of stretching women writers of the past on some procrustean bed of theory. In their works the individual variation is perhaps even more important than whatever theme we are looking for, the exception is more interesting than the rule. Women writers of the future will continue to forge a woman's style; but it will in each case be the style of each woman, and will arise out of her individuality. What we are fighting for on all fronts now is the right to be individual. In that struggle, the question of whether masculine and feminine modes exist has its value. It opens doors, teases us into inquiry, teaches us about ourselves and thus enriches our individuality. The question can be used as a ground from which figures detach themselves, and against which they may be more clearly perceived. But it is only as a question that the enquiry into sexual modes of literature has value. As soon as we settle on a definitive answer, we are less than we were.

Peter Schwenger
Mt. St. Vincent University
Halifax, N.S.

CO-TEACHING WO/MEN'S STUDIES AT M.I.T.

What Do We Teach?

Robert Fein and I have co-taught wo/men's studies at M.I.T., in a seminar called Androgyny, since 1973. The seminar is open to students, employees, faculty and spouses. It is an interdisciplinary, scholarly overview of sex roles. The goals are: to help students formulate a coherent, intellectual perspective on sex roles, to understand their own values in this arena, and to develop a basis for rational public policies affecting the lives of women and men. Seminar materials change every semester, as new research is published, and to reflect the changing public policy implications of sex roles studies. Most materials are drawn from the fields of history, psychology, economics, management, political science and law. This reflects both the training of the instructors and the fact that excellent relevant courses in anthropology and literature are taught elsewhere at M.I.T. Readings include classic and recent books, and a very wide range of materials on reserve in the Women Studies/Men's Studies Collection in the M.I.T. Library.[1]

Students are required to do a fair amount of reading, to write two short papers, and to complete a "project" of their choice. Projects have ranged from sculpture and painting to lengthy journals and diaries, through collections of poems, to reviews of the literature on a subtopic like rape, to careful papers on sex-roles in a mental hospital, in a fraternity, in a dorm, in a high school. One woman prepared and taught mini-courses on sex roles at her local high school, complete with pre- and post-course attitude surveys and a curriculum evaluation.

The seminar can be taken as part of a "Humanities concentration" in Wo/Men's Studies, but is ordinarily taken as an elective, by students in many disciplines. Ordinarily there are 5-10 women and 5-10 men; age representation has ranged from 16 to 55. The seminar is taught in our home. Vistors, auditors and irregular attenders are firmly discouraged.

The Rationale for Wo/Men's Studies

Both of us have been profoundly influenced by women's materials and men's materials separately read and taught and discussed. Each of us has participated over time in a single sex discussion group. Each of us has seen the past and continuing need for women and men sometimes to be able to meet and do sex-role research on their own. Why then do we teach (and co-teach) Women's Studies/Men's Studies?

As it happens, the Women's Studies/Men's Studies formulation is now a convenient one, from the legal point of view, since Title IX problems are being raised elsewhere around the country about teaching just Women's courses. This is, however, a serendipitous advantage for M.I.T., since we began to teach as we do for different reasons. I would like to begin by a comment on the nature of Men's Studies, for those to whom the concept is not familiar. Many feminists believe that most standard education and most traditional history is his-story, the study of men. "All of M.I.T. is 'men's studies'!" people say. We intend the term Men's Studies to refer to the study of men's lives within a new paradigm, as feminism and Women's Studies represent a new paradigm for thinking about women. Men's Studies inquires into the counterpart issues for men: expressiveness, nurturance, the ways men relate to each other, occupational segregation for men and so on.

Men's Studies is not a "Men's Auxiliary to the Women's Movement". Studies of male sex roles, and needed changes for men, are undertaken by many men on behalf of men. As many women have been interested in women's studies principally on their own behalf, many men are interested in men's lives principally for their own reasons.

However, as women's liberation betokens human liberation, so also with the liberation of men. The safety of women, of women and children, and of many men, depends in part on our better understanding male violence. Some recent psychoanalytic theorists argue that until men take equal care of children the survival of humanity will be in question. Many people feel that children, on the average, thrive better when both parents are deeply involved in child care. We also argue that the basic root of occupational segregation (which maintains the male-female wage gap and inequality of opportunity to nurture) lies in exclusively woman-oriented child care, which must change so that both men and women may nurture. These points may stand to illustrate why we believe that everyone stands to gain from the kinds of improvements in men's lives, that Men's Studies may bring about.

We believe these questions must continue to be addressed in single-sex discussions. We also believe that they should be addressed by men and women together. First, because many men and women, humanists and feminists, want to be able to make life decisions in the context of living and working with the other sex. Second because the public policy implications of changing sex roles require a systems approach, with respect to research and with respect to law. In fact the implications of this second point are so profound, in terms of power, that many exclusively women-oriented women, and men-oriented men, come to believe their interests lie in helping to build an androgynous social policy, even while they choose to lead individually segregated lives.

Why do we co-teach? We have both come to believe that the experiences of men and women are so profoundly different from each other, that it is very difficult to teach and learn about androgyny by oneself, let alone teach both sexes of students by oneself. Having a co-teacher, particularly in a frontier field, where teachers and students must both continually work to understand their own feelings about the subject matter, also provides relief and greater objectivity and perspective. It allows for greater individual support and guidance for students in need. Also, we have enormously enjoyed this seminar and enjoyed teaching it together. The subject matter thus very much enhances all the ordinary advantages from team teaching.

Mary Rowe
M.I.T.
Cambridge, Ma.