL.’ A wonderful tribute to Saviz by JackNichols of the Greenwich Village Gazette can be found at [http://gaytoday.badpuppy.com/archive-people/102300pe.htm](http://gaytoday.badpuppy.com/archive-people/102300pe.htm).

---

### Pro-Feminist

**Roles of Men with Feminism and Feminist Theory**

**Brian Klocke**

**Can Men do Feminist Theory?**

There are perhaps as many definitions of feminism and feminist theory as there are people who declare that they are feminists. Ben Agger (1998) states that the major achievement of feminist theory is to make the politics of sex and gender central to understanding oppression. However, feminist theory is not only about understanding but also about action. A goal of the feminist project is to end the oppression of women and attain social equity for them.

The politics of patriarchy have suppressed women’s voices and dominated social discourse and social action to the benefit of men and detriment of women. Thus it may be problematic for some readers that I, as a white male in this patriarchal society, am struggling to define the male role in feminism, which was born out of the women’s movement and revisits the unanswered question, can men do feminist theory?

This question can only be answered in differing ways for the meanings of text and answers to social questions are contested symbolic mediations imbedded in social relations of power. Perhaps a more important question than whether or not men can “do” feminist theory is whether men can engage feminist and anti-patriarchal behavior?

### Can Men be Feminists?

It is crucial for men to be a part of feminist agency. If feminism is to attain its goal of liberating women, men must be a part of the struggle. Indeed, men probably bear more of the responsibility for ending oppression of women since patriarchal men have been the main perpetrators of that very oppression. But can men do this by becoming feminists?

Although I believe that men can be pro-feminist and anti-sexist, I do not believe we can be feminists in the strictest sense of the word in today’s society. Men, in this patriarchal system, cannot remove themselves from their power and privilege in relation to women. To be a feminist one must be a member of the targeted group (i.e. a woman) not only as a matter of classification but as having one’s directly-lived experience inform one’s theory and praxis.

A clear analogy can be made between male pro-feminism and anti-racism. Men cannot really be feminists anymore than whites can be black nationalists. However, men can be pro-feminist and whites can be pro-black nationalists. At the same time it is not enough to simply be a member of the disenfranchised minority to be either a feminist or a black nationalist. Feminism, like black nationalism requires political consciousness and even activism.

Sexism restricts roles for men as well as women. But while sexism impacts women more negatively than men it also affects individuals to differing degrees. Some women internalize sexist beliefs and subservient behaviors to a greater extent than others and do/cannot embrace feminism.

Sexism negatively impacts men by forcing them into a hyper-masculinity which engages high-risk behavior and limits their emotional expression as full human beings. However, regardless of these and other secondary gains sexism bat less, men still benefit from patriarchy (the social system of sexism) whether or not they choose to fight sexism in others or themselves. Women, and feminists in particular, face the damaging primary effects of sexism and the wrath of patriarchal society whenever they resist their subjugated social role and often even when they don’t. So if men cannot be feminists how can we be a part of a feminist agency? Does feminism address only women or doesn’t it also address men in some way?

### What Should be the Role of Men in the Feminist Movement?

Feminist discourse might even have more pertinent impact on men than on women. Many women know they are oppressed by patriarchy. They have the life experiences of belonging to an oppressed group and have most likely shared personal stories that reveal their wounds from patriarchy. Men, on the other hand, are less likely to recognize their gender privilege and probably have not shared stories of wounding women through their own oppressive behaviors nor have they grieved with other men over the harm they have caused to women. Vulnerable, acquiescent behavior is not commonly accepted as manly in today’s society. Nevertheless, I believe that real feminism is not just about hearing personal stories but also about changing the structure of gender relations and acting to eliminate all forms of patriarchy.

Unfortunately, some segments of the men’s movement, such as men’s rights groups and followers of Robert Bly’s mythopoetic movement, seem less focused on dismantling patriarchy and more focused on, in bell hooks’ (1992) words, “the production of a kind of masculinity that can be safely expressed within patriarchal boundaries. She further explains that the most frightening aspect of the contemporary men’s movement, particularly as it is expressed in popular culture, is the depoliticization of the struggle to end sexism and sexist oppression and the replacing of that struggle with a focus on personal self-actualization. She suggests that the men’s movement should not be separate from the women’s movement but instead become a segment under the larger feminist movement. In this way men would not be taking center stage in yet another part of women’s lives allowing a slightly more subtle form of domination to continue. Paul Smith, who co-authored the book *Men in Feminism* suggested recently in Cultronix that men should not be in feminism but nearby. He challenges men to think of feminism working on them.

(continued)
But this cannot be done without changing, not only how men relate to other men, but how we relate to women as well. Perhaps men need to be "menists," supporting women in their feminist work while allowing feminism to work on them, challenging themselves and other men to end patriarchy. In this way feminist theory and practice could be a catalyst for liberating both men and women from their restrictive gender roles and the system of patriarchy.

Can Men Do Feminist Theory?

Any substantive theory for social change must provide something for most if not all members of society. Theories which use abstract and elite language will not be accessible to the oppressed groups most in need of social justice. A good theory, then, will also have multiple layers of messages for different social groupings. While some radical feminists may take an essentialist position that feminist theory construction is only possible by women other and experience from a feminist perspective. Men should consult with feminist legislation that defers to Christian unity has, once again, become and, d's eugenics hatred

This was seen in this country in the trial Jewish bankers surreptitiously controlling the accused of ritual slaughter historical anti the blood libel and kidnapping charges of proselytizers of a gay "agenda" directly echoes and therefore are viewed as objects of "pass" as either straight or gentile respectively disguised. Both groups share the capacity to outwardly different but precisely because of scapegoating of Jews has almost effortlessly psyche of our culture and, as an overlook the most potent of historical lessons. Taking to understand heterosexism is to claim to understand heterosexism (which manifests as homophobia) are directly analogous to o heterosexism (which manifests as racism) and therefore are viewed as objects of fundamentalism is openness, and passion against injustice. That the defense image of oppressions? That the defense rendition of civil rights. That it takes commitment and work to undo external and institutionalized oppression and to unlearn internalized oppression. That equality comes through coalition building and alliance with all who struggle against oppression in social and legal arenas and by supporting leaders, leadership, and institutions that work towards shared power and resources and against the weapons of oppression; against violence, disenfranchisement, and marginalization.

What Should be the Role of Men with Feminist Theory?

As suggested by Alison Jaggar and others, men must first learn the text of feminist theory before engaging in political practice. The context in which they manifest themselves -- history, economics, or politics -- makes some types of oppressions more closely related than others. I propose that anti-Semitism and heterosexism (which manifests as homophobia) are directly analogous to one another. To disregard anti-Semitism while claiming to understand heterosexism is to overlook the most potent of historical lessons. I believe that these two oppressions share many elements that are deeply rooted in the psyche of our culture and, as anti-Semitism has gone underground and heterosexism has become institutionalized, the open hatred and scapegoating of Jews has almost effortlessly been transferred to homosexuals.

Homosexuals and Jews are feared and despised not because they can be identified as outwardly different but precisely because of the relative ease with which both can be disguised. Both groups share the capacity to "pass" as either straight or gentile respectively and therefore are viewed as objects of suspicion and sources of conspiracy. The unbounded belief that homosexuals are not only furtive perpetrators of pedophilia but also proselytizers of a gay "agenda" directly echoes the blood libel and kidnapping charges of history. Anti-Semitism often made Jews were accused of ritual slaughter of Christian children and "international conspiracy" theories had Jewish bankers surreptitiously controlling the world. This was seen in this country in the trial of the Rosenbergs and in the recent murder of Dr. Schleipen.

Within the psychology of group hatred both Jews and homosexuals are viewed as having unique political and economic power. Under the scrutiny of the prejudiced eye both groups are charged with promoting "special rights" and are blamed for a variety of social ills and misfortunes. The same accusing voices that cry out to exclude these minority groups, who have no real power in the political arena, would never question the political voice of the societal majority. Institutionalized Christianity and heterosexuality wield power through legislation that defers to Christian religious sensibility and morality in a nominally secular state and to heterosexual privilege through the denial to homosexuals of marital, parental, estate and civil rights that have been normalized as majority rights.

Relatedly, religious attacks on homosexuals, defended under biblical precedent, echo the vilest forms of anti-Semitic tropes which use abstract and elitist language will not be accessible to the oppressed groups most in need of social justice. That this cannot be done without changing, not only how men relate to other men, but how we relate to women as well. Perhaps men need to be "menists," supporting women in their feminist work while allowing feminism to work on them, challenging themselves and other men to end patriarchy. In this way feminist theory and practice could be a catalyst for liberating both men and women from their restrictive gender roles and the system of patriarchy.
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Anti-Oppression

Anti-Semitism and Heterosexism: Common Constructs of Oppression

Moshe Rozdzial, PhD

All oppressions have common roots. Rooted out of misinformation and directed toward the "other," the goal of any oppression is the unjust, destructive, and unequal distribution of power to the advantage of one group over another. And although there is no specific language in terms of oppressions, the context in which they manifest themselves -- history, economics, or politics -- makes some types of oppressions more closely related than others. I propose that anti-Semitism and heterosexism (which manifests as homophobia) are directly analogous to one another. To disregard anti-Semitism while claiming to understand heterosexism is to overlook the most potent of historical lessons. I believe that these two oppressions share many elements that are deeply rooted in the psyche of our culture and, as anti-Semitism has gone underground and heterosexism has become institutionalized, the open hatred and scapegoating of Jews has almost effortlessly been transferred to homosexuals.

Homosexuals and Jews are feared and despised not because they can be identified as outwardly different but precisely because of the relative ease with which both can be disguised. Both groups share the capacity to "pass" as either straight or gentile respectively and therefore are viewed as objects of suspicion and sources of conspiracy. The unbounded belief that homosexuals are not only furtive perpetrators of pedophilia but also proselytizers of a gay "agenda" directly echoes the blood libel and kidnapping charges of history. Anti-Semitism often made Jews were accused of ritual slaughter of Christian children and "international conspiracy" theories had Jewish bankers surreptitiously controlling the world. This was seen in this country in the trial of the Rosenbergs and in the recent murder of Dr. Schleipen.

Within the psychology of group hatred both Jews and homosexuals are viewed as having unique political and economic power. Under the scrutiny of the prejudiced eye both groups are charged with promoting "special rights" and are blamed for a variety of social ills and misfortunes. The same accusing voices that cry out to exclude these minority groups, who have no real power in the political arena, would never question the political voice of the societal majority. Institutionalized Christianity and heterosexuality wield power through legislation that defers to Christian religious sensibility and morality in a nominally secular state and to heterosexual privilege through the denial to homosexuals of marital, parental, estate and civil rights that have been normalized as majority rights.

Similarly, religious attacks on homosexuals, defended under biblical precedent, echo the vilest forms of anti-Semitism. The slander of "kodomim" has replaced "Christ-killers" in the vocabulary of hatred and heaven's retribution against a minority community has, once again, become the excuse to justify victimizing the victim. Even the promise of "salvation" through "conversion" (Jews to Christianity; homosexuals to heterosexuality) reflects the common perception that both minorities are "outcast in the sight of G-d." And the stereotype of stubborn adherence to a despised lifestyle even in the shadow of salvation is another common accusatory theme. After all, how can the "other" want to be who he is and stubbornly hold on to a life of deprivation when the doors are, figuratively, opened to a life of safety, privilege, and saving grace?

To look at the similar language of marginalization of these two groups without noticing the historical connection would mean yielding to ignorance. Common weapons of oppression include the emasculation of Jews and stereotyping of homosexuals to perpetuate an excuse for dehumanization and a perception of facile targeting for violence. Thus, Jewish men are labeled Hymies, nerds, weaklings, just as gay men are the sissies and pansies -- to mention only a few of the epithets hurled at them. Jewish women and lesbians are, respectively, bitches and princesses, or butches and dykes. The modern propaganda of hatred that equates AIDS to homophobia echoes Hitler's racial anti-Semitism that accused the Jews of spreading disease, contagion and contamination and are reminders of past genocide and the excuses for a present violence. The recent push to find a biological origin for homosexuality has a frightening parallel to the Nazi's eugenic response to the "Jewish problem."

So, what are the lessons in this mirrored image of oppressions? That the defense against fundamentalism is openness, confidence, and passion against injustice. That there must be vigilance against the erosion of civil rights. That it takes commitment and work to undo external and institutionalized oppression and to unlearn internalized oppression. That equality comes through coalition building and alliance with all who struggle against oppression in social and legal arenas and by supporting leaders, leadership, and institutions that work towards shared power and resources and against the weapons of oppression; against violence, disenfranchisement, and marginalization.

Access Reality TV Series -Don't Forget!!

Barry Shapiro hosts a series of shows on men and masculinity to bring attention to the ongoing contributions made by NOMAS in combating sexism, racism, and homophobia. Ideal for public access as well as classroom training. Exclusive guests Terry Kupers, Paul Kivel, Victor Lewis, Hamish Sinclair and others. Topics include: male/female relationships, the prevention of male violence, homophobia, fathering, men in prisons, straight white male supremacy, internalized oppression, the "-isms"

For more information visit www.nomas.org or email Barry at shapirobar@earthlink.net
I propose that everyone in our society is homophobic. In addition, it is a strong belief that gay and lesbian individuals, prior to coming out, are among the most homophobic people in our society. Most of us do not think of ourselves as homophobic, however, and many people will disagree with this concept of universal homophobia, especially as applied to them. My intent in opening this article with such a potentially inflammatory statement is to focus immediately on a central dimension of the struggle homosexual youth face: that of owning an identity they have been taught to hide and develop with that identity to a society that resists it.

Having spent over 20 years studying and teaching in the field of human sexuality, I believe that it is impossible to grow up in America and not absorb some level of homophobia. The question is not "am I or am I not homophobic?" The real question is "how homophobic am I?" Long before the label of "gay" or "lesbian" is attached to them, young homosexuals are acutely aware of how our culture (including their families in most cases) feels about homosexuality. And the messages are usually negative. So as the homosexual teenager develops an awareness of his or her same-gender attraction and becomes conscious of the associated pejorative labels the societally engendered negative feelings toward homosexuality (homophobia) and toward self (internalized homophobia) are already in place.

Sex is one of the few, if not the only, physical experiences of our lives where we know how we feel about it (it is good, bad, right, wrong) before we experience it. Parents, family, society, school, church, media and others constantly barrage us with messages about cultural attitudes toward sex and gender. The overwhelmingly negative messages about homosexuality set the stage for a range of social dysfunction for the homosexual teenager including the higher than average rate of suicide among gay and lesbian teens. For those who survive, even more frustrations await.

As typical American teens enter their formative years. When gay and lesbian youth miss the something they are not. A major consequence is that gay and lesbian youth miss the opportunity to learn major relationship skills. Their population reaches adulthood with stable relationships and positive social systems for young homosexuals. Any cultural attitudes toward sex and gender. The overwhelming negative messages about homosexuality set the stage for a range of social dysfunction for the homosexual teenager including the higher than average rate of suicide among gay and lesbian teens. For those who survive, even more frustrations await.

As typical American teens enter their high school years they undertake a range of sexual and social changes and adjustments which are difficult at best. Teenagers must learn all of the survival rules around love and relationships: how to identify an appropriate potential partner; how to initiate and develop a loving and sexual relationship; how to appropriately turn down unwanted attention; how to deal with non-reciprocated attraction; how to heal from rejection; how to be interested in other people and attracted to them because of personality traits and not just because they are physically desirable; and more. While these are extraordinarily complex tasks filled with many pitfalls, failures and wounds, society offers a variety support systems for young heterosexuals during this period. Parents, family, church, popular culture and a variety of other sources encourage struggling youths with the message that the process is survivable and a host of successful role models is available. Even so the route is painful and bumpy.

There are no such positive support systems for young homosexuals. Any cultural messages that are provided are usually negative. Our society associates the adolescent feelings experienced by teenage homosexuals with images of unhappy, lonely people, rejected by family and society, afflicted with disease and with death. There are generally no positive role models available and visible for gay and lesbian teens. Two classic patterns of dysfunctional behavior tend to arise for young homosexuals in response to this failure of society to provide a positive environment for their development. The first is attempting to become the best little boys or girls in the world. Homosexual youths who take this path usually become ideal students, active in school and community. Externally they are model teenagers; internally they are torn with fear, self-doubt and self-hatred over their developing feelings and attractions. The second is one of withdrawal from society and peers. In this case homosexual youths often involve themselves with dropouts, drug-users and other social misfits. Both patterns reflect deep internal isolation and both result in the unhealthy denial of one's identity.

Thus, while heterosexual youths are acquiring the teenage developmental skills of learning how to fall in and out of love, survive broken hearts, and fine-tune their social dating skills, gay and lesbian youth are investing their energy in denial and pretending to be something they are not. A major consequence of this is that gay and lesbian youth miss the acquisition of appropriate same-sex social/sexual/dating skills during their formative years. When gay and lesbian individuals finally do "come out," no matter what the age, they essentially have to go back to adolescence and experience the developmental social/sexual tasks that were denied them by society. They must learn how, as homosexuals, to fall in and out of love, to have their hearts broken and recover, etc. In sum, they must "go through" adolescence as a gay or lesbian person.

If this development process was difficult for heterosexual teenagers post-teen homosexuals have an even more difficult time. They have acquired the cognitive awareness and judgments of adulthood which they apply in self-evaluation to the adolescent skills acquisition tasks with which they are now involved. It is very difficult to be in one's thirties or forties (or beyond) and act out a teenage developmental task. The behavior is adolescent; the judgments about the behavior are adult. It is painful and confusing to go through this process for both the individuals and those close to them. It is an unfortunate irony that the culture that makes it impossible for gay and lesbian individuals to integrate fully functioning relationship skills during the formative teen-age years is the very one that condemns them for not having done so. Gay men are portrayed as sexual libertines when essentially all they are doing is acting out an adolescent society without parental/natural supervision or support. Fortunately, for a majority of gays and lesbians once the delayed tasks of adolescence are accomplished they stabilize into committed meaningful relationships very much like their heterosexual peers.

In a healthy non-homophobic culture this natural evolution would have occurred for homosexuals at the same time their heterosexual counterparts were experiencing it. Both heterosexuals and homosexuals would have reached sexual-social maturity at the same time and both could have become productive, contributing members of society with stable relationships and positive social impact. Instead, a significant minority of the population reaches adulthood without having learned major relationship skills. Their productivity and ability to contribute to a stable social structure are compromised until they develop these skills and they are disadvantaged, both personally and socially, by having to experience this development as adults, all because everyone in our society, to some extent, is homophobic.

---

Did you know…? …NOMAS has two divisions –

Men's Studies Association (MSA)
The Men's Studies Association (MSA) is an interdisciplinary division of NOMAS that focuses a feminist-informed perspective on the ways in which the lives of men and women may be enhanced through critical study of the issues affecting men and masculinity. In conjunction with the NOMAS national M&M conference, the MSA holds an annual meeting that brings together sociologists, psychologists, anthropologists, mental health workers, and other investigators to present studies and analyses on the social, cultural, and historical constructs of masculinities and male identity formation.

Ending Men's Violence Network (EMV-Net)
The Ending Men's Violence Network was created by NOMAS to provide an umbrella organization to support domestic violence, sexual assault and victim assistance groups working in their individual communities. EMV-net offers resources, training and support that would otherwise be unavailable to local organizations. Comprised of both men’s and women's anti-violence groups, EMV-net offers additional credibility to the efforts of both on behalf of the common cause of ending men's violence.
Response to the Christian Men’s Movement.

The Promise Keepers

Allen Corben

Promise Keepers is the most popular regressive Christian movement since Prohibition. Founded by Bill McCartney in 1990 to deal with men’s failure to exercise their divinely appointed roles as heads of their households, Promise Keepers fights the “sissification of men” through literature, rallies, and accountability groups. From under 100 men at the first gathering in Colorado in 1990 to nearly a million (more than a dozen stadium events) during 1996, Promise Keepers has grown to include more than 200 full-time staff and an annual budget of over $100 million.

Rallies are held throughout the country in major sporting arenas and attract men from all over the target regions. After a weekend of upbeat music, motivational speeches, prayer, worship, and times of repentance, these men return to their families and churches, ready to be more involved — to keep their promises as husbands/fathers, congregants and citizens. Those attendees who feel the need to engage as fully as possible communicate to the organization that they are interested in becoming key men. In addition to running accountability groups in their home congregations, key men report to regional ambassadors who report to the organization itself.

Promise Keepers’ apparent goal is to “turn back the clock” to a time that existed for only a brief period and then for only a small percentage of American families. When the “average” family consisted of one man, the sole breadwinner, married to one woman. They had 2.2 children and lived in a suburban single-family home. They lived during the period from the end of W.W.II to the inauguration of Lyndon Johnson’s “Great Society.” It was the time before the second wave of the American women’s movement, when “the average” family consisted of one man, the sole breadwinner, married to one woman. They had 2.2 children and lived in a suburban single-family home. They lived during the period from the end of W.W.II to the inauguration of Lyndon Johnson’s “Great Society.” It was the time before the second wave of the American women’s movement.

Unfortunately for Promise Keepers, but fortunately for the women of society, they cannot go back and recreate for everyone a “golden era” that existed for only a few. They can only pretend that the history of the last half of this century has not taken place. It is unfortunate that many conservative Christian organizations come to their aid by attempting to put a veneer of pseudo-science and voodoo psychological theory onto what is basically an ideological position, a position not supported by careful exegetis of the Christian scriptures.

The Impact of the Promise Keepers

Promise Keepers has some laudable goals and methods. They encourage their members to become Men of Integrity by making seven promises: 1) to honor and commit to Jesus Christ; 2) to pursue vital relationships with others; 3) to practice sexual, moral and ethical purity; 4) to maintain a strong marriage; 5) to support their local churches financially and through their own active involvement; 6) to move beyond racial and denominational barriers to achieve unity within the Body of Christ; and 7) to actively evangelize the world.

It is hard to find fault with men practicing sexual, moral and ethical purity. Christians everywhere will applaud a promise to honor and commit to Jesus Christ, to provide financial support for local churches, and to actively evangelize the world. Socially conscious people recognize the value of men pursuing vital relationships with other men, even as feminists challenge the patriarchal context of those relationships. These praiseworthy goals have, in fact, resulted in some positive (however flawed) consequences among Promise Keepers.

Nevertheless, not everyone is happy with the Promise Keepers. Greater involvement by men in their families is laudable if it means a focus on shared decision-making instead of “head of the household” dominance. The phrase “maintain a strong marriage” is sufficiently vague, however, to allow quite a range of behavior, some potentially unhealthy and even illegal. The seven promises do not include foreswearing violence against family members or others and “a man’s home is his castle” is, potentially, an easy justification for violence. Promise Keepers’ messages of male dominance, its anti-gay rhetoric, and its apparent willingness to use emotional abuse are abhorrent to many progressive and feminist groups as well as individual members of society. Nevertheless, while many protest the Promise Keepers, the media generally paints a rosy, uncritical picture and the organization continues to have successful rallies though not with the same attendance as in its 1996 heyday.

It is not only progressive political and women’s organizations that challenge Promise Keepers. Mainline Christian denominations which do not accept the “male-headship” interpretation of the Christian scriptures obviously critique Promise Keepers but even some denominations that support male headship fear that Promise Keepers can cause dissension within a congregation by having a key man create factionalism among church members. Non-white Christian men often feel excluded because Promise Keepers is still predominantly white. Low-income Christian men often feel excluded since Promise Keepers’ advertising and cost of attendance fairly assure that attendees are predominantly middle-class. Single Christian men who might agree with the Promise Keepers’ agenda in principle feel that Promise Keepers is only about and for married men. And gay/bi-trans-men know they are not welcome, regardless of their theological orientation.

One of the most telling impacts of Pbe a-political, but it does encourage members to be more involved in the political process of their local and national communities. Given the conservative public stance of every national leader of Promise Keepers, the message to those attending the rallies is obvious: ‘become involved, but as a force for regressive and conservative politics.’ While not the “storm troopers of Christian fascism” some have described them, Promise Keepers are still a potent political force of the far-right/rightrpmakes the greater involvement of men in their communities. Promise Keepers claims to Costs of Promise Keepers

There are obvious benefits for men involved in an organization supporting male supremacy and anti-feminist backlash. The male-only approach in gatherings means that there is no way for attendees to hear or honor the voices of women who are among the intended recipients of their promises. In Promise Keepers, since the husband/father is supposed to lead based on what he believes, hearing a wife or child’s views could potentially confuse or compromise his insight and might be detrimental to male headship theory. Those few, carefully chosen women who are allowed to speak from the platform at Promise Keepers’ rallies are complicit with the male-headship view.

For Promise Keepers, male headship is the notion that the husband is solely responsible before God for everything that happens in his family. As head, the husband/father must use whatever means necessary to enforce his decisions. Of course Promise Keepers encourages benevolent male headship, but there are no injunctions against coercion or abuse. The Promise Keepers emphasize that the husband/father is to make decisions that serve the best interests of his wife/children as he understands those interests, even if she/they disagree with him as to what is best. This externally imposed model of male headship can become a poison in a relationship. The overwhelming brunt of the oppression falls upon the wife and any children though the husband/father must also diminish his own humanity in the process.

In the worst case, a dangerous situation can arise when a husband/father understands interpersonal power as a limited quantity in a zero-sum situation. Given the sexist culture of patriarchy and male supremacy in which every American male is steeped, the command to “take back” the role of Godly head of the household could easily lead to “justifiable” battering. Men may feel that they must coerc (hit), emotionally or physically, in order to take back what has been taken from them. They batter so that they can re-establish themselves as the unchallenged heads of households, and anything which borders on negotiation and interdependence is perceived as a challenge to their leadership.

(continued on page 9 →)
The following letter was sent to Jim Beam Brands to protest their current sexist advertising campaign. Not only are the ads misogynistic, the company has attempted to glorify antiquated patriarchal attitudes with an online voting/approval system at www.jimbeam.com/jb_web/ads/jim_beam_ads.asp. We invite you to join our organizational voice with a letter of your own.

Jim Beam Brands Co.
Clermont, KY 40110
November 30, 2000

Dear Jim Beam Brands Co.:

I am writing on behalf of the National Organization for Men Against Sexism (NOMAS) to express our concern over your recent advertising campaign (www.jimbeam.com/jb_web/ads/jim_beam_ads.asp) depicting “male bonding” in the context of female-bashing. These ads are offensive, misogynistic and denigrating of women. They imply that anything feminine or relational in nature is not of value, especially to men. For example, the ad caption stating “you can count on them to never ask you to ‘get in touch with your feminine side’” feeds into the stereotypic patriarchal image of masculinity -- devoid of nurturing, emotion, connection, etc. Such a polarized image of male gender roles is harmful to both men and women. It perpetuates the stereotype of non-communication between the sexes, whose outcome in our society has too often been violence against women. We are disappointed that you do not celebrate the potential of men and women having friendships and relationships based on equality and understanding. We hope you will withdraw this campaign as soon as possible and issue an apology to the millions of men and women who have worked so hard over the past 100 years to end sexism and the stereotypes you have chosen to glorify.

I look forward to hearing from you on this matter.

Very truly yours,
Moshe Rozdzial, PhD
Co-Chair, NOMAS

---

**Survivor without a tattoo**

_I survived the camps at Buchenwald, at Bergen-Belsen and far worse._

But no obscene numbers stain my aging arm.

The stench of carnage still burns the nostrils of my mind.

Yet the mud blood earth clings to no shoes or clothes or part of me.

I was not there.

But I survived.

I am a Jew of “a certain age;” born in a time when monsters stalked.

My young eyes looked, from the comfort of an untouched land,

For my parents faces— and my own——

In those firewood piles of corpses the newsreel cameras showed.

The distant cousins, great aunts and uncles, all up in smoke, my bubbeh wept for bring my tears too.

“Survivor guilt,” my therapist said, as I cried and cried.

I was not there.

But I survived.

Endured the amputation of roots, wounding of my culture, death of my shtetl.

You who were there, your nightmares are not mine.

I have nightmares of my own.

My horrors do not match your horrors.

My memories do not run and hide from me like yours.

I am a survivor without a tattoo;

Scared and scarred in other ways.

Martin A. David
December, 1997

---

*Survivor without a tattoo* is a poem by Martin A. David. It is taken from his novel, *Karpstein Was Hiding*. The novel is a powerful and even frightening examination of how hate and hate crimes can overwhelm the minds of individual members of the hated group. *Karpstein Was Hiding* has been widely reviewed and reviews are available from a number of sources. The book is available directly from Martin via the Internet at [http://www.comstteam.com/Karpstein/autograph.htm](http://www.comstteam.com/Karpstein/autograph.htm) or by writing him directly at the address indicated.

Martin A. David
204 Coates Avenue / P.O.Box 55
Calpine, CA 96124
The Promise Keepers (continued)

Ironies of Promise Keepers

It is ironic that in order to help men connect with a nurturing, feminine side, Promise Keepers assemble in sports arenas in male-only groups and offer highly masculine motivational speeches by males who are widely accepted as embodying "real masculinity."

It is a deeper irony that even as they seek to overcome the stereotype of harsh disciplinarians, they still use stereotypically masculine (bullying) methods to keep their followers in line. Calling men "sissies" for not keeping their promises is behavior one might expect from grade schoolers, not from mature adult leaders, not to mention the sexism and homophobia such behavior implies. Nevertheless, rally attendees respond by being shamed into behavior modification through such name-calling by a masculine "father figure."

It is ironic that Promise Keepers gather for Bible study in order to improve their relationships with wives and children; preferring the intellectual to the interpersonal. Instead of practicing a God-like love, however, Promise Keepers enforces an agenda of male headship with no negotiation.

It is ironic that despite a stated goal to increase ethnic and cultural diversity, Promise Keepers makes no allowance for a range of interpretations of masculinity. Male leadership apparently can only be expressed in one way. Any culture, ethos, or denomination that has a different view is criticized for having been "swayed by the feminists." Thus Promise Keepers seems to want diversity in skin color but no range of opinions on what it is to be a male. It is further ironic that these white, middle-class men reach out to "other" men, when the bargain appears to be that if men of color will join the white men on the sex issue, the white men will overlook the race issue.

Conclusion

The militaristic tone of much of Promise Keepers rhetoric is troubling. The hierarchical chain of command being the basis of all husband-wife (if not all male-female, relationships) is dehumanizing. The implicit, and perhaps intentional, sports aesthetic of the movement detracts from its purported spiritual objectives, revealing that Promise Keepers has drunk deeply at the well of corporate, consumer and competitive culture. Increased participation by men in their families, churches and communities can be positive. But the things left unsaid about violence, and about the means by which men will "take back the role they ceded to women" can and should be of concern to members of their families, as well as to the Christian communities to which they belong. The unspoken theocratic agenda should be unnerving to everyone who does not share Promise Keepers' interpretation of the Bible. Even in racial reconciliation, the fundamentally interpersonal nature of the Promise Keepers' approach leaves societal and systemic racism unchallenged.

Promise Keepers has one of three possible destinies: it will fizzle out completely; it will become increasingly marginalized; or it will succeed in regressing society. I believe the last is unlikely. The social justice gains of the past 100 years outweigh the recent losses, and I think the current backlash is more of a death rattle than a revitalization of fundamentalism. Promise Keepers portrays itself as too centrist to become a fringe backlash organization. Most likely Promise Keepers will ultimately fizzle out, much as did the last Christian men's stadium movement "Men and Religion Forward" back in the 1920s. Slavery was outlawed 160 years ago. The last of the de jure racial caste system ended in America about 40 years ago and while white supremacy, particularly as embodied in the Ku Klux Klan and other such organizations, is still an issue, our society is a long way from where we were in the 1890s. The second wave of American feminism is only about 40 years old. It is still early in its trajectory compared with progress on race relations. Promise Keepers may remain a fringe element expressing the more generally denied sexism and heterosexism of US patriarchy for some time. The last ditch efforts of patriarchy in the next 100 years will be painful, violent, and even fatal to some, primarily women. Still, in this age of rapid techno-logical advance, perhaps it will take less than 100 more years for feminism to begin to accomplish its goals, and with them the withering of support for Promise Keepers.

NOMAS

Become a member of:

The National Organization for Men Against Sexism

Membership application form -- please complete and return with your check or money order to the address below.

Name ____________________________
Org. ____________________________
Address ____________________________
City ____________________________
Phone ____________________________
e-mail ____________________________
Areas of interest ____________________________

ANNUAL DUES

Supporting Member $100
General Member $50
Sliding Scale $15-49 (based on your ability to pay)
Student or senior (over 65) @ 50% (Please indicate amount)
Corporation/organization $100
Non-profit - sliding scale $15-100

ADDITIONAL CONTRIBUTION

If you would like to know more about any of these task groups or volunteer to join one or more of them, you can contact the individual chair/co-chair by e-mail to info@nomas.org. We will pass your inquiry along. If you would like to establish an additional task group focused on some social issue about which you feel particularly strongly, please submit your request to the National Council by e-mail to info@nomas.org.

---

Special Pre-Conference Issue
26th Conference on Men and Masculinity (M&M26)

University of Denver, Denver, CO
July 20-22, 2001

MANifesting Global Justice: Creating Inclusive Communities

This special issue of BROTHER is being distributed to generate interest in the upcoming 26th Men & Masculinity Conference (M&M26) which will be held from July 20 to 22, 2001 on the campus of the University of Denver, Denver Colorado. This is the second NOMAS national conference to be held in the Rocky Mountain region. The very successful M&M25 was held last August on the campus of Colorado College in Colorado Springs, CO. Over 275 people attended some portion of the three-day event. The momentum that was generated last year made Denver a logical location for this year’s conference and we are looking forward to even greater attendance.

The NOMAS Men & Masculinity Conferences are the finest occasions for activists, academics, workers in mental health, diversity and anyone interested in gathering, organizing and working to end all forms of oppression and injustice and to celebrate choice, alternatives and possibilities. There will be over 40 workshops, keynotes and cultural events featuring nationally known authors and speakers. Please see the center pages for more information on the conference and on how to submit proposals for workshops and presentations.

NOMAS is seeking sponsorships and donations from a variety of sources including foundations, corporations, individuals and other non-profit organizations. Sponsorships can be financial or "in kind" for in-kind donations, meaning that your logo will be carried on all conference material in exchange for your organization promoting the conference among your membership. Current sponsors include:

Call for Workshop Proposals

NOMAS is interested in workshops that evaluate current advances in the field of men’s studies and examine diverse aspects in gender identity, gender roles, masculinity, and the experiences of men’s lives, to identify ways in which the lives of men and women might be enhanced. Presentations on a wide range of topics including, but not limited to, men and feminism, racism, homophobia, fathering, men and spirituality, prostitution and pornography, men and violence, sexual and domestic assault, men in the arts and history, constructs of gay masculinity, men in prison, multiculturalism and diversity, and more. Issues of men’s health will also be addressed including substance abuse, depression and suicide, HIV/AIDS, cancer and other chronic diseases. We will create a strong track of programming focused on celebration, wellness, and joy, incorporating group exercises, movement, dance, and song. We will continue to place an emphasis on improving communication between men and women, and among men of different sexual orientations, cultures, generations, races, and abilities. We encourage projects and presentations that focus on issues of male identity formation and men in middle and old age.

Undergraduate, graduate, and professional students are encouraged to submit proposals and participate in the meeting. We encourage creativity, audience participation, and multi-media presentations. Consider formats such as organized debates, roundtable discussions, experiential workshops, art and writing projects, skits or plays, and fishbowl discussions. We ask that everyone who leads a (90 minute) session allow ample time for participant discussion/reaction.

To propose a workshop, please send us the following information on a separate sheet of paper (one sheet for each workshop proposal). If accepted, this information will appear in the program booklet.

1) Brief title of presentation
2) Name(s) of presenter(s) as they will be printed in the conference program
3) Up to a 25-word bio of each presenter
4) Up to a 70-word description of the presentation (please warn of any expected activities that could potentially be of concern to any participant)
5) Special considerations for locating/scheduling your workshop and equipment needed.

Please send submissions to info@NOMAS.org or mail to NOMAS M&M26 PO Box 455 Louisville, CO 80027-0455. The deadline for submissions is June 15, 2001. Please share this information with your colleagues and institutions. Please feel free to contact NOMAS at info@NOMAS.org, or visit our website at www.NOMAS.org. Note that you must be registered as an attendee to offer a workshop.

The 13th Men's Studies Association Meeting

Friday, July 20, 2001
9AM-4PM.

Call for Papers

The Men's Studies Association is a multidisciplinary division of NOMAS that focuses on the ways in which the lives of men and women may be enhanced through critical study of issues of men and masculinity. It brings together sociologists, psychologists, anthropologists, mental health workers, and other investigators to present studies and analyses on the social, cultural, and historical constructions of masculinity and male identity formation.

In the past, the MSA meetings have featured papers and presentations on a wide range of topics including, but not limited to, men and feminism, racism, homophobia, fathering, men and spirituality, prostitution and pornography, men and violence, men in the arts and history, constructs of gay masculinity, men in prison, and more. Undergraduate, graduate students are encouraged to submit proposals and participate in the meeting.

To propose a paper, please send us the following information on a separate sheet of paper (one sheet for each proposal). If accepted, this information will appear in a special abstract edition of BROTHER, the Journal of NOMAS.

1) Brief title of presentation
2) Name of presenter(s) as they will be printed in the meeting program
3) Up to a 50-word vitae per presenter
4) Up to a 250-word abstract of the presentation
5) On a separate sheet of paper, describe special considerations for your workshop and equipment needed.

Please send submissions, by email, to David Greene and Carole Campana at dgreene@ramapo.edu or mail to NOMAS M&M 26 PO Box 455 Louisville, CO 80027-0455. The deadline for submissions is June 15, 2001. Please share this information with your colleagues and institutions. Please feel free to contact NOMAS at info@NOMAS.org, or visit our website at www.NOMAS.org.
Registration Form: (Please read the following information)

26th Conference on Men and Masculinity (M&M26)
University of Denver, Denver, CO
July 20-22, 2001

MANifesting Global Justice: Creating Inclusive Communities

Join NOMAS at DU for a day of institutes (Friday 7/20/01), and two full days of, workshops, keynotes, cultural events and general discussion (Saturday and Sunday, 7/21 & 7/22/01) on the issues surrounding men and masculinity in the 21st century. Nationally noted speakers and panelists will conduct sessions on topics including fathering, men and spirituality, health and workplace issues, racism, homophobia and more.

Your Name

Address __________________________ City, St. Zip __________________________

Home Phone __________________ Work Phone __________________

E-Mail __________________ Organization/Affiliation __________________

Emergency Contact Info (Name and Phone):

Full Conference (2 1/2 days) Registration Fees

| Before 5/30/01 | $150.00 |
| After 6/21/01 or on site | $200.00 |

Part Conference Registration Fees

- Full day, Saturday, or Sunday $130.00
- Opening and reception, or single keynote/event $15.00
- Saturday Banquet and program $35.00
- Walk-in fees per workshop and event will be posted at the door

Full registration entitles you to attend all conference sessions and keynotes, receive entry to all entertainment events attend the banquet, receive all official conference documents and attend the conference opening/closing and receptions. Part registration entitles you to receive conference material.

Financial Aid Adjustment

- Check here if requesting a scholarship. Please indicate amount ______ and rationale ______.

50% off registration fees may be available to youth (18-25) and seniors (over 65). Other discounts may be available based on income.

Room (air conditioned) and full board – Available on the campus of the University of Denver – Double occupancy in dorm room: $60.00 per night

(please note: Wednesday and Sunday are for National Council Members only)

- Check here if you have special dietary or other requirements. Please indicate __________________________

Registration for Pre-Conference Institutes

- 13th Men’s Studies Association Meeting (academic papers)
- Ending Men’s Violence (EMV-network)
- Undoing the “ISMs” (diversity training)

NOMAS Membership (optional): $50 (general), $15-50 (sliding scale)

Donation to the Financial Aid Fund

I would like to contribute to the M&M conference to sponsor a youth or senior attendee. $________

Total (please add up all fees and donations and indicate total amount here) $________

Amount enclosed (please enclose at least 50% of total registration not including on-campus housing costs) $________

Balance due $________

Acknowledgement: Registrations will be acknowledged by mail/e-mail

Payment of Fees: Payment of registration fees must accompany all registration forms. Make checks payable to: NOMAS M&M 26

PO Box 455

Louisville, CO 80027-0455

Cancellation Policy: Cancellations must be received in writing by the Conference organizers. There is a $25 fee for cancellations received before June 15, 2001. Cancellations received after June 15, 2001 will be refunded at 50% of total paid.

Disclaimer of Liability: The Conference Organizing Committee reserves the right to amend any part of the Conference program or event at its sole discretion. The Conference or the Conference Organizing Committee assumes no liability for damages of any nature.

Travel Arrangements: If you are flying, reserve tickets now to DIA! - If you need a ride or can offer a ride, e-mail at info@nomas.org

Other Details: Registration and participation is restricted to persons over the age of eighteen (18). All NOMAS events are drug, alcohol and weapon-free. Check below if you would like to

- Volunteer to help with the conference
- Submit a workshop or presentation proposal (deadline 6/15/01)
- Participate in the Coffee House Saturday Talent Night (poetry reading, music, stand-up comedy, etc.)
For further information see www.NOMAS.org, e-mail at info@nomas.org.