



**WESTERN
MICHIGAN**
UNIVERSITY

The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare

Volume 31
Issue 3 September

Article 13

September 2004

**Review of *Men Who Believe in Feminism*. Amanda Goldrick Jones.
Reviewed by Cheryl A. Hyde.**

Cheryl A. Hyde
University of Maryland, Baltimore

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw>



Part of the Gender and Sexuality Commons, and the Social Work Commons

Recommended Citation

Hyde, Cheryl A. (2004) "Review of *Men Who Believe in Feminism*. Amanda Goldrick Jones. Reviewed by Cheryl A. Hyde.," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 31: Iss. 3, Article 13.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15453/0191-5096.3013>

Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol31/iss3/13>

This Book Review is brought to you by the Western Michigan University School of Social Work. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



**WESTERN
MICHIGAN**
UNIVERSITY

evaluation. Second, the book is Eurocentric and offers insights only from the more developed countries. There is so much going on in Eastern and Central Europe, Asia and Africa that was completely lacking in this dialog. This was disappointing but it offers an opportunity to expand the discussion in future projects. Finally, the studies in the book suffer from the same sampling, methodology and measurement problems that plagued much of evaluation research to date. This includes small, convenience samples, no comparison groups, and lack of valid and reliable measures, to name just a few issues. The reader would have hoped that this discourse would have offered innovation in any of these issues since we have so much to learn. In summary, for anyone interested in evaluation research from a global perspective, this is a good start. Even keeping in mind the limitations, there are lessons to be learned here that is worthy-of-note.

Victor Groza

Case Western Reserve University

Amanda Goldrick Jones, *Men Who Believe in Feminism*. Westport, CT: Praegar, 2003. \$64.95 hardcover.

When I mentioned to several colleagues that I was reviewing a book on the profeminist men's movement, they made some interesting comments—"Well, that must be a thin book," "Do we really need to know how men learn to cry" and "You don't mean those guys that beat drums and hug trees, do you?" If nothing else, Amanda Goldrick-Jones deserves credit for undertaking a topic that is often met with a smirk, rolled-eyes or dismissive opinions. Fortunately, she accomplishes more than that in her clear, often engaging, account of the ignored and misrepresented effort of some men to support feminist ideals.

In *Men Who Believe in Feminism*, Goldrick-Jones traces the emergence, activities and challenges of the key branches and organizations of profeminist (also termed anti-sexist) men's movements in the U.S., Canada, Great Britain, and Australia. In each country, these collective action efforts had their roots in the new wave of feminist activism of the 1970s. Goldrick-Jones describes the ways in which male activists framed their causes, determined

"valid" issues, held themselves varyingly accountable to feminists, and addressed internecine conflicts. In the United States, these efforts reached their zenith in the 1980s; in the other countries, a bit later. Currently, there is relatively little profeminist men's mobilization.

What is apparent from this book, however, is that men do need to be involved in anti-sexist organizing and education. In her most compelling section of the book, Goldrick-Jones first outlines the extent of violence against women, what she terms "the female holocaust", and then conveys the work men did to both support the efforts of feminists (mostly through fundraising) and to confront the actions of other men. Indeed, this anti-violence wing was and is the strongest of the profeminist movement.

Much of the book focuses on intra-movement schisms. In essence, there were three streams that claimed to represent "the men's movement". One focused on how men were constrained by traditional sex roles. These activists often claimed that while some men held societal power, most were also oppressed by patriarchy. As such, they had a relatively loose connection to feminism. A splinter group of this wing coalesced and extended the notion of male oppression by claiming that women, specifically feminists, held power over men. This became the basis for the mythopoetic movement championed by Robert Bly, the founder of the fathers' rights actions in divorce and custody issues, and more traditional religious efforts such as Promise Keepers. Not surprisingly, these men are hostile to feminists (and vice versa). Finally, a comparably smaller cadre of men focused on challenging the gender power and privilege held by men. For the most part, these men focused on anti-violence, and while some of their efforts were viewed with skepticism, there was some sense of working in concert with feminists. This wing is the truest expression of profeminist men.

As with the feminist movement, the politics of race, class and sexuality undermined the profeminist movement. Regardless of which wing one focuses on, participants were overwhelmingly white and middle-class. From the conference proceedings, magazines and other literature reviewed for this book, there appears to be few attempts to engage men of color. Issues regarding sexuality, heterosexual and gay, proved even more complex. For example,

some men attempted to defend certain types of pornography as freedom of sexual expression, which met with considerable condemnation from many feminist activists. And while support for gay rights was often forthcoming, that was substantially undermined when a prominent pro-feminist leader in England confessed that when he was 17 he had a sexual relationship with a 12 year old boy. The subsequent firestorm effectively ended his activism, as well as his organization—the National Organization for Men Against Sexism.

Goldrick-Jones account of the profeminist male movement is primarily descriptive, which isn't a problem, per se. Yet had she contexted her account within an analytical framework, such as those provided by the extensive social movement literature, the reader would have a much more dynamic understanding of this movement's growth, development and decline. For example, sociological accounts of the feminist movement, with its competing ideologies, decentralized structure, and struggles with political purity and cooptation, provide ideal templates for a more rigorous examination of the profeminist movement.

The other main critique of this book has to do with the seemingly misleading focus conveyed in the title. It does provide evidence for the ways in which some of the profeminist campaigns and activists engaged in transgressive gender politics, but the reader is left to connect the dots. And, there is little information about the *men* who made up this movement. How, for example, were their lives altered? Were they able to challenge their own gender privilege, and if so, how? Did they create new forms of progressive masculinity? These questions are important not only in understanding the dynamics of the movement, but also in comprehending the social change efforts of anyone who is combating their own group's power such as white people engaged in antiracism work. Yet Goldrick-Jones leaves this important aspect of transformational politics unexamined. However, it is important to remember that the author has tackled a relatively unknown collective engagement to address sexism. She shows that there were men committed to ending gender injustice, and shows that many more are needed today.

Cheryl A. Hyde
University of Maryland, Baltimore