

ROUTLEDGE HANDBOOK OF MASCULINITIES, CONFLICT, AND PEACEBUILDING

*Edited by Henri Myrntinen, Chloé Lewis, Heleen Touquet,
Philipp Schulz, Farooq Yousaf, and Elizabeth Laruni*

First published 2025

ISBN: 978-1-032-34176-7 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-003-32087-6 (ebk)

13

MALE SURVIVORS OF CONFLICT-RELATED SEXUAL VIOLENCE, MASCULINITIES, AND PEACEBUILDING

Heleen Touquet and Philipp Schulz

(CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003320876-16

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

MALE SURVIVORS OF CONFLICT-RELATED SEXUAL VIOLENCE, MASCULINITIES, AND PEACEBUILDING

Heleen Touquet and Philipp Schulz

Introduction

This chapter focuses on sexual violence against men and boys (SVAMB), an issue that has received increasing attention in the past decade in both policy and academic circles (Touquet et al., 2020). The consideration of the victimisation of men and boys notably followed the inroads that were made on the legal recognition of sexual violence against women and girls as a war crime in the early 1990s in the aftermath of the wars in the former Yugoslavia and the Rwandan genocide. Preventing and prohibiting sexual violence against women became one of the central pillars of the Women, Peace and Security (WPS) Agenda in the early 2000s (O’Gorman, 2018), and some of its more recent resolutions also acknowledged men and boys as victims. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and humanitarian agencies, too, have extensively documented cases of SVAMB in situations of conflict and displacement, for example in Syria, Libya, or Myanmar in the past decade (Chynoweth et al., 2022; Human Rights Watch, 2020; Women’s Refugee Commission, 2018; OHCHR, 2019).

The process of including men was preceded by intense debate: many involved in policy expressed a concern that focusing the attention on men and boys might detract from the broader feminist fight against gender-based violence against women and girls (Ward, 2016). Work on gender-based violence and the empowerment of women is seriously underfunded, leading to understandable fears that the little money there is would have to be shared among more victims and more projects. Additionally, there were concerns that focusing on men and boys might feed into masculinist men’s rights movements (masculinist movements are only very superficially concerned with male victims and resist the deconstruction of masculinities). The latter hasn’t really been the case, but within the growth of anti-gender mobilizations worldwide, concerns about the shrinking space for work with women and girls remain part of the debate.

Masculinities constructions underpin wartime sexual violence against men in a number of different ways with regard to both its causes and consequences (Lewis, 2014), including survivors’ experiences and the impact of this violence on their gender identities (Sivakumaran, 2007; Schulz, 2018). As such, deepening our knowledge of what causes men and boys to be targeted for sexual violence broadens our understanding of sexual violence and informs prevention efforts. At the same time, analyzing and understanding the impact on individual male survivors’ and their

communities can enlighten debates on service provision and care for communities post-conflict as well as for refugee populations in host countries.

In many ways, then, sexual violence against men has become a relevant, prevalent and prominent political and academic entry point for engaging with masculinities in conflict and peacebuilding contexts, moving beyond a dominant focus in the literature of primarily examining violent and militarized masculinities (Duncanson, 2009; Cockburn, 2010) and, instead, also taking into account masculine vulnerabilities (Carpenter, 2006).

In the following sections, we present an overview of the literature on sexual violence against men, focusing on debates about its causes and consequences as well as on the risks of masculinity nostalgia (the yearning for a patriarchal Golden Age) and responses to sexual violence against males. We also highlight some of the gaps in the literature, especially where they are likely to affect or limit approaches to gender and peacebuilding. Methodologically, we draw on our respective research with male survivors of sexual violence in the former Yugoslavia and Uganda, respectively. In northern Uganda, Philipp Schulz has worked closely with groups of male survivors since 2015 in collaboration with the Refugee Law Project (RLP) and following a participatory research approach (Schulz, 2020). In the former Yugoslavia, Heleen Touquet has worked with local psychiatrists and NGOs, interviewing male survivors in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia and Kosovo (Touquet, 2022; Touquet & Myrntinen, 2023).

Scope and causes of sexual violence against men

Previously situated at the margins of debates about gender, peace and security (Touquet & Gorris, 2016), in recent years, sexual violence against men and boys has received growing recognition in scholarship and policy-making alike (Dolan, 2017; Zalewski et al., 2018). Yet despite this “major shift towards including male victims in international policy on wartime sexual violence” (Touquet & Gorris, 2016: 1), much continues to remain unknown about the scope, forms and dynamics of this type of violence, and specifically male survivors’ experiences are under-explored.

In terms of scope and frequency, it has become clear that sexual violence against men is committed more frequently than is commonly assumed (Schulz, 2020), even if it remains difficult to exactly determine its scope and frequency in light of numerous conceptual, methodological and epistemological challenges (including underreporting, availability and reliability of data). Despite these challenges, a growing body of literature documents various examples of male-directed sexual violence in more than 30 conflicts – including, for instance, the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, El Salvador, Sri Lanka, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Uganda, Libya, Syria or Ukraine, to name just a few (see also Erdem et al., this volume). Similar to what can be observed in cases of wartime sexual violence against women and girls (Nordas & Cohen, 2021), SVAMB varies considerably in its frequency, intensity and scope across and within different conflict scenarios (Dolan, 2017).

The questions of what causes sexual violence against men and what the motivations of perpetrators may be features heavily and prominently in emerging debates about the topic. Most existing explanations center on sexual violence as an act of male-on-male domination that sends a message of subordination to both the victim and the (ethnic) group that he is part of. According to this narrative, sexual violence against men is a highly masculinized act of male-to-male communication, aiming to systematically terrorize, punish and humiliate its victims and the group to which they belong. Through the act of sexual violence, perpetrators assert their dominant (hyper)masculinities while subordinating and compromising the victims’ masculinities. The majority of existing studies, indeed, suggest that the most common, if not the single most prevalent, driver of male-directed

sexual violence is the strategic ‘emasculatation’ of victims and their ethnic (or other) group (for a critical reading, see Schulz, 2018).

Sivakumaran, for instance, claims that male “rape is about power and dominance” only (2007: 253), while Sara Meger posits that “male victims are targeted by [sexual] violence . . . for their particular strategic value” (2016: 15). These explanations are based on the premise that masculinities are socially constructed as incompatible with vulnerability. Hence, sexual violence is seen to compromise men in their masculine identities by sexually victimizing them, foregrounding their perceived ‘unmanly’ vulnerabilities and experiences of victimhood (Sivakumaran, 2007). Building further on the idea of intra-masculine communication, it is argued that sexual violence against men is deeply ‘performative’ and “gains its meaning through the aversion and abjection evoked by a penetrated/un-phallic/emasculated body” (Drumond, 2018: 153; see Auchter, 2017). In existing scholarship, these dynamics are almost exclusively referred to as forms of ‘emasculatation’ through ‘feminization’ and/or ‘homosexualization’ (Sivakumaran, 2007), which are portrayed at once as a motivation for sexual violence to occur as well as its primary consequence (Lewis, 2014).

As with explanations for conflict-related sexual violence (CRSV) more broadly, however, mono-causal generalizations portraying the strategic ‘emasculatation’ of male victims as the only driver of SVAMB imply the risk of being too simplistic and reductionist, “failing to account for the messy complexities and variation” of this type of violence (Schulz & Touquet, 2020: 1175–1176). More recently, scholars have pointed out that other factors are at play in causing SVAMB and that the idea of sexual violence against men as a process of emasculatation is influenced by a heteronormative lens (Schulz & Touquet, 2020). Specifically, critique has been articulated that early approaches to understanding this violence have turned a blind eye to “the sexual and opportunistic factors involved in such violence” (Schulz & Touquet, 2020: 1176). As argued by Eichert, for instance, “while some explanations of man-on-woman rape by military units focus on the soldier’s libido”, very few attempts have been made “to relate this principle to the rape of men” (2018: 427). Harriet Gray similarly points out that “the question of whether perpetrators experience sexual pleasure is . . . often obscured in scholarship” on this topic (2018: 244). Aaron Belkin’s study of male-to-male rape in the US Army, on the other hand, shows how rape can also be a masculinising ritual, as it “makes you more of a man/soldier” for having “endured it” (Belkin, 2012).

This new strand of scholarship engages with the complexity and heterogeneity of SVAMB and shows that in empirical reality, cases of SVAMB also occur “within the private sphere, out of sight of any community and/or family members and therefore not occurring explicitly in any immediate subordinating performative manner” (Schulz & Touquet, 2020: 1170). As such, the driving forces behind sexual violence against men are heterogenous and cannot be made sense of through unitary or binary framings.

Many aspects of causation, strategy and perpetrator motivation remain to be explored, and there is a need for more research on, and importantly *with*, perpetrators (Féron, 2018) to complement what we already know about victims’ and survivors’ experiences and from witnesses. On a more macro-level, there has also been little consideration so far of how sexual violence against men can be part of a continuum of violence: how is sexual violence against men in peacetime (e.g. sexualised torture by security services, sexual violence in prisons or sexualised hazing rituals in armies and other institutions) linked to sexual violence against men in wartime? Probing these links could illuminate if and how sexual violence is used strategically, where and how it is part of repertoires of violence, in which contexts it is condoned, whether and how perpetrators are (not) held accountable, how it is interpreted in criminal law and what that means for similar cases in wartime. Gathering more knowledge about the continuum of violence for male victims can be immensely important for prevention efforts and peacebuilding.

Another gap that is relevant here is the lack of specific research on how sexual violence against men and boys can be part of genocidal violence and how it affects the reproductive health of the group or community rather than individuals. So far, discussions about post-war reproductive justice have mostly centered on how wartime violence affects women and girls but not men and boys (Theidon, 2022). While scholars from medicine have shown the effects of sexual violence on males' sexual health (see the next section), this knowledge has not been linked to the impact on the (ethnic or other) group that these men are part of nor the connection with women and girls from the same group – hence posing important areas for further research.

The impact and consequences of sexual violence: reflecting on male survivors' experiences across contexts

The literature on the physical and mental health consequences and impacts of SVAMB is situated mainly within medicine and psychology (Loncar et al., 2010; Oosterhoff et al., 2004), while authors within literatures on international relations (IR) and transitional justice (TJ) have reflected more broadly on the impact of social constructions of masculinities on male survivors' positions in society (Schulz, 2018) and their recovery in the wake of the violence.

Scholars working in health sciences, medicine and psychology have documented the effects of sexual violence on male survivors' well-being in both the physiological and psychological senses. Loncar et al.'s (2010) research on the physical and mental health consequences of male survivors during the war in Croatia, for example, concludes that sleep disturbances, concentration difficulties, nightmares and flashbacks, feelings of hopelessness and different physical stress symptoms such as constant headaches, profuse sweating and tachycardia are common symptoms (see also Oosterhoff et al., 2004). Research on male survivors who came to Europe as refugees describes similar consequences (Keygnaert & Linthout, 2021; Nesterko et al., 2023).

In research that we conducted with survivors across different settings,² they often talked about serious physical consequences, such as anal ruptures, physical difficulties in urinating or passing stool and back problems, among others (Schulz, 2018; Touquet & Myrntinen, 2023). In many cases, survivors would be reluctant to seek help for these issues or to explicitly link them to the assault they suffered at doctor's appointments, because they felt shame or were concerned as to how the doctors or service providers might treat them. Reactions of shame are rooted in processes of socialisation into stereotypical ideas about masculinities, such as that men have to be tough and should not express or talk about vulnerabilities (Riley & Vale; Aughter, this volume). Additionally, in many contexts around the world, tendencies persist to confuse consensual sex between men with sexual violence against men, leading to (false) assumptions about a victim's sexual orientation. Since consensual sex between men is often stigmatized or even criminalized, this entails an extra layer of shame and silence. These stereotypical ideas and social constructions of (hegemonic) masculinities are often shared by service providers from either gender, such as police, doctors, psychiatrists, nurses and others who are often a survivor's first point of contact after incidents of sexual violence. A Croatian survivor explained how he had opened up about what happened to him to a hospital nurse, only to be met with disbelief and laughter. These reactions force many men who try to speak about their experiences back into their silence, which exacerbates the problem (Schulz et al., 2023).

Ideas and preconceptions about what it means to be a 'real man' or notions of hegemonic masculinity linked to sexuality/virility, being the breadwinner, being able to do physical work and being a (leading) member of society also profoundly impact male survivors' journeys in the aftermath of the assault. One example concerns the impact on their reproductive and sexual health.

Male survivors might experience difficulties to achieve or sustain an erection or even to experience sexual desire. They might refrain from engaging in sexual intercourse because they fear that they will be triggered or not able to perform sexually. These consequences naturally have a profound impact on survivors' sense of their masculinities as well as on how partners, family members and others perceive them. As Edström, Dolan and colleagues argue, "one of the concerns around this is . . . centered on the absence of sexual pleasure and joy in a person's private life. But it is also linked to fundamental issues around masculinity and identity" (Edström et al., 2016: 26). Indeed, being sexually active and fathering children constitute central markers of what it means to be a man in many contexts around the globe (e.g. Onyango & Hampanda, 2011; Touquet & Myrntinen, 2023). The failure to fulfill these functions and (perceived) obligations can translate into an implied inability to be 'a real man' in the hegemonic sense. Due to these inability to reproduce and be sexually active, some wives of survivors in Uganda left their husbands, stating that: "I cannot stay in the house with a fellow woman" – illustrating the perceived effect on survivors' gender identities. The experience of having been assaulted and violated by another man also made some survivors from Kosovo question their gender identities. Consider the following statement from a Kosovar man who was raped by two Serbian paramilitaries in his parents' house at the age of 17: "I have never again felt like a man after that event. Ever since that happened to me, I have never felt like a man. I was always full of rage, I was always . . . I felt like whoever would look at me . . . knew my story" (Touquet & Myrntinen, 2023).

Another aspect where masculinities constructions and the specific hegemonic model of masculinity in a given society affect recovery processes concerns the idea of men as providers and as main breadwinners in the family. In many places around the world, a locally specific hegemonic model of masculinity prevails, according to which men are responsible to protect and provide for their families. Yet having been subjected to sexual violence is commonly perceived by individual survivors and their societies to demonstrate male survivors' inability to protect themselves and, by association, their inability to protect their families – thus failing to live up to key masculinities expectations. For instance, one male survivor from Northern Uganda explained that "admitting the violation would mean that I have not been able to protect myself, which means I am no longer a man". Likewise, for survivors from the former Yugoslavia, having been unable to protect the family and themselves led to great levels of stigma, and it often prevented them from talking about their experiences and seeking help (Touquet, 2022). This stigma often extends not only to individual survivors but also to the ethnic group they belong to.

At the same time, our research in Northern Uganda found that male survivors were often unable to carry out agricultural work or heavy manual labour, which often is the only form of generating an income and of providing for a household in rural Northern Uganda. As one survivor explained, "I have many scars and injuries that I got as a result of the rape and this has weakened me and it cannot enable me to do any hard labour. I am not performing as a man" (see Schulz, 2018: 1113). Survivors from Kosovo and other contexts in the former Yugoslavia shared similar concerns, and many of them could not hold jobs because they would suddenly get emotionally flooded or triggered. This exacerbated the difficult situation they were already in, affecting their livelihoods and ability to afford basic services like heating the house in the winter or much-needed surgery (Touquet & Myrntinen, 2023).

Male survivors would also withdraw from social life, from spaces and meetings with other members of society (Touquet & Myrntinen, 2023). In northern Uganda, for instance, many male survivors withdrew from communal life and have chosen not to attend community meetings or gatherings, fearing stigmatization, rejection or abuse. In a context where taking on an active role and responsibility within social and community structures constitutes a cornerstone of hegemonic

masculinity constructions, this withdrawal from social life carries further implications for how they are perceived in terms of their manhood while at the same time isolating and ostracizing male survivors from their communities, with respective implications for their well-being. In the context of northern Uganda, at least some of these dynamics were countered and remedied through the role of peer support groups, where survivors who share a lived reality have come together, support one another and build new affective and caring relationships.

Whilst the scholarly literature has started to explore how masculinities constructions impact survivors' experiences and bystander and service providers' responses in the aftermath of the assault, these considerations have so far not featured in local public discussions on male survivors in their countries of origin (Touquet, 2022). Whilst there has been some acknowledgement and recognition of SVAMB in policy and academic circles in the past decade, the level of discussion often has been rather limited to acknowledging that male victims exist, without deeper reflection on how masculinities and patriarchy contribute to its causation and hinder dealing with its consequences. Likewise, only little attention has been paid to the relational impact of wartime sexual violence against both women and men on communities and the wider 'social fabric'. More research needs to be done to truly gauge the effects.

Myths, re-masculinization and masculinity nostalgia

In many ways, the lack of explicit deeper engagement with the causes of sexual violence against men and analyses that focus on the so-called emasculation³ or the subordination of the group/nation echo with and can play into post-war efforts at rebuilding societies that center on regaining "lost masculinities" (see also Sünbuloğlu, this volume). Some examples of reinstating these gendered hierarchies are rewarding male war veterans with extra pensions and other advantages, rebuilding the army or commemorating famous military men and victorious battles (Berdak, 2015; Maia et al., this volume). This, of course, entails risks of recurrence, as it reinstates patriarchal values that fed into the conflict in the first place. This 'masculinity nostalgia' also affects service-providers and programmes designed to help male survivors. Processes of seeking to undo or reverse the impact on survivors' masculinities may translate into desires to have their previous, oftentimes socially privileged (and at times repressive) forms of masculinities repaired and restored. This may become especially acute when there is a lack of analysis on the part of service providers and policymakers as to how patriarchy and hegemonic masculinities fed into the violence that was done to survivors. Because of the lack of reflection, many stereotypes and myths about male survivors continue to exist. Some observers even seem to feel that sexual violence is worse when it happens to a man precisely because of their higher status in society (Touquet et al, 2020).

Some survivors themselves, for example in northern Uganda, want their gender identities to be repaired or restored, for instance through forms of physical rehabilitation, which is expected to enable them to work again and thus to provide for their families. As one survivor stated,

My major need is rehabilitation. When I am physically rehabilitated, I will get healing and strength, and I will get a normal life like any other community member and can provide for my wife and children again.

Similarly, a male survivor who has received physical rehabilitation through an organization supporting sexual violence survivors in Uganda explained that "through the medical treatment, I was able to work again and provide for my family like a man". As much as these views, desires and dynamics represent male survivors' very real and very understandable priorities, however, they

can also be seen as risking (re)installing and (re-)enforcing patriarchal gender orders, symbolizing a longing for a (possibly imaginary) patriarchal golden age past (El-Bushra et al., 2014), and they are immediately underpinned by forms of “masculinity nostalgia” (MacKenzie & Foster, 2017).

Another context in which some of these dynamics unfold is that of male sexual violence survivors’ groups, which *inter alia* assist survivors in rebuilding and repairing previously impaired gender identities (in addition to re-establishing relationships, for instance) (Schulz, 2019). As one survivor articulated, “before we came together, we had a lot of feelings of being less of a man, but since being in a group, the feelings . . . have reduced”. These dynamics develop, in part, because of the groups’ income-generating activities, through which male survivors are enabled to provide for their families once again, as per locally specific expectations of hegemonic masculinity. In the words of one survivor, the activities of the groups “economically empowered us and it psychologically rehabilitated us”.

Drawing on empirical research in Israel and Palestine, MacKenzie and Foster (2017: 14) argue that for some men who feel impacted in their masculine identities, “the struggle for peace, security and order can become a struggle to ‘return’ men to a supremacy status in the home and in the nation”. They theorize these dynamics as ‘masculinity nostalgia’, “associated with a romanticized ‘return to normal’ that included men as heads of household, economic breadwinners, primary decision-makers and sovereigns of the family” (MacKenzie & Foster, 2017: 15). This is similar to the “golden age-ism” identified by El-Bushra et al. (2014) in Uganda and elsewhere, which is also marked by the wish to ‘return’ to an idealized and inherently patriarchal and heteronormative status quo before the conflict. These tendencies of ‘re-masculinization’ and the longing for the undoing of ‘emasculatation’ thus often (mostly implicitly, rather than explicitly) go hand in hand with efforts to further assert male entitlement in the wake of conflict, displacement or crises (also see Myrntinen & Schulz, 2023).

As we have shown, some of these dynamics are also at play in working with male survivors of SGBV and are reflected through survivors’ priorities and their attempts of seeking to un-do the impact of sexual violence on their masculinities. From a survivors’ perspective, these desires to regain and re-attain traditional masculine roles, responsibilities and positions are understandable – also considering the fact that their partners, families and communities are measuring these men against widely accepted and hegemonic expectations. At the same time, however, from a critical feminist standpoint and taking into account wider societal dynamics, these desires can also imply the risk of further fuelling hetero-patriarchy and gender inequalities, in stark contrast to feminist projects of gender justice, which seek to dismantle these very patriarchal orders and relations (Enloe, 2004). After all, repairing the previous status quo and returning men to positions of patriarchal power and male privilege would come at the expense and detriment of efforts to craft more egalitarian and equal gender relations.

Questions remain, however, if these already marginalized and victimized groups of men can be expected and be made responsible for implementing these broader change processes or, if not, rather broader societal, structural transformations of gender inequalities are needed. How to push for and drive these transformations of patriarchal orders, however, remains an ongoing and pressing question in feminist scholarship, critique and organizing (Enloe, 2017; Peacock et al., this volume).

Responses to sexual violence against men

How have states and non-state, humanitarian actors responded to sexual violence against men? For the most part, cases of male victimization were not explicitly acknowledged by different

transitional justice (TJ) mechanisms, designed to facilitate sustainable peace and deliver justice (Schulz, 2020; see Ortiz-Acosta & Otálora-Gallego, this volume) – mirroring scarce health services and high barriers in accessing support for male survivors at different points in time and across contexts and spaces (Chynoweth et al., 2017; Alexandre et al., 2022). Leiby (2012), for example, showed how sexual violence against men was coded as torture in the documents of the Peruvian Truth Commission, obscuring this type of violence. The lack of legal and political recognition of male victimisation reflects the cultural and social norms around men as inviolable and invulnerable. Moreover, same-sex relationships between males are illegal in many contexts, and rape laws often do not recognise men as victims. This makes coming forward as a male victim highly risky. In Uganda, for example, the Ugandan Penal Code (UPC) – a product of colonial policies and laws – defines rape in gender-exclusive ways, referring to male perpetrators and female victims and thus explicitly denying the legal possibility of male sexual violence survivors. State-sponsored and/or societal homophobia, furthermore, seriously complicates male victims' pathways to healing. As a result of these state-level shortcomings and challenges, many survivors depend on NGOs and their limited and unstable sources of (foreign) funding – which is certainly the case in northern Uganda.

In some countries, such as in the states of the former Yugoslavia, there has been a process of legal recognition of male victims through reparations for sexual violence victims. Laws on reparations exist in Croatia and Kosovo and were originally intended as a means to also provide for female victims, whose plight had previously been ignored to the advantage of other groups such as veterans and children of fallen soldiers. However, due to the extensive documentation of sexual violence against men during the war by the UN Commission of Experts, male victims were also included in the respective laws on reparations. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, there is no reparation law as such, but one of the country's separate entities, the Federation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, included male victims in its social benefits for sexual violence victims (Touquet, 2022).

While this recognition is a step forward, it has also created new hierarchies of victimhood among women and men. Victims often become pawns in political games in the post-conflict reality, while their needs are not necessarily addressed (Barton-Hronešová, 2020). Reparation laws privilege victims of specific ethnic groups over others. Victims who are Serbs (regardless of gender) cannot apply for social benefit or compensation in Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo. The state of Serbia, in keeping with its political position on the wars in the former Yugoslavia, does not recognize sexual violence victims that currently live within its territory (for example, Serbs from Croatia, Kosovo or Bosnia-Herzegovina who came there as refugees). Within Republika Srpska, the mainly Serb part of Bosnia-Herzegovina, the stringent statute of limitations makes it almost impossible for victims of any gender to apply (Barton-Hronešová, 2020). The laws also treat civilian and military men differently, depending on the context. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, former soldiers cannot access the social benefits. In Croatia, the situation is the other way around: the reparations are administered through the Croatian Ministry of Veterans Affairs, and many applicants are former soldiers in the Croatian army who became victims as prisoners of war.

Responses to these measures among male victims vary, depending on their financial and familial contexts and history. For some, the fact that the state acknowledges the harm that was done to them is a kind of justice, while others felt that what they had received was not enough to address their needs (Touquet & Myrntinen, 2023).

While any efforts to include men have to be lauded, it is important to note is that these state recognitions through compensation programmes have also not led to any sort of meaningful public

debate on sexual violence against men in either of these countries. Men have been mentioned and included in these debates, but they have not been part of any analysis of the causes and consequences of sexual violence nor of how gendered constructions shape beliefs about male victims. In terms of peacebuilding, the effects are thus rather limited and have not extended beyond an acknowledgement that male victims exist.

Conclusion

This chapter has sought to provide a holistic and broad overview of emerging discussions about the intersections between peacebuilding, masculinities and conflict-related sexual violence against men. Even though this type of violence for a long time remained under-explored and sidelined, there has recently been more attention paid to SVAMB – to the extent that an engagement with male gendered vulnerabilities (Carpenter, 2006) and sexual violence against men now constitutes a dominant focus in the growing body of scholarship on masculinities in conflict and peacebuilding settings. Indeed, as we have shown throughout this chapter, masculinities feature heavily within and across these debates, focused on the causes of this type of violence and why it occurs, as well as on its consequences and impacts on survivors' lived realities. In many ways, then, sexual violence against men has become one of the paradigmatic and more prominent ways in which masculinities are incorporated into gendered analyses of conflict and peacebuilding, focused on masculine vulnerabilities in insecure settings. Indeed, discussions about masculinities, vulnerabilities and sexual violence often appear and are positioned in juxtaposition to a persistent focus on the violences of men that has dominated the literature for a long time. Exploring sexual violence against men and masculinities, thereby, widens the focus to also pay attention to the violences perpetrated against and the harms experienced by men. The result of these dual foci, however, is the violation-centric view which dominates the literature about masculinities, conflict and peacebuilding, as attested in the introduction.

Overall, more needs to be done, in research as well as in policy making, with regards to the intersections between conflict, peacebuilding, masculinities and sexual violence. Specifically, much of the literature on sexual violence is guided by hetero-normative assumptions and frameworks. And a focus on men and boys as victims, alongside this type of violence against men and girls, often reinforces binary ways of thinking around gender. As such, future research more urgently needs to take into account violations committed against persons with diverse sexual orientations, gender identities and expressions and sex characteristics (SOGIESC) (see Erdem et al., this volume), including (but not limited to) sexual violence.

In the realm of policy-making, tailored interventions and support to prevent and respond to SVAMB are urgently needed, yet without diverting attention and already-scarce resources for sexual violence against women and girls. In designing and setting in place processes to address SVAMB, it is important that survivors' views and insights are central to these understandings, processes and interventions – advancing survivor-centric approaches to responding to CRSV.

Notes

- 1 Some but not all people who have experienced sexual violence prefer the term 'survivor' to 'victim', as it emphasizes their agency and power. Reflecting that diversity, we use both survivor and victim interchangeably in this chapter.
- 2 Northern Uganda, Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Kosovo.
- 3 For a discussion on how this in itself is a problematic and misogynist term, see Schulz (2018).

References

- Alexandre, A. B., Rutega, B., Byamungu, P. A., Notia, C. A. & Alldén, S. (2022). A Man Never Cries: Barriers to Holistic Care for Male Survivors of Sexual Violence in Eastern DRC. *Medicine, Conflict and Survival* 38(2): pp. 116–139.
- Auchter, J. (2017). Forced Male Circumcision: Gender-Based Violence in Kenya. *International Affairs* 93(6): pp. 1339–1356.
- Barton-Hronešová, J. (2020). *The Struggle for Redress*. Springer International Publishing.
- Belkin, A. (2012). *Bring Me Men: Military Masculinity and the Benign Façade of American Empire, 1898–2001*. London: Hurst Publishers.
- Berdak, O. (2015). Reintegrating Veterans in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia: Citizenship and Gender Effects. In *Women's Studies International Forum*, Vol. 49. Pergamon, pp. 48–56.
- Carpenter, R. C. (2006). Recognizing Gender-Based Violence Against Civilian Men and Boys in Conflict Situations. *Security Dialogue* 37(1): pp. 83–103.
- Chynoweth, S. K., Buscher, D., Martin, S. & Zwi, A. B. (2022). Characteristics and Impacts of Sexual Violence Against Men and Boys in Conflict and Displacement: A Multicountry Exploratory Study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 37(9–10).
- Chynoweth, S. K., Freccero, J. & Touquet, H. (2017). Sexual Violence Against Men and Boys in Conflict and Forced Displacement: Implications for the Health Sector. *Reproductive Health Matters* 25(51): pp. 90–94.
- Cockburn, C. (2010). Gender Relations as Causal in Militarization and War: A Feminist Standpoint. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 12(2): pp. 139–157.
- Dolan, C. (2017). Victims Who Are Men. In: Aoláin, N., et al. (eds.): *The Oxford Handbook of Gender and Conflict*. Oxford University Press, pp. 1–20.
- Drumond, P. (2018). Sex, Violence, and Heteronormativity: Revisiting Performances of Sexual Violence Against Men in Former Yugoslavia. In: Zalewski, M., et al. (eds.): *Sexual Violence Against Men in Global Politics*. Routledge, pp. 152–166.
- Duncanson, C. (2009). Forces for Good? Narratives of Military Masculinity in Peacekeeping Operations. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 11(1): pp. 63–80.
- Edström, J., Dolan, C., Shahrokh, T. & David, O. (2016). Therapeutic Activism: Men of Hope Refugee Association Uganda Breaking the Silence Over Male Rape in Conflict-Related Sexual Violence. *No. IDS Evidence Report; 182*. IDS.
- Eichert, D. (2018). “Homosexualization” Revisited: An Audience-Focused Theorization of Wartime Male Sexual Violence. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 21(3): pp. 409–433.
- El-Bushra, J., Myrntinen, H. & Naujoks, J. (2014). *Renegotiating the “Ideal” Society: Gender Relations in the Wake of Conflict and Displacement in Uganda*. London: International Alert. <https://www.international-alert.org/publications/renegotiating-ideal-society/> (Accessed 2 July 2022).
- Enloe, C. (2004). *The Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire*. University of California Press.
- Enloe, C. (2017). *The Big Push: Exposing and Challenging the Persistence of Patriarchy*. University of California Press.
- Féron, É. (2018). *Wartime Sexual Violence Against Men: Masculinities and Power in Conflict Zones*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Harriet Gray, H. (2018). Reflections on the Slippery Politics of Framing. In: Zalewski, M., et al. (eds.): *Sexual Violence Against Men in Global Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Human Rights Watch (2020). *They Treated Us in Monstrous Ways. Sexual Violence Against Men, Boys, and Transgender Women in the Syrian Conflict*. <https://www.hrw.org/report/2020/07/29/they-treated-us-monstrous-ways/sexual-violence-against-men-boys-and-transgender> (Accessed 7 February 2024).
- Keygnaert, I. & Linthout, L. (2021). *Triage Tool for Identification, Care and Referral of Victims of Sexual Violence at European Asylum Reception and Accommodation Initiatives*. Department of Public Health and Primary Care, Ghent University. <https://biblio.ugent.be/publication/8700886>
- Leiby, M. (2012). The Promise and Peril of Primary Documents: Documenting Wartime Sexual Violence in El Salvador and Peru. In: Morten Bergsmo, Alf Buteschon Skre and Elisabeth J. Wood (eds.): *Understanding and Proving International Sex Crimes*. Beijing: Torkel Opsahl Academic EPublisher, p. 343.

- Lewis, C. (2014). Systemic Silencing: Addressing Sexual Violence Against Men and Boys in Armed Conflict and Its Aftermath. In: *Rethinking Peacekeeping, Gender Equality and Collective Security*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 203–223.
- Loncar, M., Henigsberg, N. & Hrabac, P. (2010). Mental Health Consequences in Men Exposed to Sexual Abuse During the War in Croatia and Bosnia. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 25(2): pp. 191–203.
- MacKenzie, M. & Foster, A. (2017). Masculinity Nostalgia: How War and Occupation Inspire a Yearning for Gender Order. *Security Dialogue* 48(3): pp. 206–223.
- Meger, S. (2016). *Rape Loot Pillage: The Political Economy of Sexual Violence in Armed Conflict*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myrntinen, H. & Schulz, P. (2023). Broadening the Scope But Reasserting Male Privilege? Potential Patriarchal Pitfalls of Inclusive Approaches to Gender-Based Violence. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 25(3): pp. 393–413.
- Nesterko, Y., Schönenberg, K. H. & Glaesmer, H. (2023). Mental Health of Recently Arrived Male Refugees in Germany Reporting Sexual Violence. *Medicine, Conflict and Survival* 39(1): pp. 4–27.
- Nordás, R. & Cohen, D. K. (2021). Conflict-Related Sexual Violence. *Annual Review of Political Science* 24: pp. 193–211.
- O’Gorman, E. (2018). WPS and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Sexual Violence in Conflict. In: Sara E. Davies and Jacqui True (eds): *The Oxford Handbook of Women, Peace, and Security*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 302.
- OHCHR (2019, September 9–27). *Sexual and Gender-Based Violence in Myanmar and the Gendered Impact of Its Ethnic Conflicts**. Human Rights Council. Forty Second Session.
- Onyango, M. A. & Hampanda, K. (2011). Social Constructions of Masculinity and Male Survivors of War-time Sexual Violence: An Analytical Review. *International Journal of Sexual Health* 23(4): pp. 237–247.
- Oosterhoff, P., Zwanikken, P. & Ketting, E. (2004). Sexual Torture of Men in Croatia and Other Conflict Situations: An Open Secret. *Reproductive Health Matters* 12(23): pp. 68–77.
- Schulz, P. (2018). Displacement from Gendered Personhood: Sexual Violence and Masculinities in Northern Uganda. *International Affairs* 94(5): pp. 1101–1119.
- Schulz, P. (2019). “To Me, Justice Means to Be in a Group”: Survivors’ Groups as a Pathway to Justice in Northern Uganda. *Journal of Human Rights Practice* 11(1): pp. 171–189.
- Schulz, P. (2020). *Male Survivors of Wartime Sexual Violence: Perspectives from Northern Uganda*. University of California Press.
- Schulz, P. & Touquet, H. (2020). Queering Explanatory Frameworks for Wartime Sexual Violence Against Men. *International Affairs* 96(5): pp. 1169–1187.
- Schulz, P., Touquet, H., Myrntinen, H., Prapashtica, Q., Rushiti, F., Krasniqi, S. P., . . . & Ngokomwe, F. (2023). How Male Survivors of Wartime Sexual Violence Navigate Silence and Voice. In *The Politics of Silence, Voice and the In-Between*. Routledge, pp. 95–109.
- Sivakumaran, S. (2007). Sexual Violence Against Men in Armed Conflict. *European Journal of International Law* 18(2): pp. 253–276.
- Theidon, K. (2022). *Legacies of War: Violence, Ecologies, and Kin*. Duke University Press.
- Touquet, H. (2022). Silent or Inaudible? Male Survivor Stories in Bosnia–Herzegovina. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society* 29(2): pp. 706–728.
- Touquet, H., Chynoweth, S., Martin, S., Reis, C., Myrntinen, H., Schulz, P., . . . & Duriesmith, D. (2020). From “It Rarely Happens” to “It’s Worse for Men”: Dispelling Misconceptions about Sexual Violence Against Men and Boys in Conflict and Displacement. *Journal of Humanitarian Affairs* 2(3): pp. 25–34.
- Touquet, H. & Gorris, E. (2016). Out of the Shadows? The Inclusion of Men and Boys in Conceptualisations of Wartime Sexual Violence. *Reproductive Health Matters* 24(47): pp. 36–46.
- Touquet, H. & Myrntinen, H. (2023). *Living with the Burden. Male Survivors of Wartime Sexual Violence in Kosovo*. Report for Kosovo Centre for Torture Victims (KRCT), Pristina.
- Ward, J. (2016). It’s Not about the Gender Binary, It’s about the Gender Hierarchy: A Reply to “Letting Go of the Gender Binary”. *International Review of the Red Cross* 98(901): pp. 275–298.
- Women’s Refugee Commission (2018). “It’s Happening to Our Men as Well”: *Sexual Violence Against Rohingya Men and Boys*. <https://www.womensrefugeecommission.org/research-resources/its-happening-to-our-men-as-well/>
- Zalewski, M., Drummond, P., Prugl, E. & Stern, M. (eds.) (2018). *Sexual Violence Against Men in Global Politics*. Routledge.