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Abstract

Often attempts to improve governance focus on the empowerment of women, assuming that the latter will somehow automatically generate better governance. Furthermore, extensive research has found that an increase in women’s empowerment and rights leads to lower levels of many forms of violence, including armed conflict, which can be considered the worst result of poor governance. This paper argues that while an increase in gender equality from a women’s empowerment perspective seems to lead to changes in governance and to reduce violence it’s not enough. We not only need to involve women to a larger extent, or look at structures and processes of governance, but we also need to look into the underlying norms. The norms underlying governance, structured and confirmed, are hegemonic and patriarchal norms. Research on masculinities does find strong correlations between patriarchal and hegemonic norms on masculinity on the one hand and poor governance on the other. It goes hand in hand with several forms of inequality, and positive attitudes to several types of violence, including armed conflict. Adding women and stir, still a largely favored approach in many development and especially post-conflict programs does not automatically generate good governance, not the least because by focusing on entitling and promoting women to what men traditionally have access to (and almost never the opposite), the traditionally masculine is still valued more than the traditionally feminine. The underlying inequality structures thus remain in place.

This paper wants to unpack the linkages between men and masculinities on the one hand and poor governance, including insecurity and violence, on the other. It will do so by going through the existing research in the fields of political science, sociology and social psychology. The paper will start with a discussion of the concept of masculinities and then move on to the concept of governance, including the normative notions of “good” and “poor” governance. It will then try to unpack how masculinities, and especially patriarchal and hegemonic norms on masculinities, are related to governance. The paper will finally examine how governance informed by patriarchal and hegemonic norms is related to violence and conflict and then conclude with a discussion on the importance of norms both for understanding and dealing with governance, violence and gender inequality.

Masculinity

Masculinity is a concept that encompasses how we think a “real” man should be, look, think and behave (Reeser, 2010). As there are many cultural and social norms on how an ideal man should be and behave there is thus not one single type of masculinity but rather a multitude of masculinities. Overall, norms on masculinity can be clustered in two groups: patriarchal or egalitarian (Whitehead, 2002).
Patriarchal norms stipulate that men are the dominant sex and should behave as such. They should be strong, proving how brave they are through risky behavior and competitions and not showing their emotions. Another important component of a patriarchal masculinity is its heterosexual nature, homosexuality not figuring in a patriarchal scheme of masculinity, homosexuals being often rejected as weak, women-like and not real men. According to a patriarchal understanding of masculinity, men should therefore not only dominate women but also weaker men – whatever that may include.

Egalitarian masculinities have not been studied to any large extent. In general the literature refers to egalitarian masculinities, and egalitarian norms, as opposite to patriarchal. A few attempts to define them have been made though. To start with, egalitarian men negotiates their masculinities in their relationships (Schneider, 2007) creating new norms that thrives on mutual benefits. Egalitarian masculinities involve notably emotional expressiveness, high levels of family involvement (Pyke, 1996), non-violence and no generalized roles (Rankhota, 2002). In this paper egalitarian masculinities and norms thereof further refers to norms and behavior favoring equality both between the sexes and among the sexes.

Norms of masculinity have been inventoried in the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI) (Mahalik , Locke, Ludlow, Diemer, Scott & Gottfried, 2003). The CMNI assesses levels of conformity to masculine norms in eleven categories: Winning, Emotional Control, Risk-Taking, Violence, Dominance, Playboy, Self-Reliance, Primacy of Work, Power Over Women, Disdain for Homosexuals, and Pursuit of Status. The CMNI is based on the idea that socially dominant groups shape the gender role norms that are communicated to individuals in a society. Individuals’ experiences of these gender role norms and their level of conformity to such norms are shaped by individual and group factors (e.g. personality, race/ethnicity), and there are costs and benefits for conforming and not conforming to gender role norms (Parent, Moradi, Rummell & Tokar, 2009).

As seen above the structures and processes involved in managing and governing our lives are informed by underlying patriarchal and hegemonic norms. Norms are strong, collective beliefs on what is right and wrong (Scott & Marshall, 2009) and can be seen as (in)formal guidelines for accepted and expected behavior, both of ourselves and of others (Feldman, 1984).

According to Connell (1995), patriarchal norms on masculinity can also be called hegemonic: men should not only dominate women, some men should also dominate other men. Hegemonic forms of masculinity as they are understood today developed from the advent of industrial capitalism and imperialism (Connell & Wood, 2005). The bourgeois masculinities brought forth by these processes had many local variations, from the colonial settler elite of Natal (Morrell, 2001) and the urban establishment of postcolonial Peru (Fuller, 2001) to the corporate employee of Japan (Dasgupta, 2003) and the industrial managers of Britain (Roper, 1994). These variations had important characteristics in common: association with authority; social conservatism; compulsory heterosexuality; integration with a family division of labor; strongly marked, symbolic gender differences; and an emotional – and other - distance between men and women. The very large majority of managers are still men, especially at the top levels of corporations and organizations (Hearn & Parkin, 2001). Managers have thus become, as argue Collinson and Hearn (1996), an important group for the understanding of modern masculinities.

Governance
There are many definitions of governance. A frequently used one proposes that governance is “the sum of the many ways individuals and institutions, public and private, manage their common affairs” (The Commission on Global Governance, 1995:2). Governance can be found at all levels of society, from local to global. While local governance is made up by different forms of local government and other local stakeholders, global governance is defined as states, international organizations, non-governmental organizations and transnational corporations participating at different levels and in different constellations in the creation and implementation of international rules with a global claim of validity (Rittberger & Zangl, 2003). The concept of governance is also used in the corporate sector as well as in connection with various other actors and activities such as irrigation, the environment etc. While governance can in itself be seen as a technical and rather neutral concept, the question is often put forward by organizations, institutions or individual actors of how governance should be, what type of governance would be good, which led to the development of a whole range of normative conceptualizations of “good” and “bad” governance.

Good governance was first put on the international agenda by a World Bank study in 1989 (World Bank, 1989). It is used in international development literature to describe various normative accounts of how public institutions ought to conduct public affairs and manage public resources. Unsurprisingly different organizations have defined good governance differently to promote different normative ends. Generally good governance means open and enlightened policy-making; accountable and transparent processes; capacity, effectiveness and efficiency; a professional ethos that combats corruption, bias, nepotism and personal gain; and strict financial control and management of funding. For more political organizations good governance further involves human rights, democracy, combatting poverty and inequality, responsiveness and accountability (Pienaar, 2009; de la Harpe, Rijken & Roos, 2008).

Poor governance is the opposite of good governance and involves notably corruption, inequalities, inefficiency, human rights abuse and general dysfunction (Rose-Ackerman, 2004; Kaufmann & Kraay, 2002). As poor government arguably is detrimental to both individuals and societies, creating poverty, inequalities, oppressions and violence it is important to look at the underlying norms informing the choices that lead to poor governance.

The relationship between patriarchal and hegemonic masculinities and governance

The literature puts forward many links between patriarchal masculinities and governance, a couple of which are rather obvious. Due to patriarchal norms women are often excluded from decision-making, from the household up to the highest levels of policymaking. Decisions made and policies implemented by governance institutions at global, national and local levels help to shape perceptions of the roles that women and men play in society, as well as determining their access to rights and resources. Involving women in defining these policies and processes, and in influencing the institutions that produce them, makes it more likely they will respond to the different needs and situations of both women and men, and contribute to gender equality (Brody, 2009). For instance, Caceres-Rodriguez (2013) found that the number of women police officers has a direct effect on the number of cases filed and the number arrests for sexual assault, meaning that gender can have a very direct influence on priorities. Reducing patriarchal norms thus have an impact on the way governance is carried out by involving women.
Furthermore, increased women representation in leadership ranks not only influences priorities but also has a material effect in the allocation of resources. For instance, Dolan (2002) found that women have different spending priorities than otherwise comparable men. In general, significantly more women than men believe that spending should be increased for child care, welfare programs, and aid to big cities to name a few. This is in line with the well-known tendency of women to be more inclined to vote to the left and men to the right, which in turn can be traced to gender norms, where social responsibility and welfare are considered to be “soft”, feminine issues (Mackay, Kenny & Chappell, 2010). Governance processes often exclude people with caring responsibilities - primarily women. The working arrangements of governance institutions are usually inflexible, making it difficult for women to balance their work with unpaid caring responsibilities. In turn, the processes designed to engage citizens in decision-making – such as participatory budgeting – can exclude women by failing to provide crèches or other facilities (Jones & Prezler-Marshall, 2012). Patriarchal norms excluding women from decision-making thus has a considerable impact on policies and resource allocations, leading to gender inequality in the socio-economic sector and to large social inequalities in general.

However, governance informed by patriarchal and hegemonic norms has other consequences than the obvious gender inequality related ones. Dominant forms of masculinity are associated with major forms of social power (Connell & Wood, 2005). Moreover, the most powerful institutions today, except only a few major states, are transnational corporations operating in global markets. Connell (1998) argued that these two facts should be put together and that the global corporate economy might be the setting for a new pattern of hegemonic masculinity, found particularly among globally mobile managers. Furthermore, what has been identified in the organizational and business literature as a dominant discourse of managerial masculinity focused on aggression, decisiveness, strength, efficiency, action and vision (Collinson & Hearn, 1996; Whitehead, 1999). Such norms obviously lead to a very specific type of governance and management, where short-term gain is primed over social equality and social justice.

Governance of global finance has a great influence on domestic finances, political unrest and ultimately on the lives of groups and individuals as the crisis a few years ago showed us. Griffin (2013) states that the relationship between ideas about responsibility, masculinities, and global finance is intricate and intimate. The global financial services industry is understood here as a sort of “boys’ club”, meaning a sphere where certain types of masculine subjectivity predominate and within which the prevalence, form and effects of dominant models of masculine behavior are important to consider (Griffin, 2013). The gendered nature of the financial industry makes it a community wherein certain groups and/or types of activity create and sustain a culture that offers incentives for, and rewards, certain types of behavior (e.g., aggression, competitiveness, individualism, risk taking), while delegitimizing others (Knyght , Kakabadse, Kakabadse & Kouzmin, 2011). Aggression, competitiveness and risk-taking are part of the Masculine Norms Inventory as seen above, making the global finance sector a stronghold of patriarchal and hegemonic masculinity.

An example of how traditional patriarchal and hegemonic norms can be made visible is through the clarification of their opposites as seen in the outspoken take-over of the Icelandic financial sector by women after the financial crisis that almost brought the island nation to bankruptcy. The focus of these new female financial leaders has been on what they qualify as feminine values: risk awareness; profit with social and environmental principals; emotional capital; straight talking and, independence
Patriarchal and hegemonic norms on masculinity do not only influence governance in the area of finance and corporate business. As a number of studies have pointed out, state policies such as welfare retrenchment have acted to create pools of low-waged female labor that have proven indispensable to state strategies of export-led industrialization through the attraction of foreign development investment (FDI) (Pearson, 2004; Kopinak, 1995; Bahramitash, 2005). An example of the gendered relationships between global capitalism and “developmental” states seeking to attract FDI has been provided by Ling (1999), who demonstrates how states in East Asia have promoted a particular vision of economic development that involved authoritarian, patriarchal–Confucian states pursuing economic development strategies that both confronted and incorporated elements of the dominant Western-centric neoliberal development paradigm. Ling discusses the notion of “hyper-masculinity” to convey the glorification of aggression, competition, accumulation, and power that are a hallmark of these states’ development strategies and thus impacts the different types and levels of governance in the region.

Patriarchal and hegemonic norms are not only linked to the rather visible behaviors associated with aggression, competition, risk-taking and power-hunger, they are also connected with a concept that is mostly perceived as neutral, namely professionalism. Kerfoot (2002) argues that professionalism has historically strongly overlapped with masculine discourses of management. She explains that the identity of professional is one associated with specialized knowledge, skill, emotional disengagement, instrumentality and rationality. Thus, the embodied discursive subject which is the ‘professional’ is the masculine/man/male. This can be linked to one of the arguments found in the governance literature today, namely that the private sector has a potential and capacity that is missing from the public sector (Jones & Little, 2000; Rai, 2004). This dichotomizing of the private and the public is gendered where the private sector is masculinized as efficient, decisive, robust and risk-taking, while the public sector is feminized as passive, inefficient, weak, and slow-moving (Little & Jones , 2000).

That governance is closely linked to patriarchal norms was further shown by Jones & Prezler-Marshall (2012). They list five gendered social institutions that cover a range of discriminatory sociocultural and patriarchal dimensions, thereby providing a number of useful entry points into the governance challenges entailed in effectively tackling gendered experiences of poverty and vulnerability: 1. Discriminatory family codes: parental authority, inheritance laws, early marriage practices, family structure and resulting rights and responsibilities (including polygamy, multigenerational households, female-headed households). 2. Son bias: unequal investments in the care, nurture and resources of sons and daughters within the household. 3. Limited resource rights and entitlements: girls’ and young women’s access to land, microfinance, property and natural resources. 4. Restricted civil liberties: restrictions vis-à-vis freedom of movement and freedom of association/participation in collective action, freedom of dress. 5. Physical insecurity: gender-based violence in the household, school, workplace and community and harmful gendered traditional practices, such as female genital mutilation, religious or domestic servitude. As we shall see below, three of these social institutions, namely physical insecurity, discriminatory family code and polygamy, are the three best indicators of armed conflict, effectively linking governance based on patriarchal norms with war.
Moreover, feminist academics have since a long time pointed out the privileging of masculine values and practices and the parallel denigration of femininity in security policies, militaries and peacekeeping operations. They have argued that this produces a variety of dysfunctional outcomes, from sex trafficking by peacekeepers and sexual violence in wartime to the systematic exclusion of women from processes of post-war reconstruction. While a number of Security Council resolutions in the new millennium have formulated an agenda on “women, peace and security”, they have largely failed to problematize structures of gender subordination and associated militarist masculinities (Enloe, 2008). Moreover, Myrttinen (2003) states that militarized imagery and the use of military accessories can be seen as manifestations of a militarized concept of masculinity, an aggressive hyper-individualism that is also dominant in the current neo-liberal discourse. Furthermore, conflict situations tend to reinforce narrow views of masculinity, giving the men with weapons power. Also, men are often expected by tradition to be either warriors and/or protectors, and failure to live up to these expectations can lead to violence against those perceived to be in an even weaker position. Global security governance is thus solidly based on patriarchal and hegemonic norms.

Closely linked to security governance are foreign policies and national policies on minorities. Hegemonic masculinities are closely related to nationalism (Elias, 2008) which in turn can influence both domestic and foreign policy. Looking at how masculinized state identities are rooted in a gendered politics of nationalism presents us with radical reformulation of international politics (Steans, 1998). This reformulation points not only to the relationship between nationalistic constructions of hegemonic masculinity and foreign policy making (Nayak, 2006), but also to the importance of looking below the nation-state at how national identities are formed at the intersection with specific localized gender relations and identities. Moreover, an extensive literature on militarized masculinities has investigated and found relationships between nationalism, citizenship, and militarization (Bickford, 2003; Banerjee, 2006; Gill, 1997; Moon, 2005; Nagel, 1998), as well as between militarized masculinities and alternative gender identities that challenge not only the institution of the military, but the whole masculinity myth on which national identities are built (Britton & Williams, 1995; Sasson-Levy, 2003).

As we have seen in the examples above patriarchal and hegemonic masculinities inform and influence governance at all levels, leading to competition, aggressiveness, low levels of welfare and social justice. There is reason to believe that this can be detrimental to individuals and societies in many ways. In the next section we will see how governance informed by patriarchal and hegemonic norms is linked to various forms of violence.

**How is governance informed by patriarchal norms linked to violence?**

As has been seen above, patriarchal and hegemonic norms on masculinity includes norms approving of, or even encouraging, aggression, competition, risk-taking etc. The previous section revealed that such norms are also informing structures and processes of governance. This section draws on literature that shows us that poor governance due to underlying patriarchal and hegemonic norms can lead to violence both directly and indirectly, though inequalities and poverty.

First of all, the large majority of violence in the world is conducted by men (Flood, 2013). Furthermore, many studies find strong correlations between patriarchal norms on masculinity (such as a need to be dominant; to have power over women; disdain for homosexuals; to be strong and not show emotions; to win whatever competition or battle is at stake; and to take risks (Mahalik et al.,
and tolerant or even positive attitudes to different types of violence (Higate & Hopton, 2005; Kimmel, 2000), such as violence against women (Dworkin, Colvin, Hatcher & Peacock, 2012; Flood & Pease, 2009), between men (Jones, 2009; Vandello, Cohen & Ransom, 2008), homophobic violence (Kimmel & Mahler, 2003), armed conflict (Ekvall, 2011; Hudson, Ballif-Spanvill, Caprioli and Emmett, 2012) and militarism (Enloe, 1987). Many of these studies share the assumption that there is a causal link between patriarchal norms on masculinity and (attitudes to) violence.

A specific example of patriarchal values can be found in the concept of so-called honor cultures. Sev’er (2005) points out that what unites all patriarchies is the obsessive control over women’s freedom, sexuality and reproduction and studies on so-called honor cultures show correlations between high levels of control over women’s bodies, sexuality and freedom of movement and high levels of interpersonal violence (Pinker, 2011; Begikhani, 2011; Inglis & MacKeogh, 2012; Ijzerman & Cohen, 2011; Korteweg & Yurdakul, 2010). So-called honor cultures are not only accepting and using violence against women as is commonly known but they are also more accepting of the use of violence in general than other societies (Ekvall, 2013). So-called honours cultures do not only exist in the Middle East as is notoriously believed, they exist to different levels all over the world. The many studies of the honor cultures of the American South show that several mechanisms keep this culture in place. At the macro level there are social policies and institutional practices that accept violence in response to insult or threat. These range from formal laws allowing citizen greater freedom to own guns and to kill in self-defense to informal norms acted out by people and institutions, which fail to stigmatize those who kill to uphold their honor (Cohen, Nisbett, Bowdle & Schwarz, 1996). These so-called honor norms that lead to many forms of violence, not only violence against women, are thus kept in place by structures of governance based on patriarchal norms.

Furthermore, hegemonic masculinities not only impact governance and societies, they also have ways of defending the existing order and norms. Rai (2008) shows the state is mobilized in defense of the dominant social norms through constitutional, legal and policy frameworks as well as through modes of policy implementation – police personnel, for example, are often participating in or at least ignoring violence perpetrated against transgressors of community norms. This means that such violence is seen as a “legitimate” means of regulating communities, securing its cultural borders (patriarchal and hegemonic) and insuring against transgression of its norms (Rai, 2008). Governance based on patriarchal and hegemonic norms on masculinities thus uses violence to maintain its structures and processes.

Governance based on patriarchal and hegemonic norms not only leads to violence directly but also indirectly, through inequalities and poverty. To start with, governance based on patriarchal and hegemonic norms lead to inequalities (part of poor governance). There are strong connections between gender inequalities and different types of violence, including armed conflict. In fact Hudson, Ballif-Spanvill, Caprioli and Emmett (2012) has shown, based on research using the WomenStats Database that the three best predictors of violent conflict are women’s physical security, unequal family law and polygamy – three phenomena identified by Jones & Prezler-Marshall (2012) above on their list of gendered social institutions posing a challenge for governance. Gender inequality, of which these three phenomena are indicators, although far from a new occurrence, is thus maintained by poor governance. Gender inequality in turn can lead to violence as seen above (Ekvall, 2013).
Other forms of inequality can also lead to violence. Both Beyer (2014) and Pinker (2002) argue that inequality is one of the strongest external factors that cause violence between individuals and on the international level. Inequality has also been empirically linked to cause crime, violence and wars. Wilkinson (2004) shows how the most well established environmental determinant of levels of violence is the scale of income differences between rich and poor and that more unequal societies tend to be more violent. Wilkinson and Pickett (2010) furthermore show a clear positive correlation between income inequality and homicide rates. Greater income inequality moreover increases the chance that an individual will support revolt (MacCulloch, 2005). Again inequalities, produced by poor governance and its underlying patriarchal and hegemonic norms, lead to violence.

The hypothesis of poverty and inequality contributing to civil wars also is strongly supported (Dixon, 2009; Nafziger & Auvinen, 2003; Collier, Hoeffler & Rohner, 2009). Intra-national inequality has been shown to contribute to fighting amongst parties within a given country (Ostby, 2005; Cederman, Weidman & Gleditsch, 2010). Ostby (2003) believes that an important factor that differentiates the violence from the peaceful multiethnic societies is the existence of severe, systematic inequalities between ethnic groups. She refers to such inequalities between groups as horizontal inequalities.

The violent consequences of poor governance and inequality are not limited to intra-state violence. Poor governance on an international level can lead to/maintain inequality between states. Galtung (1964) argued that rank discrepant states are most likely to engage in aggression in order to change their status in the system, particularly when other avenues for change have already unsuccessfully been tried and when there is a culture or experience of violent protest.

As seen above poor governance, i.e. governance informed by patriarchal and hegemonic norms, not only leads to inequalities but also to poverty. Rose-Ackerman (2004) states that poor governance is an important reason why some countries are poor and have low or negative growth rates. Poverty is one of the greatest challenges to human security and basic human needs and can in many instances be seen as structural violence (Galtung, 1969). Sen (2004) suggests that the neglecting, or what he terms ‘comparative indifference’ to the importance of the social needs demands a more innovative multilayered approach than a market-based logic, a different type of governance in other words.

Miguel (2007) argues that there is increasing evidence of a poverty-violence nexus, at both the macro and micro levels of analysis. Poverty and falling income are influencing the sparking of civil conflicts. This may either be because poverty breeds armed violence aimed at looting assets and natural resources or, because poor states simply have limited institutional capacity to repress armed uprisings. A region that is neglected by the central government in terms of public investment and jobs may become poorer due to its political marginalization, leading to violence. Moreover, Collier and Hoeffler (2002) find strong correlations between national income levels and economic growth rates on one hand and the occurrence of civil conflict on the other. They make the theoretical point that joining an armed group becomes more attractive, especially for unemployed young men, when legitimate income-earning options are scarce. There are often numerous lucrative looting, mining, and smuggling opportunities open to armed groups in many developing societies.

Poor governance leading to structural poverty causes alienation in those born into relatively little material comfort, who observe other strata enjoying exponentially greater material security. In addition to this, the “countries where violent crime is an endemic problem are those in which prosperity [...] is confined to some sectors of the population and denied to others” (Currie,
Thus, we can see that there is a powerful connection between inequality and poverty on the one hand and the levels of violent crime on the other.

As shown above poor governance based on underlying patriarchal and hegemonic norms can lead to violence in many ways. Firstly it can lead to violence directly as patriarchal and hegemonic norms are closely interlinked to positive or tolerant attitude to violence in many forms, including violence against women, between men, homophobic violence, military violence and more. These attitudes have an impact on governance, for instance when it comes to legislation (more or less tolerant) on different types of violence and related practices such as gun ownership and promotion of military service and actions. Secondly, governance based on underlying patriarchal and hegemonic norms can lead to violence indirectly as they tend to create societies characterized by socio-economic and gender inequalities as well as poverty, which first of all can be called structural violence and furthermore is linked to physical violence as seen above. Considering these links it is time to address these underlying patriarchal and hegemonic norms in our search for better governance, leading to less violence.

Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to unpack the relationships between patriarchal and hegemonic norms on masculinity, governance and violence. It showed that governance based on patriarchal and hegemonic norms can lead to violence both directly and indirectly, through socio-economic and gender inequalities and poverty.

Based on the literature discussed above it seems likely that a qualitative change, i.e. a change in norms, where both men and women get more egalitarian and less patriarchal norms instead of the more traditionally proposed quantitative one, i.e. the “add women and stir – approach”, would lead to a type of governance that is less aggressive and competitive than what is usual today. Such a form of governance would also involve a higher level of social responsibility, prioritizing so-far neglected un-paid activities such as caring, nursing etc. Furthermore, less patriarchal and hegemonic systems of governance would likely lead to a more egalitarian society thus leading to less conflict and violence.

A qualitative change would mean a refocus of today’s equality promoting policies and activities which are mainly targeting women’s empowerment, promoting women’s rights and possibilities to do what men traditionally do, to a situation where both men and women are encouraged to leave their traditional gender roles and do and behave in whatever way suits them, regardless of traditional gender norms. Patriarchal and hegemonic masculinities are not only oppressing women, they are oppressing men as well. Jones (2009) shows how due to norms favoring risk-taking, aggression, emotional control and idealizing the soldier etc. men are more likely to die from both work-related accidents and other accidents than women; they will get sentenced harder for the same crime than women, commit more suicide than women and are forced to participate in armed conflicts to a totally different degree than woman. Furthermore, men in most countries have little possibilities to be home on parental leave and are thus denied the right to be with their children, a right that is taken for granted by women in most countries. The list of negative effects for men due to patriarchal and hierarchical masculinities can be made long. Still we address gender inequalities and patriarchal norms as mainly a problem for women. When we take into account the effect these norms have on the totality of the population, taking into account other factors such as class and race, we have a real opportunity to change.
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