

THE AIM FRAMEWORK
Addressing and Involving Men and Boys
To Promote Gender Equality and End Gender Discrimination and Violence

Michael Kaufman, Ph.D.
Prepared under a contract with UNICEF
March 31, 2003

1. MEN AND BOYS IN OUR EFFORTS TO END DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN AND GIRLS: POSING THE ISSUE

Those of us concerned with gender inequality and its terrible toll on the lives of women and girls – witnessed in the pandemic of violence against women, in lower educational attainment in many parts of the world, in job discrimination and lower rates of pay, in health costs, and, simply, in the reduction in the quality of life and the abrogation of basic human rights – seem to have one clear path: redirect resources, energy, legislation, education, and programs towards women and girls. Only such a concerted redirection can end millennia of gender discrimination, oppression, and violation of their basic human rights.

This path, however, is neither narrow, linear, nor always clear. For one thing, it isn't only a question of directing resources *to* women and girls (although it certainly includes that), but, in a broader sense, to *the needs of* women and girls and their empowerment. Furthermore, our efforts must not be limited to meeting immediate needs, but also to what we might think of as women's transformatory and strategic needs. In that sense, resources must also be directed to ending the underlying social structures, institutions, and relationships on which this inequality is based.

This enlarged notion of the path towards gender equality and equity begins to point us towards examples of why we must include men and boys in our gender-equality and equity framework. To cite but two simple examples: A program aimed at men to increase fathers' involvement in day-to-day parenting and domestic tasks might be money spent on men, but it is part of the process of gender transformation to the benefit of women and girls. Similarly, money supporting a men's organization to carry out awareness programs with boys and men to end men violence against women and girls, is

not money spent *on* women and girls, but spent to meet both the immediate and transformative needs of women and girls.¹

This paper attempts to synthesize lessons from the past two decades of work with men and boys to end gender inequality and men's violence, and to promote new models of masculinity and new relations between women and men. It is not a review of the literature – which now represents a tremendous body of work – but a working document. It will:

- briefly summarize some of the consequences of not addressing and involving men and boys versus some potential positive outcomes;
- distil seven conceptual tools that can help organizations in the UN system, NGOs, as well as other institutions and governments, properly situate their work in relation to boys and men in order that such efforts are not simply a net drain on resources that could go to women and girls;
- introduce the AIM framework – a strategic framework for addressing and involving men and boys;
- provide illustrative examples of this framework from around the world.

2. CONSEQUENCES OF NOT ADDRESSING AND INVOLVING MEN AND BOYS

There are many good reasons why men and boys have not been a focus of work guided by a gender analysis and with an explicit gender focus, not the least of which has been the opposition of many men to gender equality either for ideological reasons, because of

1. Organizations are divided about speaking of gender equality or gender equity. However, both are critical. Gender equality refers to equal treatment of females and males in law, in civil society, the family, at work and education. Gender equity refers to fairness. So, for example, the principle of gender equality says we should not discriminate in the workplace against a woman who is pregnant: she should have equal opportunities with her male and other female colleagues. Gender equity, however, suggests that we should respond to her specific needs and temporarily take account of her pregnancy in work assignments if she requests such accommodation. This might mean temporary unequal treatment from a male or other female colleague, but it would be fair treatment.

their unquestioned assumptions, or simply to preserve entrenched privileges. In spite of the active support for change by many good men, gender and development approaches often seem to take place despite men. Such work and such approaches have been led by women and it is understandable that their focus has been on those most critically effected by gender discrimination. Resources have remained scarce and there has been justifiable concern about siphoning them away from women and girls. Added to this has been the equation of women with gender, an equation still largely true not only in development work, but also in academia, politics, and the popular mind. The equation is also a holdover, suggests Chant and Guttman, from the women in development approaches that predated the more contemporary gender and development framework.²

Much more might be said about this absence, but for our purposes the critical point is the impact of this absence. I would suggest that leaving men and boys out of the gender equation and outside of a gender and development approach is a recipe for failure:

- An assumption that we can successfully pursue programs to improve the lives of women and girls without addressing and involving men fails to acknowledge men's roll as gatekeepers of current gender orders and as potential resisters of change. Simply put, if we do not effectively reach men and boys, many of our efforts will either be thwarted or simply ignored. Male leaders, from local to international, in politics and the economy, in religious institutions and the media, may at best – if we are lucky – pay lip service to sexual equality and to meeting the human rights of women and girls. But these goals will not be fully and truly integrated into local, national, and international priorities.
- By *de facto* repeating the notion that “gender = women,” men are removed from the gender equation. This effectively marginalizes women and women's struggles even in the name of mainstreaming. This is one of the paradoxes of mainstreaming approaches that treat only half of the gender equation. Once marginalized, it is no surprise that our best efforts are thwarted in moments of national or international crisis, or in the midst of economic cutbacks, or virtually ignored at the highest levels of social, economic, and political decision-making.

2. Sylvia Chant and Matthew Guttman, “Mainstreaming Men into Gender and Development,” (Oxford: Oxfam GB, 2000), pp. 16-24.

- Leaving out men and boys can lead us to only address symptoms of the underlying gender system that structures the lives of women and men, rather than developing initiatives and programs that allow us to get to the heart of the problem. This is because, ultimately, gender is about relations of power between the sexes and among different groups of women and men. Although practical programs to empower women (for example, through improved education for girls) are one part of redressing these relations of power, there also needs to be systematic and systemic efforts to change the lives of men and boys if we are to redress power relations at their root.

3. POTENTIAL POSITIVE OUTCOMES OF ADDRESSING AND INVOLVING MEN AND BOYS TO CHALLENGE OUR GENDER ORDER

In contrast to these negative consequences, there are potential positive outcomes. Such efforts might:

- create a large-scale and broad social consensus on a range of issues that previously have been marginalized as issues only of importance to women when in fact they are often also issues for men;
- mobilize resources controlled by men and mobilize the social and economic institutions controlled by men. In other words, such efforts could result in a net gain in resources available to meet the needs of women and girls;
- develop effective partnerships not only between women and men, but between a range of institutions and organizations, some representing the interests of women and girls, and others *de facto* representing the traditional interests of men and boys;
- increasingly and patiently isolate and marginalize those men working to preserve men's power and privilege;
- raise the next generation of boys and girls in a framework of gender equity and equality;
- by changing the attitudes and behaviour of men and boys, improve the lives of women and girls in the home, workplace, and community;

- gain unexpected insights into current gender relations and the complex forces that promote discrimination against women and prevent gender equality;
- gain unexpected insights into other social, cultural, political issues.

4. SEVEN CONCEPTUAL TOOLS TO BETTER ALLOW US TO STRATEGICALLY APPROACH AND INVOLVE MEN AND BOYS

That much said, such outcomes remain only a possibility. The danger is that money and effort spent on men and boys will simply maintain the status quo, perpetuate gross inequalities in the division and allocation of social resources, and serve only to perpetuate the institutions and privileges that men and boys have traditionally enjoyed relative to women and girls.

Our best promise for success and actually contributing to the goal of ending a gender order that has such harmful effects on children, on women (and, I would suggest, in different ways, on men as well) and on the planet as a whole, comes from developing and finding practical means of applying a set of conceptual tools that can guide our approaches in this area. Here are seven such tools:

i. The move from WID to GAD shifted focus to patriarchy and relationships. The women in development (WID) focus in the 1970s and into the 1980s was an important step in development efforts. It named women both as a specific object and subject of development and it led to women-centered programs. But as various authors have noted, it often led to token or add-on efforts, as if women could be empowered in isolation of all else.³

The emergence of gender and development (GAD) approaches marked an important step in that its theory focussed on gender as a social relationship. Efforts aimed at challenging discrimination and improving the lives of women were brought into the mainstream of development organizations. Ultimately this has meant, in theory at least, a challenge to the existing relations of gender power and the institutions and ideologies that preserved that power.

3. See for example, Chant and Guttman, *op. cit.*, C. Moser, *Gender, Planning and Development: Theory, Practice and Training* (London: Routledge: 1993).

Although this has led to many practical questions, including how institutions organize these approaches, and although, in practise, the framework is often reduced to a woman and development framework, this does represent an important step forward. When all is said and done, the focus on gender relations means that the fulfilment of the promise of GAD requires an engagement with all the actors in those relations. It requires a challenge to the institutions and structures, the ideologies and practices that have cemented and nurtured the relations of gender inequality and gender power. It requires an engagement with women *and* men at the family level – the key (if diverse) institution through which gender identities and relations are first instilled and constantly perpetuated. This, in turn, requires approaches for the engagement of men and boys for if relationships are to change, then all those involved must be pulled into a process of change.

While the WID frameworks could only set the stage, the widely-established GAD framework gives us at least some of the basic conceptual tools for the engagement of men and boys for a project of challenging our established gender status quos and promoting human rights for both women and men.

ii. Socially-constructed gender vs. biological sex. Basic to a GAD analysis and to any approaches that seek to change gender relations is the critical (but sometimes overlooked) distinction between biological sex and socially-created gender. “Sex” refers to the immutable characteristics (boiling down to our different place in the process of reproduction) that distinguish males and females of our species. “Gender” is our definitions of manhood and womanhood, our learned behaviours, the relations of power between the sexes, the accentuated or suppressed physical and emotional characteristics, and the forms of behaviour that are desired or deemed inconsistent with masculinity or femininity.

Although, in reality, the line between sex and gender isn’t always clear (simply because our biological species doesn’t exist outside of cultures deeply imbued with gender divisions) the distinction remains a critical bit of shorthand for our work: it is, after all, the basis for the proposition that a change in gender relations is possible.

The distinction is also the basic tool for challenging men and boys: we are not challenging them as males, but rather we are challenging negative or oppressive gendered

behaviour and relations. In this sense, for example, we should speak of “men’s violence” rather than “male violence,” or “men’s social power” rather than “male social power.”⁴

iii. Gender Work, the Family, and Early Childhood Development. Gender is not a static and fixed entity, either biologically or socially fixed. Rather, it is a process and a relationship.

The possibility for the creation of gender lies in two biological realities, the malleability of human drives and the long period of dependency of children.⁵ Upon this biological edifice, a social process goes to work for the simple reason that this period of dependency is lived out in society. Within different family forms, each society provides a charged setting in which love and longing, support and disappointment become the vehicles for developing a gendered psyche. The family gives a personalized stamp to the categories, values, ideals, and beliefs of a society in which one’s sex is a fundamental aspect of self-definition and life. The family takes abstract ideals and turns them into the stuff of love and hate.

By five or six years old, before we have much conscious knowledge of the world, the building blocks of our gendered personalities are firmly anchored. Over this skeleton we build the adult as we learn to survive within an interlocked set of patriarchal realities that includes family, school, religion, the media, and the world of work.

The internalization of gender relations is a building block of our personalities – that is, it is the individual elaboration of gender. Consequently, we make our own subsequent contributions to replenishing and adapting institutions and social structures that wittingly

4. See the discussion in chapter one of Michael Kaufman, *Cracking the Armour: Power, Pain, and the Lives of Men* (Toronto: Viking Canada, 1993). Also some of these issues are explored in Michael S. Kimmel, *The Gendered Society*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).

5. This section is based on portions of: Michael Kaufman, “Men, Feminism, and Men’s Contradictory Experiences of Power,” in Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman, editors, *Theorizing Masculinities* (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1994), pp. 142-165; Michael Kaufman, *Cracking the Armour, op. cit.*, and Michael Kaufman, “The Construction of Masculinity and the Triad of Men’s Violence,” in *Beyond Patriarchy: Essays by Men on Pleasure, Power and Change*, ed. by Michael Kaufman (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1987). All are available at www.michaelkaufman.com/articles.

or unwittingly preserves patriarchal systems. This process, when taken in its totality, forms what I have called the *gender work* of a society.⁶

Because of the multiple identities of individuals and the complex ways we all embody both power and powerlessness – as a result of the interaction of our sex, race, class, sexual orientation, ethnicity, religion, intellectual and physical abilities, family particularities, and sheer chance – gender work is not a linear process.

For a man, his masculinity is a bond, a glue, to the patriarchal world. It is the thing which makes that world his, which makes it more or less comfortable to live in. Through the incorporation of a dominant form of masculinity particular to his class, race, nationality, era, sexual orientation, and religion, he gains real benefits *and* an individual sense of self-worth. From the moment when he learns, unconsciously, there are not only two sexes but a social significance to the sexes, his own self-worth becomes measured against the yardstick of gender. As a young male, he is granted a fantasy reprieve from the powerlessness of early childhood because he unconsciously realizes he is part of that half of humanity with social power. His ability to incorporate not simply the roles, but to grasp onto this power – even if, at first, it exists only in his imagination and play – is part of the development of his personality.

The notion of gender work suggests there is an active process that creates and recreates gender. It suggests that this process can be an ongoing one, with particular tasks at particular stages of life and that allows us to respond to changing relations of gender power. It suggests that gender is not a static thing that we become, but is a form of ongoing interaction with the structures of the surrounding world.⁷

6. There are many sources with fascinating discussions of various dimensions of this gender work. On the formation of masculinities through sport and the impact of this on the wider body politic see, for example, Varda Burstyn, *The Rites of Men: Manhood, Politics, and the Culture of Sport* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999) and Michael Messner, *Power at Play: Sports and the Problem of Masculinity*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1992). On many of the issues raised in this section, see R.W. Connell, *The Men and the Boys* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

7. The concept of building a culture of peace, popularized by UNESCO, dovetails nicely with the notion of changing gender relations. The word “culture” is not simply a noun, referring to diverse artistic and social expressions of individuals and groups, nor even a description of

One practical implication of this is the tremendous importance of changing family relations in any GAD approach and of the importance of an explicit priority on early childhood experiences and education.⁸

iv. Diverse masculinities suggests diverse relationships to patriarchy. Men are not a unitary subject. Speaking of “men’s social power” is a simplification for, actually, it is “men’s social power relative to women in their same social class or social grouping.”

Just as a patriarchal, or male-dominated, society is one with a hierarchy of men over women, it is also an elaborate hierarchy of some men over other men. And, as Bob Connell and others have explored, this is reflected in diverse masculinities structured between ones which are hegemonic and others which are subordinate. This reflects that men in certain groups have social or economic, political or physical power over other men and also that some definitions of manhood have power over others. Some are valorized, while others are ridiculed or diminished.⁹

Part of what keeps men in check and in support of the *status quo*, part of what polices men, is the power of hegemonic masculinities, the gold standards of manhood. They provide models for men and boys to live up to. As Michael Kimmel notes, they provide a constant warning not to deviate.¹⁰ And, as a hegemonic form of personal and sexual identity for that very group which is also the more socially powerful of the sexes,

society as a work in progress. It is also a verb. Like the farmer who cultures plants or the biologist who cultures bacteria in the lab, culture is all about what the world’s citizens grow. The idea of culturing gendered relations of peace (and peace through transformed gender relations), is based on the premise of active and conscious interventions by governments, schools, religious institutions, families and communities to cultivate very different gender identities and relations. See, for example, I. Brienes, R. Connell, and I. Eide, eds, *Male roles, masculinities, and violence: a culture of peace perspective*, (Paris: UNESCO, 2000).

8. A similar point is made in the draft working document, “Gender Socialization in Early Childhood,” Education and Gender Sectors, Program Division, January 31, 2002.

9. R.W. Connell, *Gender and Power*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987).

10. Michael Kimmel, “Masculinity as Homophobia: Fear, Shame, and Silence in the Construction of Gender Identity,” in Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman, (eds), *Theorizing Masculinities*, (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1994), pp. 119-141.

hegemonic masculinities are also an enormous prop to other structures and ideologies of social power.

The emergence of a growing body of international research is beginning to draw a picture of varied and culturally-specific masculinities. Meanwhile, historical research points to constant and ongoing changes in our definitions of masculinity and in the relationship between different masculinities. Masculinity is far from a fixed or timeless entity.¹¹

Jeff Hearn has suggested that we must focus not only on diverse masculinities but on diverse men's practises. Patriarchy is not constituted simply through identities, but lived realities.¹² While one man might beat his wife, his neighbour might work publicly against wife abuse. While one man terrorizes his children, another might be a loving and nurturing individual. Furthermore, just as the mechanisms for experiencing power and powerlessness will be guided by the complex set of factors in a man's life, the behaviours of men will have multiple determinations.

Men are certainly not a homogeneous lot. Our strategies of change must be guided and fine tuned not only to reach diverse men, but to be able to identify potential allies and possible rifts in the camp of men.

This knowledge has enormous implications: For one thing, it allows us to more clearly see that traditional forms of social and political analysis have mis-labelled or only partially labelled phenomena or personal characteristics that have impeded development. The actions of certain national leaders, for example, might not only be to advance particular economic or social, religious or personal interests, but might also express the mandate of a hegemonic masculinity or, in the another case, of a figure desperate to show his power within the masculine equation.

11. The diversity of masculinities is being explored in an emerging body of literature. See, for example, the journal *Men and Masculinities* (Sage Publications), as well as a new book series by Zed Books on global masculinities. One useful bibliographic source is Michael Flood's on-line *The Men's Bibliography*, <http://www.xyonline.net/mensbiblio/index.html>.

12. Jeff Hearn, "Is Masculinity Dead? A Critique of the Concept of Masculinity/masculinities," in M. Mac an Ghail, ed., *Understanding Masculinities*, (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1996), pp. 202-217.

It also means that we can better appreciate the uneven rewards different men receive from patriarchy. A Brahmin male is not a *dailit* male. An urban black working class man in London is not a white stock trader in the City. The camp of men is not a unified camp.

There are fissures in the structures of patriarchy: a GAD agenda must find ways to address and exploit these differences.

v. Manhood equals power. In spite of such difference – both over time and within and between cultures – there are some common elements. In particular, a common feature of many definitions of manhood, both hegemonic and not, is the equation of manhood with power. Although “power” can be experienced in many different ways, from the “power of love” to the “power to control,” within male-dominated societies, the latter tends to dominate. Power to control may be experienced physically or financially, emotionally or intellectually, politically or through brute force.

This equation of masculinity with power is one internalized by boys into their developing personalities. In the patriarchal universe, power is equated with a capacity to exercise control. Hegemonic masculinities are ones in which such power is displayed, at least within the terms of that particular culture or sub-culture. Perhaps a boy embraces this power because it gives him privileges and advantages that girls do not usually enjoy or, perhaps it is simply a means that allows him to feel strong, capable, and grown up. Whatever it is, the source of this power is in his surrounding society, although he quickly learns to exercise it as his own. And so, the collective power of men is perpetuated only in part through social and cultural institutions and structures. It is also given life and given an individual mechanism of perpetuation through the individual men who come to embody and thus individually represent and reproduce a particular definition of power.

This is critical for our work for it suggests that, whatever cultural differences we observe, whatever the cross-cultural specificities to manhood and masculine experiences, there are common patterns, themes, and challenges. Thus we can make cross-cultural generalizations at the same time as being sensitive to the unique gender relations and features of each culture.

vi. Men’s contradictory experiences of power. Both the fissures and commonalities between different men and groups of men become particularly apparent when we draw

on the concept of men's contradictory experiences of power. This concept is also critical to understand the potential of men embracing gender equality.¹³

Men and boys do enjoy social power, many forms of privilege, and a sense of often-unconscious entitlement by virtue of being male. But the way we have set up that world of power causes immense pain, isolation, and alienation not only for women, but also for men. This is not to equate men's pain with the systemic and systematic forms of women's oppression. Rather, it is to say that men's worldly power comes with a price for them. This combination of power and pain, this hidden story in the lives of men, is what I have called men's contradictory experiences of power.

The key to this notion is the relationship between men's power and their experiences of pain, fear, and alienation. The existence of men's pain cannot be an excuse for acts of violence or oppression at the hands of men. However, it might enable us to reach out to men with compassion and a message of change even as we are highly critical of particular actions and beliefs.

In more concrete terms, the acquisition of hegemonic (and most subordinate) masculinities is a process through which men come to at least partially suppress a range of emotions, needs, and possibilities, such as nurturing, receptivity, empathy, and compassion, which are associated with femininity and experienced as inconsistent with the power of manhood. These emotions and needs don't disappear; they are simply held in check or not allowed to play as full a role in men's lives as would be healthy for themselves and those around them.¹⁴

The ideals of dominant masculinities are, ultimately, childhood pictures of omnipotence, and, as such, are impossible to attain. Surface appearances aside, no man is completely able to live up to these ideals and images.

13. This section is based on text in Michael Kaufman, "Men, Feminism, and Men's Contradictory Experiences of Power," *op. cit.* and Michael Kaufman, *Cracking the Armour: Power, Pain and the Lives of Men*, (Toronto: Penguin, 1993).

14. Jeff Hearn suggests that what we think of as masculinity is the result of the way our power and our alienation combine. Our alienation increases the lonely pursuit of power and emphasizes our belief that power requires an ability to be detached and distant. Jeff Hearn, *The Gender of Oppression*, (Brighton: Wheatsheaf Books, 1987).

As men's power is challenged by women, those things that once came as a compensation or a life-long distraction from any potential pain are progressively reduced or, at least, are called into question. In other words, if gender is about power, then as actual relations of power between men and women, and between different groups of men, start to shift, then our experiences of gender and our gender definitions must also begin to change. The process of gender work is ongoing and includes this process of reformulation and upheaval.

The notion of contradictory experiences of power, in the plural, provides an analytical tool for integrating issues of race, class, age, and ethnicity into the heart of work with men and boys within a GAD framework. It allows us to empathetically relate to a range of men's experiences, to understand that men's power is non-linear and subject to a variety of social and psychological forces. It suggests forms of analysis and action based on an understanding that the behavior of any group of men is the result of an often contradictory insertion into various hierarchies of power. It belies any notion that our identities and experiences as men can be separated from our identities and experiences based on the color of our skin or our class background or our sexual orientation. It therefore suggests that struggling against racism or class privilege, for example, are integral to a struggle to transform contemporary gender relations and vice-versa.

This analysis suggests a peculiar relationship to the stated tasks of feminism. It is true that addressing and involving men and boys has an aim of supporting women's struggles and challenging men's power over women. At the same time, once we take account of the impact of a male-dominated society on men themselves, then the project becomes more broad, not just "pro-feminist" but something that is "anti-sexist" (in the sense that sexist ideas and practices effect both women and men, even if very differently), "anti-patriarchal," and "anti-masculinist" (while being clearly male-affirmative, just as it is female-affirmative.)

Today, the rewards of hegemonic masculinity are simply not enough to compensate for the pain in the lives of so many men. The men in a growing number of cultures are discovering that the pain of trying to conform and live up to the impossible standards of manhood outweigh the rewards they currently receive. In other words, patriarchy isn't only a problem for women. The great paradox of our patriarchal culture (especially since experiencing significant challenges from women) is that the damaging forms of masculinity within our male-dominated society are damaging not only for women, but for men as well.

The implication of all this is that the feminist challenge to men's power has the potential of liberating men and helping more men discover new ways of being men. Whatever privileges and forms of power men will lose, they will be increasingly compensated by the end to the pain, fear, dysfunctional forms of behavior, sense of loss, and violence experienced at the hands of other men, violence men inflict on themselves, endless pressure to perform and succeed, and the sheer impossibility of living up to a patriarchal society's masculine ideals.

This suggests not only diverse relation to patriarchy but a subjective basis for men's embrace of change. Our awareness of men's contradictory experiences of power gives us the tools to simultaneously challenge men's power and speak to men's pain. It is the basis for a politics of compassion and for enlisting men's support for a revolution that is challenging the most basic and long-lasting structures of human civilization. I explore these implications below.

vii. Crisis of masculinity and globalization of feminist discourses. From the beginning of the women's movement in the mid-1850s, progress was not only slow but limited to a handful of countries. While the rebirth of the movement in the late 1960's saw the beginning of explosive change in a growing but still relatively limited number of countries (especially in western Europe, North America, and Australia), by the 1980's and particularly through the 1990's, the women's movement became a truly international movement and women's issues came onto the agenda in most parts of the world.

This is, indeed, one aspect of globalization that is extremely positive. The rapid diffusion of information and ideas, combined with the possibilities of rapid international responses means a reduction in isolation for women around the world. This trend will only increase in the future.

This ubiquitous spread of concern for women's issues and the rise of empowerment of women are one set of factors underlying what has been referred to as a crisis of masculinity. Simply put, men's power has been challenged. The combination of this with the availability of options for family planning in many countries, changes the gender equation in the home and community. Meanwhile, the economic and social changes associated with globalization or simply with development have eroded some of the economic and social stability previously enjoyed by men. No longer can many men

automatically assume the economic and social privileges their fathers or grandfathers enjoyed.

This combination of the globalization of feminist discourses and the crisis of masculinity provides significant dangers (the ongoing backlash against feminism, religious fundamentalisms, the displacement of the crisis into ethnic hatred or war-mongering). But it also provides unprecedented opportunities:

- Efforts to redress gender imbalances and discrimination are increasingly part of the social and cultural mainstream;
- Men and boys are increasingly looking for answers to the problems that confront them (even if such a search doesn't necessarily take them in a positive or healthy direction);
- Just as the women's movement and the themes associated with the end of discrimination against women have emerged as international themes, so too do we see the diffusion of approaches and themes concerning men and masculinities.

5. THE AIM FRAMEWORK: STRATEGICALLY ADDRESSING AND INVOLVING MEN AND BOYS

All of the above strongly points to the need to address men and boys because they participate in the gender equation and because their lives are shaped by gender. Consciously and unconsciously, they individually reproduce gender privilege in all facets of their lives. What's more, since they still control social discourse and resources, we must address men and boys if we want to ensure success at changing our gender order and ending discrimination against women and girls.

But addressing men is not enough. In a sense, women have long addressed men, but with only partial success. Men must also be involved in struggles for gender equality and they must help define the nature of that participation.¹⁵ One reason for the effectiveness of

15. For a discussion of how defining the nature of one's participation is critical for effective popular participation, see, Michael Kaufman, "Community Power, Grass-Roots Democracy, and the Transformation of Social Life," (pp. 1-24) and "Differential Participation: Men, Women and Popular Power," (pp. 151-170) in Michael Kaufman and Haroldo Dilla, eds., *Community Power and Grass-roots Democracy: The Transformation of Social Life* (London: Zed Books, 1997).

actual participation is that through participation, men and boys will feel a sense of “ownership” in the problem. This doesn’t mean that it is their issue as opposed to women’s, nor that resources should be directed away from women, women’s organizations, or programs aimed at or involving women. Rather it is simply a recognition that many issues that have been cast as “women’s issues” are very much “men’s issues” as well: *men’s* violence against women, the relative absence of *men* from childcare and domestic work, and so forth.

Through active involvement, boys and men will feel they have a personal relationship to the issues and a stake in the process of change. Such a feeling, in turn, will unleash greater energies and unlock new resources. This is the way to address the very real concern about scarce resources getting siphoned off by/to men and boys. Developing awareness of problems and a personal relationship to the issues means that increasing numbers of men will develop a commitment to redirecting resources towards measures promote gender equality. And increasing numbers of men will learn to address the gender dimensions of all issues.

A strategic approach to men and boys

The AIM framework is a strategic approach because the goal isn’t to work with men and boys *per se*. Rather it is to launch particular initiatives or develop new components of existing programs to mobilize men and boys to work on their own and in partnership with women and girls to transform destructive masculinities, end oppressive gender relations, and promote gender equity and equality.¹⁶

This framework is based on the eight conceptual tools listed above. More specifically, the AIM framework is based on the following strategies and guiding principles.

A. The Primacy of Women’s Oppression and Struggles for Equality and Equity

While our framework takes into account men’s experiences of pain, loss and alienation, we start with the primacy of men’s power and privilege. We do so not for ideological

16. Of course there are many programs that might address men and boys *per se* – one can imagine a program on men’s specific health concerns – and, while some of these will certainly benefit from the AIM framework, that is not the particular focus of this paper.

reasons, but because the particular nature and character of the negative impact of patriarchy on men is precisely the result of the way that men have learned to exercise individual and social power, and the contradictory experiences of that power.

Thus we are not equating women's oppression with this negative fallout for men. Only by dismantling the gendered hierarchy and the institutions of patriarchy, will men be able to escape their pain. This is why I suggested that we are not necessarily addressing men and boys *per se* in the manner we might address women and girls *per se*.¹⁷

This has practical consequences for everything from the allocation of scarce resources to the language we use when addressing men and boys. While we acknowledge their frustrations and fears, we clearly state that only by challenging their power and privileges will they (and the world) be able to move forward.

Thus, "address and involve" is not counterposed to challenging and confronting men and boys about their attitudes, behaviours, and forms of entrenched privilege and power. Rather, it is the means to successfully challenge them.

B. Navigate Through Men's Fear

We must never underestimate the huge individual investment that men can make in maintaining their masculinity and maintaining power and control. Struggling for gender equality puts us up against not only structures of patriarchy, but also the individual incorporation of patriarchal definitions and relations into the psyches of men. Men and boys resist change not only because of their learned ideologies and assumptions or even because of their privileges as men; they *also* do so because their whole experiences of themselves and the surrounding world often leads to a struggle to hold onto their ephemeral purchase on power and control. Since power is equated with manhood, loss of power equals a loss of manhood.

17. When it comes to boys, the issue is more ambiguous. Although in some cultures boys are given tangible privileges from a very early age (such as access to more food, escape from certain domestic tasks), the key point is that before they are mature enough to assess these unequal privileges and make decisions to confront them, we can not hold a young boy responsible for the differential treatment he might enjoy. In that sense our efforts with young children are absolutely parallel: we are addressing the needs of young girls and boys *per se*.

One practical consequence is this: challenging men and boys can create an irrational reaction based on fear. Fear among those to whom society has given disproportionate power and a license to exercise that power is a dangerous thing.

Thus our approaches must find ways to appeal to some of the very values we are ultimately challenging. How we can navigate this challenge? One example, if we're working to end violence against women, is trying to reach men and boys based on the notion that "You have the power to end violence against women in your community." We are appealing to men's notion that they are powerful, but we are here subverting the notion of power, from one of domination to the power to care and nurture.

This also highlights the importance of relating to men's own experiences. If we are able, for example, to relate to men's and boy's contradictory experiences of power, we are much more likely to gain a hearing by those males about the negative consequences for women and girls of the ways we have defined men's power. A head-on challenge to men's power is often necessary, but it often provokes fear and backlash; a challenge to their power through hooking into men's own contradictory experiences can promote understanding of their own links to the issues and problems we are confronting and how they too will benefit from change (in spite of the privileges they stand to lose.) This is not to suggest we only promote change when it is palatable to men; rather a strategy to promote gender equality and human rights for women will be most effective if and when we are able to neutralize men's fears and find ways for them to embrace change.

C. Use the language of responsibility rather than blame.

In our work to promote gender equality within an AIM framework, we try to avoid a language that leaves all men and boys feeling blamed because this will simply not be effective. Of course, we hold individual men and male-dominated institutions responsible for their actions. But our general orientation should be to promote a positive responsibility for change.

The language of generalized blame reduces sexism to individual relations and individual identity, rather than understanding patriarchy and sexism as systemic and institutional as well. Nor is blame pedagogically useful. Language that leaves males feeling blamed for things they haven't done, or for things they were taught to do, or guilty for the sins of other men, simply will alienate most boys and men. It will promote backlash. It will push these individuals up against a wall. It just won't get us anywhere.

We can draw on this, for example, in addressing violence against women. While all men – a majority of men in many parts of the world – do *not* commit individual acts of violence against women, *all men must take responsibility for helping end the problem*. This is because manhood is constructed in the eyes of men and because men have long controlled the instruments of opinion-making, law-making and administration of justice. That violence will continue so long as some men encourage displays of violence and so long as other men do not challenge these versions of manhood or challenge the individual or social acts of violence, or challenge society’s permission of the violence,.

Or let’s think about promoting men’s responsibilities for childcare and domestic work. Men in most cultures have grown up with the belief that earning a living or tending their fields is precisely the way they support their family. Their economic responsibility is their nurturing responsibility. They likely had no models themselves for men performing domestic work. Do we blame them for the way they were raised and the assumptions they have about their roles? I would say no. At the same time we should challenge men to be responsible for the choices they now make. Thus, we can talk about the importance of men taking on new responsibilities in the home, for the education and health needs of their children, and of the many positive benefits of this to children, women, and men themselves.

D. Create and nurture groups of men

Any doubts a man has as an individual are often quickly dismissed by he himself because, in isolation from other men, a man assumes that he alone does not live up to the images and demands of manhood. The conflict between his individual reality and his gendered expectations is one basic reason why a man engages in behaviours that are destructive to himself and those around him. Simply put, he is trying to prove his manhood. This is why developing a social action approach in a GAD framework is entirely consistent with (and perhaps ultimately requires) men developing supportive organizations, support groups, and informal ties of intimacy with other men. Such groups and individual practices allow men to look at their individual processes of gender work, how they have all been mis-shaped by our patriarchal system. It allows them to examine their own contradictory relationships to men’s power. It allows them to overcome the homophobic fear that prevents most men from speaking out and challenging sexism. It can give them a new and different sense of strength.

The promotion of men's groups within a GAD framework is to develop forms of organization that explicitly and implicitly challenge "the old boys' networks" and the institutions of patriarchy. Although in practise there may be challenges and conflicts between men's and women's organizations, these can be part of the healthy lived reality of changing gender relations.

E. Importance of Men's and Boys' Voices

Part of the reality of sexism is the privileging of the male voice. Furthermore, men gauge their manhood in the eyes of men, boys gauge their manhood in the eyes of other boys and men. Thus it is critical that we mobilize and use the voices of men to speak to other men and boys. This might be the voices of male celebrities or it might simply be a man or boy respected among his peers.

More than just their voice (in the sense of a male voice on a radio advertisement, or a male sports hero on a poster) is the involvement of boys and men in helping design the message to their peers. This sort of involvement is critical for pinpointing and focussing messages.

It may seem a sexist decision to say we need to use men's voices to reach men with the goal of listening to women's voices and concerns, but it actually is a practical choice thrust on us by a sexist reality. If we want to change that reality, we must wade in with both feet and find the language, approaches and techniques that will actually reach and change the behaviour of boys and men.

F. Create a Politics of Compassion

In our public work to end the discrimination and oppression of women, we mustn't shrink back from a politics of compassion when we address men and boys and challenge them to support the human rights of women and girls. This means never losing sight of the negative impact of contemporary patriarchy on men and boys themselves even if our framework puts as central the oppression of women. It means avoiding the language of generalized guilt and blame and substituting for it the language of taking responsibility for ones own actions and for promoting change.

Such a politics of compassion is only possible if we begin from the sex/gender distinction. If patriarchy and its symptoms were a biological fiat then not only would the

problems be virtually intractable, but punishment, repression, blame, and guilt would seem to be the necessary corollaries. But if we start with the assumption that the problems are ones of gender – and that gender refers to particular relations of power that are socially-structured and individually-embodied – then we are able to be simultaneously critical of men’s collective power and the behavior and attitudes of individual men *and* to be male affirmative, to say that demolishing patriarchy will enhance the lives of men, that change is a win-win situation but which requires men giving up forms of privilege, power, and control.

On the psycho-dynamic level – the realm in which we can witness the interplay between social movements and the individual psyche – the challenge of feminism to men is one of dislodging the hegemonic masculine psyche. This isn’t a psychological interpretation of change because it is the social challenge to men’s power and the actual reduction of men’s social power that is the source of change. What was once a secure relationship between power over others/control over oneself/and the suppression of a range of men’s own needs and emotions – is under attack. What had felt stable, natural, and right is being revealed as both a source of oppression for others and the prime source of anguish and disquietude by men themselves.

G. Finding Entry Points to Particular Age Groups.

We might want to talk, for example, with teenaged boys about the problem of wife assault. This is important for those who have, at some point of their life, witnessed violence against their mother. It is important they hear a message about its unacceptability and it is important they hear this from men as well as from women. It is also important that we plant a seed that might grow in the minds of all young men in the years ahead. However, if we really wish to galvanize teenaged boys, if we really want to reach them, if we really want to have a life-long impact on their relations with women, then the key entry point might be on building healthy relationships. This is the way these young men can really understand the immediate relevancy of the issue of violence against women. Such work would focus on communication in relationships, respect, sexual responsibility, sexual violence, and emotional and verbal abuse.

For younger boys, our initiatives might even appear more indirect. In the years where they are forming their self-identity as men, it is critical we intervene with work focussed on gender identity. Here we have an opportunity to shape their attitudes, behaviours, and

expectations. Our work might productively focus on themes such as respect and conflict resolution. It might be on basic nurturing and domestic skills with the emphasis put on self-sufficiency, something every child aspires to.

The point here is the challenge of taking a life-cycle approach. This requires understanding what are, at different ages, the specific links of boys to gender issues.

H. Avoid generalizations and stereotypes

This is closely tied to the earlier point about the importance of using language of responsibility rather than blame; its implications are seen most acutely in work to end violence against women. Following the lead of practitioners such as Dale Hurst, let us avoid terms such as “violent man” or “perpetrator.” It is preferable to use the more awkward, but more accurate phrase, “a man who uses violence against women.” This is because most such men selectively use violence. The man who goes home and beats his wife may be the most pleasant man on earth to his workmates and neighbours. Very little of his life is defined by “violence” and he is unlikely to be violent in a sociopathic sense. In fact, the whole thrust of feminist scholarship on men’s violence is to stress how “normal” it has become. Even that man who beats his wife or children, might at another moment be caring to them, he might work hard because he sees his job as supporting his wife and children. He’s not simply a “perpetrator” of violence against a woman, he may also be a perpetrator of love and responsibility. (I wouldn’t want to generalize about this either: he may well be someone who is consistently and overwhelmingly violent and domineering in his relations with his wife and children where glimmers of love are distant and rare.)

The point here isn’t to paint him as the hero of this story. But neither should we paint most such men as monsters (although we might paint certain of their actions as monstrous.) Rather it is to paint him as a flawed human being who does terrible things that he must be held accountable for. The point here is one of terminology and its implications for redress. If we use the terms “violent man” or “perpetrator” we are reducing him to one aspect of his behaviour and personality and we are saying that he is different than other men.

Rather, we must understand that the factors that lead that individual man to commit a seemingly individual act of violence are not about personal pathology (except in rare cases), but are an extreme expression of what we consider normal masculinity. The

awkward terminology “a man who uses violence against a woman” puts responsibility on that man while, at the same time, does not allow society in general (or men in particular), to absolve itself of responsibility for addressing the underlying causes of that one man’s attitudes and actions.

Such a pedagogy of responsibility improves our chances of actually reaching those men.

I. Work with men and boys to develop their emotional life and a language of emotions.

As noted above, one of the common threads in the lives of many men is a reduced sense of empathy, a hampered language of emotions, and relative lack of awareness of both their own emotions and the feelings of those around them. The root of this appears to lie in the intragenerational absence of men from nurturing roles with children.¹⁸ While the solution requires long-term changes in the family and the economy, in attitudes and behaviours of men and women, one of the principles of the AIM framework is a different sort of engagement with emotions.

This means different things within different forms of intervention. It might mean interventions that directly teach nurturing skills to boys or prospective fathers, or teach conflict resolution skills (that require emotional awareness). Or it might be workshops and support groups that put boys or men in situations where they are engaged in a process where their normal barriers come down and they learn to think and speak openly about their feelings and their lives. Or it can mean, within campaigns or political action organizations, careful attention to avoid the normal dynamics of men in organizations and, instead, adopting principles and forms of organization that promote cooperation and trust (especially through organizational structures that are as non-hierarchical as possible), and emotional openness among men.

18. See Nancy Chodorow, *The Reproduction of Mothering* (Berkeley: University of California, 1978), Dorothy Dinnerstein, *The Mermaid and the Minotaur* (New York: Harper Colophon, 1977), Jessica Benjamin, *The Bonds of Love* (New York: Random House, 1988), and Gad Horowitz, *Repression. Basic and Surplus Repression in Psychoanalytic Theory* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977), and Michael Kaufman, *Cracking the Armour*, *op. cit.*, chapter 3.

J. Measure men’s attitudinal and behavioral changes – the GEM scale. Change needn’t be measured for it to take place. However, our efforts could be greatly aided if we were to find better ways to measure the effectiveness of new initiatives aimed at men and boys.

What appears to be the first such tool, currently under development by Instituto Promundo in Brazil and the Horizons Program (The Population Council) in the US, is the gender equitable norms and behaviour in men (GEM) scale.

The scale is “a series of attitude questions, some affirming traditional patriarchal beliefs or values, and others affirming more gender equitable beliefs. The questions were combined together and in testing with a random sample of men in Brazil, were valid (that is they consistently varied together), and were highly correlated with a number of key behaviours (self-reported use of violence against women and self-reported condom use.) Thus, they are useful for assessing where men are on these issues, as well as measuring changes as a result of men participating in a given program activity. The scale contains items that were developed out of a specific context. What is more gender-equitable in a given setting may be different or impossible to achieve in other settings.”¹⁹

19. Personal correspondence from Gary Barker. In the Brazilian context, the Horizons Program and Instituto Promundo operationalized the term “gender equitable” to refer to young men who: “1) Are respectful in their relationships with young women and other young men and currently seek relationships based on equality and intimacy rather than sexual conquest and believe that men and women have equal rights, and that women have as much sexual desire and ‘right’ to sexual agency as do men. 2) Would and do seek to be involved fathers, such as believing that they should take financial and at least some caregiving responsibility for their children. They have shown this involvement by providing at least some child care, showing concern for providing financially for the child, and/or take an active role in caring for their child’s health. 3) Assume some responsibility for reproductive health and disease prevention issues, such as a belief that both members of the couple should share the responsibility, and assisting their partner with the purchase of condoms. 4) Are opposed to violence against women in their intimate relationships. This may include young men who report having been violent toward a female partner in the past, but who currently believe that violence against women is not acceptable behavior, and who do not condone this behavior by other men.” Gary Barker and Julie Pulerwitz, “Promoting More Gender-Equitable Norms and Behavior Among Young Men as a Strategy for HIV/AIDS Prevention,” (Project Proposal by Instituto Promundo and The Population Council, 2001)

The practical value of such a scale is that it might help us measure the impact of different programs and interventions. Right now, most work in the area is carried out in an intuitive fashion. Furthermore, such a scale might help us appreciate the process of transition, that it isn't simply a matter of an individual boy or man being "non-sexist" or "gender equitable," but rather where he is in a process of transition.

6. COMPREHENSIVE AND DIVERSE RESPONSES WITHIN THE AIM FRAMEWORK

The set of conceptual tools and the strategies and guiding principles that define the AIM framework don't answer the question of exactly *what* to do although it is suggestive at times. The simple answer to that is extremely broad.

Because of the varied structures of and supports to a patriarchal society, comprising the state, religious and cultural institutions and traditions, family structures and practices, the structure of the economy and the gendered division of labour, individual psychologies, and the articulation of the structures of gender with other structures and ideologies, there is no magic program. For any one problem, say violence against women or the need to increase fathers' participation in parenting and change gender relations in the home, we need comprehensive and diverse responses.

Where possible, we would hope that responses in one programmatic area would be integrated. But that usually is not the case for the simple reason that different organizations will take on different parts of the solution.

Let me illustrate this with an example, the goal of increasing men's involvement as fathers, and promoting responsible and nurturing fatherhood. Here are just some of the projects, programs, campaigns that would advance this goal within an AIM framework:

- research and collect data on father's involvement, on the culturally and economic specific barriers to greater involvement, etc.
- promote men's involvement in family planning;
- promote legal changes (where necessary) and education of health-care providers to encourage men's participation in prenatal preparation and childbirth;
- enact government policies to promote paternal leave, conduct public education, and work with employers and trade unions to promote the benefits of this leave;

- enact laws to enforce child support in cases of separation;
- conduct public awareness programs to promote fathers' involvement in childrearing;
- develop and fund school-based programs to teach nurturing skills to boys;
- carry out community-based reproductive health education with married men to promote sexual responsibility;
- support diverse programs to end violence against women and children, most of which takes place in the home.
- support increased social services, including childcare, so families have the help they require;
- mount public education programs to promote men's involvement in domestic tasks;
- encourage international organizations and governments to provide more financial and technical assistance to the above.²⁰

7. TYPOLOGY AND EXAMPLES OF EFFORTS TO ADDRESS AND INVOLVE BOYS AND MEN

Ten years ago, perhaps even five, one could have written a short paper summarizing various programs and projects that are, implicitly, within an AIM framework. Now, we are in the midst of an explosion of efforts and approaches. It is well beyond the scope of this paper to catalogue, let alone evaluate, the thousands of initiatives around the world addressing and involving men and boys for gender equality.

However, I would like to suggest a schema for grouping programs and give a few examples of some best practises that fall within each:

20. A 1997 UNICEF publication, "Role of Men in the Lives of Children," cites several programmatic examples of strategies to more positively involve men in the lives of children. (Interdivisional Ad Hoc Working Group on Men and Families, Dec. 1, 1997)

- Level One: Addressing Boys and Young Men Through Education and Government Policies to Involve Them in Self-Reflection, Behavioural and Attitudinal Change
- Level Two: Involving boys and men to educate and address their peers.
- Level Three: Involving boys and men in defining efforts to address men and boys.

There are no clear and hard lines between the three levels; virtually every program has some characteristics of another level (or has the potential to have some of its characteristics.) There is some suggestion of hierarchy of value or potential impact in that a level two effort will also include the features of level one and so forth; but a well-designed and well-carried-out level one program will have far more impact than a poorly designed or carried-out level three program.

Level One: Addressing Boys and Young Men Through Education and Government Policies to Involve Them in Behavioural and Attitudinal Change

Level One: Addressing Boys and Young Men Through Education and Government Policies to Involve Them in Behavioural and Attitudinal Change

The aim of Level One efforts are to promote behavioural change and/or changes of attitude among boys and young men. There is a basic amount of involvement in that, in some cases at least, boys and young men are drawn into a process of discussion, reflection, and soul-searching.

Most current efforts fall into this level. Here is a sample that illustrates, among other things, thematic and geographic diversity.

i. Educational Materials for Boys and Young Men for Educational and Community Settings: Of a number of examples here, some of the best are the materials of “Project H” developed by Instituto Promundo (Brazil) in partnership with PAPA and ECOS (Brazil) and Salud y Genero (Mexico). Their ‘Working with Young Men’ is a set of five manuals and an animated video for educators and health workers who work with young men. There are versions in Portuguese, Spanish and English with plans for adaptation in South and Southeast Asia. The five manuals cover sexuality and reproductive health; fatherhood and care giving; reason and emotions (which includes substance use and suicide); violence and peaceful coexistence; preventing and living with HIV/AIDS. The

manuals include an introduction to the issues and group exercises for both educators and adolescent boys. The accompanying animated video is without dialogue so it can be used in multiple settings and adapted to other languages. One feature of this set is that it appears to be the only such resource specifically aimed at young men that has undergone a rigorous field test (with a long-term impact evaluation study currently underway.) The developers of the manuals also conduct training for those who will use the manuals, although this is not mandatory.²¹

The Youth Relationships Project (YRP), another impressive effort for educating youth on healthy relationships and violence against women, is a program developed in London, Canada. The YRP is aimed at 14-16 year olds and includes components on woman abuse, violence, sexual assault, and date rape, as well as skill development (conflict resolution and communication) and social action. It was extensively tested over five years. It is structured to be offered by classroom teachers as well as by older students who have been trained in the materials; the model is for work with small groups of students in sex-segregated discussions.²²

A third example (for both male and females) is the three part Healthy Relationships Curriculum, developed by Men For Change (Canada). The three volumes, Dealing With Aggression, “Gender Equality and Media Awareness,” and “Forming Healthy Relationships” are respectively for use in Grades 7, 8, 9 (approximately 12-15 year olds.) Its student-centered activities are designed to assist youth in the development of a range of skills and attitudes necessary to form healthy and equitable relationships.²³

ii. Public and professional education on fatherhood

21. More information is available at www.promundo.org.br.

22. David A. Wolfe and Christine Wekerle, “Promoting Healthy, Non-violent Relationships Among At-risk Youth,” Final Report to the National Health Research and Development Program, February 22, 2001.

23. For more information: Men for Change (Halifax, Canada), info@m4c.ns.ca; FAX: (902) 457-4597, (902) 457-4351. www.m4c.ns.ca. Another example from Canada is the “Education and Action Kit” prepared by the White Ribbon Campaign (available in English and French), with exercises aimed at teenagers. www.whiteribbon.com.

The Mexican organizations Salud y Genero and CORIAC (Coletivo de Hombres por Relaciones Iqualitarias) with the support of UNICEF sponsored a national campaign of reflection on fatherhood called “How My Daddy Looks to Me.” In 1998 and 2000, school children in various parts of the country were asked to submit paintings and drawings, and 250,000 did so. These were widely displayed, posters and books which served as the basis for discussion and awareness-raising in schools and communities.²⁴

In Chile, el Centro de Investigación y Desarrollo de la Educación (CIDE) is promoting father’s involvement through a training manual and workshops with parents, social service providers and teachers.²⁵ In the United Kingdom, Oxfam’s Poverty Programme sees engaging men as fathers as an entry point to its work with men.²⁶

iii. Paternity Leave and Government Action to Encourage Involved Fathers:²⁷ A different level of initiative has been the important changes in the Nordic countries to promote father’s involvement in early childhood care. Under legislation in Sweden, for example, fathers and mothers can share ten months of paid parental leave with another month reserved for fathers as a specific incentive to encourage fathers’ participation. This program led to a dramatic increase in fathers taking parental leave, from 3 per cent in 1974 to 51 per cent in 1994. Similarly in Norway, responding to the fact that few men took advantage of parental leave, new rules stipulated that one of the twelve potential

24. “Cómo veo, a mi papá. Por una paternidad más padre,” Instituto Nacional de las Mujeres, 1998.

25. See, “Fatherhood in Action: work with educators on the importance of father’s involvement” <http://www.cide.cl/campos/fam-pa.htm>.” El Centro de Investigación y Desarrollo de la Educación, Casilla Postal 13608, Santiago 21, Chile, Tel: 6987153 Fax: 671 8051 <http://www.cide.cl/>

26 . See, Sue Smith, “Why men, why now?,” Oxfam UK Poverty Programme, <http://www.id21.org/zinter/id21zinter.exe?a=24&i=insights35art4&u=3e8d9d7e>

27. A useful article summarizing some of the current research and programs relating to fatherhood is, Graeme Russell, “Adopting a Global Perspective on Fatherhood,” in Bob Pease and Keith Pringle, eds., *A Man’s World: Changing Men’s Practices in a Globalized World*, (London: Zed Books, 2001).

months of parental leave could only be taken by the father and one of the twelve only by the mother. With this change, fathers' participation soared to 70 per cent.²⁸

In Australia, the government is supporting a range of community-based support services for men going through relationship breakdowns to help them re-establish more positive relationships with their ex-spouses and children. The British government has supported the NGO, Fathers Direct in its efforts to raise public awareness.

iv. Boys for babies: This low cost but imaginative program in Toronto, Canada treated boys as partners in change and took a positive approach that focussed on skill development. It sought to build alternative models of manhood and develop nurturing skills among 10 to 12 year old boys. Each year from 1982 to 1992, between 15 and 20 schools took part in an effort organized by one parent, with the support of teachers and parents. They matched each boy with a baby – either in a local daycare centre or younger siblings of the boys. Over the course of several weeks, the boys were taught basic caregiving skills, from holding to feeding to changing a diaper. From initial scepticism among each new group of boys, the program always became an instant success. In spite of the small cost, approximately \$400 per school per year, it was discontinued during a round of government cuts in funding to schools.²⁹

v. Public-awareness campaigns to end violence against women: This is the biggest single category and represents a huge range of initiatives including some within the AIM framework.

28. I. Haas N and P. Hwang, "Programs and Policies Promoting Women's Economic Equality and Men's Sharing of Child Care in Sweden," in I. Haas N, P. Hwang and G. Russell, eds, *Organizational Change and Gender Equity: International Perspectives on Fathers and Mothers in the Workplace*, (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2000). R.W. Connell, "Men, Masculinities and Violence," Keynote address to Seeking Solutions: Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Conference, Gold Coast, 5 September, 2001.

29. This might be seen as an example of the type of preparation for parenthood programmes recommended in the draft working document, "Gender Socialization in Early Childhood," UNICEF, Education and Gender Sectors, Program Division, January 31, 2002.

There are many excellent initiatives that explicitly address men and boys. However, in these efforts to encourage self-reflection and promote behavioural change, involvement is often limited to the presences of well-known men such as actors, musicians, writers, sports figures. Here are a few examples of dozens of such efforts:

- a poster and billboard campaign in Munich, Germany showing a football star brandishing a red card. The caption: “Red Card Against Men’s Violence.”
- in Sweden, a series of posters of various men, including a police chief, with messages against men’s violence;
- radio advertisements in Pakistan and the Phillippines as part of a White Ribbon Campaign (WRC);
- WRC posters on bus shelters in Beijing with a well-known male or a female actor holding out their hand in a “stop” signal with a message about ending violence against women in the home.
- WRC posters in Brazil depicting a football team of ordinary men and the caption, “Be Part of This Team. Men Against Violence Against Women.”
- a Nicaraguan poster by Association of Men Against Violence proclaims, “In our relationship, I am her partner, not her master.”
- In the United States, a number of local, regional and national men’s organizations distribute posters and awareness materials every year.

vi. Vietnam’s child vaccination program: Concerned about low rates of child immunization, UNICEF and Save the Children US sponsored a contest (called “facts for life”) to involve Vietnamese men and get them thinking about their responsibilities as fathers, especially in relation to the health of their children. In the end 47,000 men took part. In one province immunization increased by 90% and use of oral rehydration salts increased by 60%.³⁰

vii. Programs with men who use violence. Although this work was pioneered in the United States, there are now many different models around the world. The most

30. Yale/UNICEF Project, *The Role of Men in Families*, (UNICEF 1997), pp. 78-79.

prominent North American psychoeducational programs – the anger-management programs on one end of the spectrum and what have been described as the pro-feminist programs – are not ones I will focus of here because, in spite of their contributions and strengths, I do not feel they fit completely into the AIM framework.

Models that do, include those developed by Dale Hurst in Australia and Marius Raakil and his colleagues in Norway. The latter for example goes through a process of having a man (individually or in a group) focus on his violent behavior, then on taking responsibility for his actions, on the connection between personal history and present use of violence, and finally on the dangerous and destructive consequences of his violence behaviour.³¹ The former seeks to develop “community-based options and alternatives for men to access help to change violent behaviour, before the criminal justice system becomes involved.”³² The latter has been developed among both white working class and Aboriginal men in Australia, as well as in Mongolia by the National Centre Against Violence in Ulaanbaatar.

viii. Stopping the Spread of HIV/AIDS. Along with public awareness programs on domestic violence, this is the major area of international campaigns to address men and boys. A number of the project referred to elsewhere have a strong component of HIV/AIDS prevention work, but there are many other interesting examples, of which but one is the “Men, Sex and AIDS” project in Botswana which mobilizes volunteers to speak to teenaged and adult males. They visit schools and appear on radio talk shows, conduct workshops, and have organized a men against rape march. An important part of their educational work is carried out in the *sheebens*, the drinking spots in low income areas. They get permission from the woman owner to come in, then ask to join groups of

31. Marius Raakil, “A Norwegian Integrative Model for the Treatment of Men Who Batter,” Alternative to Violence (ATV), Oslo, Norway. Available from ATV, Korsgata # 28b, Oslo 0551, Norway, or by writing the author at: atv-alle@online.no.

32. Dale Hurst, “Transcultural Masculinities: Engagement Of Men In Domestic Violence Prevention: Key Issues,” Presentation to Violence Against Women Conference: Understanding the Complexities of Violence Against Women: Meanings-Culture-Difference, Sydney, 2002. Available from the author at P.O. Box 201, Trinity Beach, Queensland 4879, Australia, dalehurst@compuserve.com

men with an offer to buy a beer for them, and then guide them through an informal discussion on sex, STIs, and HIV, providing them with information along the way.³³

ix Living with HIV/AIDS and new models of manhood: The AIDS crisis is the crucible for new models of manhood. The rapid spread of HIV/AIDS in the gay community in North America led to the transformation of that community in terms of the emergence of new institutions and models of caregiving among men. Elsewhere, there are programs that consciously encourage this. For example, the Southern African AIDS Training Program (SAT) supports a program in Malawi to mobilize and train men to be home-based volunteer caregivers. These men are trained in tasks (such as bathing and basic health care) and also in counselling skills.³⁴

x. Support groups and workshops. Throughout the world, there are a growing number of groups for small numbers of men or boys, some meeting on an ongoing basis, others as part of a workshop, and yet others as part of a series over the course of several weeks. These groups work to raise awareness, promote self-reflection, and, in some cases, are tied in with promoting social action. Two, of many, examples are:

The Mexican organization, Salud y Genero, based in Veracruz and Quéretaro, has run men's workshops and other activities in 24 states in Mexico, as well as throughout Central America and Peru. Its workshops with men (it also does workshops with women)

33. Botswana National Youth Council, P/Bag BO 108 Gaborone, Botswana, 267 3922 110, FAX: 267 3922 899, msa@info.bw.

34. "Community Responses 1: Mobilizing Men as Home-Based Care Volunteers." at http://www.satregional.org/pubs/Community_Responses_1.pdf. SAT is a partnership program that supports a range of programs in Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe, and has a range of publications, including on mainstreaming gender in response to AIDS, and counselling guidelines on topics such as AIDS and domestic violence and on sexual abuse of children. SAT, 3 Luck Street P. O. Box 390 Kopje, Harare, Zimbabwe, 263 4 781-123, fax: 263 4 752-609, info@sat.org.zw, www.satregional.org. Also see, Robert Morrell, "Mobilising young men to care," <http://www.id21.org/education/EgveMorrell.html>

employ a number of exercises to give men the opportunity to examine their socialization and health issues, trying to develop greater self-awareness, emotional expression, and awareness of a range of gender issues in order to apply what they learn within their own lives. It is also now engaging in more train-the-trainer workshops.³⁵

The Association of Men Against Violence (which also runs a national public awareness campaign on VAW) runs workshops throughout Nicaragua on gender, masculinity and violence, set up as a series of five day-long workshops.³⁶

xi. Research and outreach on new models of masculinity: Research efforts, especially those leading to publications or other media resources, can be an effective way to address men. One breakthrough example was Ruth Finney Hayward's book, *Breaking the Earthenware Jar*, published by UNICEF. The significance of this book was not only in providing the first exhaustive account of the dimensions and contours of violence against women and girls in South Asia, but the documentation of efforts to end the violence and the lessons, implicit and explicit, coming out of those efforts. Apropos of involving men, one very notable feature, was that it treated men not only as part of the problem, but a key part of the solution. It included many men among the activists and practitioners it highlighted and discussed the importance of new models of masculinity.³⁷

Another example is the training and research project on HIV/AIDS carried out in Namibia over the past six years. Comparative research among three populations – in

35. Benno de Keijzer, Emma María Reyes, Olivia Aguilar, Gisela Sánchez and Gerardo Ayala, "Constructing New, Gender-Equitable IdentitiesSalud y Género'sWork With Men to Change Gender Norms and Prevent Violence," *Salud y Genero*, 2002. Carlos M. Palacios No. 59 Col. Venustiano Carranza, Xalapa, Ver. C.P. 91070, Mexico, tel: 228 8 18 93 24, salygen@edg.net.mx

36. Asociacion de Hombres Contra la Violencia , Apdo Postal 5242, Managua, Nicaragua, 505-249-46-97, ahcv@ibw.com.ni. Many of those who run these workshops were trained by Centre for Popular Education and Communications (Cantera), Repto. Pancasan, Apdo. A-52, De Plaza el Sol, 2c. al sur, 1c. arriba, Managua, Nicaragua. 505-277-5329, cantera@nicarao.org.ni, www.oneworld.org/cantera.

37. Ruth Finney Hayward, *Breaking the Earthenware Jar. Lessons from South Asia to End Violence Against Women and Girls*. Kathmandu: UNICEF, Regional Office for South Asia, 2000.

Owamboland (the epicenter of Namibia’s AIDS epidemic), among urban youth in the high schools of Windhoek, and among the pastoral Ju/’hoansi of the Nyae-Nyae Dobe – shows a high correlation between women’s empowerment/autonomy and low seropositive rates (among the latter group) and high rates among the very patriarchal culture of the Owambo people.³⁸

Level Two Efforts: Involving Boys and Men to Educate Their Peers

Level Two activities can be step forward in that they encourage a more widespread involvement in advocacy and educational efforts. Here are some examples:

i. Mobilizing men work to end FGM in Central and East Africa: A number of programs (including in Sudan, Gambia, Egypt and Senegal) working to end FGM and other harmful traditional practices, have made an explicit orientation to involve men. Community and religious leaders have been mobilized to speak out, lead petition drives, and issue religious declarations. In the case of Sudan, for example, the SNCTP is attempting to draw on religious leaders in other countries in an attempt to pressure local imams to issue a *fatwah* on the issue. In Senegal, Tostan organized a drive that has led to over 100 villages signing a declaration banning FGM, with male community, religious and political leaders playing an important role. BAFROW in Gambia has mobilized men as well as women to promote alternative coming-of-age ceremonies for girls. In Egypt, CEDPA has worked with community organizations to mobilize doctors and religious leaders, as well as other men and women from the community.³⁹

38. The project, by Richard B. Lee and his colleagues including Scholastika Iiping, Pombili Ipinge, and Ida Susser, involved a six year long training and research program. For further information: richardb.lee@utoronto.ca.

39. Sudan National Committee on Traditional Practices Affecting the Health of Women and Children (SNCTP), P.O Box 10418 Khartoum, Sudan, snctpiac5@hotmail.com, www.snctp.org. TOSTAN, BP 326, Thies, Senegal. www.tostan.org, info@tostan.org, 221-951-1051. The Foundation for Research on Women’s Health, Productivity and the Environment (BAFROW), 214 Tafsir Demba Mbye Road, Banjul, The Gambia, 220-225-270, bafrow@gamtel.gm. Centre for Development and Population Activities (CEDPA) 53 Manial Street, Suite 500, Manial El Rodah, Cairo, 11451, Egypt. 2-02-365-4567, cedpa@intouch.com, www.cedpa.org.

ii. Involving men and boys through media. In 1998, UNICEF and the South Asia regional offices of Save The Children (UK) supported the production of films on masculinities in Bangladesh, India, Nepal and Pakistan. The films, to address the experiences and processes related to masculinities, provided a platform to initiate a discourse with young people, especially boys and young men. These non-didactic films had the goal of starting a discourse at the general level of experience as a way into wide-ranging issues covering school, family, relationships, gender conflicts, abuse, violence, and HIV/AIDS. The films, with discussion guidelines, have been used in meetings and workshops throughout the region and beyond, but most particularly in India, where they've been screened in all major cities.⁴⁰

iii. Involving men and boys to educate their peers to end violence against women: There are diverse activities that promote a high degree of involvement by boys and men. Here are a few examples:

- on college and university campuses across the United States, male students train other male students to carry out public information campaigns including forums, information tables, leafleting, and posters;
- in Pakistan, the NGO ROZAN mobilizes and trains volunteers to be at gas stations distributing information to men on the WRC and the need for men to speak out on violence against women;
- in South Africa, a number of men's marches have directly involved men. Innovative educational initiatives (such as "guerrilla theatre" in bars) have sought to spark discussion and debate;
- in Nicaragua, in addition to radio and TV ads, there has been training of activists (primarily men) and ongoing distribution of pamphlets and educational materials in markets.
- in Cambodia, the Cambodian Men's Network and GADnet has organized hundreds of students and other community members to fan out to markets across the country to distribute white ribbons and a flyer that declared: "Violence against women is above all a men's problem which men themselves have to resolve: Stop

40. Indian filmmaker Rahul Roy took the lead in this project. For more information, contact: Rahul Roy, aakar@del3.vsnl.net.in and, at Save the Children (UK): Ranjan Poudyal, ranjan@scfscaro.mos.com.np,

all forms of discrimination against women. Stop domestic violence. Stop sex trafficking. Stop sexual harassment.”

- in Canada, a WRC poster features a headline, “These men want to put an end to violence against women” followed by 100 blank lines. Posters are put up in schools, stores, and workplaces for men and boys to sign. It is a collective gesture of breaking men’s silence and of taking a stand against violence. Some versions of the poster come pre-printed with the signatures of a 20 well-known Canadian men followed by blank lines. This poster has been adapted in other countries.

Level Three Efforts: Involving Boys and Men in

Defining Efforts to Address Men and Boys

There are few examples of Level Three efforts. Here “involving” means more than a learning activity that men or boys participate in or even facilitate. It means activities that boys and men can actually shape and direct. Of course a number of the activities and programs listed above have an element of that, in that they are developed by men’s organizations. But here I give examples of programs where involvement in defining activities is at their core.

i. The White Ribbon Campaign. The White Ribbon Campaign: The campaign aims to mobilize the voice of men and boys. Wearing or displaying a white ribbon is a public pledge never to commit, condone, nor remain silent about violence against women, and it is a call on governments and other institutions controlled by men to seriously address the issue. White Ribbon’s basic philosophy is that while not all men are responsible for committing violence against women, all men and boys must take responsibility for helping end it. It is non-partisan and attempts to include men from across the social and political spectrum. It works with women’s organizations and urges men to listen to the voices and concerns of women; it conducts public awareness campaigns and involves high-profile men in speaking out against the violence; it provides resources for work in schools.⁴¹

41. Begun in Canada in 1991, the White Ribbon Campaign has since spread – to varying degrees of public profile and activity – to become the largest effort in the world of men working to end violence against women. There are or have been WRC activities or use of the WRC symbol in at

In addition to a number of activities of the sort mentioned in previous sections, one of the most interesting features is its decentralized nature which aims at encouraging as much local initiative and involvement as possible. While a campaign in a particular community or school or country may draw on ideas from other campaigns, a basic tenant of the WRC is the importance of individuals and groups of men and boys (and in some cases, mixed groups of men and women, boys and girls) figuring out what will work best to reach the men and boys in their community. This has produced some idiosyncratic activities, but ones that are in synch with those around them: one school holds a male talent show to raise money for a woman's shelter, a sports team holds a benefit game, a group of students make a video, a church hangs a huge white ribbon from its steeple, trolley drivers hang ribbons from their vehicles, a condom manufacturer prints a white ribbon and the word "respect" on condom packages, a beer company inserts a white ribbon into every case of beer, a medical journal features a white ribbon on its cover, a corporation has a meeting for all its employees, a trade union distributes ribbons to miners coming out of a coal pit and another to workers streaming out of an auto plant, parliamentarians wear ribbons, and so forth.

The importance of these activities isn't only the activities themselves. The WRC aims to give boys and men the structure, the encouragement, and some tools to work as allies with girls and women to end violence against women.

ii. Conferences to promote men's involvement: There are a growing number of examples, but one particular conference provides a good example of directly promote men's initiative and involvement. UNICEF provided some financial support.

The Namibia National Men's Conference, which attracted 250 men in the year 2000, was the first of its kind in the world: a national conference to educate grassroots men about the problem of violence against women and for them to plan strategies to work to end the problem on return to their communities. Participants came from all over the country and ranged from their twenties to their seventies; they were respected elders, clergy or teachers, farmers, students, or unemployed. Only a minority arrived with an awareness of the issues and thus were very representative of the men in their communities.

least thirty-five countries, including, in Asia and the Middle East (Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Cambodia, China, India, Israel, Japan, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, and Vietnam), Europe (Austria, Belgium, Denmark, England, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Lithuania, Norway, Russia, Spain, and Sweden), Africa (Morocco, Namibia, South Africa), Latin America and the Caribbean (Brazil, Guyana, Nicaragua, Trinidad, Uruguay), the United States and Canada. For more information: www.whiteribbon.com

We decided at the outset of planning that this conference should depart from the usual formal conference format. Our goal was to actually involve men in a process of discussion and introspection, one that would allow them to relate the issue of violence against women to issues of masculinity, gender relations, and power in the family and community.

The conference was preceded by a careful planning process: a working group based in the capital of Windhoek, 25 consultative meetings throughout the country, and a facilitation training workshop on the day before the conference. The three day conference included presentations by male and female speakers but centered on small group discussions and facilitated exercises having to do with gender identity, power relations between the sexes, men's own contradictory experiences of power, and, of course, the problem of violence against women. On the final day, regional groups developed action plans.

In the months that followed, Namibia Men For Change was established and exists to this day. Regional and local groups have held demonstrations and meetings in villages and towns across the country, and have spoken in churches and schools.⁴²

iii. Networking potential of the new media. In its Virtual Seminar Series on "Men's Roles and Responsibilities in Ending Gender-Based Violence," INSTRAW conducted a collaborative on-line discussions in 2001 on causes of gender-based violence and working with men in order to end violence. Some 560 people from 46 different countries signed on to receive and, if they chose, to discuss six seminar papers and concluding remarks by the facilitators.⁴³

iv. Conferences and workshops to bring women and men together as allies. UNICEF's South Asia Regional Meeting on violence against women in October 1997 is a good example not only of bringing women and men together for discussion, but of involving both sexes in networking and planning. One of the themes of the conference, which brought together 120 women and men in Kathmandu, was the importance of new models of masculinity as part of the solution to violence against women.

7. Conclusion

42 . The report on this conference, "Namibian Men Against Violence Against Women: Report on the National Conference in Windhoek on 23-25 February 2000," is available at: <http://www.lac.org.na/deptproj/grap/default.htm#namec>

43. James Lang was the moderator of the discussion. The seminar papers and an archive of the entire discussion are at: <http://www.un-instraw.org/en/research/mensroles/index.html>. At the time of writing, another online discussion, "Building Partnerships to End Men's Violence," was being initiated in North America to be held between May and July 2003: www.endabuse.org/bpi.

These diverse examples, representing only a small portion of emerging national and international efforts, show the effervescence of activities to address and involve men and boys. The AIM framework provides an approach for planning, delivery, and evaluation; it provides a conceptual framework and a set of operating principles that can be enlisted, but also adapted and modified, in the years ahead.

Michael Kaufman

mk@michaelkaufman.com

www.michaelkaufman.com

Not to be reproduced without permission.