UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

“MAKING A MAN OUT OF A BOY”:

MASCULINITY, MALE PRIVILEGE, AND MISEDUCATION

IN THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

CHARLES JOSEPH MEINHART
Norman, Oklahoma
2009

“MAKING A MAN OUT OF A BOY”:
MASCULINITY, MALE PRIVILEGE, AND MISEDUCATION
IN THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
AND POLICY STUDIES

BY

_____
Dr. Susan Laird, Chair

_____
Dr. Courtney Vaughn

_____
Dr. Irene Karpiak

_____
Dr. Tom Boyd

_____
Dr. Catherine Hobbs

_____
Dr. Susan Kates

Acknowledgments

Like anything important in life, the work on these pages is no isolated effort, but one made possible by the encouragement, support, and loving critique of others who have nurtured my life as well as my scholarship. I would like to think that this whole process has helped make me a better scholar, teacher, colleague, neighbor, and friend.

I wish to express my gratitude to my committee for their insights, patience, and wisdom. Tom Boyd, Catherine Hobbs, Irene Karpiak, Susan Kates, and Courtney Vaughn have all gifted me with their insights and hard work as committee members. Susan Laird, who chaired my committee, has become not only a mentor but a most valued friend.

I would also like to thank professors Susan Birden of Buffalo State University, John Covaleskie of the University of Oklahoma, Jim Garrison of Virginia Tech, Jane Roland Martin of the University of Massachusetts, Jeffrey Milligan of Florida State University, and Al Neiman of the University of Notre Dame, for the many ways they have befriended and encouraged me in my research.

Colleagues Michael Surbaugh, Nance Cunningham, Teresa Rendon, Robin Mitchell Stroud, Deborah Shinn, Steven Mackie, and Lady Branham have been invaluable friends and collaborators on a variety of projects as

well as readers of portions of this dissertation. Their suggestions have been helpful, and their ability to choose enjoyable restaurants and night spots on conference trips has been, shall we say, instructive.

Where would I be without friends who over the years have challenged and encouraged me to be myself, pursue my dreams, and not back away from the difficult questions? Special thanks to Bill Zambon, Carmen Partin, Dorothy Eaton, Diana Vezmar-Bailey, John Green, Tom Kovach and Will Weir, Ellen Frank and Tom Fredgren, Becca and Randy Hewes, Cheri and Ron Remington, and others as well.

A special word of thanks to the members of Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays, Norman Chapter, for their love and support. They have helped keep me honest and involved in the community.

Last, but certainly not least, I am forever grateful for my family, without whose love and support I would not have been able to consider or attempt this work. My parents, my brother Bob, his wife Gloria, and their daughter, my favorite niece Jessica, have "been there" for me. My father, Charles, who died during the writing of this dissertation, and my mother, Barbara, always encouraged my brother and me to pursue a full education. (Actually, expected would be a better word than encouraged.) They always valued our curiosity, imagination, intelligence and compassion, and so, I dedicate this to them.

Table of Contents

Abstract

This inquiry responds to a perceived "masculinity crisis" by examining the educational meanings and cultural values of "masculinization." (Pollack, 1998, 2000; Sommers, 2000; Gurian, 1996) Claiming that a masculinization process premised upon the dominant form of masculinity in American culture brutalizes boys, and contributes to social violence, misogyny, and homophobia, this study challenges the narrow conception of manhood on which this "crisis" is premised. This study theorizes such masculinization as a form of "cultural miseducation" (Martin, 1992, 2002) by means of "regimes of truth" (Foucault, 1984) that construct a violent social order and establishes criteria for understanding boys' responses to brutalization as "varieties of masculine experience" derived from William James' *Varieties of Religious Experience* (1902). Through numerous educational strategies and environments, a variety of masculinities emerge as boys respond to masculinization in American culture – Prisoner, Victim, Stranger, and Healthy-Minded. Thus masculinity is a social construction of spiritually consequential meaning attributed to male bodies, rather than a biological determination; formulating a concept of "serial masculinity" derived from Iris Marion Young's concept of "gender as seriality"(1997). It argues that education (and miseducation) is the primary means for the social construction of masculinity.

This inquiry's central thesis is that educators can respond helpfully to the brutalization of boys by resisting masculinization and recognizing boys as "live creatures" (Dewey, 1934) who can and should learn through adventure rather than brutalization.

As the Boy Scouts of America exemplifies the dominant mode of masculinization, this inquiry conducts a case study of the Boy Scouts of America, examines the works of Boy Scout founder Baden-Powell (1908), BSA's textual curricula, and recent court cases against BSA as its primary sources, introducing and applying a "cultural scouting" method of critique that traces and maps "adventures" and "brutalizations" in those sources as cultural assets and liabilities. While thus mapping and critiquing the BSA's miseducative curriculum, this study also recognizes the educational wisdom of its method, and provides clues for future meliorist construction of a curriculum for boys (and girls) as "live creatures," to foster their partnership over privilege, resist their brutalization, and construct new opportunities for adventure in building a less violent society. The study closes by proposing further work in developing strategies of resistance which address adventures and brutalizations.

Chapter 1 Masculinization as an Educational Problem

Jails and prisons in the United States are filled with a higher percentage of young male offenders than any other nation.[1] Each year, over 690,000 juveniles enter the prison system. In the state of Ohio, there are almost two thousand teen boys in jails and detention centers, and one in four is a sex offender.[2] Louisiana has almost six thousand youth, the majority of which are male) locked up in jails and another fifty-seven thousand in court supervision.[3] Seventy-eight percent of them are African-Americans, and over sixty percent are serving long term sentences.[4] According to the American Bar Association, forty-six of the fifty states have juveniles on death row. The United States leads the world in the execution of boys, with Texas, Oklahoma and Virginia leading the way (other nations executing youth include Iran, China, Saudi Arabia, Yemen and Pakistan).[5] Other signs of a problem involving "masculinity" are numerous. The suicide rate among teen boys is four times higher than that among teen girls, and tends to be higher among native American, black, as well as gay, transgender and questioning boys.[6] School shootings by teenaged boys, such as the Columbine, Colorado incident raise questions about socialization and masculinization in school and society.

This inquiry arises out of my interest in and study of social violence, religious and cultural values, and the education of boys. It participates in an

ongoing social conversation about 'masculinity' as well as cultural values. There are various approaches to these issues. What educational philosopher Jane Roland Martin calls the "problem of generations"[7] poses questions about what one generation passes on to the next: what is to be valued, who is to decide what these values are and how best to communicate them through the myriad educational agencies that permeate a society. The transmission from one generation to another of what she calls harmful values (such as racism and misogyny) is cultural miseducation, which society should seek to avoid as much as possible.

I begin my inquiry by acknowledging that an educational problem confronts our society that needs careful attention by educators. That problem centers on how boys are educated about “growing up.” I will begin also by examining different ways of perceiving what is going on with boys and education for adult manhood. In this work, I propose that the current masculinization of boys is a form of cultural miseducation which contributes to the construction of a violent social order. Masculinization, as I deploy the term here, is the education of boys to be men, seeking to conform boys to a model of learned manhood. This philosophical-historical case study of the Boy Scouts of America will argue that masculinization is a form of cultural miseducation, which brutalizes boys and men, to the further detriment not only of boys and men, but girls and women as well.

What is meant by the use of the word "masculinity"? Lord Robert

Baden-Powell claimed that the Boy Scouting movement he founded existed to 'make a man out of a boy'.[8] The Boy Scouts of America are an example of a cultural organization that has as its mission the masculinization of boys. What is masculinization about? It is quite possible that the concern about masculinity is a crisis in meaning, and therefore, perhaps, a spiritual crisis. It might be helpful to explore the relationship between the masculinization process in our culture and its high level of violence and social inequality. Since we live in a male-dominated society, it would seem wise to examine connections between the way boys are educated about what it means to be men, and the violence and misogyny in our culture. Might the currently accepted forms of masculinization encourage or tolerate violence? Is it possible for educators to imagine and even help construct an educational environment for boys that does not reward or promote violent behavior? What kinds of education about masculinity might help construct a society based on equality, nonviolence, compassion and democratic ideals? Can educators engage this process in a way that liberates boys from violent forms of masculinity that alienate them from themselves, one another, and girls?

This inquiry will suggest the possibility of a pragmatic, meliorist response to the cultural miseducation that currently provokes so much debate, frustration, and violence in schools and society. It will formulate a philosophical foundation for educators' creative response to foster a

healthier approach to masculinity. In light of these questions I will study William James' *Varieties of Religious Experience* critically, in search of a useful, pragmatist framework for addressing the relationship between boyhood/manhood and violence. Might James' framework provide helpful criteria for envisioning new possibilities for a pragmatic response to the current "crisis"? I will look to his own framework to assist my thinking about the experiences of boys and men, by reclaiming their variety and the scope of their experiences in making meaning of their lives, identities, and relationships. This inquiry will consider the possibility that the inner sense-of-self of a boy (or man) is not exhausted by being male. In the middle chapters I will apply criteria derived from my study of William James, with other helpful insights from Martin and feminist political theorist Iris Marion Young, to examine philosophically -- and ethically critique -- the texts of the Boy Scouts of America, the largest educational agency charged with educating boys in the United States. Based on the conclusions of that study, I will begin theorizing ways in which educators can respect the variety of boys' experiences and promote a healthier, less violent social order.

Masculinity and Masculinization

If masculinity and masculinization seem to have gone awry, where can we turn to understand this development? The Heroic Age and its attendant legends and cults shaped the Greek and later western

understanding of masculinity. Legends of heroes such as Herakles and Jason are numerous - legends of struggle, triumph, and virility. Masculinity was a quality seen in heroes (all male) who exhibited physical courage (especially in battle), virility, command over the lives of others, and a take-charge style of leadership.

Plato addresses masculinity in some of his works, most notably *Meno* and *Laches*. In *Meno*, Socrates discusses the teaching of virtue to young men with Meno, a city elder. The life of virtue was what made a boy a man, and masculinity was tied up in these virtues. The Greek common wisdom was that men had certain virtues and women had differing virtues. While Socrates does not question this differentiation per se, he asserts that behind these separate virtues there are common universal virtues, such as justice, moderation, and wisdom. Furthermore, Socrates and Plato were among those who believed that the virtues of manhood were not inherent in a person, but had to be taught. Other schools of thought tended to believe that virtues were innate, and that training (such as the martial arts) simply helped boys discover the masculine truth already there.[9]

In *Laches*, masculinity (andreia) is an ideal pursued by the virtuous man. In this dialogue, a Council of (male) Elders discusses how to educate boys for manhood. The consensus is that military training is the surest way to train boys in the courage required for manhood. As the dialogue in *Laches* unfolds, the heroic vision of masculinity held by the Council exalts courage

and boldness, especially expressed through strength, as an ideal that males are to hold before themselves. This heroic sense of masculinity sees might making right, expects the leader to enrich himself and his friends at the expense of his detractors or enemies, and exalts physical protection and use (or threat) of force. Socrates and Nicias, a member of the Council, bring a different perspective to the conversation.[10]

Council member Laches is himself a model of heroic warrior masculinity, because of his courage, virility, instinct, service in armed conflict and non-intellectual demeanor. He stands in contrast with the more intellectual and reflective Nicias, who is not known for heroism in combat or instinctual behavior. The difference between Laches' approach to being a man and the approach of Nicias becomes clarified in two portions of the dialogue. First is the definition of courage. Laches defines courage as having the guts to stand up against whatever it is that one fears. For Nicias, on the other hand, courage is having the wisdom to know what is worth fighting for. Secondly, they evaluate Socrates' courage in different ways. Laches admires Socrates because he took up arms and fought in battle to defend Athens. Nicias, on the other hand, admires him for his ethical and intellectual courage. Throughout the dialogue, Socrates seems to suggest that there is more to masculinity than either innate behavior or social conformity. As Michel Foucault suggests, in our own day, (in *Care of the Self*) the self is no longer conceived of as a result of social conditioning, but is to

become an object of the reflective activity of continuous learning.[11] This 'examined life' constitutes the core value communicated in Socratic philosophy. Socrates demonstrates in these dialogues that such a life demands introspection and self-tending, rather than conformity to social norms and proper standards of behavior, to ensure the health of one's soul.

Today in our culture, observers of the practice of 'masculinity' raise questions about violence, authority, male privilege, and approaches to sexuality. What are boys learning about what it means to be a man? A quick review of statistics will suggest that boys are learning that violence as a response to problems is acceptable (prison numbers, school shootings, suicides, rapes), that authority is to be obeyed (or rebelled against), that boys are to define themselves over against women, and that the meaning of masculinity is wrapped up in a particular view of nature and religion, or spirituality. In the following section, I question whether boys may be experiencing an education that is actually harmful and miseducative.

Miseducation

What kind of 'masculinity' do we want to be teaching children? What kind of masculinity are we in fact handing on to them now? What are boys learning about being men? It appears, from information mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, that either they are learning the masculinity that society values (and society therefore must value violence, obedience, and

misogyny) or that the violence and misogyny which boys learn is not what is intended, in which case it should be clear that they are learning the wrong things about masculinity. In either case, in the process of masculinization, boys are being miseducated. I will consider the possibility that the very miseducation by masculinization is producing a violent society. It should be possible for us to imagine and put into practice an educational environment for boys that does not promote violent behavior. In this section, I will look at the significance of masculinization as a form of cultural miseducation.

While theories of gender are plentiful and complex, feminism began constructing various theories in response to two concerns. Initial concerns included countering essentialist approaches to gender by male theorists, and Marxist-based class theories. A number of feminist and postmodern theorists have expanded the scope of their scholarship to include particulars such as race, class, ethnicity, age, and other experiences that particularize models that might otherwise prove universalizing.[12]

Foucault constructs an approach to gender that deconstructs normative gender models. Perhaps the most important thing Foucault does is call into question those approaches to and theories about gender and sexuality that universalize and homogenize. His “genealogical” analysis shows how what might be called the “modernity project” desired a scientific way of making general statements which might always and everywhere be true. In studying prisons, medicine, and sexuality, he questions the way this

desire for universals plays out, sometimes in intended and sometimes in perhaps unintended ways. Once the need for standardization occurs, there is a need to define the “normal”. Scientifically speaking, there are deviations from the norm that are expected (and not seen as unexpected or undesirable).[13] But in applying science to human issues, something happens. The mutually constitutive ideas of idea of norm and deviation create categories that facilitate social and political control. The “modernity project” sees science and the quest for universals as freeing humans from the shackles of superstition and fear. Although in a sense that did come about, Foucault’s studies would suggest that the very field of freedom becomes the planting ground for tyranny and repression. Foucault's notions of "regimes of truth" and "disciplinary systems" are premised in such disciplines as philosophy, culture, science, law, and political practice the processes and institutions through which power is replicated, extended, and enforced.[14] He asks questions about relations between and among actions that suggest reality is not as settled or harmless as one might think. In his view, masculinity becomes a performance imposed on male bodies by those who exercise power, and the body becomes a text on which the hegemonic masculinity is inscribed. The Foucauldian analysis of discourse, in dialogue with feminist thought, can become a tool for understanding and responding to power and its projection as a determiner of masculinities.

Postmodern scholar Judith Butler builds her gender theory around the

idea of performance. Butler's work has been influential in helping to rethink gender and sexuality in anti-essentialist terms. She theorizes gender as an act that is both intentional and performative, with "performative" suggesting a purposeful, momentary construction of meaning by the individual.[15] For Butler, gender as "always a doing" allows gender dualisms or binary opposites to be interrogated.[16]

Although postmodern thought easily dispenses with the humanistic unified self, some of its practitioners seem to reduce individual human beings to mere aggregates of the many discourses in which they are situated.[17] In such a situation, human agency can be lost, leaving the person to be swept along by the tides of discourse. Ignoring or dismissing the different arrangements of power, much popular and scholarly thought normalizes and quantifies masculinity, manhood, and boyhood.

What do we mean by the use of the word "masculinity"? In light of the high level of violence among today's young men, we ought to ask, "what is the relationship between masculinity and violence?" Boys and men today are in trouble with authorities, and there is unrest in schools. This study will test the possibility that we can learn something about this "boy crisis" by letting James help us think about the ways various experiences of and responses to masculinization are quests for meaning. In this inquiry, I will establish criteria for understanding boys' responses to the brutalization of the masculinization process as "varieties of masculine experience" derived

from William James' *Varieties of Religious Experience*. I will name specific "varieties of masculine experience." These varieties can be seen as similar to Iris Marion Young's philosophical concept of "gender as seriality." I will explore the conceptual meaning of "seriality" in the third chapter.

Who chooses what to teach boys about masculinity? I contend that, given the insights of Martin and sociologist Michael Kimmel, an unreflective society is miseducating boys about manhood precisely by holding to definitions of masculinity that look at manhood in a narrow fashion (not taking into account a broader cultural richness). It is important to note that Martin names as "multiple educational agency" the variety of organizations and institutions that provide education, overtly or otherwise in a culture. [18] Schools alone are not the educators of society's children. Family, church, school, cinema, television, Boy Scouts, the advertising industry, the health-care industry, and many more contribute to a cultural understanding to masculinity (and therefore sexuality and gender, authority and community). Martin is concerned about how those who educate youth, in the wide variety of educational organizations, can educate for a better future, by being aware of "cultural assets and liabilities". She looks at the uses and misuses of social and cultural heritage as a means for cultural education, building upon the ideas put forth in earlier years by John Dewey, in *Experience and Education*.[19]

For Dewey, education and miseducation were broad categories.

Dewey writes of the need for schools to contribute to the building or directing of a more intelligent common life, and proposes experience as an interpreting factor in improving education.[20] Martin expands on his thinking by proposing education as a means of consciousness raising that can help craft a renewed society.[21] Such a society works to develop the tools to overcome the liabilities of the old. Martin is more specific in addressing "cultural miseducation," by which she refers to violence, bigotry, and hatred. She defines "cultural miseducation" as the transmission of cultural liabilities in such a way that heavy burdens are placed on the next generation. In addition, otherwise invaluable portions of "cultural wealth", which she calls "cultural assets", are neglected and not passed down.[22]

When Dewey speaks of educators helping their students learn from the past about the present, it is so that a future might be envisioned and championed that is not based on the ugliness of certain past events.[23] An experience is "miseducative" if it distorts or harms the possibility of further growth and experience.[17] Martin describes this process occuring when a society passes on a "cultural liability" rather than a "cultural asset".[24] By continuing to pass on liabilities, society chokes off certain possibilities for change, and as Dewey warned, any further growth is distorted. For Martin, the question for educators is how to identify liabilities and render them harmless by teaching about them in the context of democratic values.[25]

In discussing her concept of "multiple educational agency", Martin

opens the way for us to understand how education consists not only of what happens in schools and schoolyards. Students and citizens are educated daily by the media, Hollywood, radio talk show hosts, advertising and so many other factors. All these influences in addition to others help shape students' ideas, preconceptions, and worldviews. The school can lead the way in addressing miseducation, but somewhere along the process, the other agents need to be challenged.[26]

Keeping liabilities hidden does violence against history, because history as a process is built on the past, and requires an honest assessment of the past to construct a helpful and democratic future. For Dewey, history was connected with social consciousness, and the sense in which a common life provided meaning and direction.[27] He was not an idealist, like Marx or Hegel, and so would seem to reject the idea of inevitable progress often associated with them. History, like personal and social life, is experimental. Healthy growth is dependent on the exercise of intelligence in naming and overcoming difficulties.[28] Martin seems to strike the same chord when she writes about the naming of liabilities and assets. Who will do the naming and who will address the need to render liabilities as the "dead relics" they should become? This is a question Dewey seems only to glance at, while Martin identifies it for the serious issue it is, avoiding the naïve optimism that seems to lurk in the background of some of Dewey's writings.

By keeping gender talk narrowed to easy essentialisms –

masculinization as normalization - are we not excluding and silencing the voices of those with other, broader experiences? This silencing of boys' experience, might it not distort or harm the possibility of further growth and experience? Might it be time to re-examine the way masculinity, obedience and violence are related? Is it possible in our culture for boys to construct meaning for themselves that is not sexist, that is not bound to violent patriarchy and heteronormativity? In order to help build a less violent society it might be helpful to reconsider how boys are taught what it means to be a man.

Emasculation, Brutalization or Something Else?

I will now look at some of the disputed ways in which masculinization is perceived as a crisis in American society. Serious criticism of the current hegemonic forms of male privilege is offered by pragmatists, existentialists, postmodernists, feminists, and queer theorists.[29] In response, there is a renewal in academic circles, religious communities, neo-conservative think tanks, and popular culture of claims that western culture is suffering from a "masculinity crisis."[30] Such voices often claim that boys are in crisis, and schools are often quick to be blamed. These voices suggest that the youngest generation of boys is growing up emotionally handicapped, and potentially violent, precisely because it has been cut off from "masculine" ways of expressing their own feelings. This notion of a so-called "masculinity

crisis" reflects the belief, held by some, that the masculinization process has gone awry and must be recovered and reinstated.[31]

There are, indeed, indications of a problem. That there is some "crisis" with boys in America is not really an issue. How to interpret the crisis, and what to do with that interpretation, is more controversial. Masculinity, manhood, and the crisis itself are framed by a variety of contested meanings. One way to address this 'problem' is to emphasize the need to re-masculinize boys, by engaging in masculinization programs. I will examine two of those, and also look at another response that suggests a more pragmatic approach to the experiences of boyhood.

Recovering masculinization today

Is there some dis-ease among males in America? Is there, indeed, a masculinity crisis? After the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the United States government responded to the violence of that day by turning to violence itself, first invading Afghanistan and later Iraq. Hundreds of thousands of lives have been lost to date in response to the initial loss of three thousand. The response of many leaders on the Christian Right to the events of 9/11 suggested that the terrorist attacks were connected to modern society's tolerance of feminism and homosexuality.[32] Using differing approaches, popular writers such as Christina Hoff Sommers, Steve Biddulph, Michael Gurian, William Pollack, and others respond to the wide

spectrum of social controversies by suggesting that the real problem is a “crisis in masculinity.” Among their many shared concerns, they seek to counter the writings of pro-feminist male writers such as John Stoltenberg and Warren Farrell (his early writings).

The claim that a "masculinity crisis" exists is an important one, because it affects (and has affected) public policy, especially in regard to the education of young people in the United States. Beyond the popular writings suggesting the dire implications of such a crisis, there are serious works that raise this question, and must be taken seriously. Psychologist Stephen J. Ducat has recently conducted studies that indicate a direct relationship between the way a man envisions masculinity and the way he approaches politics and social relationships. The more traditional the values of masculine privilege, the more likely a man is to support violence as a means for resolving differences, to oppose government programs that help those in distress, to feel less of a connection with nature, and to be homophobic.[33]

In *Real Boys: Rescuing our Sons from the Myths of Boyhood*, psychologist Pollack writes about how masculinity is a mask boys wear, trying it on, performing it. Yet it is a mask that can bring shame and separation.[34] In another book, he speaks again of the mask of masculinity, this time as a source of bravado and suppression.[35] Pollack is convinced that violence is an inescapable part of wearing the mask. He is not opposed to the mask, per se, suggesting that it is part of the inescapable baggage of

manhood. Indeed, his approach is not to suggest throwing away the mask, but wearing it in a disciplined way.[36] His talk of masks resembles the "performance" language of Judith Butler, the feminist philosopher who critiques feminist essentialists by asserting that all sexuality and gender are matters of performance, rather than identity.[37]

Michael Gurian, a family therapist, proposes a new “Nature-Based Theory,” which attempts to construct a scientific approach to human nature that builds on religion and social ideologies, but "also elevates hard science into equal partnership with religion and ideology in human identity development."[38] He also uses brain studies and kinesthetic studies to claim that boys need physical activity, physical discipline, and physical working out of issues and differences.[39] His fascination with the brain is such that he maps out different brains to distinguish between what he calls the “normal” boy and what he calls the "sensitive" boy.[40]

While these authors take differing approaches, all of them write in response to what they see as a masculinity crisis that raises questions in relation to how boys are educated about gender, relationships, and growth toward maturity. All of them tend to suggest that boys need more masculinization, rather than less, or something different. These writers suggest that the youngest generation of boys is growing up emotionally handicapped, and potentially violent, precisely because they have been cut off from certain naturally 'masculine' ways of expressing their own feelings.

Often the call is for a return to traditional gender roles, modified by new psychological insights. Blame is placed on feminism and liberal attitudes toward sexuality.[41] This "post-feminist backlash"[42] response to the current situation portrays boys as emasculated by society in general, and the educational system in particular. Parents and teachers are encouraged to "let boys be boys." Advice-giving literature and socially critical literature from socially conservative writers and scholars suggests that concepts of masculinity have become too broad and need to be tightened up. Because boys are seen as being emasculated, the "crisis of masculinity" is seen as a social crisis.

Recovering masculinization a century ago – church and school

The idea that boys are being robbed of their masculinity when they are discouraged from fighting and other behavior is not new. One only needs to look back one century to see turmoil and dispute about gender roles and social norms. Preaching and writing – church and school – become arenas for this dispute.

Literary historian Ann Douglas, in her study of American culture, argues that in the religious disputes of the Victorian Era, a strict patriarchal Calvinism gave way to what she calls softer forms of Protestantism. She documents how, with the demise of a muscular Christianity, clergy began using what Douglas calls more feminine forms of expression in order to

appeal to women.[43] They started talking and writing more about feeling and emotion. Lamenting the loss of romanticism, Douglas interprets this feminization as weakness. While not denying the social oppression of a muscular Calvinism, she documents how sentimentalism creeps into popular culture, and women write books that esteem the very qualities that historically kept them powerless - softness, timidity, piety, and a disdain for competition. Douglas' claim is that these values influenced the social development of the national culture, so that it became (and remains) preoccupied with glamour, banal melodrama, and mindless consumption. She argues that a creative alternative discourse was never developed.[44]

The result of this historical situation has been a backlash that defines women as subservient, replacing women with men in the traditional feminine professions and seeking the re-establishment of muscular theology and economics. This backlash actually exploits the feminized sense of feeling and emotion to appeal for more muscular and martial society. The current American sense of masculinity is heavily influenced by this development, as well as the redefinition of persons as consumers.[45]

Moving from religion to writing, Miriam Brody studies the changing gender roles in relation to the literary styles of the period. Her book, *Manly Writing*, illustrates how a style of composition marked by ornamentation, embellishment, and the “normal” organizing standards of the time was considered feminine, and therefore somehow less than masculine.[46] Manly

writing is supposed to be passionless, structured in a close fashion, and virtuous in presentation.[47] The new writing was to reflect the Enlightenment interest in essentializing and normalizing explanations for everything.[47]

Recovering masculinization a century ago – boys

When war hero Lord Robert Stephenson Baden-Powell returned to England and started the Boy Scout movement almost a century ago, he did so because he saw problems in the Britain of his day. He saw a country trying to cope with a war that has not been going well. His country also had endured a much publicized trial involving a celebrity in a sex scandal. It was embroiled in a long social struggle around women's rights issues. Churches were organizing to thwart the gains in the women's movement. Preachers, politicians, and media commentators regularly lamented the "moral crisis" into which the nation has fallen. Schools were being blamed for the nation's moral weakness, and commentators claimed that boys had been emasculated.[49]

Baden-Powell saw these events as evidence of moral failure, and as a poor reflection on the schools and churches of England. For Baden-Powell, it was clear that they simply had not done their job. Both had failed their service to the Empire. More to the point, both had lost their masculinity.[50] Baden-Powell countered these developments by starting the Boy Scout movement. The Boy Scout idea of masculinity begins with the

idea that a man does his duty at all times, keeping himself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight.[51]

Baden-Powell chose to call the movement Scouting because it was a military term that also contained a hint of the romance of the frontier. He had helped train Scouts in the Royal Army, and war was, for Baden-Powell, the supreme test of manhood. In providing organization for the Scouting movement, boys were organized in patrols, because patrols resembled both the military unit and the gang, and Baden-Powell believed boys naturally gravitated toward gang activity. This was both a tool for developing masculinity and a key for understanding what it meant to be a man.

This hero worship was very important for him, and served to define leadership as offering oneself as a hero. People, or at least boys and men, needed heroes by nature, and heroes were beneficial to society. Heroes were those around whom legends were built, and legends were good for society in general and boys in particular. Heroes inspired loyalty – personal loyalty as well as loyalty to a cause, a way of life. And boys could be very loyal.[52]

While all of the above is important for educating boys in masculinity for Baden-Powell, at the center of Baden-Powell's concept of masculinity is the warrior and the battlefield. His model of manhood is the warrior, and he built his Boy Scout value system around the ideas of battle, the Empire, and colonization of others for their own good.[53]

In the decades since, in much of what was once the British Empire, the Boy Scouting movement has decided to move beyond Baden-Powell's vision in order to enlarge and expand the membership of the organization to include and involve girls, as well as gay and irreligious youth. It is in the United States – within the Boy Scouts of America - that the warrior/hero values Baden-Powell thought so definitive of manhood remain unchallenged and unchanged… values essential for producing obedient soldiers and building empire. Since 1975, Boy Scouts of America has been involved in more than thirty lawsuits. These cases have challenged the standards for membership of the BSA, principally that Scouts are required to be male, believe in God, and not be homosexual. The Boy Scouts have won every single one of these cases, either at trial or on appeal.[54] The Boy Scouts, as an educational agent throughout the nation, is involved centrally in the education about masculinity that this study examines. Their interaction with boys, men, parents, girls and civic organizations promotes a specific approach to masculinization, one bent on preventing the emasculation mentioned above.

A Pragmatist Reading of Masculinization: Brutalization

Is the claim of emasculation helpful in explaining the current situation? Should we simply accept the emasculation analysis of the social commentators mentioned above as the appropriate starting point? In fact,

the view that boys are being emasculated is not universally accepted. Martin writes in *The Schoolhome* about the current concern over boys and their manhood. She disputes the assumption that challenging violence, aggression, and male supremacy endangers the masculinity of boys.[55] She also suggests the pursuit of virtue in educating boys will confront the issues of violence, aggression and misogyny with care, concern, and connection. Might this important turn in educational strategy actually civilize boys, rather than brutalizing them, as current dominant strategies seem to be doing? Brutalization, of course, has two outcomes. When X brutalizes Y, two things are happening. First, X is being brutal toward Y, assaulting and mistreating. But secondly, X in acting the brute, is reducing himself to something less than what one might expect from a mature human being. The beliefs a boy embraces regarding masculinity will enhance or brutalize both the boy and society.

This is a provocative claim, for Martin understands that the statistics regarding juvenile male incarceration, suicide, and other forms of violence all indicate that the present education of boys is "brutalizing" rather than enhancing their lives. Indeed, Martin suggests that to fall back on what some see as "long-established" values would only heighten the brutalization, since the manhood boys seem to be learning represents the excesses of the dominant "masculine" virtues, and the boys of today are growing up as caricatures of manhood.[56]

She makes this point in criticizing James' famous essay, "The Moral Equivalent of War," which was published in 1906, the year before Baden-Powell founded the Boy Scouts. (It is an era when critics in Britain and the US urge a recovery of the martial spirit, and lament the feminization of society, and the "softness" of boys.) Even though James would support the policy aims of those opposed to American imperial designs, he insists that the "martial virtues" are to be privileged, in order to bring out the best in a society. His argument opposes the lethal violence and social destruction of war, not the virtues inherent in the war experience. He proposes the development of social projects as a moral equivalent to war, in hopes that the nation's energies can be positively redirected. These projects would engage young men in a highly disciplined social service. Done correctly, these projects could preserve the martial virtues (intrepidity, contempt of softness, obedience, and surrender of self) and help men see the importance of a war against nature.[57] Examples of such organizing in American culture include the Civilian Conservation Corps of the Great Depression era, and in present times the Peace Corps, Teach for America, war on poverty organizations and others following this line of appeal.

Martin deftly contrasts the choice of military service as a curriculum for the good life with the choice made by Maria Montessori who conceptualized the home as such a curriculum. For James, heroism in the face of struggle and the possibility of death and other dangers is an

elevating experience that needs to be preserved. The man who in 1864 told friends that he had chosen for himself the speculative life over the active, promotes for others an embrace of active risking and boldness as superior to cooperative conversation.[58] He distances himself from the popular Chautauqua movement with its emphasis on cooperative learning and mutuality, calling it "unspeakable."[59] James urges teachers to encourage a combat mentality in their students and shame in motivating learning.[60]

Martin's claims are all the more important when seen beside the research of sociologist and educator Michael Kimmel, who studies a wide variety of cultural expressions of gender. Kimmel questions the validity of studies which seek to chart differences in brains according to sex, by citing research that sees no significant physical difference between male and female brains.[61] He shows how, with the advent of the scientific age, the objectification of women takes a "scientific" turn. Once scientists begin measuring brain size and proportions and other bodily aspects, conclusions are drawn about differences between the sexes and ethnic groups that could then be labeled as "natural." A centimeter difference in brain size here, and a different shape there, can be interpreted as indicating capacity for reason or emotional stability.

> No sooner had the biological differences between men and women been established as scientific fact than writers and critics declared all efforts to challenge social inequality and discrimination against

women to be in violation of the "laws of nature".[62]

Kimmel illustrates how this same argument is used by some modern critics of feminism not only to defend conventional approaches to women in society, but to define masculinity in a biologically essentialist fashion.[63] He points out that different studies of the brain draw different conclusions about some functions. Perhaps the more helpful question for scholars is not which part of the brain is used, but how it is used. This focuses the question not on how female brains are different from male brains (or how gay male brains are different from heterosexual brains[64]) but on how different populations use the same part of the brain differently.[65] There is no indication of anything biological that dictates these different usages, so the logical question to ask would be about learned behavior and social conditioning.

Kimmel traces how social conditioning has affected the ways masculinity has been understood. He documents what he calls the "re-creating of masculinity" around physical activity and recreation, during the end of the nineteenth century and beginning of the twentieth.[66] This very re-creation is a response to late nineteenth century feminism. It is both a political and spiritual conflict. At that very time, Baden-Powell's Boy Scouting movement, centered around physical activity and games, was providing a curriculum to re-create masculinity for the sake of the British Empire.

Masculinization, Brutalization, and Spiritual Crisis

If beliefs are rules for action, as James theorizes, how might educators confront harmful beliefs? Should educators even be concerned with helping to shape a more constructive, less violent image of masculinity in schools and other educative settings? A variety of scholars and others seem to agree that the education of boys is a real problem. Things are not going right. Although they have differing perspectives, they have a similar approach: understanding this to be a social policy issue. Social and political discussions about boys and girls, gender roles, and the "boy crisis," are about more than social policy. Might one accept the pragmatist reading and build on it, by proposing a direction in which it can go? Behind the policy debates lurks a deeper question, for the making of meaning is a philosophical issue. Whether one calls the making of meaning a philosophical reflection or spiritual quest, what is central is the search for meaning in one's existence. If education for making meaning focuses only on a limited definition of masculinity, are not questions regarding beliefs and values approached from a confining perspective, rather than an expansive one? Can educators find ways to enhance the search for meaning? Perhaps we are dealing not so much with a masculinity crisis but with a moral or spiritual predicament? If this is so, is not the conversation about masculinity pushed beyond a social crisis to one of the spirit?

When I speak of spirit, spirituality and religion in this inquiry, I am not referring to institutional religion. Is religion what an individual does in his solitude? Is religion a source of cultural meaning and cohesion? Is religion an evocative social engagement for communal as well as individual transformative action? William James would suggest the first interpretation, and this is the generally accepted usage in American culture. The second reflects an anthropological or sociological approach, and requires a religiously unified country. The interpretation I mean when I use the words religion, religious, or spiritual in this work is a third approach, which borrows from the insights of John Dewey, who understood religion and God to signify the ideals that arise out of everyday living that impel individuals and communities to take action for growth and betterment.[67] The active relationship between imaginative ideals and the actual lived environment is the divine space.[68]

I will turn to Pragmatist James for a framework that may help in thinking about experience of this kind. For James, author of *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, the beliefs that men and women hold are more than speculations or good feelings. James reminds us that beliefs are rules for action.[69] It is important to separate James' sexism and exaggerated sense of manhood, mentioned above, from the insights he can provide regarding how what we believe makes rules for action. Although Martin's critique of James' essay "The Moral Equivalent of War" reveals his fears of the feminine and

his love for robustness, we can still learn a great deal from his insights into the various ways people experience the making of meaning. *Varieties* explores in a helpful way the relationship between experience and belief. Beliefs have practical consequences that affect how we understand ourselves as well as how we relate to others and the world around us. They both reflect and shape our vision of life, or what James would call our religious experience or spirituality. James reminds us that "only when our thought about a subject has found its rest in belief can our action on the subject firmly and safely begin".[70] If James is right, then in order to understand what is going on in American culture today in regard to masculinity, we must examine the culturally dominant beliefs about what it means to be a man.

A Crisis of Spirit

To summarize: the current methods for educating boys about gender are miseducative. While there is profound disagreement about what that means and what ought to be done, the sense that something is wrong is widespread, as noted above. Everyone seems to agree that the education of boys is a real issue. Things are not going right. The fact that cultural miseducation is occurring on such a large scale should raise questions about what is actually valued in boys and men. The kind of masculinity that relies on domination, which Kimmel refers to as biological essentialism, sets

the tone for what little conversation is going on regarding masculinity and masculinization in the public arena. It is possible that by focusing only on a limited definition of masculinity, questions regarding beliefs and values are approached from a narrow perspective which misdirects the conversation. The "masculinity crisis" and the question of miseducating boys can be seen a crisis of spirit.

If actions are indeed guided by beliefs, then in order to understand what is going on in American culture today in regard to masculinity, we should examine the beliefs that inform it. I begin this dissertation by looking at miseducation, because I argue that education (and miseducation) is the primary means for the social construction of masculinity. Through numerous educational strategies and environments, a variety of masculinities are realized in American culture. All of these masculinities manifest what I will call “adventures” and “brutalizations.” I claim a masculinization process premised upon the dominant form of masculinity in American culture brutalizes boys, which often contributes to social violence, misogyny, and homophobia. I will conceptualize boys’ response to that brutalization. I also contend that educators can respond helpfully to the brutalization of boys by resisting masculinization and recognizing boys as “live creatures”[71] who can and should learn through adventure rather than brutalization.

While there are a number of ways to do that, it makes sense to examine an organization or institution that exists chiefly for the education of

boys. Since there are no clear cases of large numbers of boys being educated outside of a masculinization framework in our society, I will set aside the possibility of an ideal, and look at an educational agency that exemplifies the masculinization process. In the United States, one organization, which has become an institution in American culture, is actually chartered by Congress to do just this – the Boy Scouts of America.[72] They have over 800,000 boys participating in their programs, and are an exemplar of the dominant masculinity.[73] Founded by Lord Baden-Powell to re-masculinize boys, the Boy Scouts of America, as an institution, are dedicated to the re-masculinization of American youth. But first, I will turn to James, Young and Foucault to provide a framework for conceptualizing the varieties of masculine experience.

Notes

1. “U.S. prison population dwarfs that of other nations” Adam Liptak, *International Herald Tribune*, April 23, 2008. See also James Vicini, Reuters, December 9, 2006.
2. National Criminal Justice Reference Service website: www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications/abstract.aspx?ID=113033. See also Opening Doors website: http://openingmoredoors.org/content/ministries/downloads/Opening%20Doors%20facts%20youth.pdf
3. Juvenile Justice Project of Louisiana. See online reports: http://jjpl.org/new/?page_id=41 and http://jjpl.org/new/?page_id=40
4. www.brainevent.com/be/TheNews/controversy/20010808/index_html Also see: references Glick, B. (1998) No Time to Play: *Youthful Offenders in Adult Correctional Systems*. American Correctional Association Wilkerson, I (1996) Death Sentence at Sixteen Rekindles Debate on Justice for Juveniles. New York Times, November Butts, J.A. and Snyder, H. (1997) *The Youngest Delinquents: Offenders Under the Age of 15*, Juvenile Justice Bulletin (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice) Lefevre, P.S., Professor Grapples with Execution of Juveniles. National Catholic Reporter Snyder, A. Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders (1997) National Center for Juvenile Justice
5. see Amnesty International report http://web.amnesty.org/library/Index/engAMR511432002?OpenDocument&of=COUNTRIES%5CUSA. and http://www.deathpenaltyinfo.org/article.php?scid=27&did=203#execsworld
6. National Criminal Justice Reference Service website (endnote 2)
7. Jane Roland Martin, *Cultural Miseducation: In Search of a Democratic Solution*. New York: Teacher’s College Press, 2002. 62-64.
8. Robert Baden-Powell, *Scouting for Boys*. 301
9. *The Meno.* trans. by Benjamin Jowett http://classics.mit.edu/Plato/meno.html
10. *Laches.* trans. by Benjamin Jowett http://classics.mit.edu/Plato/laches.html
11. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: The Care of the Self*. New York: Vintage, 1988. 64-68
12. Iris Marion Young, *Intersecting Voices: Dilemmas of Gender, Political Philosophy, and Policy.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997. 16
13. Paul Rabinow, ed., *The Foucault Reader,* New York: Pantheon, 1984. 124-140, 273-289
14. Paul Rabinow, 258-272
15. Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* Oxford: Routledge, 1999. 33-40
16. Judith Butler, 23
17. Judith Butler in *Gender Trouble* and *Bodies that Matter*, Foucault in

Discipline and Punish are examples of the tendency to see persons this way.
18. Jane Roland Martin, *Cultural Miseducation,* 32-36
19. John Dewey, *Experience and Education* (Kappa Delta Pi, 1938; New York: Touchstone, 1977), 25
20. John Dewey, *Experience and Education*, 81
21. John Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1916 & 1944) 86-87, 223-228
22. Jane Roland Martin, *Cultural Miseducation*, 5
23. John Dewey, *Experience and Education* 76-77.
24. John Dewey, 25
25. Jane Roland Martin, 1-4, 124-129
26. Jane Roland Martin, 1-4, 36-39
27. John Dewey, 33-50
28. John Dewey, *Experience and Education,* 79: also see Dewey, *Democracy and Education.* (New York: Free Press, 1916. 4) where Dewey points out that "Schools are, indeed, one important method of the transmission which forms the disposition of the immature; but it is only one means, and, compared with other agencies, a relatively superficial means."
29. I am thinking here of pragmatist theorists Susan Birden, Alven Neiman, Susan Laird; feminist theorists such as Judith Butler, Eve K. Sedgwick; and queer theorists Cris Mayo and Diana Fuss.
30. Jackson Katz and Sut Jhall, The Boston Globe, Sunday, May 2, 1999
31. http://www.safeyouth.org/scripts/facts/suicide.asp#sex
http://www.unicef.org/pon96/insuicid.htm
http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2248/is_146_37/ai_89942832
www.jedfoundation.org/documents/YouthSuicide.pdf
32. *New York Times*, September 14, 2001. p. A8
33. Stephen J. Ducat, *The Wimp Factor: Gender Gaps, Holy Wars, and the Politics of Anxious Masculinity*. (Boston, Beacon, 2002), 12-14
34. William Pollack. *Real Boys: rescuing our sons from the myths of boyhood.*
New York: Random House, 1998. 3-19
35. William Pollack *Real Boys' Voices.* New York: Random House, 2000, 33-48
36. William Pollack, *Real Boys*, 338-348
37. Judith Butler. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1999. 30-33
38. http://www.michaelgurian.com/social_theory.html
29. Michael Gurian & Kathy Stevens *The Minds of Boys: saving our sons from falling behind in school and life.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005, 42-46
40. Gurian & Stevens, 286-287
41. Christine Hoff Summers, *The War Against Boys: How Misguided*

Feminism is Harming Our Young Men. New York: Touchstone, 2000, 133-137
42. The post-feminist backlash refers to women theorists who reject feminism, as well as to certain theorists in the men's movement who consider feminism wrong about gender. It is generally seen as emerging at the same time as second-wave feminism. Susan Laird addresses this in "Backlash? Advocacy for Boys in a Post-Feminist Era," in JoPHE (Journal of Philosophy & History of Education), ed. David C. Snelgrove (Oklahoma City: Society of Philosophy & History of Education, 2004). Susan Faludi addresses it in her book *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women*, New York: Vintage, 1993
43. Ann Douglas. *The Feminization of American Culture*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977. 84-88, 109-117
44. Ann Douglas. *The Feminization of American Culture,* 10-13
45. Ann Douglas. *The Feminization of American Culture,* 253-256, 304-313
46. Miriam Brody. *Manly Writing: Gender, Rhetoric, and the Rise of Composition.*
Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1993. 6-11
47. Miriam Brody. *Manly Writing,* 126-138
48. Miriam Brody. *Manly Writing,* 72-86
49. Tim Jeal, *Baden-Powell: Founder of the Boy Scouts*, New Haven: Yale, 357-362
50. Robert Baden-Powell, *Aids to Scoutmastership.* Dallas: Stevens Publishing, 1992. 9.
51. These words are from the American version of the Boy Scout Oath.
52. Robert Baden-Powell, *Aids to Scoutmastership.* 28-33.
53. Robert Baden-Powell, *Scouting for Boys*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. 295-306
54. Boy Scouts legal issues are discussed at a special BSA website http://www.bsalegal.org/ also, Lambda Legal discusses them at http://www.lambdalegal.com/
55. Jane Roland Martin, *The Schoolhome: Rethinking Schools for Changing Families.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 76-77, 108-111. see also, Susan Laird, "Backlash: Advocacy for Boys in a Post-Feminist Era". *Journal of Philosophy and History of Education,* Vol.54, 2004. 91-96
56. Jane Roland Martin, S*choolhome*, 104-119
57. Jane Roland Martin, S*choolhome*, 17-19
58.Cushing Strout, "William James and the Tradition of American Public Philosophers" in *Partisan Review* 3/21 2001, volume lxviii number 3.
59. Jane Roland Martin, *Schoolhome,* 23, 193
60. Jane Roland Martin, *Schoolhome,* 128-12
61. Michael Kimmel, *The Gendered Society,* New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. 23-24, 31-37
62. Michael Kimmel, 23

63. Michael Kimmel, 32-35
64. Michael Kimmel, 35-39. 46-51
65. Michael Kimmel, 34
66. Michael Kimmel, *Manhood in America: a cultural history*. New York: Free Press, 1996. 117-155
67. John Dewey, *A Common Faith*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934. 42-43
68. Dewey, 51
69. William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience.* New York: Random House, 1994. 484-486
70. William James, *Varieties,* 484
71. Dewey, *Art as Experience*. New York: Perigee,1934. 3-19
72. Sec. 3, *Federal Charter, Boy Scouts of America,* June 15, 1916, by the United States Congress.
73. "2006 BSA Year in Review" (PDF). Boy Scouts of America. http://marketing.Scouting.org/research/demog/02-030.pdf.

Chapter 2 Varieties of Masculine Experience

In this chapter I will conceptualize the variety of ways boys and men make meaning out of the masculinization experience that is at the center of our culture. I will do this by looking to Jane Roland Martin's concept of “the problem of generations” and then by employing William James’s framework for conceptualizing masculinity as a spiritual event.

Whether consciously or not, each generation passes to the next the values it holds and the ideals it intends to prevail in the future. The whole range of cultural institutions is involved in this “passing the torch to the next generation," which is really an educational task.[1] Parents and families are the primary transmitters of cultural heritage when a child is very young. But, as they grow from infancy and engage more and more of the world, they encounter various other agents passing on the culture and its values. This variety of institutions serves to disseminate a culture’s assets and liabilities. Schools serve as one such agency. But most societies, including our own, have a multiplicity of such guardians and transmitters of culture. The challenge is always to transmit assets while avoiding the passing on or encouragement of cultural liabilities.[2] When this task is not attended to in a careful way, cultural education becomes cultural miseducation.

What should be preserved? How will we work together to decide? Who will do the work of preserving and passing on the assets? Who will edit

out the harmful heritage, the liabilities, and help future generations avoid the mistakes of previous generations? This maximizing of assets and minimizing of liabilities is an ongoing process.[3] so, too, is imagining an educational environment for boys that does not promote the liabilities. Can this process be engaged in a way that liberates boys from violent masculinity? Might educators learn to speak of masculinities in ways that allow for a broader understanding of what it means to be a man, ways that permit and even encourage a wider diversity of experience?

The Problem of Generations & Educating for Masculinity

The question of what kind of masculinity we should teach our children presents us with a problem that Martin identifies as the "problem of generations."[4] I believe understanding this "problem of generations" can help in understanding the so-called "masculinity crisis." It can also help clarify a path for educators interested in building on cultural assets and strengths in a way which frees boys to discover and trust their own experience in making meaning for their lives.

While critics often target schools when social problems develop, schools are only a part of a much larger educational picture. Schools, libraries, and museums are not the only educational agents in our society. John Dewey reminds us "Schools are, indeed, one important method of the transmission which forms the disposition of the immature; but it is only one

means, and, compared with other agencies, a relatively superficial means."[5] Religious institutions (churches, synagogues, mosques, etc.), voluntary civic associations (Kiwanis, Lions, etc.), the media, Hollywood, public relations firms, and other cultural entities also transmit cultural values.[6] When Martin writes of multiple educational agency, it is important for us to acknowledge that these agents may or may not think of themselves as educational. However, the reality is that their impact - on young people especially - has a formative, and therefore, educative quality. They decide, by the way they employ any observable program (as well as any hidden curriculum), what assets and liabilities should live on in the next generation. Among the values these multiple educational agencies hand on to the children that make up the next generation is an education in masculinity.

Precisely because these stewards of cultural education and miseducation are many and varied, they are bound to share overlapping civic interests. Each such agent influences, by the way it makes use of its programs (as well as any hidden curriculum), the assets and liabilities that will live on in the next generation. The way an American boy understands what it means to be a man is part of the cultural wealth these agents pass on to the next generation.

One prominent example of such a cultural custodian would be the Boy Scouts of America, the only organization in the United States chartered by the U.S. Congress to educate boys for manhood and citizenship. Virtually

every type of cultural transmitter mentioned above sponsors local Boy Scout organizations: schools, religious groups, voluntary civic organizations, and other cultural entities. They interact with more agencies, organizations and institutions than perhaps any other organization in American society. One example of the "problem of generations" is seen in the way the Boys Scouts of America pursues membership policy that is at odds with the rest of the Boy Scout movement in relation to gender issues. The BSA excludes from membership girls, gay boys and men, and boys who do not profess belief in a Supreme Being. The religion issue inter-relates with the gender issue in the Boy Scouts of America because of the BSA's use of theology to explain sexuality. The founder of the Boy Scouts, Lord Robert Baden-Powell, took an approach to religion that was deliberately vague, stating that religion was about enjoying nature and doing a "Good Turn" daily. Yet, in the United States, the Boy Scouts of America embrace a theology of "fatherhood" that they use in their educational literature to explain sexuality, religion and the concept of obedience. Other Boy Scouting organizations around the world (such as those in Britain and Canada) downplay, reinterpret, or even drop references to God from literature, and more importantly, from the rituals and oaths of the organization. The point is that in addressing the problem of generations, the BSA has chosen to go in a different direction than much of the rest of Boy Scouting. The British and Canadian Boy Scouts have interpreted their cultural stock in one way, while the American BSA has gone

in a different direction. These choices make a difference in boys' lives.

In *The Schoolhome*, Martin writes about issues facing schools today. As I mentioned in the first chapter, one concern that she addresses is the current concern about boys and masculinity. She challenges an assumption made by many, which claims that the masculinity of boys is somehow endangered or emasculated by educational and social policies that constrain violence, aggression, and male supremacy.[7] Martin suggests that the pursuit of virtue in educating boys will, in fact, confront honestly the issues of violence, aggression and misogyny with care, concern, and connection.[8] She reads statistics regarding juvenile male incarceration, suicide, and other forms of violence as indicating the present education of boys is brutalizing rather than enriching them. To fall back on "traditional" values and beliefs about masculinity would only heighten the brutalization, since the manhood boys seem to be learning represents the excesses of the traditional masculine virtues, and the boys of today are growing up as caricatures of manhood. Such caricatures take a masculinist form, perpetuating the social structures and relations of male supremacy. Martin raises this concern in discussing miseducation, reminding educators that the way boys learn masculinity has social consequence. Martin, as noted in Chapter One, raises the problem of brutalization. Brutalization, according to Martin, has two outcomes, an assault on another, and a lowering of oneself. The beliefs a boy embraces regarding masculinity will enrich or brutalize both the boy and

society.

In what way is the social construction of masculinity related to the social construction and maintenance of “normalized” behavior Might we consider the possibility that the masculinization process itself, as an experience, brutalizes them, as they seek to survive in a narrowly defined masculine world, despite their array of feelings and experiences? As they struggle with social expectations few options seem to be socially sanctioned.

The Live Creature & Masculinization

Two American pragmatists, John Dewey and William James set the context for this discussion of boys’ experience of masculinization. Dewey writes about life experience, and names the aware and fully present human being as a “live creature.” In *Art as Experience*, he distinguishes between the ‘mere’ creature and the “live” creature by a number of indicators.[9] The “live creature” is present to the immediate environment in such a way as to celebrate ordinary everyday experience (life goes on in an environment, because of an environment, interacting with an environment.) The “live creature” is present to everyday experience and through reflection and action expands and enhances that experience. All this happens because he avoids the temptation to erect a wall between the ideal and material, spirit and flesh, or soul and matter; and because he is at home in both body and surrounding environment. For Dewey “experience” is the interaction with the

environment that leads to transformative presence.[10] Such interaction includes the broad range of human feeling and emotion, including the sexual.

As Dewey points out, the rush in nations to build opera houses, art museums and other "cultural" venues parallels the holier-than-thou attitude of much religious posing. In the much the same way, definitions of what is masculine exclude and repress, to the benefit of the dominant ideal. We endanger the live creature by removing "art" to museums supervised by cultural experts, isolating "spirit" to separate places of worship controlled by a priestly class, and confining gender identity definitions to "guardians of culture".[11] By extension, should not every aspect of human experience be appreciated? Can any aspect of human action be left in the hands of specialists who decide what to enshrine or depreciate? There is no such thing as "art for art's sake." In the same way can we not say that art, spirit, gender, and other everyday experience exists to enhance the individual in community.

One could read Dewey's chapter on "ethereal things" as a commentary on and questioning of the American culture's depreciation of the body, and by inferential extension gender and masculinity as well.[12] What Dewey describes as the dynamism of live creatures interacting always creates a possibility for change. The desire to compartmentalize, to shut off into some "special category" the spiritual, the sexual, or the esthetic, is to

react with dis-ease to the possibilities of such change. The presence Dewey speaks of in the dynamics of experience expresses itself in three stages: first in interaction, then participation, and finally communication.[13]

Educational settings that frustrate experience inhibit interaction and participation, thus blocking the transformative path, and dictating when and how individuals must assign their experience to acceptable compartmentalization. Such settings have the effect of shackling the live creature. Thus, educators, students, and parents should be wary of school environments that all too neatly compartmentalize or confine gender knowledge and experience. Just as the social values of our day tend to remove the idea of the artistic or esthetic from the streets of workaday women and men and express concern when a "work of art" is brought out of a museum into an ordinary setting, so the same values recoil at ordinary everyday sexual thoughts, feelings and actions being discussed among those who have them – members of the school community: students, teachers and staff. Just as most wage earning artisans are assured that their work does not somehow qualify as artistic, so boys learn that certain everyday sexual feelings and actions are not sanctioned as truly masculine.

Along with Dewey, William James exemplifies a philosophical pragmatism that seeks the meaning of "true" by examining how a 'truth' functions in real human lives. James writes of the 'cash value' of truths and beliefs, stating in *The Varieties of Religious Experience* that beliefs are rules

for action. Beliefs and accepted truths have consequences and should be evaluated in the light of those consequences. James acknowledges a role for contingent passions, and thus the freedom of each individual to build a self out of whatever desires, associated beliefs and abilities are available to him. Such a self is built on the resources which contingency allows.

Naming the Varieties of Masculine Experience

In *The Varieties,* James explores the relationship between experience and belief.[14] Beliefs have practical consequences that affect how people understand themselves as well as how they relate to others and the world around them. Beliefs reflect and shape one's vision of life, or what James would call the religious 'sense' or 'experience'. James says that "only when our thought about a subject has found its rest in belief can our action on the subject firmly and safely begin".[15] If James is right, then in order to understand what is going on in American culture today in regard to masculinity, the beliefs that inform it need to be examined and clarified.

I enter a conversation with William James' *Varieties of Religious Experience* for two purposes. First, I propose that a boy's coming to terms with his maleness or 'masculinity' is a spiritual quest with a wide variety of experiences. I propose the use of *Varieties* as a tool for thinking about the myriad ways in which boys react to the brutalization that comes with a miseducative masculinization process. I am suggesting that the masculinity

experience (coming to terms with gender identity, coping with masculinity and the social masculinization process) is a (perhaps *the*) religious experience for men. Understanding various experiences of masculinity as varieties of religious experience might aid in constructing alternatives that mitigate those varieties that brutalize boys.

The Sick Soul

James divides religious experience into four varieties, three making up one type of religion, that of the Sick Soul, and the fourth consisting of a separate and radically different approach, the Healthy-Minded. In the first three, some sort of melancholy, dissatisfaction, or evil is seen as a pervasive and determining element of the world in which we live. James refers to these three experiences as Sick Soul experiences. I will refer to the three varieties as Prisoner, Victim, and Stranger. In Sick Soul religion, there is a rupture experienced between what is experienced and what is thought to be desirable or expected. Enchantment turns to disenchantment. Brutalized, the Sick Soul looks at himself and the world as damaged goods. The Sick Soul is so grasped by its encounter with disenchantment or displacement that this disenchantment becomes central in sorting out meaning. There is a realization that the world of meaning does not just shed light on the world as it is being experienced, but may contradict it, calling it into question in some way or another.[16]

The Prisoner

The first of these sick soul varieties, James sees marked by a sense of sin and guilt. This is a crisis of meaning centered on sin, guilt, shame, and a sense of being polluted and unacceptable. Shortcomings and a sense of not living up to expectations haunt this particular religious experience, which I call the Prisoner experience. The disenchantment the Prisoner feels is caused by disobedience and a sense of impurity or uncleanness. The Prisoner looks within and sees dirt. Self-contempt often marks this experience, especially at the beginning. The writings of spiritual pilgrim John Bunyan can provide an example. Bunyan was riddled with doubts, filled with fears of unworthiness, burdened by a sense of being polluted with wickedness.[17] He is constantly aware of his own sin and sense of uncleanness, and that of the world around him. In this spiritual path, the world and God are seen through the lens of crime and punishment. Indeed, the world can be seen by some in this experience as God's Panopticon: God is Watching You![18] Fixing blame and punishment are central to this experience.

In a very real sense, the Prisoner experience is a response to being brutalized by the male supremacy system. The brutalized boy feels dirty by way of his brutalization. Having once tried the straight and narrow door to manhood, and been mistreated, the Prisoner often acts out in a variety of 'impure' ways before giving up, feeling guilty, and rediscovering the safety of

the acceptable path. Since, in this variety, everyone is guilty or blameful, the Prisoner looks for forgiveness, so as not to be imprisoned in shame and guilt. The Prisoner, feeling unworthy, pursues those paths he feels will make him worthy.[19]

Such an approach might be good news for those boys whose daily performance of masculinity fits the general expectations. Boys learn what is expected of them in terms of masculinity, and they either feel comfortable with that or find ways to conform. Boys who stray from those norms would be seen as ignoring what comes naturally. Boys who explore a variety of relationships or sexual expressions, or boys who are not 'strong' would be seen as harmful to the cultural wealth as Prisoner men understand it.

Clearly, in the Prisoner experience, a young man who questions the masculinity of domination is considered 'confused'. There is little room for the gay, bisexual, or transgendered boy, among others. (Prisoners treat sexual 'minorities' as if they are Strangers.) Such 'confusion' carries a (hidden) stigma of guilt and shame. Redemption comes when the guilt is admitted, and since it is often hidden (closeted) and not addressed, the redemptive steps required by the Prisoner experience are never taken.

The Victim

The second variety of Sick Soul that James addresses (he refers to it as a dread-centered melancholy) is what I will call the Victim experience.

James describes this experience as fitting those people who fear the universe, who experience it as a place of immense suffering. The real problem is not so much sin or being-out-of-place as it is the experience of anxiety, suffering, and fear. The Victim responds to his brutalization by living in constant anxiety and apprehension.[20] This particular path is represented in *Varieties* by an anonymous writer (perhaps James himself) who speaks of anxiety and dread being at the core of his experience. The Victim walks a spiritual path that looks for security, protection, shelter in the storm, a healthy dwelling in the midst of adversity.[21] God often becomes a Father-Protector, a light in the darkness of anxiety and fear, and a model for men.

In the Victim experience, boys and men who do not 'fit' experience insecurity about being 'man enough'. They might tend to see themselves as victims (perhaps of genetics, a bad childhood or a homophobic society). In a world of male supremacy and compulsory heterosexuality, life is experienced as hostile at many turns. Brutalization is no mere concept for this particular experience of masculinity. Participation in male violence is often experienced as recipient rather than dealer of violence. Often, Victims are blamed for their victimhood, just as sexually abused boys are frequently demonized as having some seductive contol over the abuser. Life may take a liberating turn when the Victim seeks a healthy dwelling in the midst of adversity, cultivating a sense of the divine as companion and co-sufferer.[22]

The Stranger

The last Sick Soul variety I name the Stranger experience. James describes this as an experience centered on the feeling that all is vanity, that life tends toward the absurd, and that the person just does not fit into the world as it is experienced. There is a feeling of being-out-of-place.[23] James uses words like disillusionment and alienation to define this variety.[24] His primary example is Tolstoy. In his *Confessions*, Tolstoy, saw the ordinary consciousness as the world of fashion, conventionality, and artificiality. (This is the world of "projects" and personal ambition as well.) His is an experience of not-being-at-home in the world that leaves him feeling purposeless, "thrown" into a world that seems absurd. His ambivalence regarding women may be seen in his life in relationships with women, as well as his portrait of *Anna Karenina*, at once admired yet dismissed as weak.

This disenchantment reaches a crisis point for Tolstoy. It is only addressed satisfactorily when he turns to God as the source of meaning in a new way (poverty), and accepts his sense of difference or "thrown-ness" as a gift and a clue for living with purpose.[25] Tolstoy's experience suggests that the Stranger makes a conscious decision to enter a new or deeper consciousness and leave behind the fashions and definitions of the world. Faith (or religious experience) thus nudges a person from falsehood and illusion to truth and clarity. In this spiritual path, the world and the divine are

seen through the lens of disillusion and difference. The Stranger's path, whether speaking of religious or sexual journeys, seeks to discover purpose in the midst of one's difference, to develop what James calls a deeper kind of consciousness.[26]

The Stranger experience of masculinity raises questions about how comfortable boys and men might be with the socially approved domination paradigm for masculinity. Strangers, upon realization of how brutalized they have become, either become, like Tolstoy and others, suicidal or bent on various forms of self-destructive behavior, or begins to rethink the whole enterprise, by trusting their own experience as the better guide.

The Choices Boys and Men Make

In addressing the religious experiences of Strangers, Prisoners, and Victims, James points to differing manifestations of those experiences that he refers to as lower forms and higher forms, or the pious and the saintly. He notes that lower or constrictive forms magnify excesses and caricatures of holiness. On the other hand, persons who embrace the higher or expansive form can move through it to an experience which transforms them so that they transcend their experience.[27] He calls this transcending experience 'saintliness'. The saint sees and realizes a merging of the life lived and the ideal life.[28] The spiritual emotions become "the habitual center of the personal energy".[29] James describes how saintliness is marked by

certain universal characteristics:

- a feeling of being in a world wider than one's selfish experience
- a sense of the presence of some power companioning one's experience
- a 'melting down' of the confines of selfhood and a sense of freedom
- a shift toward an emotional center built on love and a 'yes' to life.

This has practical moral consequences, that include resisting 'official' values, embracing simplicity and honesty, enlarging one's sense of life, being concerned for purity in a new way, and embracing compassion or 'charity'.[30] Saintliness means that the Sick Soul can, by embracing the higher form of their Experience, experience a healing of spirit, and a new life in the world, a life that casts away fear and anxiety.[31]

In the masculinity experience, lower forms surrender to the masculinist vision, and convert to and collaborate with brutishness. Following James' lead, higher forms of the masculinity experience would convert away from brutishness and use the experiential reference to reframe and re-engage reality.

One example of Prisoner masculinity, of what James would call its 'higher form', would be John Stuart Mill. Raised in a class-conscious, androcentric and confining Victorian culture, his personal transformation led toward an understanding of life that found meaning in liberal values like equality and personal freedom, including social equality for women, a value

absent in what James would call the 'lower forms' of Prisoner experience.[32]

An example of a lower and more common form of Prisoner masculinity might be the muscular Christianity of the Promise Keepers movement, with its emphasis on piety, sin and redemption. Promise Keepers are convinced that many social problems today are the direct result of men not taking charge of their marriages and families more decisively. No doubt Promise Keepers is concerned about social cohesion and family life. Men who participate in Promise Keepers are encouraged to listen to their spouses, and to share their emotions. Surveys seem to indicate that most men in Promise Keepers are concerned about being better spouses and fathers.[33] However, it approaches those problems through the lens of a fundamentalist critique of modernity that sees women as “responders” rather than partners, and gay and lesbian persons as “stark, raving mad.”[34] Tony Evans, a leader in the organization and author of *Seven Promises of a Promise Keeper*, says, in referring to the traditional male role, "I'm not suggesting you ask for your role back; I'm urging that you take it back." [35]

Prisoners sustain the brutalization of masculinist culture by developing apology for it. They draw parallels between the general sin and redemption motif of evangelical Christianity and the sin of wandering from being a Good Husband and Father. The religious task here is to experience mercy and reclaim masculinity in its traditional mode. From this Prisoner perspective, just as Adam and Eve were seduced by an apple, modern

males have been seduced by the fruit of feminism, relativism, and the playboy philosophy. The task is to recover and maintain purity in themselves and in their families, where they are in charge, as redeemed and 'godly' men. Other attempts to 'recover' masculinity in policy debates today appear to share the characteristics of the Prisoner.

An example of what James calls a lower form of Victim masculinity might be careful and discrete closeted gay men, who live with a constant sense of insecurity and tragedy that affects their professional and personal destiny. The founder of Boy Scouting, Lord Robert Baden-Powell, is perhaps a Victim, as he saw himself and the youth of England victimized by the feminization of school and church, and organized the Boy Scouts as an antidote to 'feminization' and 'softness'.[36] In addition to being married to Olave (thirty two years younger than Baden-Powell), he had a hidden relationship with a younger man for over thirty years. A higher form of Victim might be found in someone like Malcolm X, who wrestled with his own sense of being a man in the harsh environment of American racism, and did time in prison. In his victimhood he first turned to the answers found in the teachings of Elijah Muhammed. Later, his encounter on the Hajj with a more global Islam changed his perspective again, and enlarged his sense of humanity.

An example of a lower form of Stranger experience would be a boy or man who decides life is absurd and reduces it to a game to be played, and

'manhood' as a socially approved role to perform. Because a Stranger feels out of place, that dissonance can become either a source of harm or an opportunity to re-examine life. An example of healthier Stranger masculinity might be a boy who accepts his sexuality without buying into the illusions of masculine supremacy, who may see that model as dehumanizing or brutalizing to him. This is accomplished by the Stranger learning a different way of relating to others, and refusing to buy into what James calls the 'official values'. Rousseau's *Emile* relies on nature, but understands that a natural education will produce values contrary to those of the corrupt society.

We can see that each variety has a constrictive expression and an expansive one. It would seem that these expressions are fluid, as boys grow, as they encounter other varieties. A constrictive Stranger, for instance, is not necessarily stuck there. Transitions can happen in many ways, from a constrictive to an expansive mode, or from one constrictive mode to another.

Healthy-Minded Experience

The fourth variety James examines, is not part of the Sick Soul typology. He calls it (with tongue in cheek) Healthy-Minded Religion. He also refers to it as Sky-Blue because he considers it naïve. It is optimistic about reality as it is. James says that healthy-mindedness is the "tendency which looks on all things and sees that they are good". The 'involuntary' variety is rather simple - being happy about things in their immediacy. The sting of sin

and the sense of being disoriented are seen as false concerns. All is well with the world. For James, the other three varieties are examples of twice-born or born-again spiritualities, while Healthy-Mindedness seems content with what he calls a once-born perspective.

What James calls the 'voluntary' healthy-mindedness is a systematic way of looking at life as good, "conceiving good as the essential and universal aspect of being ." [37] Because Healthy-Minded people see evil as a maladjustment to reality, which is best dealt with by focusing on the good rather than the evil, they insist on the dignity rather than the depravity of human beings. They trust in the possibility of human evolution.[38] James believes this to be dishonest, because it minimizes or denies evil. The Sky-Blue person often simply chooses to ignore evil, and this may grow into a deliberate policy, theologically and philosophically speaking. Yet, James acknowledges that this systematic cultivation of healthy mindedness is not absurd, but 'consonant' with currents in human nature. We avoid discussing death or disease, the world gets sanitized in our minds on a regular basis.[39]

Some insist on happiness and success (positive thinking) in the midst of a world that sends mixed signals. Others see the world as really an enchanting and enchanted place. Still other Healthy-Minded folk acknowledge the difficulties of the world, but insist that this is the way things were meant to be. In terms of the question of masculinity, such thinking accepts the dominant paradigm for manhood and seeks to conform.

Sky-Blue masculinity would seem to be that approach to the cultural definition of manhood that embraces it uncritically. In its tacit appeal to gender essentialism, Robert Bly's popular work, *Iron John,* could be an example of Sky-Blue masculinity. His claim is that men have lost touch with an innate or original maleness, the recovery of which will bring health and happiness; similar to the thinking of Mary Baker Eddy, cited by James as a model of this experience. Another model is found in the ways William Pollack addresses the 'Boy Code'. The “code”, for Pollack, stands for the social image of boys as rambunctious and tough, which points to an inner inherent reality, that boys need to learn to discipline and control. Both Bly and Pollack claim that original masculinity is just there, if we would only recognize it.

The lower form of the Prisoner experience seems to capture the dominant paradigm for masculinity in America today, at the beginning of the twenty-first century. If philosophers of education are to work to evaluate broader and more expansive approaches to masculinity education, they should be aware of all these varieties. Because the Stranger experience stresses knowing and experiencing, it seems to fit well with pragmatist approaches. However, there is one experience James does not explore, which may be worth our attention. Each religious variety plays out in what James refers to as lower and higher forms. He acknowledges what might be called expansive as well as constricted forms of each experience. Yet, he

does not do this with Healthy-Minded religion, preferring to dismiss it all as a lower form.

I think James may be unfair to the Healthy-Minded experience. At first glance, he seems to sell the Healthy-Minded experience short, by setting it up as a straw man. Yet, characteristics of those he calls saintly - fearlessness, a sense of union with nature, confidence – are similar to the marks of the Healthy-Minded folk he disparages. He seems to dismiss Healthy-Minded experience because it does not encourage a crisis approach to matters of spirit. He dismisses it out-of-hand because it stresses goodness and appears to neglect evil. In transitioning from Healthy-Minded to the Sick Soul varieties, he remarks, in telling the distinguishing characteristic of the Sick Soul:

> "Now in contrast with such healthy-minded views as these,
> if we treat them as a way of deliberately minimizing evil, stands
> a radically opposite view, a way of maximizing evil…"[40]

He never seems to consider the possibility that a healthy-Minded experience might take what he calls evil seriously without wanting to 'maximize' it. For James, evil is the interpretive key to life.[41] That is what makes all three Sick Soul varieties so appealing to him. Viewing Healthy-Minded religion as naivete in clerical robes, he does not seem to consider that a human being might choose goodness, truth, or beauty to be interpretive keys, while still acknowledging evil. Questioning James' fascination with evil might be

appropriate in light of his own experience as Victim. It might also be helpful to examine his approach to masculinity and his fascination with the battlefield experience.

My claim is that James, by selling short the possibilities in Healthy-Minded experience, deprives us of another interpretive key, and neglects an approach centered on goodness, truth, and beauty. Must boys and men be 'redeemed' from harmful forms of masculinity only by maximizing evil? Might not the Healthy-Minded possibility of interpreting life by focusing on the good offer something new to the discussion of masculinity? What if boys and men constructed meaning by using something other than evil as the key to existence? A higher form of Healthy-Minded experience has yet to be constructed, but Spinoza and perhaps Emerson or Thoreau could provide clues.

Consider Rousseau's *Emile*, where the philosopher claims that humans are not only naturally good but also can become naturally just. Rousseau contends that humans are free by nature, and that virtue is in some sense natural to being human. Rousseau argues that moral virtue is the culmination of natural human development: the natural human can become moral. An education that trusts this goodness in nature can make Emile good both for himself and for others. This trust in nature and goodness does not ignore problems or destructive behavior, but brings to bear an approach that refuses to 'maximize evil'. In contrast, James himself

links trust of nature with lower forms of religion in Varieties'[42], and calls for a war against nature in *The Moral Equivalent of War.*[43] War seems fascinating for James, along with heroism in the face of struggle and the possibility of death and other dangers. He distances himself from the popular Chautauqua movement because he sees it as soft, and therefore harmful to society.[44]

Perhaps James excludes an expansive Healthy-Minded experience because Healthy-Minded people he examines seem uninterested in aggressive, warrior behavior. One such example is George Fox, the founder of the Quakers, also called the Society of Friends, because the individual's life requires interaction with others, who become friends. This individual flourishing in a community of friends may pose a question for James, who insisted, in the first chapter of the *Varieties*, that religion was an individual affair. Additionally, one should take into consideration the number of women James cites as examples of Sky-Blue thinking. (He does include Teresa Of Avila among the Sick Souls, yet dismisses her as a model of excess.) Is there a reason for his seeming slight of woman's experience?

It is helpful at this point to remember Martin's critique of James discussed in Chapter One. While James's concern was to propose a helpful channeling of energies into service of the broader society, he does this by promoting a martial spirit which tends to narrow understandings of masculinity.[45] Additionally, he urges society to make war against nature and

urges teachers to encourage a combat mentality in the classroom, including the use of shame to motivate learning.[46]

In reading boys' experience through James, I find his way of explaining spiritual or religious experience helpful in understanding boys' experience of masculinization. His various approaches to understanding psychological and spiritual experience help frame an understanding of masculinities as ways in which boys respond spiritually to the brutalization that accompanies the often narrow and conformist male supremacy model that is hegemonic in our culture. To recover Dewey's terminology, differing experiences lead to differing ways of looking at the world and human relationships. Those experiences form beliefs, which in turn become rules for action, as James reminds us.

The Sick Soul and the Future of Boys

Learning from James, might not educators make connections between religious experience and masculine experience? There are harmful forms of religion or spirituality, as well as helpful (constrictive as well as expansive, in Jamesian terms.) If I am correct in seeing the experience of coming to terms with one's maleness as a religious experience, and the varieties as responses to the brutalization that accompanies the dominant forms of masculinity, then enlarging this discussion, by showing the religious import of masculinity, could have vital social and educational ramifications.

If “masculinity” is an experience – indeed, a plethora of experiences - it can not be reduced to a “traditional value” set in stone. (What Jane Martin might call a “dead relic”.[47]) By exposing boys and men to the whole plethora of experiences, it may be possible to promote a more fluid way of looking at masculinity (and gender). Masculinities are plural because they are wide-ranging. Differing responses to this brutalization result from the form of male privilege promoted by dominant culture, and imposed on boys by miseducation in myriad forms. It seems obvious that there is no “true masculinity,” but rather there are masculinities -- an array -- each with its own assets and liabilities. Is it not also possible to begin to address the brutalization of boys by beginning to understand the variety of spiritualities they embrace as responses to their brutalization?

Do boys and men see themselves primarily as human beings, or primarily as bearers of manhood? Is a model of manhood that rejects the objectification of women and nature, which teaches a child to rely on experience and reflective action, even compatible with masculinity? The possibility of taking bodily differences seriously without buying into current masculinities would seem to invite us to consider the primary question to be, what does it mean to be fully human in a male body? Seeing masculinity as a religious experience with a variety of possibilities might open up new prospects in redirecting education. What might happen to American masculinity's Sick Soul if the whole range of religious experience is brought

into play? How could acknowledging the varieties of masculinity as religious experience – in response to brutalization - affect the welfare of boys and men?

Getting all the 'higher forms' on the table may be a necessary step for a meliorist approach, in constructing a future that is healthier for boys and men. (For instance, setting the higher form of Stranger masculinity in dialogue with the higher form of Victim might help boys see new choices in reflecting on and constructing their own experience of masculinity.)

How might educators help in constructing possible new ways of thinking about a higher form of Blue Skies masculinity, which can be brought into the discussion? Could not such a construction rely on boys' own reflections on their experience, rather than speculation? To take seriously the brutalization of boys, we must address the consequences of that brutalization.

Notes

(A portion of this chapter appears in the 2007 Yearbook of the Philosophy of Education Society (Nicholas C. Burbules, editor), as Must "Real Men" Have Sick Souls, pages 395-403)

1. Jane Roland Martin, *Cultural Miseducation: In Search of a Democratic Solution* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2002), 32-36
2. Martin, *Cultural Miseducation*, 32-43
3. Martin, *Cultural Miseducation,* 62-66, 113-123
4. Martin, *Cultural Miseducation,* 62-68
5. John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: MacMillan, 1916), 4
6. Martin, *Cultural Miseducation,* 36-43
7. Jane Roland Martin, *The Schoolhome: Rethinking Schools for Changing Families* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), 107-108
8. Jane Roland Martin, *The Schoolhome,* 108-111
9. John Dewey, *Art as Experience* (Perigree Books, 1980, copyright, 1934).
22. For Dewey, being a live creature, fully interacting with ones environment permits a "transformation of interaction into participation into communication".
10. John Dewey, *Art as Experience,* 3-19
11. John Dewey, *Art as Experience,* see also John Dewey, *On Experience, Nature, and Freedom* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1960), 150-175
12. John Dewey, *Art as Experience*, 20-34
13. John Dewey, *Art as Experience*, 35-57
14. William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature* (Gifford Lectures, 1901-1902) (New York: Modern Library, 1999), 484
15. William James, *Varieties*, 484
16. William James, *Varieties*, 150-160
17. William James, *Varieties*, 175-181
18. This is a reference to the Panopticon designed by the philosopher Jeremy Bentham and utilized by Michel Foucault as symbolic of observation and bodily discipline as social control mechanisms.
19. William James, *Varieties*, 176-177
20. James, *Varieties*, 178-180
21. James, *Varieties*, 178-184
22. James, *Varieties*, 240-243
23. James, *Varieties*, 170
24. James, *Varieties*, 175
25. James, *Varieties*, 167-170
26. James, *Varieties*, 175
27. James, *Varieties*, 290
28. James, *Varieties,* 403
29. James, *Varieties*, 298

30. James, *Varieties*, 298-300
31. James, *Varieties*, 291
32. James, *Varieties,* 358-372
33. Judith L. Newton, *From Panthers to Promise Keepers*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005, 215-217
34. Opinion piece, National Organization of Women, http://www.now.org/nnt/10-97/viewpoint.html
35. Michael Gurian, “Avoid Groups That Do Not Work for Equality, on Menweb, http://www.menweb.org/gurianpk.htm
36. Tim Jeal, 357-362
37. James, *Varieties*, 101
38. James, *Varieties*, 103-105
39. James, *Varieties*, 103
40. James, *Varieties*, 148
41. James, *Varieties*, 148
42. James, *Varieties,* 98-103,158-159
43. William James. "The Moral Equivalent of War", paragraph 25
44. Jane Roland Martin, *Schoolhome*, 23
45. Jane Roland Martin, 17
46. Jane Roland Martin, 127-130
47. Jane Roland Martin, *Cultural Miseducation*, 54-61

Chapter 3 Queering Masculinity

The reality of our situation is that the generalized concept of manhood and masculinization in the west is a form of warrior-hero model modified in American culture to fit Christian restrictions on bodily interaction. This model may bear a resemblance to the "prisoner" of the varieties mentioned in the previous chapter. This approach to masculinization is a normalizing one, choosing a model or experience of masculinity that "works" for some and expecting it of all. This normalizing imposes conformity on boys and men, and silences the voices of those who experience their bodies, attractions, desires and sense of self in ways other than those that are sanctioned and rewarded by state or society.

In the previous chapter I examined the wide-ranging ways boys and men make meaning out of the masculinization experience that dominates our culture. From my reading of William James I derived a framework for conceptualizing masculinity as a spiritual crisis. I suggest we now read James through lenses provided by Iris Marion Young and Michel Foucault. They have contributions to make to this study regarding social cohesiveness and uses of power, which may help keep this study of masculinization honest about present social realities. Having formulated a Jamesian framework for understanding the varieties of masculine experience, I now read that framework through the work of Young and Foucault, for help in

understanding and reframing “masculinity” as “masculinities” and understanding those varieties as spiritual responses to brutalization.

Constructing perspective: Serial masculinity

I turn now to the work of feminist political philosopher Iris Marion Young and her concept of “gender seriality” as a tool for thinking about relationships and identity in masculinization. As I noted in the first chapter, I have found her pragmatist approach to be helpful in amending my appropriation of the pragmatist approach of James and Dewey. The element she adds is a distinction between what she labels “series” and “groups.” Assigning labels to boys by experience or any other mode can be frustrating because there are no truly universal or common characteristics, and the search for such often leads to normalizing based on cultural or religious standards, myths and social projections. Even the varieties I have theorized from James can be used to label boys in ways that can be harmful or misleading, relegating boys (and girls) to behavior the labels are not meant to predict. In addition, labels, although culturally bound, tend to be used in essentializing ways that can be imposed inaccurately on other cultures. As an example, this present study does not explore the difference between white American boys and African-American, Asian-American, Hispanic-American, or Native American boys. Neither does it take into consideration differences in and concerns attendant to economic status. Such studies are

sorely needed.

Young reclaims the idea of seriality from Jean-Paul Sartre's *Critique of Dialectical Reason*, where he differentiates between series and groups as a way of explaining the relationship between persons and capitalist modes of production and consumption. For Young, thinking of gender as seriality helps situate women in complex social contexts and characteristics. This is her attempt to address the problems in feminist discourse surrounding the grouping of all women in a single category, with its attendant problems of essentialization in the midst of the strategic need to speak of women in general in light of sexism. Here I co-opt her notion of gender as seriality to think about masculinization and varieties of masculinity.

A series is a collection of persons that share a relationship to a social practice or object. That relationship may be all they have in common. There is an unself-conscious sense of unity, yet members of a series see themselves as well as the other series members as 'other'. Examples of a series would include soccer fans, Protestants, shop owners, and teachers. People in a cinema watching a film are part of a series, unless attending as part of an organized group.

In contrast to a series, a group is a collection of persons who recognize a shared relationship to a goal or a sense of identity. There is a very real sense of having a common self-understanding. United in action, they share a common project or mission. Members of groups are often

bound together by shared experiences and stories, and may immerse themselves in the group life.[1] Examples of a group include an athletic team, a religious congregation, a bank, a corporation, a dissertation committee, and the Boy Scouts of America.

Boys who experience life through the variety identified in the previous chapter as Stranger are part of a series, until some of them establish connections with each other that lead to some shared action. United in shared Stranger experiences, if they collaborate to support one another, and develop a response to the social practice they confront in common, they construct a group.

Imagine an airport and those who are waiting there at a particular gate to catch a plane to another city as an example of a series. They have in common only their being at the same gate, and an orientation toward the object 'airplane'. They come from different walks of life. They are in all likelihood not all members of the same economic class, educational level, or ethnic group. The people at the gate are a series. A series has a sense of people being thrown together. Suppose the people waiting to board the flight at that particular gate are told it has been postponed and will not arrive until the next day. Some of them may begin to collaborate with each other to find an alternative mode of transportation to their common destination. Perhaps they organize to effect some solution to their common problem. That collective of persons would be a group, because they have a shared

purpose and commitment. A group requires some choice for interaction and commitment.[2]

Another example can be seen in the world wide web. Users of the Internet are members a series. The only thing they have in common is their use of the Internet. They are from all genders, classes, nationalities, and varieties of personal experience. (Even robots can also be said to be part of the series 'Internet'.) A group comes into being when certain Internet users organize together to accomplish something either affecting the Internet (as in web standards developers) or through the Internet (such as anti-war bloggers, political organizers, instructional programmers). A series is incidental (a certain boy happens to see the world through the lens of his Prisoner experience), while a group is a intentional.[3] A person in a series shares a relationship with other persons in the series only in relation to a common object: people at a gate awaiting a plane, persons at computers accessing the Internet, males labeled boys who are subjected to the social definition and promotion of masculinization. In a series, one faces what Young calls 'counter-finalities' like a flight delayed, weather difficulties that make waiting for a plane flight a challenge, too many hits on a website, a crashing computer, sites down because of server difficulties. 'Counter-finalities' are those events related to the object that are beyond the control of both the individual and the series. They are the unintended consequences of the social interaction involving the series. While there is a certain generally

expected behavior in a series, each member of a series is otherwise free to do his or her own thing, as the only commonality is the object that links them, such as the airplane or the Internet.[4]

Why do I find the idea of “serial masculinity” helpful as a way of thinking through the vast array of men's and boys' experiences? Young's concept of “gender as seriality” is helpful in not reducing the person to just an aggregate of discourses, nor ignoring the social "intersections" in which the individual is embedded. She takes post-modern questions into consideration without sacrificing agency. Young applies this idea of "seriality" to gender as a way of honoring collective experience without displacing the intersecting categories of ethnicity, age, race, and class. Think of Malcolm X, who can be said to have participated in myriad series: poverty, African-American, criminal/prisoner, Black Muslim, public speaker, civil rights leader, pilgrim, Muslim, martyr. None of these series can be said to define Malcolm. It can be said that the intersection of these series shaped his responses to life, and steered him in the direction of certain groups and commitments. These intersecting categories are often ignored in theories of gender that normalize white western middle-class experience. Applying this concept to gender and masculinization, a boy in relation to the masculinization process in American culture is a member of the series called masculinity. Organizing with others around a purpose related to that process 'groups' the boy. Boys as a population are serial, while boys joining the Boy

Scouts are grouping.[5]

Young's insight into seriality can help us to see the Jamesian varieties explored earlier in a fluid way. A constrictive Stranger, for instance, is not necessarily stuck there. Transitions can happen in many ways, from a constrictive to an expansive mode, or from one constrictive mode to another. Applying Young's concept of seriality to the overall framework suggests that each variety can be viewed as a series. This concept is helpful, because the dominant form of male supremacy would claim that a male is defined by how well he lives out the myths of masculinization. If we read James through Young, the very idea of maleness as definitive simply cannot hold. If the various experiences of masculinization are serial, then what defines a boy as a boy? By viewing boys' growth in masculinity as an experience, especially a spiritual experience, new possibilities are opened up. Serial masculinity shows us how the varieties of masculine experience are serial experiences, not necessarily identity markers, and reveal the ways boys and men have chosen to respond to the brutalization inherent in the masculinization process. Serial masculinity may provide educators and others insights which can assist in calling into question masculinization and the array of domination practices that accompany it.

Serial masculinity reminds us that 'boy' is a social construct, most frequently attached to a male child, though at times attached to a female child labeled a “tomboy.” It encourages reflection on masculinity without

normalizing or universalizing on the one hand, or dismissing shared and collective experiences on the other. On the one hand, it avoids losing the uniqueness of the individual by avoiding essentialisms and the compliance to standards that results from normalization. On the other hand, it avoids the trap of liberal individualism that easily obscures the social structures of control and oppression. It requires keeping each boy in a social context in order to understand the individual, giving us a way to think about boys that accounts for social, cultural, and educational environments. Conceptualizing boys in collectivities is necessary because boys cannot be isolated from the contexts of race, economic class, religious background, etc. Furthermore, allowing Young to redact my Jamesian framework offers a more pragmatic approach that allows development of and explanation of categories that help address the specific social/political/cultural problem that is masculinization. To be a boy or a man is to respond to this seriality, by buying into its milieu, or utterly rejecting it, hiding from it, denying it, divinizing it, or finding some other way to cope. Boys walk the concourse of masculinization, looking for the gate that will connect them to their flight, the plane that will make them a man.

Young's concept of seriality allows us to do a few helpful things alongside James. First, seriality helps us avoid essentialisms by reminding us that no 'snapshot' of a person can name some 'essence.' Essentialists of all stripes tend to believe that there is a singular version of reality, equally

applicable to all, which can be identified and conformed to. Second, Young's seriality helps us also avoid the opposite view, which suggests that there is nothing 'real' there, that a human life is nothing more than a series of 'performances'. Judith Butler builds her theory around this idea of performance. She theorizes gender as an act that is both intentional and performative, at times almost a game. Her theory may be read in a way that seems to hint at the reduction of individual human beings to mere aggregates of the many performances in which they engage.[6] While Butler locates gender in the performance of the individual, Young's concept of seriality locates gender in the culture and the power structures that perpetuate it. For Butler, gender is a game that comes from within, while for Young, gender is an environment imposed from without. Seriality means that a boy's sense of who he is will not be exhausted by his maleness. This helps us recognize with Foucault that desire circulates among bodies, travels from one person to another, and knows no gender or other social norms. It means that a variety or norm is not a permanent location, but a station along the way, a connecting flight, as life is constituted by many series at once, as well as sequentially. The series masculinity is constituted by bodies, social expectations, heroes, male supremacy, heteronormativity, and domination. But boys also happen to be Hispanic, white, poor, middle-class, Christian, transgendered, and many other combinations or intersections of social realities. All these realities determine the boy’s self-understanding at any

given time.

I find what I call the idea of serial masculinity helpful in thinking through the vast array of men's and boys' experiences, such as those provided by the Jamesian framework I constructed above. To be a boy or a man is to respond to this seriality by buying into its milieu, or rejecting it outright, hiding from it, denying it, divinizing it, or finding some other way to cope. Seriality recognizes and valorizes the variety of experiences and milieus in which an individual boy will find himself, and refuses to universalize or normalize. To normalize is to discount or over-emphasize difference in a way that can brutalize, while to filter all issues through individualism is to risk cloaking subjugation and brutalization. Young applies this idea of seriality to gender as a way of honoring collective experience without displacing the intersecting categories of ethnicity, age, race, and class. These intersecting categories are often ignored in theories of gender that normalize white western middle-class experience. Such normalizing should provoke suspicion.

Regimes of Truth and Masculinization

Like James and Dewey before him, Foucault reminds us to examine how the drive for normalizing and standardizing serves those who hold and perpetuate power. The 'normal' becomes the essentialized and enforced standard. To speak of change becomes nearly impossible. To insist on such

standards and norms automatically implies the presence of the “abnormal” and “perverse”. Social structures work to reinforce the power of the norm and to displace, control, and silence those named as “deviant” or “perverse”. These are what Foucault calls 'regimes of truth' enforcing a singular controlling version of reality, equally applicable to all, which can be identified and conformed to with clarity.[7] Foucault's theories of “regimes of truth” and “biopower” can be helpful to this project. Every culture constructs a "regime of truth" according to its beliefs, values, and mores. These values are not given as inevitable truths by some outside source, but constructed by the society itself over time. Dewey touches on this in writing of the social environment and education, and social dynamics that are cooperative or hostile, as well as the criteria of experience.[8] “Regimes of truth” are those areas of social discipline that promote the approved ways of thinking and acting. Regimes of truth are social objects and organizations which claim there is an unequivocal version of reality which can be identified, and as such, enacted with clarity. Such regimes usually create and sanction religious institutions, schools, the military, social organizations (such as Rotary and Lions Club) to become venues for these regimes of truth. In fact, each Jamesian variety (explored in Chapter Two) can be viewed as a regime of truth or a response to one.

Although some social commentators might point out that the permitted expressions of bodily activity and desire have widened somewhat

in recent decades, those approved expressions still fall in a narrow range of options. These options provide the acceptable definition and discipline of bodily desire and activity, and acknowledge that what is called truth is generated only because of multiple constraints. Thus, in a regime of truth, approved types of discourse and mechanisms for discerning truth from falsehood are promoted while others are silenced, in order to valorize the ideology of the regime. Values that are generally accepted, through the way in which power circulates in society, become solidified into regimes of truth.[9] Practices built upon these ideologies further "naturalize" the ideologies to the point that their ontology is obscured, until they are accepted almost without question as somehow natural or inevitable. Regimes of truth about masculinity supply the framework whose effects masculinize boys. Foucault makes a helpful distinction between sovereign power, and disciplinary power or biopower. Sovereign power is recognizable because it is personified in a leader/authority, clothed in trappings of office, exercising specific deeds: a president declaring war, a judge passing sentence, a priest giving absolution, a teacher lecturing. Biopower is more subtle and elusive, and – at the same time - more totalizing, deployed in every facet of social existence.[10]

What Foucault refers to as biopower regiments, controls and redirects desire, and dictates laws on how to express it. Biopower sets up a social atmosphere that condemns some acts, controls others, and creates an

atmosphere of hostility that (perhaps unwittingly, perhaps not) tolerates acts of violence toward transgressors.[11] Biopower works from infancy to instill in boys (and girls) a need to subjugate desire, cloak feelings, fear affection and conform to the social expectations of masculine privilege, governing the ways boys learn to discipline themselves regarding sex and gender identity. This desire for conformity, the need to appear completely normal at all costs is the greatest example of biopower at work. It inscribes the bodies of boys with the hegemonic reality of male privilege. Foucault's understanding of regimes of truth serving the diffusion and consumption of "truth" sounds very much like how Martin describes the relationship of multiple educational agency in transmitting cultural stock.

As a regime of truth, the American way of masculinization has its own way of arriving at, defining and delimiting the "truth" called "masculinity". Each variety explored in Chapter Two is a strategy for the enforcement of the regime I am calling masculinization. Each variety can be understood as a disciplinary space. Each variety, a response chosen consciously or not by a boy, actually channels the response into an acceptable expression of masculinization, within the bounds of that variety. Guilt, shame, displacement, anxiety, and alienation ratify the biopower connected with masculinization. Educational institutions like the Boy Scouts of America are participants in the regimes of truth of which Foucault writes. Their educational assumptions are constructed to insure their regime of truth, and

their strategies are enacted in the biopower imposed on the boys and men they educate.

Conclusion: Freeing Boys' Experience

By providing a Jamesian context and reading that framework through the lenses of Young and Foucault, I have constructed a conceptual framework for understanding and reframing “masculinity” as “masculinities” and for understanding them as spiritual responses to brutalization. Obviously, many boys are not what may be conventionally considered "masculine" in the most superficial sense of the word. Some are quiet, shy, bookish, bespectacled, non-athletic, slight of build, etc., all of which reads as something less than manly. It should seem obvious by now that there is no “true masculinity,” but rather there are *masculinities* –- wide-ranging ones -- each with its own assets and liabilities.

Masculinities are plural because they are varied in light of differing responses to the brutalization that results from the male supremacy promoted by dominant culture, which is inscribed on boys’ bodies by miseducation in myriad forms. As noted above, in serial masculinity, each variety is a different response to masculinization and the accompanying forms of brutalization, and is a series of its own, with its own logic and patterns. Each variety is a regime of truth that in some way maintains the masculinization process, while at the same time permitting members of each series to find different modes for self-discovery. Each develops a

“spirituality” that can, in its constrictive form, work to preserve the program of masculinization. Yet each can also take a more expansive form, permitting a transcendence of the masculinization program and the development of a distinctive spirituality that liberates the individual from the tyranny of the regime. Each variety has a constrictive expression and an expansive one. Examining Young's insight into seriality can help us in the next chapters to see these expressions as fluid. A constrictive Stranger, for instance, is not necessarily stuck there. “Educational metamorphoses”[12] happen in many ways, from a constrictive to an expansive mode, or from one constrictive mode to another. Applying Young’s concept of gender as seriality to the overall framework suggests that each variety can be viewed as a series. This is significant, because the dominant form of male supremacy would claim that a male is defined by how well he lives the masculinist myth. If we interpret James in light of Young, the very idea of maleness as definitive cannot hold. If the various 'masculinities' are serial, what defines a boy is live-creaturehood, not masculinity. By viewing boys' growth in masculinity as an experience, especially a spiritual experience, new possibilities are opened up. (This is akin to the experience of what Dewey would call the live creature.) The varieties provide the “environing conditions” in which and with which the live creature interacts. The live creature moves by growing or constricting in dialogue with these conditions. This dialogue also shows us ways to call into question male-supremacy and the array of domination

practices that accompany it.[13]

Do boys and men see themselves primarily as live creatures, or primarily as bearers of manhood? Is a model of manhood that rejects the objectification of women and nature, that teaches a child to rely on experience and reflective action, even compatible with masculinity? The possibility of taking bodily differences seriously without buying into current masculinities would seem to invite us to consider the primary question to be, what does it mean to be a live creature in a male body? In looking at masculinities as they have developed in the West, a few conclusions about masculinization (as it is commonly understood in the west) are important for this study.

First, all ideals of masculinity in the West define masculinity over against the feminine, as well as against (or above) nature.[14] To bring Young to bear on this discussion, in the seriality of maleness, a regime of truth perpetuates itself, promoting within that series a particular self-understanding. Regimes of truth function within a series. Whether or not a particular description of masculinity flows from the heroic model (which exists as a power inside the series, also), all such models define the feminine in terms of lack or dependence when compared to the masculine. Every such definition and every effort at masculinization defends and preserves some sense of male privilege. The Prisoner experience of masculinity seeks to reinforce the idea of an innate nature of male

supremacy and the need for dominating nature and women. Boys and men are taught to see themselves as human because they see the male as human, and girls and women become secondary, perhaps somehow less than human, or not a live creature in the sense that males are.

Secondly, violence is central to the performance of masculinization. This regime of truth is possible when constructed inside the series boys and men. When I say that violence has a role as regime of truth within the series boys and men, I refer to how it functions within both the preference of the series Prisoner for violence as a response to problems, and reliance on the violent underpinnings of social structures of the series Victim. This not so hidden threat of violence even provides the background for more "peaceful" coercion.

Thirdly, masculinity as learned, performed and maintained by the masculinization processes in the West relies on obedience to an outside authority, and the possible neglect of personal reflection on experience.[15] This outside authority may be a deity, a tradition, a male hierarchy, a social superior, or even custom that becomes significant within the series. There is a relationship between obedience and violence that is ignored to our peril. The Stranger experience of masculinity offers a helpful deviation from the norm by coming to grips with being out of place in a world that assumes innate male supremacy.

Are we stuck with a masculinity that is all about male privilege,

obedience and violence? Is it even possible to consider masculinity apart from male privilege? I believe the varieties of masculinity constructed by way of James, Young, and Foucault can help us see present strengths or assets to be kept, as well as possibilities for change. If change is to happen, reducing violence and educating boys to be partners in “live creaturehood,” then the next step in addressing the problem of generations involves sorting through this collection of male experiences, and discovering the assets that enrich, and the liabilities that hinder, a broader more human experience. In the next chapter I will examine the educational program of the Boy Scouts of America, with that task in mind.

Notes

1. Iris Marion Young, *Intersecting Voices: Dilemmas of Gender, Political Philosophy, and Policy* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1997), 12-36
2. Young, *Intersecting Voices*, 35
3. Young, *Intersecting Voices*, 36-38
4. Young, *Intersecting Voices*, 38
5. Young, *Intersecting Voices*, 37
6. Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Oxford: Routledge, 1999. 23
7. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction* (New York: Random House/Vintage: 1990) 53-73
8. John Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, 10-22
9. Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, New York: Pantheon, 1980. 109-133
10. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 209
11. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 77-102
12. Jane Roland Martin, *Educational Metamorphoses: Philosophical Reflections on Identity and Culture,* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2007, 11-16
12. John Dewey, Democracy and Education, 35-49
13. Ernest Becker, *The Denial of Death,* New York: Free Press, 1997, 30-34
14. Mary Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Men,* 1790

Chapter 4 Cultural Scouting

In the first chapter, I concluded that American education faces a problem of miseducation regarding masculinity. I claimed that the masculinization process in American culture is a form of cultural miseducation that brutalizes boys. Either boys are learning the masculinity that society values (in which case, society seems to value violence, obedience, and misogyny) or the violence and misogyny that boys seem to be learning is not what is intended. In the second and third chapters I theorized about masculinity in the context of how boys respond in a variety of ways to the brutal process of masculinization in our culture. These responses play out in a serial masculinity, which can have constrictive as well as expansive possibilities. I sought to conceptualize the relationship between this miseducation through multiple educational agency and what Foucault refers to as “regimes of truth”. In this chapter, I will introduce my case study masculinization as a central aim of the BSA, develop a tool for approaching that case study, and introduce the specific texts I will analyze.

Confronting Miseducational Strategies

In this section I want to address how we might examine the cultural assets and liabilities evident in the texts of the Boy Scouts of America. If we are to make intelligent choices about improving both education and society

by confronting miseducative strategies, it is vital to examine how we think about those strategies. Such an approach must not only be theoretically sound, but pragmatic in approach, in order to be grounded in ongoing experience and to remain open to new insights. Furthermore, this approach must be useful for examining and analyzing texts and methods of teaching masculinity that are dominant in the culture of the United States today.

Jane Roland Martin's interest in “cultural miseducation” challenges educators to ask how society can be educated toward being a more caring, concerned, and connected society. When Martin speaks of “cultural stock”, she is addressing the whole cultural make-up of a society. “Cultural wealth” signifies those elements of the stock which are valued in the culture, while “assets” and “liabilities” designate wealth in terms of that which promotes the Three Cs and that which hinders.[3] Her practice of “cultural bookkeeping” suggests ways to evaluate what she calls “cultural stock,” by examining “cultural wealth” to seek out what is helpful in strengthening constructive “assets” and lessening destructive or harmful “liabilities.” Martin identifies what she calls a cultural asset as any project, strategy, or action that promotes care, concern, and connection (the Three Cs). One example of a cultural asset is public education, because an implicit purpose of education is training in responsible citizenship. The way that boys in the Boy Scouts are taught to care for the “outdoors” would be another example of a cultural asset.[4]

What is a cultural liability? A cultural "liability" is anything that inhibits, distorts or silences the "Three Cs" (care, concern, and connection). Primary examples of cultural liabilities would be bigotry, violence, and hate. An example of a cultural liability in education would be how lynchings of African-Americans were generally not reported as part of U.S. history in school textbooks. This is a liability because the effect of such concealment is to hide eruptions and undercurrents of racism in American culture and suggest that race has been less a problem than it has. An example of a liability from inside the Boy Scouts of America might be how, for most of its history, the only reference to sexuality in educational texts was a warning against masturbation. The fact that the only sexual act mentioned in the text is considered impure or dirty could be considered injurious to the formation of healthy sexual attitudes. The question for educators is how to identify liabilities and render them harmless by teaching about them in the context of democratic values.

Cultural bookkeeping, for Martin, is a way of looking at educational agendas utilizing a variety of strategies. The purpose of such strategies is to help identify cultural wealth that needs to be strengthened and nourished, precisely because it helps develop, maintain, and further the care, concern, and connection so essential to a healthy, democratically-oriented society. Each strategy developed asks questions in order to uncover and keep track of both assets and liabilities.

When we place Martin in dialogue with James in the *Varieties*, we can see how this structured approach to texts can be helpful. When Martin speaks of "cultural stock", she is addressing something similar to what James names "religious experience" and what Dewey addresses in describing the movement of the live creature within environing conditions. James is not interested in examining only one religion, but, rather, the whole religious experience and make-up of a culture. Furthermore, as a pragmatist, James is not content to limit religion to abstract or philosophical concepts, but uses concepts to describe and evaluate the wide varieties of experience that fall under the umbrella of "religion." "Cultural wealth" in Martin's terminology, which describes valued stock, seems similar to what James' means in his use of the term "varieties," because wealth includes all the different stock that is valued in some way by a culture, and "varieties" is the term by which James labels all those different experiences and phenomena which give meaning and direction.[5]

Looking within a culture's wealth, Martin finds and names assets and liabilities. In a similar way, James examines each variety and discovers expressions that expand experience and help persons transcend their experience. He labels the transcending expressions "higher or expansive forms" and refers to people in these "expansive forms" as having "saintly character." These higher forms refer to the same qualities inherent in Martin's "assets." In the same way, just as Martin uses the term "liabilities" to

indicate wealth that leads to anti-democratic and violent attitudes, James discovers that some religious expressions lock persons into experience in ways that limit them and stunt growth. He names these expressions as "lower or constrictive forms" or "pious character."[6]

Cultural scouting

While it is true that my project is about education and addresses masculinity as a spiritual crisis, my project differs from both Martin's and James's projects. Martin is advocating cultual bookkeeping to provide a way to improve public education with a way to engage in self-examination from the standpoint of cultural and community values, using terminology that is common in community development circles. James' survey of religious varieties grew out of his interest in religious sensibility as an experience rather than a doctrine.

While I find Martin's "cultural bookkeeping" approach instructive, I do not find the banking imagery of assets, liabilities, stock, and wealth helpful in the context of my particular study. I understand the usefulness of that language in her theory of cultural miseducation, and I realize that it parallels the language of benefits and risks in the Belmont report.[7] The Helsinki Declaration (1964), similarly, uses "risks" and "burdens."[8] "Assets and liabilities" are central to the work of John McKnight, who developed the Asset Based Community Development (ABCD) strategies for thinking about

community development in human resource theory.[9] While balance-sheets can be helpful, I would prefer another metaphor for examining boys' masculinization.

James' terminology is even less helpful, as it would frame the examination inside an antiquated religious terminology, in which the meanings of terms used in James' day have changed significantly. Religious metaphors, while capturing the spiritual crisis aspect of masculinization, would not do justice to its other aspects.

Instead of Martin's "bookkeeping" or James' "survey" as guiding metaphor, I will here extend the rather obvious metaphor "scouting." In founding the Boy Scouting movement, Sir Robert Baden-Powell chose this word carefully when beginning his boys' program of education. Scouting is a word that suggests the gathering of information. The army scouts he trained during his military career were spies in the field, doing reconnaissance work. Besides the military usage of the term, Baden-Powell was fond of the frontier (American and otherwise) and would speak of scouts going ahead of bands of pioneers, gathering information, making sure the path was clear, and mapping the territory, and at times preparing the way.[10] Scouts gather helpful information from which decisions can be made about future choices. Baden-Powell sees parallels between scouting in the battlefield and the learning and exploring that occurs in Boy Scouting. The discipline and

energy of the boys would prepare the way for the expansion and defense of the Empire.[11]

To engage in cultural bookkeeping is to assess the cultural stock and sort out assets and liabilities. In the same way, to engage in what I will here *cultural scouting* is to conduct a *bodily examination* of a culture and its cultural guardians in order to survey and assess the effect on the body of masculinization processes. I choose to refer to what Martin calls "stock" by the term "body" for two reasons. First, my use of the word "body" here refers not just to physical bodies, but minds and spirits as well. It also can refer ambiguously to a collective whole as well as an individual within that whole. Secondly, as Foucault reminds us, the regimes of truth that shape our lives inscribe their claims on our bodies, through the discipline of biopower. This scouting of the cultural body allows us to explore ways boys are being taught what it means to grow into manhood by examining the cultural body. A scouting of the cultural body will uncover cultural strengths (which Martin calls assets and James calls higher forms) which I will call "adventures". Any such bodily scouting will also uncover the harmful effects of biopower which I will call *brutalizations*.

Brutalizations

Normally, when we hear the term *brutalization*, we associate it with bullying, terrorist acts, gruesome murders, warfare or the like. However,

what I mean by brutalization has a broader application. By brutalization I mean any aspect of the cultural body that either fails to promote or actively works against the care, concern, and connection necessary for human flourishing.

I use this term for those experiences that James calls constrictive because they stunt growth and limit possibilities. I assert that boys are brutalized, body and soul, by practices, attitudes, and ideologies that masculinize in ways that interfere with such flourishing. In *The Schoolhome*, Martin herself writes of the brutalizations that are inscribed on boys' bodies.[12] Because I will be using the term brutalization in this study, and because it can seem a harsh term, I want to clarify differing senses of the term. Brutalization, of course, has two initial outcomes. When a subject (S_1) brutalizes another (S_2), two things are happening. First, S_1 is being brutal toward S_2, disrespecting, assaulting, mistreating, and misleading. But secondly, S_1 in acting the *brute*, is reducing himself to something less than what one might expect from a mature, civilized human being.

Let me be clear about terminology here. *Brutalization* is a consequence of a *brutalizing* event. The subjects that brutalize others are *brutes*, and the ones *brutalized* by the event or act are the *brutalized*. An example might be an altercation on a playground. Suppose two boys, Jason and Matt are friends, who are playing on the playground, when a third boy named Ryan comes over and goes straight for Jason and kicks him a few

times until he falls to the ground. In this example, Ryan is acting a *brute*, and *brutalizing* Jason. However, Jason is not the only one *brutalized*, as his friend Matt has just witnessed the *brutalizing*. Looking at this event, we can see that one boy, Ryan, a *brute*, is brutal (cruel) toward Jason, the *brutalized*. Both Jason and Matt have been *brutalized*. They both have experienced something that becomes a learning experience. What will they learn?

There are three consequences that could play out in response to any brutalizing event. The *brutalized* may learn to fear and expect further brutalization, and develop a cautious approach to life. This respondent I will name the *Wary One*. Secondly, the *brutalized* may decide, in the interest of "survival," to become like the *brute* at least in part, learning the ways of brutality as "the way of the world." This respondent I will call the *Apprentice*. Apprentices either learn to become *brutes* or learn to see violence and mistreatment as acceptable. Finally, the *brutalized* may also find other various ways to cope, steering between the poles of fear and learning to be a brute. This respondent I refer to as *Simply-Brutalized*. Furthermore, the *brute* Ryan, is a *brute* because he was once *brutalized* in some way, and chose an *apprenticeship* to brutality. Those who become *brutes* were earlier victims of brutalization, and took the path of *apprenticeship*. All brutalizations and responses have consequences. It is concern for those consequences that poses questions for educators.

Some brutalizations, like the one described above, are intentional. Many others are incidental. Some of these incidental events are not planned, and just seem to happen as a part of life; and others result as unintended consequences of a planned act or event that has no intention of brutalizing, yet is experienced that way by many of the subjects acted on by the brutalizing subject. Wherever there is a brute, an apprentice, or a wary one, there is evidence that some sort of brutalization has occurred. This is clearly a concern for educators who wish to help construct a healthier society.

In *The Schoolhome*, Martin herself writes of the brutalizations that are inscribed on boys' bodies. Violence, aggression, devaluing of woman and nature are examples of brutalizations. If care, concern, and connection are at the center of a social reality that promotes the flourishing of human society, then brutalizations can be said to be those acts and dispositions that promote indifference, violence, and glorified individualism instead. (I am not meaning here the heroic individualism which seeks a *via media* between indifference and violence.) All intentional and some incidental brutalizations are expressions of attempts to control boys and men, and to impart a compliant mentality, a regime of truth, that reproduces slavish conformity and obedience.[13]

In examining the relationship between adventures and brutalizations, it is important to point out that many (perhaps most) incidental brutalizations

do not seem to be avoidable. As noted above, some of these just happen in the normal course of living (seeing an animal die, accidentally witnessing a tragedy, being caught up in a violent situation, etc.). Children cannot always be protected from brutalizing events. Indeed, the relationship between a child's learning to risk and vulnerability to brutalization is a topic ripe for exploration. Children as well as adults can grow in expansive ways in response to a brutalizing event. That of course should not be a rationale for allowing or encouraging intentional brutalization; but rather, acknowledging the reality of incidental brutalization. I would assert that most educational texts and schemes are not guilty of engaging in intentional brutalization, but do often create situations where students experience incidental brutalization. This would certainly be true of cultural institutions like the Boy Scouts of America. Educators (and parents) who are concerned about brutalization in schools and cultural institutions will look to consequences and evaluate the possibility that commonly accepted behaviors may carry the potential for incidental brutalization, in order to reduce unnecessary brutality.

Adventures

In contrast to a brutalization, an adventure is any aspect of the cultural body that enhances a liberating approach to masculinization by encouraging care, concern, and connection. The very word "adventure" suggests a certain openness, even a lack of control. New experiences are

adventures. Journeys to new places are adventures. Democracy is an adventure. The driving idea behind Baden-Powell's vision of Scouting is that most boys experience traditional educational structures as stifling. Reacting negatively to the confines of the traditional classroom, and adapting Maria Montessori's methodology of the engaging of students at their developmental level, and structuring physical activity into ordinary learning experiences, Baden-Powell developed an educational approach that engaged the interest of the boys through games and small group activities. In writing for scoutmasters and adult leaders, and even for scouts themselves, he saw this as congruent with the approach to life he was trying to promote. The good life, the helpful life, was for Baden-Powell a game, a great adventure.[14]

In writing for scouts he recalls, "The history of the Empire has been made up of adventurers and explorers, the scouts of the nation."[15] These adventurers live the fulfilling life, and make the most of their situation in order to better the world. Their efforts are not just for themselves, but for something larger. They become, in his writings, models of manhood. These are the kind of people who challenge or set aside what Martin would refer to as liabilities, what I call brutalizations. When James refers to persons who engage in the higher forms of the varieties, he is suggesting much the same thing. The quest for James was to acknowledge where one was in the multitude of spiritual varieties and to grow in such a way as not to be trapped

there, but to transcend by way of one's own experience. The transcending led to a higher form of the variety, an expansive commitment that had the most influence in a person's life.

The story of Kim, told in its most well known form by Rudyard Kipling, was one of Baden-Powell's favorites for teaching the disciplined life he was advocating through Scouting. He uses it along with two other stories to introduce Scouting to boys in his first *Handbook for Boys*. He frequently referred to it, not only in writing, but in campfire talks and other situations. He calls it an adventure, and sees it as a model for setting aside brutalizations and making the most of a situation by embracing the good. Baden-Powell saw the story as a model adventure, and often would tell it to invite boys to share the adventure.[16] He also referred to Boy Scouting itself as the "exciting adventure". One way he emphasized the adventure metaphor was by centering much of the learning experience in games and other activities that required teamwork. Indeed, the term "game" could be considered a synonym for adventure in Baden-Powell's lexicon.

Developing Strategies for Scouting the Body

Having examined the need for cultural scouting in regard to the masculinization of boys in American society, I now turn to how I intend to practice cultural scouting through the textual terrain of the Boy Scouts of America. As I have indicated, cultural scouting is a way of looking at

masculinization agendas utilizing a variety of strategies to do two things. First, it should help identify adventures that need to be strengthened, nourished, and encouraged. Secondly, it should identify incidental and intentional brutalizations that need challenged and contextualized. Adventures need to be encouraged precisely because they help develop, maintain, and further the care, concern, and connection so essential to a healthy, democratically oriented society. I do not mean adventure in the sense used by Baden-Powell, of excitement, gamesmanship, or the thrill of competition. Rather, I mean by adventure, those experiences that open up possibilities for growth and development, individually and socially, which James heralds as expansive and transcending.

Brutalizations need to be scouted out and uncovered because of the harm they bring, not only to random individuals, but to social realities as well. Each strategy will therefore query the texts with the intention tracing and mapping both adventures and brutalizations. Learning from Martin's work promoting the development of bookkeeping strategies, we can frame strategies that are helpful in exploring educational texts for cultural scouting.

Scouting for Masculinities

In Chapter Two, in examining the varieties of masculine experience, it becomes clear that boys respond to the masculinization process in a number of ways, each a response to the regimes of truth in which they find

themselves. These various responses give the lie to the idea of a narrowly defined manhood. Obviously, many boys will never fit what may be conventionally considered "masculine" in the most hegemonic sense of the word. It should seem obvious by now that there is no “true masculinity,” but rather there are *masculinities* —- wide-ranging ones -- each with its own assets and liabilities. Care, concern, and connection would seem to be given space to flourish when boys are not limited to one variety of masculine experience. Do the texts of the BSA acknowledge this and promote the expansive forms of the varieties of masculinity mentioned in Chapter Two? Do they encourage the exploration and discovery that allows for all varieties of masculine experience? Or do they embrace a narrow approach to masculine experience?

Might we be able to say whether or not the BSA educates in a way that offers opportunities for open development and discovery on the part of boys? Does Boy Scouting seem to limit itself to narrow views within the hegemonic culture, or does it choose instead, not only to offer a wider range of approaches from within the culture, but also to expose the Boy Scout to ways other cultures have lived with the same or similar issues? Does the BSA see itself as a regime of truth on behalf of male privilege?

Scouting for the Live Creature

The boy as subject of the biopower of regimes of truth, such as the Boy Scouts, learns a restrictive masculinity. As I have indicated in previous chapters, the attitude encouraged among men toward nature often seems to be directly related to attitudes about women. Lower or constrictive forms of masculinity accept and maintain an ideology regarding nature/woman that sees both as an other/object to be dominated. In Chapter Two I discuss the Prisoner response to masculinization and show how the Prisoner can adopt a constrictive approach, in compliance with the demands of a masculinization process promoting male privilege. This compliance has consequences for how a boy or man views women, nature, and questions of sexuality identity. On the other hand, it is also possible for a Prisoner to move to a higher or more expansive form by finding meaning in values like equality and personal freedom, including the recognition and advocacy of social equality for women. Do boys and men see themselves primarily as live creatures, or primarily as bearers of manhood?

Do the BSA texts offer a model of manhood that rejects the objectification of women and nature? The possibility of taking gender and body differences seriously without buying into current masculinities would seem to invite us to consider the primary question to be: what does it mean to be a live creature in a male body? In the second chapter, conceptualizing the Stranger experience of masculinization and how the Stranger may

transcend that experience, I remind the reader how Rousseau's Emile learns by exploring nature and is deliberately removed from the educational "molds" and expectations of what Rousseau understood to be a social education in compliance and control.

Rather than being seen as "responsible for" women and nature, a program that educates for care, concern, and connection will teach boys and men to see themselves as "responsible to" or "responsible with" others in an educative environment that respects and values all. The nature/woman ideology affects religious or spiritual story-telling, imagery, concepts and commitments as well. Any strategy for examining BSA texts (or those of any other educational organization) needs to interrogate the attitude toward both women and nature. This is a question of biopower. In interrogating educational texts we must seek to trace how attitudes are perpetuated that promote (or at least tolerate) misogyny, homophobia, violence, and an ethic of domination.

Scouting for Friendship

As described above in the earlier section, I use the word adventure in contrast to brutalization. Adventure as an educational project, as curriculum, is about encouraging those values that James points to in discussing saintliness, and refers to as that which enables a person to transcend the limits of their own experience in order to befriend others and their

experiences, as well as the larger world. How do the texts of the BSA encourage this friendship? How do they encourage care for self, others, and the rest of the natural world? How do the texts communicate concern for others? Are boy scouts encouraged to move out beyond themselves and connect with other boys and girls and their experiences of cultures, learning styles, social concerns, and sexualities?

Serial masculinity reminds us how boys' experiences and explorations, like the varieties of masculine experience, are serial experiences, in process, situated in a larger context, and not necessarily identity markers. Dewey's live creature is open to growth, and engages the world about him with reflective action. Do the texts help create an environment that is cooperative, rather than hostile, to the expansive explorations and adventures of boys? Are there approved types of discourse in the BSA, as a regime of truth, that inhibit or silence the experience of boys themselves as an interpretive factor? If differing experiences lead to differing ways of looking at the world and human relationships, do the texts encourage learning from those wide ranging experiences and befriending them?

James offers a guideline for what such friendship might look like in his discussion of saintliness, when he names the identifying characteristics. They include enlarging one's sense of life, embracing simplicity and honesty, being compassionate, and acting reflectively in a way that allows for the

resisting of “official” values.[17] These marks of saintliness can serve as descriptors of the expansiveness that leads to friendship.

Mapping the textual terrain of the Boy Scouts

As I pointed out in Chapter One in discussing cultural miseducation, there are a number of social institutions with educational agency that influence the masculinization process among boys, and schools, libraries, and museums are not the only ones. Religious institutions (churches, synagogues, mosques, etc.), voluntary civic associations (Kiwanis, Lions, etc.), the media, and other cultural entities transmit cultural values as well. They decide, by the way they employ any observable program (as well as any hidden curriculum), what adventures and brutalizations should live on in the next generation.[18] To explore and examine how American culture educates boys for masculinity, I will take as my primary sources the educational texts of the Boy Scouts of America.

The BSA is the only organization in the United States that has been chartered by the U.S. Congress to educate boys for manhood.[19] Local Boy Scout programs are sponsored by virtually every type of cultural guardian mentioned above: schools, religious groups, voluntary civic organizations, and other cultural entities. They are intertwined with more agencies, organizations and institutions than perhaps any other organization in American society. If there is a compulsory form of masculinity, a process of

masculinization that defines American culture, the way the Boy Scouting movement understands what it means to be a man would be the first place to start in mapping that form. Therefore, exploring what they intend to teach boys about masculinity seems necessary if we are to address the adventures and brutalizations which are present in the education of boys for manhood.

To map the educational assumptions and agenda of the Boy Scouts of America, I will explore *The Boy Scout Handbook*, originally written by Baden-Powell and called the *Handbook for Boys. The Boy Scout Handbook* is currently in its eleventh edition in the United States. I will also examine the *Scoutmaster Handbook*, originally titled *Handbook for Scoutmasters*, which is currently in its ninth edition. I will also look at the various legal cases in recent years that have given expression to those assumptions. *The Boy Scout Handbook* is the primary printed educational text for the Boy Scouting movement, placed in the hands of every boy who enters Boy Scouting. Each national organization has its own, based on and inspired by the original text, by Baden-Powell. The American text has undergone some significant revisions over almost a century.

I also cover the terrain of some recent court cases involving the BSA, which provide information about the BSA's educational self-understanding. The most prominent of these cases is *Boy Scouts of America v. Dale*, involving the dismissal of a Boy Scout leader because of his association with

the gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered and queer community. The Boy Scouts have been taken to court over issues related to religion as well in cases like *Welsh v. Boy Scouts of America*. In a third set of cases such as *Schwenk v. Boy Scouts of America* the Boy Scouts were challenged over their policy of excluding girls and women from membership.

Early texts

In this section, I will introduce the basic texts of the BSA. As Michel Foucault reminds us in explaining his genealogical method (follow the trail, in Scouting parlance), disruptions and shifts (trail detours or switchbacks) in myths, texts, and other aspects of educational agency signify changes in direction or understanding in regimes of truth.[20] A simple, straightforward example of this sort of switchback would be the history of the Scout Oath, also known as the Scout Promise. The original oath was short, and said simply,

> I will do my duty to God and the King.
> I will do my best to help others, whatever it costs me.
> I know the scout law, and will obey it.

The International version of the Oath or Promise states,

> On my honour I promise that I will do my best—
> To do my duty to God and my Country
> To help other people at all times
> To obey the Scout Law.[21]

When the Boy Scouts of America came into existence three years later, the U.S. committee that organized the BSA added three completely new concluding phrases,

> To keep myself physically strong,
> mentally awake,
> and morally straight.

This addition to the Oath is only found in scouting organizations in those nations whose scouting organizations are influenced directly by U.S. rather than British Scouting.

The first text of the Boy Scouting movement – *Scouting for Boys*[22] - was written by Baden-Powell, the founder of the movement, as the movement began to take shape. This text was originally written as an experimental educational text, to explain the Boy Scouts as an educational concept, and to provide material for initial activities in establishing scouting troops. Baden-Powell tested these ideas in August of 1907 on a camping trip on Brownsea Island. In the United States, there have been ten subsequent editions of the *Boy Scout Handbook*. These texts, along with the *Scoutmaster Handbook*, provide insight into the way the Boy Scouts 0f America conceptualize masculinity and reveal how they intend to educate boys. Baden-Powell was clear that what he was founding was intended to be an organization that educates and trains boys for manhood with a distinct method.[23]

When Lord Robert Baden-Powell formed the Boy Scout movement, England was mired in a culture war. The choices Baden-Powell made in forming the Boy Scouts and writing *Scouting for Boys* reflected his sense of masculinity and how best to inculcate in boys a life-shaping experience of that masculinity. While he was comfortable with the martial atmosphere of other boys groups extant at the time, he believed an openly militaristic group would not grow as fast or be as broadly based (with regard to social class) as a group which was more subtle in communicating its martial perspective. He wanted it to be as broad-based in appeal as possible, in order to educate the greatest number of boys.[24] The whole purpose was to rescue England and the British Empire from what he saw as the "feminizing" effects of school and church on boys, an effect that was, in his view, harming the spread of empire. The task was clear: remasculinizing boys for obedient service and resisting egalitarian and democratic impulses of the reform movements of that era.[25]

For Baden-Powell, the marks of masculinity could be summed up in the Scout Oath, and manly life was undergirded at all times by discipline and obedience. "A dull lad who can obey orders is better than a sharp one who cannot", he once said.[26] So, taking the Scout Oath as a starting point, the Boy Scout idea of masculinity begins with the idea that a man does his duty at all times. He said that knowledge was not as important as "obedience, loyalty and guts".[27] Originally the duty was to God, country and employer.

Duty to parents was not included because Baden-Powell considered most parents in that generation to be morally weak.

Baden-Powell chose to call the movement Scouting because it was a military term that also contained a hint of the romance of the frontier. He had helped train scouts in the Royal Army, and war was, for Baden-Powell, the supreme test of manhood.[28] In providing organization structure for the Boy Scouting movement, he organized boys in neighborhood or area units called troops which contained a number of small groups called patrols. Patrols resembled both the military unit and the gang, and Baden-Powell believed boys naturally gravitated toward gang activity. This was both a tool for developing masculinity and a key for understanding what it meant to be a man. Games, athleticism, and camping would assure the physical strength necessary for manliness, while also providing a setting for the sublimation of the individual into a group where everyone knew their place. (A snob, for Baden-Powell was a boy who didn't know his place or have respect for the place of others, either above or below them.) Thus, athleticism and competition were essential to educating for masculinity. Earning badges of accomplishment or merit would address the need for mental wakefulness as well as individual expression. Obedience, trustworthiness, fulfilling of religious obligations, and sexual purity would keep a boy morally straight.[29]

While all of the above is important for educating boys in masculinity for Baden-Powell, at the center of Baden-Powell's concept of masculinity is the warrior and the battlefield. His model of manhood is the warrior. Not only is the battle the event that proves the man, but it requires duty and obedience, the most highly prized characteristics of a man, in western thought going back prior to Plato.[30] So, Baden-Powell refers to war as a "school of manhood" as well. He agrees with a contemporary of his, Paul Jones, who wrote that "training for the path of duty is the ideal end of all education."[31] For both men, athleticism and the contest were more educative than the academy. He opined that if boys were taught how to shoot and obey orders they would be good men. He was fond of telling stories about men - but more especially boys - who died in battle or in other gruesome situations that became opportunities for self-sacrifice. These stories, some of which were included in the first scout handbook, serve to reinforce what Barbara Ehrenreich, in our own time, would call the cult of the glorious death.[32]

He enjoyed telling stories from the age of knighthood as a way of driving home lessons in obedience, loyalty and purity. These were the marks of chivalry, a theme to which he would often return. He claimed that he got the idea for the Scout motto ("Be Prepared") from the Arthurian code for knights. The 1911 Handbook had an entire chapter on chivalry, kindness

and public behavior.[33] The code stressed the knight's readiness at all times for battle as well as acts of kindness toward the defenseless.

When he was approached about including girls in scouting or developing a girls wing of the Scouts, he started the Girl Guides, refusing to call them Scouts. He was adamant that "scouting" was a battlefield and frontier term, and thus not the place for women. He decided on "guides" instead, because, as he understood it, a mother served her country by guiding her children into being dutiful citizens and obedient employees. Guiding (children) was for women, while leading was for men.[34]

So, we can see brutalization in the early texts of Boy Scouting. Following the trail of these texts, Boy Scouting's appprocach to masculinization rests on a resistance to social equality for women, a dedication to the maintenance of empire and colonization, an energetic masculinity centered in warriorhood, and sexual purity. In addition, the authority of employers was prized more than the authority of the home. These values reflect the regimes of truth at the center of the boy scouting educational vision.

Conclusion

In the next chapter I will turn to the modern texts and scout them for how they promote the varieties of masculinity, nurture the live creature, and encourage friendship. I will practice cultural scouting to probe the issues

surrounding the masculinization of boys and the extent to which growing up and growing into manhood becomes an adventure or a brutalization. Exploring these educational texts might help us think in ways that allow us to move beyond the cultural and ethical traps inherent in the forms of masculine privilege currently in vogue.

Notes

1. Martin, *Cultural Miseducation: In Search of a Democratic Solution*. New York: Teachers College Press, 2002, 33-43
2. Sec. 3, *Federal Charter, Boy Scouts of America,* June 15, 1916, by the United States Congress
3. Jane Roland Martin, *Cultural Miseducation,* 7-20
4. Martin, *Cultural Miseducation,* 14
5. William James, *Varieties of Religious Experience.* New York, Modern Library: 1999. 36, 54-55, 61
6. James, *Varieties,* 285-300
7. *The Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of*
Human Subjects of Research. Report of the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, April 18, 1979
8. World Medical Association, *Declaration of Helsinki, Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Subjects*, 1964
9. John McKnight has developed this idea in social services education. See http://www.sesp.northwestern.edu/abcd/
10. Baden-Powell, *Scouting for Boys*, 77
11. Baden-Powell, *Scouting for Boys,* 13-14
12. Martin, *The Schoolhome: Rethinking Schools for Changing Families*, Cambridge: Harvard: 1992. 108-109
13. Martin, *Cultural Miseducation*, 14, and *The Schoolhome: Rethinking Schools for Changing Families*, Cambridge: Harvard: 1992. 104-111
14. Baden-Powell, *Scouting for Boys*, 295, and *Aids to Scoutmastership,* 56-61
15. Baden-Powell, *Scouting for Boys*, 13, 273-280
16. Baden-Powell, *Scouting for Boys*, 14-18
17. James, *Varieties*, 298-300
18. Martin, *Cultural Miseducation*, 105-112
19. *Federal Charter, Boy Scouts of America,* June 15, 1916, by the United States Congress
20. Michel Foucault, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, and History", in *The Foucault Reader*, edited by Paul Rabinow, New York: Pantheon, 85-88
21. see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scout_Promise#Scouts_Australia for the history and present usages of the Promise or Oath.
22. Robert Baden-Powell *Scouting for Boys*. (1908 Edition) Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
23. Robert Baden-Powell. *Aids to Scoutmastership: A Handbook for Scoutmasters on the Theory of Scout Training.* Dallas: Stevens Publishing: 1992. vii, 13
24. Tom Jeal, *Baden-Powell*, 409, 627

25. Tom Jeal, *Baden-Powell*, 409-415
26. Michael Rosenthal, *The Character Factory,* New York: Harper Collins, 1986, 6-8
27. Michael Rosenthal, *The Character Factory,* 94-96
28. Robert H. MacDonald, *Sons of Empire: The Frontier and Boy Scout Movement 1890-1910.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993. 1-3
29. Michael Rosenthal, *The Character Factory,* 94-96
30. see my discussion of *Laches* and *Meno* in Chapter One, above
31. Michael Rosenthal, *The Character Factory,* 94-96
32. Barbara Ehrenreich, *Blood Rites: Origins and History of the Passions of War,* New York: Henry Holt, 1997, 150, 204-222
33. *The Boy Scout Handbook* 11th Edition. Irving,TX: Boy Scouts of America, 1998. 45
34. Tom Jeal, *Baden-Powell*, 469-471. Just how opposed he was to girls as scouts is debatable, given new findings that suggest he was of two minds regarding this issue.

Chapter 5 Adventures and Brutalizations in Boy Scouting

In previous chapters (Two and Three) I examined how cultural learning is generated by multiple educational agency: the various cultural institutions, organizations and entities that function as custodians of cultural myths and values. I conceptualized the masculinization process in American culture as a form of “cultural miseducation” which brutalizes boys and should be understood as a spiritual crisis. I also demonstrated the relationship between this miseducation through multiple educational agency and what Foucault refers to as “regimes of truth.” In the hegemonic masculinity of (white) American culture, desire itself is often grounds for reproach, unless expressed in strictly sanctioned ways. Although some social commentators might point out that the range of permitted expressions of desire has widened some in recent decades, those approved expressions still fall within a narrow range of options. The reproach is regulated through what Foucault refers to as biopower. "Power is essentially what dictates its law to sex. Which means first of all that sex is placed by power in a binary system: licit and illicit, permitted and forbidden."[1] Biopower regiments, controls and redirects desire, and dictates laws on how to express it.[2] Through the exercise of biopower, each regime of truth sets up a social atmosphere which condemns some acts, controls others, and creates an atmosphere of hostility that allows or even encourages acts of violence toward

transgressors. Educational agents, perhaps unwittingly, often maintain and promote this bio-power institutionally.

The Boy Scouts of America is one such educational agent, with an immense impact on American culture. Boy Scouting is an educational institution that disciplines the lives of more American boys than any other single educational movement in the nation. In this chapter I will scout the textual body of BSA curriculum to evaluate how they educate boys for masculinity, using the three strategies developed in Chapter Four. In that chapter I mentioned the texts I will examine. In the first section of this chapter, Scouting for Masculinities, I will go into more depth about the adventures and brutalizations surrounding the various responses (varieties) toward masculinization. Following that I will look, in the second section, Scouting for the Live Creature, at how the Boy Scouts of America teach boys about care, concern, and connection with nature, woman, and related issues. The third section, Scouting for Friendship, looks at how the BSA does or does not encourage friendship that expresses itself in care, concern, and expansive connection.

In these sections I will examine the handbooks as well as legal cases for verification. The legal cases may not seem at first to be curricular source material, but since the BSA has engaged these cases in order to defend what they see as the truth contained in the Scout Oath or Promise, and

since the legal cases have affected policy emphases, a look at them should be instructive.

Scouting for Masculinities

To scout for masculinities is to examine the educational texts of the BSA to see whether they promote (or encourage or tolerate) the wide varieties of masculine experience. Do the texts of the BSA acknowledge and promote the expansive forms of the varieties of masculinity theorized in Chapter Two? Do they encourage the exploration and discovery that allows for varieties of masculine experience? Or do they embrace a narrow approach to masculine experience? Does the BSA educate in a way that offers opportunities for open development and discovery on the part of boys? Does Boy Scouting limit itself to narrow views of manhood within the hegemonic culture?

Varieties of masculinity

At the center of Baden-Powell's concept of masculinity are the warrior and the battlefield. He often told stories which romanticized the battlefield, even though he was rarely on it. The battle is the event that proves the man, and it requires duty and obedience, which, for Baden-Powell, are the most highly prized characteristics of a man. Yet, Baden-Powell had a distinct approach to masculinity. In many ways his ideal Scout resonates with

Rousseau's "natural man" in *Emile* (1762) as well as the martial virtues of James' *Moral Equivalent of War* (1906). It is the battlefield to which he constantly returns, even if only to tell stories which seem to promote other varieties of masculine experience. Yet these stories -- stories like Kim or stories from the frontier -- are told, not so much to valorize various experiences of masculinity, but to contextualize them. These other varieties of experience are only acknowledged in the light of war and conflict, punishment and purity. It is -- for Baden-Powell -- the struggle of war, the shedding of blood, and the combat against evil (and for purity) that makes the man and that supports the regimes of truth perpetuated by Boy Scouting. The founding of the Boy Scout movement is about promoting a variety of masculinity that appeals to duty and obedience, and thus, on shame and guilt as formative of the restoration of masculinity, not to the total exclusion of other varieties, but clearly privileged over those others.

Like Maria Montessori, who admired his teaching method centered on games, he insists that a young person's experience was unique and unrepeatable.[3] While he was not interested in social change in terms of class difference or economic justice, he was a frequent champion of the outcast boy, and urged Scoutmasters not to abandon the difficult cases but to find ways to engage the individuality of the boy. The individual boy and the exercise of his agency was always to be respected, even as it was to be captured by an ideal, the ideal of the warrior. He wanted the Boy Scouts to

be a place where every boy could belong.[4] Like Rousseau, he believed that certain elements of masculinity would emerge naturally if boys were placed in a more "natural" environment. The natural environment for Baden-Powell provided the basis for his concept of religion, which was a cultivation of reverence for nature and neighbor, based on a sort of romantic naturalism. This natural environment, controlled by the Scout movement, would guide and shape a boy's agency. He wants Scouting to be an adventure.

Gay Scouts

> "In the Scout Oath, a Scout promises to be "morally straight,"
> and in the Scout Law he promises to be "clean."
> The Boy Scout Handbook (11th ed.) explains "morally straight"
> as "To be a person of strong character, your relationships with
> others should be honest and open. You should respect and
> defend the rights of all people. Be clean in your speech and actions,
> and remain faithful in your religious beliefs. The values you practice
> as a Scout will help you shape a life of virtue and self-reliance."
> The Handbook explains "clean" as "A Scout keeps his body and mind
> fit and clean. He chooses the company of those who live by high
> standards. He helps keep his home and community clean." [5]

With the above words, the BSA begins its defense of discrimination against gay, transgendered, queer and questioning boys, as well as self-identified gay men who are leaders of troops and packs. The words of the Oath and the Law, repeated constantly in Boy Scouting events, spell out the

vision of manliness taught by Boy Scouting through the years. They also provide the rationale for the BSA's opposition to the recognition of gay Scouts: moral straightness and cleanliness.

In the earliest case, filed in 1981 (*Curran v. Mount Diablo Council*) an openly gay Scout leader sued Mount Diablo Council under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act, challenging the council's refusal to approve him as an adult leader. On appeal, the Los Angeles County Superior Court ruled in favor of the Boy Scout council. When this was appealed, the California Supreme Court, in 1998, upheld the lower court decisions, saying that the Unruh Act only applied to businesses.[6]

The most prominent of these cases is *Boy Scouts of America v. Dale* (2000). In that case, an openly gay Assistant Scoutmaster sued after his leadership was revoked, when an article in a local paper about a conference on health issues facing gay and lesbian teens included his name. He is not given a reason for his termination, and so, inquires of BSA officials, who reply that he was expelled because the Boy Scouts "specifically forbid membership to homosexuals."[7] Dale sues, alleging that Boy Scouts violated the New Jersey *Law Against Discrimination,* which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in places of public accommodation. The New Jersey Superior Court ruled in favor of the Boy Scouts of America, but the Appellate Court and later the state Supreme Court held that the Boy Scouts had acted in violation of the state's public accommodations law. The

U.S. Supreme Court reversed the New Jersey Supreme Court on the grounds that a state may not, through its nondiscrimination statutes, prohibit the Boy Scouts from adhering to a moral viewpoint and expressing that viewpoint in internal leadership policy. In a dissenting opinion Justice Stevens emphasized the importance of the freedom of association and free speech, but pointed out that the evidence in this case showed that the members of Scouting do not actually come together for any message or purpose that would be harmed by continued participation of gay youth and adult members, and thus there is no true First Amendment violation.[8]

Other lawsuits regarding gay Scouts include cases filed in Chicago (*Chicago Area Council of Boy Scouts of America v. City of Chicago Commission on Human Relations,* 2001) and the District of Columbia (*Boy Scouts of America v. District of Columbia Commission on Human Rights*, 2002), involving local courts that repeated previous U.S. Supreme Court arguments and asserted that the BSA had a right to require employees to obey the Scout Oath and Scout Law, and that discrimination against gay male youth and adults was a matter of freedom of expression.[9]

In barring from the BSA any gay or bisexual youth, and those who are unsure or questioning their sexuality, the organization makes reference to the last line of the Oath, which states that a Scout will be “morally straight”. Reference is also made to the fact that in reciting the Scout Law, a Scout promises to be Clean. Cleanness and moral straightness appear to be the

rationale for excluding gay, bisexual, and transgendered boys. In a policy statement about membership, the BSA says that "homosexual conduct is inconsistent with the obligations in the Scout Oath and Scout Law to be morally straight and clean in thought, word, and deed".[10] How it is inconsistent has not been explained. Only in recent years has the BSA specifically addressed the issue of sexual identity. The rationalization from the Oath and the Law cannot help but leave one with the impression that Boy Scouting sees gay, bisexual, transgendered and questioning youth as unclean and morally askew. Interestingly, the very openness and honesty which the Handbook (quoted above) says that Scouting requires of a boy, is punished if that honesty and openness is about sexual or relational self-concept. This may brutalize boys who are queer or questioning, rather than offering adventure.

The BSA promotes heterosexuality as the default sexual orientation and thus they assert non-normative sexual identity as unclean and morally bent, and gay, lesbian and transgendered youth are labeled as somehow dishonest, unclean, irreligious, immoral, and lacking in character. How or why this might be true is never explained by the BSA. It is just assumed. It is precisely this assumption that shapes the regimes of truth propagated by the BSA. Such labeling also ignores the lessons of gender as seriality, discussed in Chapter Three, which remind us that a person in a series shares a relationship with other persons in the series only in relation to a

common object. Serial aspects of identity are not moral objects in and of themselves. A serial approach to masculine experience will not allow us to reduce the person to being just an aggregate of discourses, nor to ignore the social "intersections" in which the individual is embedded. Intersecting categories are often ignored in theories of gender that normalize white western middle-class experience. It appears that the Boy Scouts would do just that which seriality would caution against.

In contrast, Baden-Powell explicitly shied away from connecting sexuality to religion in early editions of the handbook, where any reference to sex was relegated to a chapter on health. He explicitly taught Scoutmasters to leave issues and questions about sexuality to individual Scouts and their various religious communities, although he did urge Scoutmasters to caution boys about the dangers of masturbation.[11] In the three most recent editions of the *Handbook*, a more explicitly religious tone is brought to bear in sections on sexuality and service to the nation. These more recent texts have, contrary to Baden-Powell's concept of Scouting, made explicit links between theistic belief, citizenship, sexual identity, and obedience. The ninth edition (1979) clearly connected belief in a Father God to acceptance of a sexuality of fatherhood. While this connection has been toned down in recent editions, there is still an implicit connection to a theological worldview. Boy Scouts who do not comply with the BSA

teachings on masculinity in these matters may find themselves expelled from the movement.

Militarized masculinity

The choices Baden-Powell made in forming the Boy Scouts and writing *Scouting for Boys* reflected his particular sense of masculinity and how best to inculcate in boys a life-shaping experience of that masculinity. For Baden-Powell it is the struggle of war and the combat against evil (and for purity) that makes the man. His model of manhood is the warrior, and yet he did not design the Boy Scouting movement to explicitly teach soldiering. He believed an openly militaristic group would not grow as fast or be as broadly based (with regard to social class) as a group which was more subtle in promoting a martial perspective.[12] He wanted it to be as broad-based in appeal as possible, in order to educate the greatest number of boys. The whole purpose was to rescue England and the British Empire from what he saw as the feminizing effects of school and church on boys, an effect that was, in his view, harming the spread of empire. He honestly believed the martial values would provide for a more orderly and peaceful society. Thus, this martial community of boys would promote peace by serving the Empire. The task was clear: remasculinizing boys for obedient service and resisting egalitarian and democratic impulses of the reform movements of that era.[13]

While other naturalists (Rousseau and James) embrace non-violence, Baden-Powell seems to tacitly embrace violence and encourage militarism. In some ways the militarization of masculinity is even more pronounced in today's Boy Scouts of America, as National Jamborees have moved from National Parks and Historic Sites to military bases, and include an around the clock military recruitment environment in the midst of tens of thousands of boys.[14] Today, eleven Boy Scout Handbooks after Boy Scouting began on American soil, the BSA promotes a male-privileged program that encourages martial virtues, much like Baden-Powell conceived and enacted in those first decades. In terms of serving empire by disciplining boys into a martial masculinity, the BSA has gone "one better" than the First Scout himself.

It is interesting to note that Baden-Powell built his Boy Scout value system and curriculum around the service of the warrior, the Empire, and colonization of others for their own good. In the decades since, the Boy Scouting movement, in much of what was once the British Empire, has decided to enlarge and expand the inclusiveness of the organization to include girls, as well as gay and irreligious youth. It is in the United States -- the BSA -- that the values thought so vital remain unchallenged, values essential for producing obedient soldiers and maintaining empire. While others have chosen a more expansive and adventure-like approach to the

curriculum of Scouting, the BSA has chosen to constrict that curriculum and indoing so, risks the brutalization of boys.

Scouting for the Live Creature

Do boys and men see themselves primarily as live creatures, or primarily as bearers of manhood? Do the texts of the Boy Scouts of America offer a model of manhood that rejects the objectification of women and nature? What does it mean to be a live creature in a male body? In scouting through the educational texts we must seek to trace how attitudes are perpetuated that promote (or at least tolerate) misogyny, homophobia, violence, and an ethic of domination.

Nature

The BSA has always been a leader in the USA in teaching care for and protection of the environment, and many American boys have learned campfire safety and first aid for isolated situations through Boy Scout educational programs. The *Boy Scout Handbook* has changed in many ways over the past century, but one constant has been its reliability as a sourcebook for living in the wilderness. One way in which Boy Scouting certainly offers adventure for boys is through introducing them to the outdoors and teaching them ways to care for the natural environment. In recent years, the BSA has taken even firmer steps to connect behavior in

the outdoors with ethical behavior, by endorsing and promoting what the new handbooks call the “Leave No Trace” ethic.[15] The Outdoor Code[16] and “No Trace” hiking are further examples of this care for the environment.[17] The natural environment is explained in the *Handbook* as a complicated web of relationships that must be protected for the present as well as the future.[18] While these instances suggest that the BSA does not objectify nature, there are texts which refer to the environment as “natural resources.”[19]

This approach to nature is taught using many strategies. Codes and ethical statements aside, boys engage in hiking, camping, service projects and other outdoor activities on a regular basis. This is a teaching strategy which exposes the Scout to a variety of encounters with nature as well as with other boys. These outdoor events create a learning environment which not only intends an appreciation for nature, but an opportunity for the boy to grow physically and mentally. These activities are always done in groups, large and small, in order to teach teamwork, discipline and cooperation. As noted above, Baden-Powell believed these experiences, like games, appealed to a boy’s sense of adventure and made learning easier.

Women

In the *Boy Scout Handbook (1998)*, boy scouts are taught they have a responsibility to women.[20] That is the only explicit mention of relationships with women in the handbook, in a section on sexual responsibility, inside a

chapter on relationships (Chapter Fourteen, “Getting Along with Others”). The emphasis here appears to be the concept that every boy is meant to be a father. It is a brief statement stressing responsibility. The direction of that responsibility is two-fold: toward one’s own future fatherhood and toward women. While this lone reference to women and its relegation to a discussion of sexual ethics may be interpreted in various ways, male privilege and compulsory heterosexuality are implicit in such an approach. Why not mention women as partners in work or in non-sexual relationships? The language of the legal cases surrounding membership issues is even more emphatic. Women are excluded because the BSA is convinced that their educational method would be disrupted by girls’ participation.

Perhaps the best place to explore the BSA understanding of woman is to examine the legal cases challenging the exclusively male membership of the Cub Scouts and Boy Scouts. Boy Scouting fended off attempts by girls to join the BSA in court cases designed to gain membership for females. In cases such as *Schwenk v. Boy Scouts of America* (1976) and *Quinnipiac Council v. Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities* (1987) the Boy Scouts kept woman leaders from becoming Scoutmasters and girls from joining troops. In *Schwenk*, the Oregon Supreme Court held that Oregon law did not apply to Scouting, since it was a private, noncommercial group. The BSA argues, in this case, that boys naturally seek out other boys for association and that Congress had chartered the Girl Scouts of America to

educate girls, not the Boy Scouts. They further argue that as a private, voluntary association, they are free to establish gender-specific membership.

In *Quinnipiac Council v. Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities* a woman volunteer leader sued that barring her from volunteer leadership positions in the BSA violated public accommodations law. The BSA argued that volunteer activity was not a right. In *Mankes v. Boy Scouts of America (1991),* a girl denied access to the Cub Scouts was denied membership by the court, which stated that the Boy Scouts did not discriminate against girls intentionally.[21]

Since the first two cases, the BSA has opened some voluntary positions to women, and has created a program for older adolescents called Venture, which is coeducational. This is commendable. However, the Cub scouts and Boy Scouts remain exclusively male.[22] A later case, *Yeaw v. Boy Scouts of America (1997)*, has an interesting reasoning by the BSA for excluding girls. The BSA said in their defense, “One of the principal units through which the Boy Scouts accomplishes its goals is the Patrol. Every boy is, first and foremost, part of a Patrol, a group of three-to-eight boys within a Troop. Each Patrol has its own name, its own badge, its own meetings, its own elected leaders and its own sense of identity. The members lead, plan and organize their own activities, thereby gaining skills in leadership, planning and cooperation. The Patrol becomes a close knit

group of boys who have learned to provide for each other's personal needs."[23] Does this suggest that close-knit groups might not be possible if they include both sexes? Might it suggest that identity and leadership for boys might be threatened by the presence (and equality of identity and leadership) of girls? Is the presence of girls a danger to boys' education?

The BSA is holding fast on this issue even as other national Scouting organizations in the world open up membership to girls. The United Kingdom, Canada, Thailand, Belgium, France, Greece, New Zealand, Sweden and Germany are just some of the many diverse national Scouting organizations that welcome girls and women as members.[24] These Scouting organizations have also made it clear that gay and lesbian youth are welcome into Scouting in those nations. In contrast, the BSA, still prohibits girls from joining the Cub Scouts and the Boy Scouts. The adventure promised by Scouting, is, in the United States, only available to boys, segregated from girls.

Thus, while the world Scouting movement has moved in a more democratic direction in social, gender and sexuality issues, the BSA seems to move in a different direction altogether, with an ideological approach that Baden-Powell would not recognize. Remember that brutalization includes those unintended consequences of a planned act or event that has no intention of brutalizing, yet is experienced that way by many of the subjects acted on by the brutalizing subject. Given that qualification, it seems clear

that the BSA emerges as an agent of brutalization, rather than adventure, of cultural miseducation and resistance against the egalitarian aims of co-education.[25]

Religion

In recent decades, the worldwide Scouting movement has moved somewhat in the direction of the democratic cultural concerns of Dewey (1916). One example is religion. Religion was present but not theologized into the movement by Baden-Powell. Baden-Powell always emphasized to Scout leaders that they were teaching boys a manly version of religion. By teaching religion, he was not talking about specific beliefs or doctrines, but rather specific educational tactics that would engender a religious sensibility. These tactics include nature study, practicing a Good Turn daily, encouraging self-discipline and self-respect, and the adult male in a position of leadership offering oneself as a hero or example to the boy. Nature would teach a sense of place, and a reverent appreciation of the idea of a Creator. The Good Turn would be a daily reminder that service to others was the essence of religion. Acts of kindness and service activities that encouraged self-discipline, and self-respect were important as ways of introducing and reinforcing the value of purity that seems so vital in BP's understanding of religion. Being an example allows the boy an opportunity for hero-worship, which in turn would foster reverence for God and morality.[26]

In worldwide Scouting, the religious component now generally includes respect for and admission into Scouting of agnostic, atheistic and humanistic Scouts. Some Scouting organizations have reworded the historic reference to God in the Oath, explained it in humanistic or naturalistic terms, or eliminated it altogether. In contrast, the BSA insists on theistic religious belief as definitive for a Boy Scout, and rejects boys who belong do not believe in God.

A man who believes firmly in innate goodness peeks through in Baden-Powell's writings about religion as well as diversity and may be seen in his insistence that Boy Scouting insist on teaching boys kindness and compassion in such a way that it becomes an everyday practice. His concept of religion was somewhat of a romantic naturalist character. He limited his discussion of religious practice to an appreciation and care for nature and kindness toward others (including chivalry toward those in distress).[27] The textual evidence - the manuals for both Scouts and Scoutmasters - suggests that the founder of Boy Scouting may have seen himself as a Victim of many circumstances in life – incidental brutalizations. His constant battle with physical illness and vulnerability is a contributing factor to this victimhood outlook.[28] He publicly iterated his belief that the youth of England were being victimized by the "feminine" or "softening" effects of school and church.[29]

Because of its interpretation of the “duty to God” clause in the Oath or Promise, Boy Scouts of America does not permit non-theist boys or men to be members. This is explained as a commitment to religious belief, meaning belief in a Supreme Being and a desire to obey that Being. The eleventh edition of the *Boy Scout Handbook* says “Your family and religious leaders teach you about God and the ways you can serve. You do your duty to God by following the wisdom of those teachings every day and by respecting and defending the rights of others to practice their own beliefs.”[30] Interestingly, while the BSA excludes non-religious agnostics and atheists, it may include practicing Buddhists and Quakers, who are not required by their religious practice to believe in a God. It appears that either the BSA is unaware of this contradiction, or perhaps that the real meaning of ”duty to God” revolves around practicing an acceptable devotion in an approved religious community, rather than actual belief in a divinity. Some religions seem to be encouraged or tolerated, while others are ignored. Among the awards they offer for religious activity, there are none for youth in the pagan/wiccan traditions.

In policy statements the Scouts say that good citizenship requires belief in God. “The Boy Scouts of America maintains that no member can grow into the best kind of citizen without recognizing an obligation to God... The recognition of God as the ruling and leading power in the universe and the grateful acknowledgment of His favors and blessings are necessary to

the best type of citizenship and are wholesome precepts in the education of the growing members."[31] Perhaps because of this prior commitment, BSA also says that only religious believers can be "appropriate" role models for young people.[32]

The Boy Scouts have been taken to court over issues related to religion. The first significant case was in 1993. In *Welsh v. Boy Scouts of America*, the plaintiff, a father and son who identified as agnostic, were denied membership, and sued the BSA for violation of public accommodation laws within the meaning of Title II of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The court of appeals declared that the BSA was not subject to Title II, and furthermore they qualified as a private club. A second case, *Seabourn v. Coronado Area Council*, 1995, defended the BSA from similar state laws regarding discrimination. Finally, *Randall v. Orange County Council*, in 1998, declared that as a voluntary association, the BSA was exempt from laws applying to businesses.[33] In more than one case, Scouts who were agnostic or atheist refused to recite the "duty to God" line in the oath and were removed from their troops for that behavior. In every case, the BSA statements simply describe the plaintiffs in question as refusing to do their "duty to God." A clear message here is that the BSA (never envisioned by Baden-Powell as a religious organization) believes theistic belief to be essential to good citizenship. Another message to boys and their families in these cases is that belief in God is necessary for manhood, and that is a

goal of BSA educational methods. Boys learn this by constant reference to this “duty to God” throughout the newer handbooks. Participants in Boy Scouting are required to demonstrate publicly their “duty to God” in various ways, including one requirement to lead other Scouts in prayer. The BSA makes it clear to boys that it believes that an a boy can not be a good Scout and be an atheist or agnostic. Also, it makes clear that atheists and agnostics are not seen as suitable role models of the Scout Oath and Law for adolescent boys.[34] Baden-Powell’s approach to religion seems to have been left behind for a much more theological approach. While Baden-Powell summarized religion by encouraging a good turn daily and respect for nature, the BSA has become more decidedly theistic in attitude. In excluding agnostic and atheistic boys from the BSA, the leadership has moved away from Baden-Powell’s willingness to leave religious matters to the Scout, and insists, instead that the very meaning of the Scout Oath is seen as endangered by the presence of agnostic or atheist Boy Scouts. An approach to religion that Baden-Powell may have seen as an adventure has become a brutalization.

Male Privilege

Today, ten *Boy Scout Handbook*s after the first one, the Boy Scouts of America continue to promote male-privilege by using teaching and learning strategies that brutalize boys by reinforcing the obedience and

conformity necessary for the maintaining of a martial culture. In fact, in some ways the militarization of masculinity is even more pronounced today by the BSA than in Baden-Powell's day, as National Jamborees have moved from National Parks and Historic Sites to military bases, and include military recruitment. In terms of serving empire by disciplining boys into a militarized masculinity, the BSA has gone "one better" than the First Scout himself.

The current *Boy Scout Handbook* (11th edition, 1998) can also seem confusing on the issues mentioned earlier. One the one hand, girls and women deserve respect and also should be treated equally, yet they are denied membership, and the text cues boys to see girls as future mothers.[35] The *Handbook* contains artwork showing a Boy Scout holding a sword for a mythic warrior[36], and holds Jamborees on military bases, yet speak of the need for world community and peace.[37] It encourages boys to respect the opinions and beliefs of others and yet does not make room for those beliefs (or lack of belief) within its own community.[38]

Scouting for Friendship

Adventure as an educational project, as an approach to curriculum, is about encouraging those values that James points to in discussing saintliness, and refers to as that which enables a person to transcend the limits of their own experience in order to befriend others and their experiences, as well as the larger world. How do the texts of the BSA

encourage this friendship? How do the texts of the BSA encourage care for self, others, and the rest of the natural world? How do the texts communicate concern for others? Are Boy Scouts encouraged to move out beyond themselves and connect in friendship with other boys and girls and their experiences of cultures, learning styles, social concerns, and sexualities? James offers a guideline for what such friendship might look like in his discussion of saintliness, when he names the identifying characteristics: enlarging one's sense of life, embracing simplicity and honesty, being compassionate, and learning to act reflectively in a way that allows for resistance against "official" values.[16] These marks of saintliness or friendship can serve as descriptors of true adventure, and counters to the brutalizations boys face.

Grouping

In the third chapter, in discussing Iris Marion Young's concept of seriality, I explained how in contrast to a series, a group is a collection of persons who recognize a shared relationship to a goal or a sense of identity. There is a very real sense of having a common self-understanding. The formation and utilization of small groups, centering around common tasks is an educational strategy of all Boy Scouting organizations, including the BSA. We should recall that Baden-Powell called the movement Scouting because it was a military term that also evoked images of the frontier. He had built a

military career training reconnaissance scouts in the Royal Army.[40] In providing organization for the Scouting movement, boys were organized in patrols, because patrols resembled both the military unit and the neighborhood gang, and he believed boys naturally gravitated toward gang activity.[41] This was both a tool for developing masculinity and a key for understanding what it meant to be a man.

In developing an approach to educating boys toward his vision of masculinity, Baden-Powell saw games as central to the Boy Scout experience as well. Team games were essential, and other activity not connected with military life, such as lifeboat and fire brigade drills. Games, drills and other athletic activities were important because, in addition to the bodily care issues, they promoted discipline, fostered teamwork, encouraged self-sacrifice, taught a sense of fair play, developed esprit de corps and also instilled a desire to win. In addition, Baden-Powell believed that these aspects worked together to impart morality.[42] Games, athleticism, and camping would assure the physical strength necessary for manliness, while also providing a setting for comradery as well as the sublimation of the individual into a group where everyone knew their place. Thus, athleticism and competition were essential to educating for masculinity.[43] Groups, such as troops and patrols, can be educational and liberating. They can also become brutalizing.

This continues today in the BSA, in a number of ways. Hikes, campouts, outdoor and indoor games, safety drills, and other team-oriented activities dominate Scout events. The Boy Scout Handbook provides detailed information about how to organize and conduct each of these activities, with great concern for safety.[44] Games and other team activities are the primary teaching strategy, providing an environment where boys learn from each other, as they cooperate with each other in play as well as in projects. This provides fun as well as a friendly learning environment. It affords the boy with opportunities for friendship and intimacy, even as it provides the BSA with a venue for the exercise of biopower.

A primary teaching tool in Scouting is advancement through ranks. These ranks have age-appropriate requirements that are to be met by the boy, supervised by a Scoutmaster or parent or other suitable adult. The activities necessary for attaining a specific rank involve individual effort, as well as group activity.[45] Each rank builds on the work of the lower rank, raising the level of difficulty and competence in demonstrations of camping, citizenship, and Scouting values.[46]

Another teaching tool in the BSA is the merit badge. There are a variety of merit badges available in today's BSA, over one hundred. Unlike rank advancement, merit badges are for the most part voluntary, with boys choosing the ones that interest them. Each allows the Scout to pursue knowledge and personal experience in a particular area of interest. Merit

badge topics include outdoor interests such as fish and wildlife management, backpacking, forestry, wilderness survival, and canoeing. It promotes scientific knowledge through badges such as reptile and amphibian study, electronics, chemistry and weather.

Citizenship and social responsibility are taught through badges such as disabilities awareness, citizenship, American heritage, American business, and Public Health.[47] The merit badge system is a way to address the need for mental wakefulness as well as individual expression. Originally the merit badges were individual activities, but changes in recent years require a boy to pursue the badge with a "buddy" as learning companion. This opens yet another avenue for friendship to develop. While the merit badges allow for freedom of exploration in terms of choosing what one will study, the officially approved guidelines for each badge channel the learner in specific directions.

Befriending & expanding vistas

The texts of the BSA certainly encourage learning as befriending[48] in multi-faceted ways, and the National and World Jamborees do expose Boy Scouts to a variety of cultural differences. Over thirty thousand boys usually attend the national jamborees, held on military bases.[49] Gatherings with boys from across the nation or around the world are surely an opportunity for growth, new friendships, and the opportunity for a by to move beyond

himself and connect with someone from a different culture or life situation. While these are large events, it should be noted that the great majority of boys in the BSA never attend these events. The emphasis in such events is on commonality in pursuing Boy Scouting honors, not in the diversity of experience and viewpoint, although that certainly may happen in informal interaction.

When James addresses the characteristics of the saintly, he includes the ability to embrace simplicity and honesty as one lives compassionately in the world.[50] Such values remind one of Martin's care, concern, and connection.[51] Clearly many of the texts of the BSA encourage care for self, others, and the rest of the natural world. (Yet women are absent from the narrative of the BSA.) The scope of that concern seems limited to family, religious community, school, and troop, yet some merit badges focus on care for others as well as knowledge of different or distant cultures. The language of the court cases and the handbooks regarding obedience suggest that much learning goes on inside an environment that may inhibit adventure. The policies of the BSA place a limit on the friendships and adventures available to boys by purposely excluding whole segments of society (girls, gays, non-theists) from membership. In addition, the stress on obedience and conformity inside the troop also suggests that openness to wider views and experience -- those not visibly seen within Boy Scouting -- is not encouraged. The Scout is encouraged in many ways to respect and

even defend the rights of others to their own beliefs and sense of identity, and yet, those rights are limited inside the BSA itself when it comes to girls, gays, and gods. Boy Scouts are encouraged to be honest, to tell the truth, and to be brave. Nevertheless, Scouts who are brave enough to voice the honest truth about their own feelings, desires, or beliefs are disciplined by removal from the organization. Obviously, given the recent history of the BSA, when boys choose to give voice to their religious or sexual explorations they are no longer welcome.

Conclusion

Earlier in this inquiry I stated that most educational texts and schemes are not guilty of engaging in intentional brutalization, but do often create situations where students experience incidental brutalization. A cultural scouting of the textual landscape of the BSA shows that while the BSA has constructed an educational organization that continues many of the past strengths of the Boy Scouting movement, it also perpetuates many earlier brutalizing aspects, even as world Scouting organizations have made moves to correct those earlier elements. The Boy Scouts of America have abandoned Baden-Powell's approach to religion and to sexuality, and those ruptures have made an impact on the educational environment in the BSA which can only be called brutalizing. At the same time, I have shown that,

while other Scouting organizations have moved away from the martial ideology of the founder, the BSA has maintained that commitment.

The contradiction -- the moral rupture here -- is unavoidable. The BSA in recent years has charted a path neither faithful to the founder's vision, nor in step with the internal and international dialogue happening inside the wider Scouting movement. Recall that William James identified one mark of saintliness or expansive living to be the ability to resist "official" values. It seems clear that BSA is not interested in educating boys for resistance to "official" values. The BSA appears to be an agent of cultural miseducation and resistance against the egalitarian aims of co-education. The BSA calls boys to adventure, yet it has adopted and chosen to pass on to the next generation a constrictive view of the Boy Scouting experience, which brutalizes boys in the process.

Notes

1. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, (New York: Random House/Vintage: 1990) 83
2. Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, New York: Pantheon, 1980. 109-133
3. Tim Jeal. *Baden-Powell*, 413
4. Robert Baden-Powell. *Aids to Scoutmastership,* 28-33
5. This explanation is found on the BSA Legal issues website: http://www.bsalegal.org/morally-straight-cases-225.asp
6. http://www.bsalegal.org/
7. Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund assisted with legal counsel in this case. Their chronology is found here: http://web.archive.org/web/20060905092126/http://lambdalegal.org/cgibin/iowa/news/resources.html?record=474
8. http://web.archive.org/web/20060613034740/lambdalegal.org/cgi-bin/iowa/cases/decision.html?record=194
9. See BSA Legal website and Lambda Legal.
10. From the "morally-straight-cases" website section on policies:

Volunteer Adult Leadership
Boy Scouts of America believes that homosexual conduct is inconsistent with the obligations in the Scout Oath and Law to be morally straight and clean in thought, word, and deed. Scouting's position with respect to homosexual conduct accords with the moral positions of many millions of Americans and with religious denominations to which a majority of Americans belong. Because of these views, Boy Scouts of America believes that a known or avowed homosexual is not an appropriate role model of the Scout Oath and Law for adolescent boys.

Employment
With respect to positions limited to professional Scouters or, because of their close relationship to the mission of Scouting, positions limited to registered members of the Boy Scouts of America, acceptance of the Declaration of Religious Principle, the Scout Oath, and the Scout Law is required. Accordingly, in the exercise of its constitutional right to bring the values of Scouting to youth members, Boy Scouts of America will not employ atheists, agnostics, known or avowed homosexuals, or others as professional Scouters or in other capacities in which such employment would tend to interfere with its mission of reinforcing the values of the Scout Oath and the Scout Law in young people.

Youth Leadership
Boy Scouts of America believes that homosexual conduct is inconsistent

with the obligations in the Scout Oath and Scout Law to be morally straight and clean in thought, word, and deed. The conduct of youth members must be in compliance with the Scout Oath and Law, and membership in Boy Scouts of America is contingent upon the willingness to accept Scouting's values and beliefs. Most boys join Scouting when they are 10 or 11 years old. As they continue in the program, all Scouts are expected to take leadership positions. In the unlikely event that an older boy were to hold himself out as homosexual, he would not be able to continue in a youth leadership position.

11. Robert Baden-Powell. *Aids to Scoutmastership,* 65-68
12. Robert Baden-Powell. *Aids to Scoutmastership,* 17-18
13. Robert Baden-Powell. *Aids to Scoutmastership,* 31-33 and Tim Jeal, *Baden-Powell,* 409-410
14. The sites of previous Jamborees are:
(1935) Washington, D.C. – celebrated the 25th anniversary of the BSA; canceled due to a polio epidemic.
(1937) Washington D.C.
(1950) Valley Forge, Pennsylvania
(1953) Irvine Ranch, California
(1957) Valley Forge, Pennsylvania
(1960) Colorado Springs, Colorado – celebrated the 50th anniversary of the BSA.
(1964) Valley Forge, Pennsylvania
(1969) Farragut State Park, Idaho
(1973) Farragut State Park, Idaho and Moraine State Park, Pennsylvania
(1977) Moraine State Park, Pennsylvania
(1981) Fort A.P. Hill, Virginia
(1985) Fort A.P. Hill, Virginia – celebrated the 75th anniversary of the BSA.
(1989) Fort A.P. Hill, Virginia
(1993) Fort A.P. Hill, Virginia (1993 National Scout Jamboree)
(1997) Fort A.P. Hill, Virginia
(2001) Fort A.P. Hill, Virginia
(2005) Fort A.P. Hill, Virginia (2005 National Scout Jamboree)
(2010) Fort A.P. Hill, Virginia – celebrating the 100th anniversary of the BSA.
15. *The Boy Scout Handbook*, 11th Edition (Irving, Texas: Boy Scouts of America, 1998) 244-245
16. *The Boy Scout Handbook*, 11th Edition, 218
17. *The Boy Scout Handbook*, 11th Edition, 212
18. *The Boy Scout Handbook*, 11th Edition, 136
19. *The Boy Scout Handbook*, 11th Edition, 45
20. *The Boy Scout Handbook* 11th Edition, 212-245, 376

21. Cases barring girls and women from membership are discussed by the BSA at the legal issues website, http://www.bsalegal.org/gender-cases-226.asp
22. http://www.bsalegal.org/faqs-195.asp
23. http://www.bsalegal.org/gender-cases-226.asp
24. World Organization of the Scout Movement (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_Organization_of_the_Scout_Movement)
25. Martin, *Cultural Miseducation*, 82-86
26. Robert Baden-Powell. *Aids to Scoutmastership,* 93-108
27. Robert Baden-Powell. *Scouting for Boys*, 22-25
28. Tim Jeal. *Baden-Powell*, 55-56, 101-103, 307-307, 538-539,
29. Robert Baden-Powell. *Aids to Scoutmastership,* 9-10
30. *The Boy Scout Handbook* 11th Edition, 45
31. Declaration of Religious Principle, Bylaws of Boy Scouts of America, art. IX, § 1, cl. 1
32. "Because of its views concerning the duty to God, Boy Scouts of America believes that an atheist or agnostic is not an appropriate role model of the Scout Oath and Law for adolescent boys. Because of Scouting's methods and beliefs, Scouting does not accept atheists and agnostics as members or adult volunteer leaders." http://www.bsalegal.org/duty-to-god-cases-224.asp
33. These cases are documented on the BSA site at www.bsalegal.org/duty-to-god-cases-224
34. www.bsalegal.org/duty-to-god-cases-224
35. *The Boy Scout Handbook* 11th Edition, 376
36. *The Boy Scout Handbook* 11th Edition, 338
37. *The Boy Scout Handbook* 11th Edition, 348
38. *The Boy Scout Handbook* 11th Edition, 287-329
39. *The Boy Scout Handbook* 11th Edition, 38-41
40. Robert H. MacDonald, *Sons of Empire,* 3
41. Robert Baden-Powell. *Aids to Scoutmastership,* 28-36
42. Robert Baden-Powell. *Aids to Scoutmastership,* 27
43. Robert Baden-Powell. *Aids to Scoutmastership,* 28
44. *Boy Scout Handbook*, 197-329
45. *Boy Scout Handbook*, 17
46. *Boy Scout Handbook*, 14
47. *Boy Scout Handbook*, 190-193
48. Susan Laird has theorized about teaching and befriending. See Susan Laird, "Befriending Girls as an Educational Life-Practice," *Philosophy of Education 2002*, ed. E. Scott Fletcher (Urbana: Philosophy of Education Society, 2003), Featured Essay, pp. 73-81. Also, see Susan Laird, "Gift Labor for Practical Wisdom in Public Schools: Befriending Teachers, Befriending Students," for submission to review by Kathleen Kesson and Wayne Ross, editors of *Defending Public Education* (Praeger)

49. Jamboree numbers and information can be found at the national jamboree website (http://www.bsajamboree.org/) and the world site (http://www.worldscoutjamboree.se/)
50. William James*, Varieties of Religious Experience*, 298-300
51. Jane Roland Martin, *Cultural Miseducation*, 41

Chapter 6 Adventures in Partnership

The issues raised in my case study of Boy Scouts of America texts focus on girls, religion, and gay boys as educational stances taken by the BSA that reveal attitudes that brutalize boys. In American culture, the presence and participation of girls in educational settings is seen by the BSA and by many others as a threat to the education of boys. It is also a fact that boys who do not openly espouse theistic beliefs continue to be the target of discrimination and harassment. In addition, in the larger society, of which the BSA is a part, gay and transgender boys are still being beaten and killed by other youth with homophobic attitudes. As educators, what can we do to open broader horizons of possibility for boys caught in current miseducative strategies? These are issues any educator ought to wrestle with as they construct curricula, provide educational leadership, and participate in educational programs.

As I have noted before, in *The Schoolhome*, Jane Roland Martin cautions educators against making educational choices for students that narrow their experience and their educational viewpoint. Control of education in its many forms by constrictive forces in society contributes to an anti-democratic and brutalizing culture that ignores other voices that have been part of the formation of that culture. In addition, by the use of language and miseducative strategies, they actually target those “outside” segments of the

culture.[1] Here the line between incidental and intentional brutalization sometimes blurs.

There is an immense responsibility here to proceed carefully but boldly in offering a different approach to this challenge. I want to contrast two responses to masculinization from which we might learn something about this task, in order to suggest a way forward for the Boy Scouts and for the larger culture in which educators find themselves. I turn first to a story of Abraham and then to a modern one from Charlotte Perkins Gilman. I will address the Boys Scouts of America's present situation, as well as propose points of concern and strategies for educators.

Sacrificing Boys on the Altar of Masculinity

I turn first to a story that is in some sense foundational for the three major western religions as well as for much of western culture as we know it, because it can be argued that it has had an effect on how western society sees boys and men, and it can be read as a commentary, not only on masculinity, but on the crisis facing American culture toady in the masculinization process. In the three Abrahamic religions (Judaism, Christianity, and Islam), a central element in the common founding story is the Sacrifice of Abraham's Son, commonly called the Binding of Isaac.

In Jewish and Christian tradition the narrative tells how Abraham is put to the test by his God (Genesis, chapter 22). Abraham is asked to prove

his faithfulness and love for God by killing his only son, Isaac, on a makeshift altar on Mt. Moriah. In Islamic tradition, the son is Isma'il, who was Abraham's first child chronologically, born to the concubine Hagar. Both Hagar and Isma'il had been cast out of Abraham's camp at the request of his wife, Sarah, the mother of Isaac. In Arab legend and Muslim teaching, Abraham escorts them to a safe place, either Moriah or much further south at Mecca, where Abraham has a vision and is put to the test. In all accounts, he goes through the preparation for the killing, to the consternation and confusion of the son, and is prevented at the very last moment from dealing the deathblow by an intervening angel.

This story is a centerpiece of the Jewish New Year celebration, in which the clear message regardless of interpretation is to remind Jews that God blesses those who submit and are faithful to their divine calling.[2] There are many different interpretations of the story within Judaism, from a literal understanding, to an interpretation that suggests Abraham was delusional, to an interpretation that insists the story is a clear renouncing of all sacrifice: God would never require such a thing since God would never require injustice, and the murder of one's offspring is clearly injustice. Most Islamic interpretations are similar to Jewish ones, with the difference being the identity of the son, as well as location. Most Muslim interpretations re-affirm that one lesson of the narrative is that killing one's offspring is wrong. The clear message in all the varying Muslim interpretations is that God is Owner

and Giver of all, including life and offspring.[3]

While Judaism and Islam offer a wide variety of interpretations, Christianity historically offers but one, consistently insisting that God was indeed requiring Abraham to kill Isaac, as a sign of Abraham's faith. However, the assumption among most commentators is that while God required Abraham to kill his son, God would never actually allow the killing. It was a test, but it was also more. Christianity historically interprets the sacrifice of Isaac as a type of the sacrifice of Jesus. In fact, the Passion narratives in the synoptic Gospels intentionally mirror the actions of the Binding narrative. Thus, the literal sense of the story must hold true for the Christian story, for if fathers killing sons for God is wrong, as many Rabbis and Imams have claimed throughout history, the type or prefiguring would not hold, and the death of Jesus would beg a different interpretation than that which Christian doctrine has assigned to it.

The message that seems clear in all three Abrahamic religions is that fathers must be willing to sacrifice their sons for a higher good. Even if the demand by God for the son's death is a test in which God never intended to allow the boy to be harmed, the emotional and psychic brutalization of both father and son cannot easily be overlooked. This story could well be a commentary on what the masculinization project does to boys and men in our society, as well as a story told by some in justification of that process. It is also a reminder of the role religious, cultural, and social myth and imagery

plays, even subtly, in the public imagination, in cultural education and miseducation, regarding expectations about gender, sexual identity, and violence. I now turn to an alternative to the masculinization project.

Partnership as Adventure

One place we might look for ways to broaden our options in addressing education for masculinity is an often neglected classic of feminism, the 1915 utopian novel *Herland*, by Charlotte Perkins Gilman. The novel tells of an isolated land inhabited only by women, who build a distinct civilization. The story revolves around three men who get separated from a scientific expedition (of men) and stumble on this hidden land of women. The novel plays out the reactions the three men have to what befalls them during their stay in *Herland*'s country.

While most utopian novels are proposals for social change, reading this novel in a way that focuses on the three men and their differences suggests it is a novel about three differing ways of conceptualizing gender and relationship. The novel is groundbreaking in exploring what it means to be human by using woman (rather than man) as the template. Since masculinity is often seen as a way of distancing the male from that which is feminine, Gilman's work subverts that hegemonic framing, allowing for a fresh critique. The three men in the novel, Terry, Jeff, and Van, embody three different approaches to issues of gender, three different ways to

conceptualize masculinity. Indeed, the development of thought on masculinity in the West can be seen as a playing out of these three types, which I call the Warrior, the Guardian, and the Partner.

Masculinity as Domination: the Warrior

The character named Terry is a "man's man", physically aggressive, strong, clever, brave, a model of the warrior-hero type. When the three scientists stumble into *Herland*'s country, Terry insists the remarkable condition of the territory is an indicator that there must be male leaders nearby. He is sure that where there is leadership and intelligence, a man is in charge. He assumes society needs a hierarchical structure, and sees women as dependent on men. Objectifying women, he defines women as dependent on males. He sees woman as "other", as lesser, and at the same time as a threat. At the beginning of their stay in *Herland's* country they are under house arrest for a short period of time, and Terry decides the best response is to escape. He wants to return to the "normal" world and bring back a military force of men, to restore the country of women to "normalcy". He convinces Jeff and Van to join him in escaping.[4] From this viewpoint, like nature, woman needs the husbandry of men in order to be complete. Terry's relationships with the women are tense and distant, yet he talks to the other two men about the women as if the women would welcome his power over them. His attitude when he is "captured" by the women is defiance and

violence. He later decides he can win them over and is convinced once he does, the women will want to elect him to govern as king.

I call the masculinity he embodies the Warrior model. In various forms, this model has been highly prized in Western thought since before Socrates.[5] Warrior masculinity envisions a man who knows what is right because a male authority defines that right for him. That male authority may be another man, or it may be a Sky-Father God. In relation to others, the Warrior sees himself as a leader and a taker. The warrior concept of masculinity is grounded in violence or the threat of violence. Sexuality is good when it helps Warriors to reproduce, or demonstrate power. A long tradition of rape and plunder during time of war is merely an extension of this kind of thinking. Concerned with power, punishment, and purity, any young man in a Warrior culture who acts apart from a strict norm of sexual behavior, or who has doubts and struggles with his sense of masculinity, carries a hidden stigma of guilt and shame. Walking this path as a man, therefore, requires keeping oneself clean or pure as possible, and fighting against the sin and evil "out there" in the world.[6]

In earlier chapters we see this warrior masculinity in the history and present direction of the Boy Scouts of America. The very adventures which Scouting offers seem to turn into brutalizations. Girls are not welcome as part of the educational setting, as their presence is disrupts and subverts the regimes of truth central to the BSA educational self-understanding. Boys in

Scouting who act apart from the norm, especially in terms of religious expression (or lack) and sexual desire, are stigmatized and excluded. Boys included inside the BSA thus learn to stigmatize others whose religious or sexual expression deviates from the BSA norm. This is a brutalizing environment. That environment is further maintained and nourished by the relationship the BSA has established with the American military.

Masculinity as Custody: the Guardian

The second character in *Herland* is Jeff. He is not as violent in attitude as Terry, and yet he shares many of Terry's assumptions, if in mitigated form. Jeff knows what is right because tradition dictates it. If Terry subordinates women, Jeff romanticizes them. He distances women, not by insisting on his own authority, but by placing them on a pedestal. While he admires their intelligence, he is sure they are incomplete without male companionship. Women can be intelligent, but they are still 'clinging vines', ultimately relying on men as guardians. For Jeff, the time in *Herland*'s country is a great adventure, because he finds the women fascinating, and relishes being a gentleman in conversation and interaction. Things are the way they are, in Jeff's world, because of custom dictates it be so. Guardian societies see the status quo as the outcome of tradition.[7]

He is an example of the second model of masculinity: the Guardian. Like Terry, Jeff sees woman as "other", but for the Guardian, the emphasis is on woman as complement rather than as threat. Each sex has a naturally

given and innately distinct role. The Guardian understands men to be responsible for the care and management of nature, women, and children. We can see how this ultimately (if in a quieter way than among Warriors) objectifies women, children, and nature. He relates to those he sees as weaker others, especially women, as protector. The Guardian resolves differences by appeals to tradition and custom, and only secondarily through violence.

A protective attitude affects relationships by automatically placing one person in an unequal position, on the basis of a tradition of "complimentarity". Men and women, being innately different, can have healthy relationships based on that complimentarity. Sexual relationships that ignore that complimentarity are to be avoided. Guardian religion and culture, like that of the Warrior, is rooted in hierarchical and sacrificial behavior, though with a somewhat custodial attitude toward women and children. These are both sustained by stories and symbols of safety and purity. As Guardians envision masculinity we see much in common with the Warrior model, though it is mitigated by masking the violent aspects.

While the BSA no longer sees nature as something to be subjugated and managed, its view of women in the texts I have examined in this study shows that women are still seen through the lens of male privilege. Even though recent handbooks speak about treating girls as equals, this equality is seen in the light of complimentarity. Male privilege is evident in

membership requirements, the understanding of girls and women primarily as potential mothers, and the legal testimony that girls presence in educational settings can be threatening to boys. This attitude brutalizes girls and women as well as boys and men.

Masculinity as Cooperation: the Partner

The third character is Van. He is the first of the three explorers to notice that the women of *Herland*'s country treat the men primarily as fellow human beings, not as men. He is interested in learning why things are so different in this land, and initiates conversation with the women around him. He is aware and envious of their sense of social cohesion. He observes an egalitarian social arrangement among the women in this strange land, and, after a rocky start, he begins to assume a certain equality in his conversations with them. His continuing conversations lead him to examine his assumptions and to look more closely at his own understanding of gender and relationships. Through these encounters and conversations, he awakens to just how male-centered his own culture is, in its social, familial, and religious arrangements. His own experience begins to reveal the givens in his culture to be socially constructed rather than innate. He arrives at newer definitions of what is good through the conversations he has, and the experiences he reflects upon. Van begins to see woman, not as an "other" to be feared or placed on a pedestal, but as a partner in building a meaningful

society. Whether he sees men and women as “different” or essentially the same is unclear, but he sets aside differences in the interest of cooperating. He decides to relate to others as a friend or partner. He observes that the task of this *Herland* society is not to raise girls to be women, but to educate them to be human. He finds himself learning to be, not a Warrior, nor a Guardian, but a Partner. [8]

The Partner sees nature as a home rather than as a hostile place to be conquered, and does not assume a sense of being distinct from nature as the Warrior or Guardian tends to do. In consequence of this, he looks at women as fellow human beings, sharers in nature and society. From this flows an egalitarian sense of the social order. Authority and leadership is not dependent on gender assumptions, but is (as Van observes in *Herland*) something that flows through carefully made democratic action. Thus, one could say that authority and meaning are not bestowed or discovered, so much as created by social reality. In the country of women, Van sees social expectations and rules enforced, not with weapons, but group influence. In the path of partnership, violence and coercion are minimalized, since social relations would depend on interaction, conversation, and cooperation. Gilman’s character Van is not saying anything new. While Socrates did not question gender differentiation per se, he asserted in *The Meno* that behind these separate virtues there are common universal virtues, such as justice, moderation, and wisdom.

Van stands as a symbol of what could be, of changes that are possible. Van learns by engaging in dialogue with the women of *Herland*'s country, listens carefully, and observes interactions, and in so doing allows that dialogue to critique his previous experience. In the same way, rather than simply telling girls to join the Girls Scouts, the BSA might benefit from an open and honest dialogue with the Girls Scouts of America. That dialogue might be even more beneficial if it occurred simultaneously with a dialogue involving Scouting organizations in other nations that have become coeducational. Until the BSA expands its membership to girls, and replaces the complimentarity of the guardian with the equality of partnership, it will continue to brutalize both boys and girls.

Educating the Live Creature

Gilman's novel shows us a way to call into question male privilege and the array of domination practices that accompany it. It offers an important critique that harkens back to issues raised by Catherine Macaulay and Mary Wollstonecraft in an earlier century, and is addressed by Susan Laird in our current era.[9] Van glimpses this critique when he realizes that in *Herland*'s country, education is not about raising girls but cultivating human beings. Do boys and men see themselves primarily as human beings, or first and foremost as bearers of manhood? Is a model of manhood that rejects the objectification of women and nature and teaches a child to rely on

experience and reflective action even compatible with masculinity?

The Boy Scouts of America offers boys adventure in many forms: an appreciation for the outdoors that values the interconnectedness of nature, teamwork, play, learning opportunities, enjoyment with others of the same age range, the presence of adult mentors, and the opportunity to establish friendships that can be personally transforming. These are important contributions toward a culture of adventure.

At the same time, we have seen that within the framework of the BSA curriculum, brutalization is also present. The violence of excluding boys because of unsanctioned religious or sexual expression, the exclusion of girls, the martial underpinnings, all point to brutalization. In the seriality of maleness, regimes of truth perpetuate themselves, promoting within a series a particular self-understanding. Varieties of masculine experience all exist with the BSA, yet the sanctioned experience is much like the Stranger of James's varieties, and the model for manhood closer to the Guardian of Gilman than the Partner. The BSA, even in structures that seem to promise adventure, such as patrols and troops, perpetuates regimes of truth through those exclusions and stigmatizations, and the sanctioning of a narrow, constrictive masculinity. In the BSA, boys and men are taught to see themselves as human, and to see theistic, heterosexual militarized male as the model for what it means to be human. Girls, women, atheistic or agnostic boys, gay, bisexual, and transgendered boys become secondary, perhaps

somehow less of a person. If change is to happen, if violence is to be lessened, if boys are to have a broader and more enriching education in the varieties of masculinity, boys must be educated to be partners in humanity.

Adventures for educators

In the first chapter, I concluded that American education faces a problem because boys are being miseducated regarding masculinity. I also claim that the masculinization process in American culture is a form of cultural miseducation which brutalizes boys. Either boys are learning the masculinity that society values (in which case, society seems to value violence, obedience, and misogyny) or the violence and misogyny that boys seem to be learning is not what is intended. Either way, it should be clear that they are learning harmful things about masculinity, and that very miseducation is producing a violent society. In order to reduce unnecessary brutality, educators (and parents) who are concerned about brutalization in schools and cultural institutions (such as the BSA) will look to consequences and evaluate the possibility that commonly accepted behaviors and curricular agendas may carry the potential for incidental brutalization.

The fact that miseducation is occurring on such a large scale should raise questions about what is actually valued in boys and men. However, simply focusing on various limited definitions of masculinity that might

replace the current one does not necessarily move the conversation in a direction where violence and brutalization can be eliminated.

In the second chapter, I proposed that what many call the "masculinity crisis" is, in fact, a crisis of meaning. I employed William James' insights about spiritual experience to frame gender experience among boys. Is it possible for educators to imagine an educational environment for boys (and girls) that does not promote violent behavior? What would be helpful in addressing the question of masculinity and violence? What kinds of masculinity education might help in building a social reality based on equality, nonviolence, compassion and democratic ideals? Can educators engage this process in a way that liberates boys from a violent masculinity?

To continue down the present path, as enacted by the Boy Scouts of America and allied organizations, is to promote human relationships that would only prolong and perhaps magnify present social problems such as social violence, bullying, domestic abuse, delinquency, and disruptive school environments. A continuation of present practice -- of sacrificing boys on the altar of masculinity -- would seem likely to continue the misogyny, homophobia, and religious intolerance that creates psychological and social brutalizations such as self-esteem issues, high teen suicide rates, and gender disphorya. What is needed is adventure in the place of these brutalizations.

The central thesis of this inquiry is that educators can respond helpfully to the brutalization of boys by resisting masculinization and recognizing boys as “live creatures” who can and should learn through adventure rather than brutalization. I suggest now three strategies for educators in responding helpfully: discovering and collaborating with allies, challenging the regimes of subjection and compliance, and promoting experiments in adventurous democratic culture.

Discovering and collaborating with allies

Educators in all of the varied aspects of multiple educational agency would be well served to keep in mind that every experience of masculinity defines masculinity over against the feminine as well as against nature. Whether or not a particular description of masculinity flows from the Abrahamic, the Heroic, or the Socratic model, such models define the feminine in terms of some other/thing to be dominated and subdued, characterized by some lack or dependence when compared to the masculine. Every such definition defends and preserves a sense of masculine privilege. Educators who choose to promote partnership will need to develop strategies for collaboration and action to dismantle the subjugation of woman and nature by adventuring together in experimenting with and discovering new ways to promote partnership and undermine the brutalization of male privilege.

If we are to make a difference as educators for boys and girls in our schools as well as other educational venues, we can promote and develop new models for understanding gender, gender identity, and specifically, in the problem I am researching, masculinity. Given the masculine privilege that currently dominates our culture, any attempt to change the broad range of gender issues in school and society must begin with a reframing of the masculinization project itself. What can educators do in the often constricted roles they find themselves in to resist the brutalizations that boys (and girls) encounter?

Remembering the issues addressed in Chapter Two, collaborating with others to get all the 'higher forms' of masculine experience “on the table” may be a necessary step for a meliorist approach in constructing a future that is healthier for boys and men. For instance, setting the higher more expansive form of Stranger masculinity in dialogue with the higher form of Victim might help boys see new choices in reflecting on and constructing their own experience of masculinity in a more adventurous way.

Educators can advocate for youth activities and organizations already existing which offer varieties and models of masculinity that are not mirroring the dominant, prisoner/warrior paradigm. There are already, in most schools, academic and extra-curricular activities and organizations that offer more than one model of masculinity for boys. Girl Scouts, Campfire, Boys and Girls Clubs are examples of national programs worthy of support. Educators

should take the initiative in promoting and supporting these as a way of promoting a more diverse approach to masculinity in the learning community.

Educators and their allies can work together to advocate for the maintenance and expansion of art and music programs in the community, as well as classes in public schools. While physical education and athletics programs are often the last programs to be cut when budgets become tight, art and music classes are often the first. Educators can organize with one another, parents, and students to advocate for expanding, rather than reducing the visual and performing arts offerings in a school or school system, as well as fostering artistic expression in other educational formats in the larger community.

Challenging the regimes of subjection and compliance

Secondly, masculinity as performed and maintained in the West relies on obedience to outside authority, and the neglect of personal reflection on experience. This outside authority may be a deity, a tradition, a male hierarchy, or a social superior. But such outside authority is always present, to be obeyed. The not so hidden threat of violence provides the background for more "peaceful" coercion. Educating for adventure would allow and encourage reflective action and a more nuanced sense of authority.

Educators engaging in advocacy for a more liberating educational

and social environment for boys (and girls) would benefit from further study of the role of religion in the formation of masculinities and their promulgation. How have changes in the American religious landscape affected educational institutions and popular culture regarding what it means to be a man? It is worth considering, in light of my case study of the Boy Scouts of America, that the religious denominations that sponsor the most Scout troops today are the Latter-Day Saints (Mormon), Southern Baptists, and Roman Catholics. This stands in contrast to the leading denominational sponsors of ninety years ago such as the Congregationalists, Episcopalians, and Presbyterians.[10] Are there religious, cultural, and social myths and images that offer adventurous visions of what it means for boys to grow to adulthood? What opportunities are there for boys to be exposed to adventure rather than brutalization, as they make choices for themselves about growing up? Might educators assist boys (and girls) in broadening knowledge of such options in creative ways?

Educators and their allies should ask Congress to reconsider its charter of the BSA, if for no other reason than as a strategy to promote open dialogue about masculinization. This could also mean that educators should find ways to take the initiative in working with boys and families involved in the Boy Scouts in becoming allies for change inside the BSA, although the prospects for change inside the BSA in the near future is not promising. Since the BSA has shown little interest in such dialogue it may be more

effective on local levels to simply approach other organizations (such as those mentioned above) and work with them, or create new groups for youth that are built around the educational wisdom of the Boy Scouting movement in a way that *does* emphasize adventure over brutalization. This study has recognized the educational wisdom of the Boy Scout method, and the adventurous side of that method provides clues for construction of a curriculum for both boys and girls as "live creatures," to foster their partnership over privilege, resist their brutalization, and construct new opportunities for adventure in building a less violent society.

Of course, the BSA is not the only organization outside of schools to have an educational impact on youth. A number of organizations exist that attract large numbers of boys and girls. Further work needs to be done in studying organizations that educate boys and girls for adulthood in order to understand their educational agenda and impact. Such a study would be beneficial to families as well as professional educators. There are a number of such organizations popular in current American culture, such as Girl Scouts, Campfire, Four H, and Boys & Girls Clubs. Various religious organizations have initiated nationwide youth programs as well, such as Royal Rangers and campus based national organizations such as Campus Crusade. A study of the educational texts of these organizations might be helpful to educators and others concerned with maintaining cultural education agency that transmits adventure and resists brutalization.

As noted in Chapter Three, this study does not delineate between the experiences of white boys in America and African-American or Asian-American boys. Neither does it take into consideration economic status. These are fitting, and even necessary areas for further study. Research into how race and ethnicity shape the varieties is beginning to happen in men's studies. Research about the effect of poverty or wealth on these same varieties is sorely lacking in this country.

Promoting experiments in adventurous democratic culture

My reading of *Herland* would suggest that a more adventurous and democratic viewpoint must be valued in setting educational agendas that do not brutalize boys or girls. A democratic culture, enacting citizenship or partnership, is inclusive and egalitarian, like the one in Gilman's novel. The way in which the women work together peacefully, in overcoming an incident of violence, is a model for thinking about relationships in schools. The role of educators in constructing and nurturing such a democratic culture is important. The word democracy is used in a lot of ways in our nation, and has been linked to the American experience with a multitude of usages. Perhaps most Americans associate it only with the idea of freely elected governments. But, if democracy describes the way a society governs itself, perhaps that signals more is at stake, where democracy is seen as a way of living.

In *Democracy and Education*, Dewey notes that a democracy is marked by varied points of shared common interest, recognition of mutual interest and concern, and free interaction between social groups. Such interpenetration of interests and commitments requires a continuing flexibility for social adjustments as new situations are met in common endeavor.[11] However, a democratic social reality is not just marked by shared interests. Shared interests surely mark some monarchies and other social systems as well. Dewey goes on to point out that a democratic society is distinguished from others by a repudiation of imposed external authority, a common commitment to social progress, a commitment to the consideration of the needs and experiences of others, the liberation of persons for a greater personal capacity, a belief in and promotion of personal and social adaptability, and universal access to education as a strategy for maintaining democratic impulses. Underlying these marks is the idea that democratic living is what Dewey calls a "mode or disposition" which impels one to maintain and improve democratic culture. [12] Educators have the opportunity to enact that disposition in their relationships with students fostering friendships with an educative intent that help humanize the educational setting and offer an educational solidarity with students, as Susan Laird as shown in her own work.[13]

Such a democratic culture would seem to require educators to encourage students to embrace care, concern, and connection - adventure

over brutalization. Helping students see the connection between cultivating the self-care mentioned above with a democratic "disposition" or approach to life would seem an important step in a helpful, liberating direction. As educational philosopher Al Neiman has said in a paper on Rorty, "pragmatism, in order to be a viable philosophy of education, must find room for the ancient imperative that self-examination, the passionate search for self-understanding, is a crucial element of democratic as well as classical education. In other words, John Dewey's concern with the public, more socially involved self, and for democratic solidarity, must allow room for the more private, supposedly subjective, concern with "the meaning of life" as espoused by writers such as Kierkegaard and James."[14] If Dewey is correct, democratic culture is, itself, educative by definition. This means that education in a democratic culture cannot be content to pass on tradition unquestioningly, but rather promote an approach to learning that is open to new possibilities, and geared to change.

As I wrote in Chapter One in addressing miseducation, if we are to speak of democratic education, we must work to ensure that educational agents in American society provide access to stored knowledge and wisdom even as it seeks to develop the capacity among children, youth and adults for a lively critique of that tradition through inquiry and the adventure of experimentation. In the present social climate, it seems critical for educators to find ways to cooperate in creating environing conditions where democratic

ideals can be lived out in everyday life and where the democratic disposition spoken of by Dewey (and Gilman, Wollstonecraft, James, Martin and others) can someday be realized.

Educators might engage in the practice of "befriending" students, along the line of Susan Laird's study of befriending girls, which she labels "educative befriending." What would it mean for educators to purposely befriend sexually, racially, economically and religiously diverse boys, as well as girls?[15] In the same vein, educators can pick up on Iris Marion Young's insight about seriality and group membership and help boys (and girls) who are in a non-hegemonic masculine series by organizing voluntary groups that provide a sense of identity and purpose for students in those series. Some of these may be ongoing organizations or clubs, while others may be occasional events, like a Medieval Fair, Chinese New Year, or Mardi Gras celebration, which utilize costumes and masks to permit experimentation and exploration by boys and girls.

In addition, further study might engage the educational texts of democratically oriented youth organizations in other cultures, to examine their assumptions and discover what can be learned for our own American context, if we are to move from brutalization to adventure. One example of such an organization is the Wandervogel, an organization that originated at approximately the same time as the Boy Scouts of Baden-Powell.[16] The Wandervogel (Wandering birds or Wanderers) originated in Prussian

Germany, in a highly militarized culture. It was an attempt to provide boys (and later girls as well) with experiences of nature and culture that promoted appreciation of folk culture, artistic creativity, democratic decision-making, and a natural spirituality (as opposed to a dogmatic one), as well as an emphasis on resisting militarism, consumerism and violence as a mindset. They were also known, from the beginning, for their acceptance of queer and questioning boys. They have managed to survive through the Nazi and Soviet eras to the present. Curiously, the U.S. Government studies of them consider them to be a gang, since they are historically non-conformist in attitude.[17] Such treatment of "non-conformity" should not surprise us, since it is a manifestation on the very male privilege we need to challenge as educators in order to bring adventure back to growing up.

Conclusion

No boy or girl can grow up without wrestling with (or simply surrendering to) the authority structures, sex role expectations, and underlying violence against women and nature that marks the brutalization of the current hegemonic model. It should be clear that the miseducation of boys by way of promoting and maintaining male privilege has a brutalizing affect on boys as individuals as well as on the larger society. The issues raised in my study of Boy Scout texts focus on girls, religion, and gay boys as issues that reveal attitudes that brutalize boys, yet these topics do not

exhaust the shape of the brutality of the masculinization process. If these brutalizations mark the curriculum of the nation's largest institution educating for masculinity, an institution whose influence we have already seen to pervades the culture, the task before educators is no easy one.

> "Children should be brought up as cheerfully and as happily as possible...In this life one ought to take as much pleasure as one possibly can...because if one is happy, one has it in one's power to make all those around happy."
>
> -- Lord Robert Baden-Powell [18]

Notes

1. Jane Roland Martin, *The Schoolhome*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, p. 76-77, 108-111. see also, Susan Laird, "Backlash: Advocacy for Boys in a Post-Feminist Era". *Journal of Philosophy and History of Education*, Vol.54, 2004. 91-96.
2. see David Hoffman, *Parashat Va-yera*. http://www.jtsa.edu/x7423.xml and http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Binding_of_Isaac
3. see Muhammad Ghoniem & M S M Saifullah, *The Sacrifice Of Abraham: Isaac or Ishmael(P)?* http://www.islamic-awareness.org/Quran/Contrad/MusTrad/sacrifice.html
4. Charlotte Perkins Gilman. *Herland.* New York: Pantheon, 1979. 33-36, 60-61,
98-99, 130-131.
5. *Meno* & *Laches* (or Courage) by Plato, Translator Benjamin Jowett.
6. See my PES 2008 paper for how I conceptualize these varieties of responses to the masculinization process.
7. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, 7-9, 89-93
8. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, 74-80, 101-108, 141-142.
9. For Macaulay see *Letters on Education with Observations on Religious and Metaphysical Subjects* (1790). For Wollstonecraft, *Vindication of the Rights of Men (1790)* and *Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792). For Laird, see "Rethinking Coeducation," Studies in Philosophy and Education 13 (1995): 361-378.
10. *Scouting* Magazine archives, 1922.
11. John Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, 86-87.
12. John Dewey, 316
13. Susan Laird, “Befriending Girls as an Educational Life-Practice,” Philosophy of Education 2002, ed. E. Scott Fletcher (Urbana: Philosophy of Education Society, 2003), Featured Essay, 73-81. And see “Gift Labor for Practical Wisdom in Public Schools: Befriending Teachers, Befriending Students,” for submission to review by Kathleen Kesson and Wayne Ross, editors of Defending Public Education (Praeger), in press.
14. Alven Neiman, “Rohrer and Rorty: The Contingency of Desire,” Philosophy of Education 2002, ed. E. Scott Fletcher (Urbana: Philosophy of Education Society, 2000), Featured Essay, 63-66
15. Susan Laird, 73-81
16. official website: http://wvdb.loucreative.de/
17. Gilbert Geis. *Juvenile Gangs.* U. S. Govt. Print. Office, 1965. pp 8-9
18. Tim Jeal, *Baden-Powell,* 365

Bibliography

Robert Stephenson Baden-Powell, *Aids to Scoutmastership: A Handbook for Scoutmasters on the Theory of Scout Training.* Dallas: Stevens Publishing: 1992.

Robert Stephenson Baden-Powell, *Scouting for Boys*. (1908 Edition) Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

George Bataille, *Erotism: Death & Sensuality*. San Francisco: City Lights, 1986.

Susan Birden, *Rethinking Sexual Identity in Education*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005.

Boy Scout Handbook (11th Edition). Irving: Boy Scouts of America, 1998.

Robert Bly, *Iron John: A Book About Men.* Reading, MA: Addison Wesley, 1990

Miriam Brody, *Manly Writing: Gender, Rhetoric, and the Rise of Composition.* Carbiondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1993.

Judith Butler, *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subvervision of Gender Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Judith Butler, *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

John Dewey, *Art as Experience.* New York: Perigee Books, 1980. (first published, 1934)

John Dewey, *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education.* New York: Free Press, (first published New York: Macmillan, 1916)

John Dewey, *Experience and Education.* New York: Touchstone, 1977 (Kappa Delta Pi, 1938)

Ann Douglas, *The Feminization of American Culture*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977

Stephen J. Ducat, *The Wimp Factor: Gender Gaps, Holy Wars, and the Politics of Anxious Masculinity*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2004.

Barbara Ehrenreich, *Blood Rites: Origins and History of the Passions of War.* New York: Holt, 1998.

Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge & the Discourse on Language* New York: Pantheon, 1972.

Michel Foucault, *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* New York: Vintage, 1991.

Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction (volume 1).* New York: Vintage Books, 1990.

Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction (volume 1).* New York: Vintage Books, 1990.

Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: The Care of the Self (volume 3).* New York: Vintage Books, 1988.

Diana Fuse, *Inside/Out: Lesbian Theories, Gay Theories*. New York: Routledge: 1991.

Charlotte Perkins Gilman, *Herland.* New York: Pantheon, 1979.

Michael Gurian, *The Wonder of Boys: What Parents, Mentors and Educators Can Do to Shape Boys into Exceptional Men.* New York: Putnam, 1996

Michael Gurian, *What Could He Be Thinking?: How a Man's Mind Really Works.* St. Martin's Press, New York: St. Martin's Press, 2003

Michael Gurian with Kathy Stevens, *The Minds of Boys: Saving Our Sons From Falling Behind in School and Life.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005

Handbook for Boys, revised edition. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1911 and 1914.

Handbook for Boys, revised edition. New York: Boy Scouts of America, 1944

*Handbook for Scoutmaster*s 2nd Edition, New York: Boy Scouts of America, 1922

Luce Irigaray, *An Ethics of Sexual Difference.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Luce Irigaray, *Sexes and Genealogies.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience.* New York: Modern Library, 1999.

Tim Jeal, *Baden-Powell: Founder of the Boy Scouts.* New Haven: Yale Nota Bene, 1989.

Susan Schober Laird, *Maternal Teaching and Maternal Teachings: Philosophic and literary case studies of educating.* Ann Arbor: UMI (for Cornell University), 1988.

Robert H. MacDonald, Sons of Empire: The Frontier and Boy Scout Movement 1890-1910. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

Jane Roland Martin, *Cultural Miseducation: In Search of a Democratic Solution.*
New York: Teachers College Press, 2002.

Jane Roland Martin, *Educational Metamorphoses: Philosophical Reflections on Identity and Culture,* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2007

Jane Roland Martin, *Reclaiming a Conversation: The Ideal of the Educated Woman.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

Jane Roland Martin, *The Schoolhome: Rethinking Schools for Changing Families.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.

D.G. Mulcahey, *Knowledge, Gender, and Schooling: The Feminist Educational Thought of Jane Roland Martin*. Westport, CN: Bergin & Garvey, 2002.

Katherine S. Newman, *Rampage: The Social Roots of School Shootings*. New York: Basic Books, 2004.

Judith L. Newton, *From Panthers to Promise Keepers*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005

William Pollack*, Real Boys: rescuing our sons from the myths of boyhood*. New York: Random House, 1998

William Pollack, *Real Boys' Voices*. New York: Random House, 2000

C.G. Prado, *Starting With Foucault.* Boulder, San Francisco, Oxford: Westview Press, 1995.

Paul Rabinow, ed., *The Foucault Reader,* New York: Pantheon, 1984. p. 124-140, 273-289.

Michael Rosenthal, *The Character Factory,* New York: Harper Collins, 1986

Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Christine Hoff Sommers, *The War Against Boys: New Misguided Feminism is Harming Our Young Men.* New York: Touchstone, 2000.

Cushing Strout, "William James and the Tradition of American Public Philosophers" in *Partisan Review* 3/21 2001

Iris Marion Young, *Intersecting Voices: Dilemmas of Gender, Political Philosophy, and Policy.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Appendix

1. Grid display of Varieties of Masculine Experience

2. Vita

Grid display of Varieties of Masculine Experience

prisoner	***victim***	***stranger***	***sky blue***
a discourse of...			
rebellion	anxiety	displacement	satisfaction
attributes...			
condemned	hostage	spellbound	innocent
prison	wilderness	abyss	garden
sin disobedience	hostile world	thrown-ness alienation disillusionment	life is good original goodness
experiencing life...			
crime & punishment quality	suffering angst	vanity absurdity	good is the essential
guilt shame self-contempt	anxiety dread	out of place disenchanted	ignorance maladjustment
way out or through...			
judgment forgiveness obedience	protection peace shelter compassion	clarity trusting one's own experience	trust nature healthy-mindedness
god concepts...			
enforcer stern father redeemer	protector companion co-sufferer	truth guide light in darkness	music of the spheres
constrictive types surrender to masculinist project...			
Promisekeepers	Baden-Powell	game-players	Robert Bly
expansive types transcend masculinist project...			
John Stuart Mill	Malcolm X	Rousseau's Emile	R. W. Emerson Baruch Spinoza

Curriculum Vitae

Charles Joseph Meinhart
P. O. Box 2574, Norman OK 73070
405 / 201.2333
jmeinhart@gmail.com

Education

University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK. Ph. D., spring 2008. Educational Studies. Major: Philosophy of Education. Minor: History of Education: sexuality, religion, and education for non-violence. Dissertation in progress: "Making a Man out of a Boy": Masculinity, Male Privilege, Miseducation, and the Boy Scout of America. Advisor: Susan Laird, Associate Professor of Educational Studies and past President, Philosophy of Education Society.

Sacred Heart School of Theology, Milwaukee, WI. M. Div. with honors, 1990. Catholic philosophy and theology. Advisor: Thomas Knoebel, Professor of Systematic Studies, Vice-Rector.

McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, IL. M. Div., 1978. Reformed theology. Advisor: Jack Stotts, Professor of Ethics and President of the Seminary.

University of Tulsa, Tulsa, OK. B.S. in English, 1974. Major in English (Rhetoric and Writing), Minor in History. Advisor: Daniel Marder, Professor of English (Rhetoric and Writing).

Honors

University of Oklahoma
- A.E. Clark Memorial Graduate Scholarship, University of Oklahoma, College of Education, 2006

Oklahoma Educational Studies Association
- President, 2002-2003.
- Presidential address, "Straight Talk to Teachers About Compulsory Heterosexuality", 2003.

McCormick Theological Seminary
- John W. Meister Award for Pastoral Care, 1978.

K-12 Work Experience

Sooner Upward Bound, Norman Summer 2008
- Instructor, Creative Writing

Bishop McGuinness Catholic High School, Oklahoma City 1992-1995
- Administrator (administrative duties: 30% of time)
- Chaplain (30%)
- Classroom teacher (30%): Religion, English, Government, History
- 10% other Archdiocesan responsibilities

Santa Fe South Middle School, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 2008
- Substitute teacher
- (student population over 80% Hispanic.)

Fairfax High School, Fairfax, Oklahoma. 1978-1985
- Substitute teacher
- (Agricultural community)

Higher Education Work Experience

Oklahoma City University 2009-Present
Adjunct Professor, Peace and Conflict Studies
- Contemporary Masculinity and Social Issues

University of Oklahoma 2004-Present
Graduate Teaching Assistant
- Schools in American Cultures. University of Oklahoma, College of Education, 2004-present. (Dana Cesar and John Covaleskie, supervisors)
- First Year Composition. University of Oklahoma, Department of English, 2004-present. (Catherine Hobbs and Susan Kates, supervisors)

Instructor
- Gateway Program
  Seminar on education and self-concept, Fall 2002.

Kansas Newman College 1996
- Adjunct Professor
- Catholic moral thought and social issues

Other Professional Work Involving Education

United Ministry Center, University of Oklahoma January 2005 - June 2007

- Director
- Interfaith campus ministry program. Facilitating educational events around ecumenical, interfaith and social justice issues.

Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Oklahoma City 1991-2002

- Priest
- Pastor of a University Parish, 1995-2002
- Director of archdiocesan diaconate program, 1994-2002
- Teacher in Archdiocesan Adult Education program (see Kansas Newman above)

Domestic Violence Intervention Services, Tulsa OK 1986-1987

- Child Advocate
- Created curriculum to teach abused children strategies for safety and for making non-violent choices.

Larkin Street Youth Center, San Francisco CA 1985-1986

- Interim Administrator
- counseling, clinic, and drop-in center for street youth, runaways, implemented tutoring program and GED preparation program.

Presbyterian Minister, Fairfax & Hominy, Oklahoma 1978-1985, Norman, Oklahoma, 2002-2007

- provided pastoral care
- led organization of educational events in community
- taught Scripture Studies
- youth ministry
- directed campus ministry center

Refereed Publications

C. Joseph Meinhart, "Must 'Real Men' Have Sick Souls?", in *Philosophy of Education 2007,* Barbara Stengel, ed., 2007.

C. Joseph Meinhart, "A More Luminous Life: An Attempt at a Religiously Informed Pragmatism", in *Philosophy of Education 2002,* Scott Fletcher, ed., 2002

Proceedings

C. Joseph Meinhart, "Good Christian Boys: Scouting for Masculinity".

Society of Philosophy and History of Education, *Journal of Philosophy and History of Education*, Oklahoma City, September 2005.

C. Joseph Meinhart, "Hegemonic Masculinity: Is its Promotion Good for Schools?", Society of Philosophy and History of Education, *Journal of Philosophy and History of Education*, Oklahoma City, October 2004.
C. Joseph Meinhart, "The Cultural Costs of Hidden Violence", Society of Philosophy and History of Education, *Journal of Philosophy and History of Education*, San Antonio, September 2003.

National Papers and Presentations

C. Joseph Meinhart, " 'By accommodation and defense but also by conquest': Boys Learning to be Men", paper, American Educational Studies Association. November 2007.

C. Joseph Meinhart, Steven Mackie and Michael Surbaugh, "No 'Live Creature' Left Behind: A Conversation with Dewey about Embodied Learning". Panel at American Educational Studies Association. Cleveland, September 2007.

C. Joseph Meinhart, "Must "Real Men" Have Sick Souls?", paper at Philosophy of Education Society, Atlanta, March 2007.

C. Joseph Meinhart, Deborah Shinn. Symposium: Learning to Become Women and Men: Critical Studies of Gender Essentialism. "Making a Man Out of a Boy: The Politics of Miseducation". American Educational Studies Association. November 2006.

Respondent, "Moving Beyond the Blame Game: Subverting Privilege". Response to paper by Barbara Stengel, "No Fault Responsibility", moderated by Barbara Houston. Philosophy of Education Society, Puerta Vallarta, April 2006.

C. Joseph Meinhart, Deborah Shinn and Robin Stroud, "Symposium: Good Christian Boys and Girls: Critiques of Essentialism from the Bible Belt". Panel at American Educational Studies Association. November 2005. (paper entitled "Essentialist Masculinity: the Boy Scout Movement") Charlottesville, VA November 2005.

C. Joseph Meinhart, Deborah Shinn and Kadiker Dahn, "Out of Place: Localizing Cultural Miseducation" Panel at the American Educational Studies Association, Kansas City, November 2004.

C. Joseph Meinhart, " Straight Talk to Teachers About Compulsory Heterosexuality: Reparative Therapy as Violence Against LGBTQ Youth", Paper at Panel presentation at Philosophy of Education Society, Miami

(topic: reparative therapy and counseling youth), spring of 2002.

Regional Papers and Presentations

C. Joseph Meinhart, Robin Stroud, Sean Carroll, panel: Panel: “Educating for Obedience: Aspects of Religious Authoritarianism”, presentation: “Religious Authoritarianism, the Compliant Society, and Education for Manhood’, Society of Philosophy and History of Education. September 2008.

C. Joseph Meinhart and Michael Surbaugh, panel: "Assuming Masks: Questions of Gender and Disability in Education", presentation: “Masks of masculinity: agency and boyhood in the BSA”, Society of Philosophy and History of Education. September 2008.

C. Joseph Meinhart, Steven Mackie, Michael Surbaugh, panel: “No Live Creature Left Behind,” presentation: “By accommodation and defense but also by conquest”, Society of Philosophy and History of Education. September 2007.

C. Joseph Meinhart, “Boys as Living Creatures: ‘By accommodation and defense but also by conquest’”, part of panel at Society of Philosophy and History of Education. Oklahoma City, September 2007.

C. Joseph Meinhart, Deborah Shinn, “Learning Gender: (Mis) Educating ‘Girls’ and ‘Boys’”. Panel at Society of Philosophy and History of Education. San Antonio, September 2006.

C. Joseph Meinhart, Deborah Shinn and Robin Stroud, "Critiques of Essentialism from the Bible Belt.” Panel at Oklahoma Educational Studies Association. Stillwater, January 2006.

C. Joseph Meinhart, “Good Christian Boys: Scouting for Masculinity”, paper at Society of Philosophy and History of Education. Oklahoma City, September 2005.

C. Joseph Meinhart, “Hidden Histories of Violence in Oklahoma Schooling”, Oklahoma Educational Studies Association, (topic: hidden violence, social control and schooling) Stillwater, January 2004.

C. Joseph Meinhart, “Reparative Therapy and Violence Against Youth“, Presidential Address presented, Oklahoma Educational Studies Association, (topic: school counseling and sexuality issues), May 2003.

C. Joseph Meinhart, Kadiker Dahn, Teresa Rendon, “Cultural

Miseducation – Local and Global", panel presentation, Oklahoma Educational Studies Association, (paper entitled: "Social Conformity and Violence in Oklahoma") May 2003.

Professional Service to Academy & Community

Sexuality & Education

Moderator, panel discussion: Joe Meinhart, Susan Laird, Deborah Shinn and Robin Stroud, discussion titled "Oklahoma's Mary Wollstonecraft: 'Embodied Readings in Conversation". Society of Philosophy and History of Education. Oklahoma City, September 2005.

Board Member, Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays (P-FLAG), Norman chapter. Member, 2002 to present.

Religion & Education

Moderator, panel discussion: C. Joseph Meinhart with Yoshiko Nakani and Ann Diller, "Searching for Moral Education in an Age of Nihilism: An Examination of Keiji Nishitani's Philosophy of Emptiness", moderator of Panel, Philosophy of Education Society, Toronto, March 2004.

Organizer Week of Interfaith Understanding at University of Oklahoma, Norman, Fall 2001.

Retreat leader, medical staff, regional hospital, Ilo Ilo, Philippines, summer, 2000.

Board Member, United Ministries Center, University of Oklahoma, 2002 to present.

Non-violence Education

Organizer, Fellowship of Reconciliation, University of Oklahoma, 2002.

Organizer, the Norman Worship Group, Oklahoma City Monthly Meeting, Religious Society of Friends, 1999.

Board Member, PFLAG Norman

Member, Oklahoma Coalition Against the Death Penalty. 1996 to present.

Secretary, Oklahoma Educational Studies Association, 2003-2004.

President, Oklahoma Educational Studies Association, 2002-2003.