

## Interventions with men for gender equity: criticism of individualizing approaches

### Intervenciones com hombres para la equidad de género: crítica a los enfoques individualizadores

Vanessa do Nascimento Fonseca\*

**Abstract:** The article makes a brief mapping of how interventions with men have been configured since the 1970s, analyzing the individualizing and behavioral character that has been built for this type of work, based on feminist criticisms that differentiate patriarchy from sexist behavior. We start from the assumption that men are important allies in facing the harmful effects of gender. However, in addition to thinking about their male chauvinistic behaviors, among themselves, seeking individual compensation arising from the changes of male chauvinism, their engagement in the fight against a system that articulates different power relations, normalizing subjects from colonial, capitalist, intersected cisheterosexuals and sexists.

**Keywords:** Interventions with men, masculinities, gender

**Abstrato:** El artículo hace un breve mapeo de cómo se han configurado las intervenciones com hombres desde la década de 1970, analizando el carácter individualizador y conductual que se estaba construyendo para este tipo de trabajos, a partir de críticas feministas que diferencia nel patriarcado del comportamiento machista. Partimos del supuesto de que los hombres son aliados importantes para enfrentar los efectos nocivos del género. Sin embargo, además de pensar em su comportamiento sexista, entre ellos, buscando la compensación individual de los câmbios em el machismo, su compromiso en la lucha contra un sistema que articula diferentes relaciones de poder es fundamental, normalizando sujetos a partir de patrones coloniales, capitalistas, entrecruzados cisheterosexuales y sexistas.

**Palabras clave:** Intervenciones com hombres, masculinidades, gênero

---

\* PhD in Psychology from Universidade Federal Fluminense - UFF, with CAPES scholarship.

This article is a part of the thesis<sup>1</sup>, which aimed to analyze the way in which masculinities have been the object of international interventions. This analysis was based on materials generated and collected in eleven years of work as a consultant for the involvement of men in the promotion of gender equality in Latin American and African countries, based on projects, above all, financed and methodologies developed by organizations of the Global North. The materials generated and collected over this time refer to fieldwork records, reports, notes from meetings and events, as well as manuals, toolbooks and campaign materials, analyzed based on contributions from intersectional and decolonial studies, which meet the problematization of gaps and abusive generalizations of a knowledge that identifies men and white and cisheterosexual masculinities as universal. I present, in this article what served as a contextualization of the doctoral work. This is a brief mapping of how interventions with men have been configured since the 1970s, in which I analyze the individualizing<sup>2</sup> and behavioral character that was built for this type of work. By interventions I mean both the transformative actions of masculinities planned together - such as group and community activities, social campaigns and to influence public policies - as well as the idea of a "come between", "interpose", capable of generating events which are themselves transformation in process, definitions mentioned by Simone M. Paulon (2005). It is important to note, however, that the first notion is usually the object of orders and debates for the transformation of masculinities, in which new models, considered non-sexist, are used as parameters for such transformation, in response to the need to control the results. for the evidence of the financial resources committed to the projects for this purpose.

In the 1970s, groups of men began to organize themselves, especially in the United States, with the aim of debating their roles in the processes of social restructuring driven by the post-war period and by the questioning promoted by the women and gay movements. It is at this time that the studies of masculinities begin to question the nature of the ways of being a man – white, heterosexual and adults –, opening space for the discussion of transformations in masculinities, based on a critique of their effects on the lives not only of women, but of men as well. In this way,

---

<sup>1</sup> See FONSECA (2019) in bibliographic references.

<sup>2</sup> By individualizing I mean the naturalization of a certain "way-of-being-individual" (ABREU and COIMBRA, 2005, p. 42), which shields our access to history and the collective forces that establish our ways of existing.

masculinities and their reconfigurations became the motto of groups of men who began to meet. In the 1990s, with the international conferences sponsored by the United Nations, which paid particular attention to gender issues, the debate on the transformation of masculinities intensified and passed through a series of international projects related to economic development and health.

In the 1990s, therefore, we began to notice the dissemination of interventions with men that were, above all, influenced by American groups that organized themselves from different approaches, whose objective was to rethink their masculinities. Despite the different positions and approaches, it is common among groups to build strategies aimed at individualizing changes in male behavior. Whether by recognizing the privileges of men in gender relations, or by understanding that gender norms are also harmful to men, interventions, usually carried out in awareness groups or social marketing campaigns, they aim to change male behaviors and attitudes considered negative for men and women.

Even when the claims are addressed to public or institutional policies, the concern has been to facilitate the transformation of male chauvinist behaviors, such as taking care of children, sharing household chores, sharing the use of the contraceptive method, not committing violence, etc. However, feminist production regarding the transformations necessary to face gender power relations indicates that the path is beyond the transformation of machismo, that is, of the behaviors or forms resulting from a way of producing human relations. It is necessary to subvert the logic of patriarchy that governs gender relations in our society.

Gender and patriarchy go beyond the reproduction of sexist behavior. Chauvinism refers to behaviors and behaviors that are part of patriarchy. Patriarchy, based on the plural and community experiences of women engaged in feminist struggles, is defined as a regime articulated to all the oppressions and violence under which humanity and nature live (PAREDES, 2016). It is a repeated action of draining and expropriating the creative energies of the women, amalgamated with capitalism, coloniality (GUTIÉRREZ AGUILAR, 2018) and compulsory cisheterosexuality.<sup>3</sup>

The subversion of patriarchal relations thus requires changes in the vectors that are articulated in the production of subordination relations, such as cisheterosexuality, racism, the coloniality of knowledge and practices and the neoliberal capitalist regime.

---

<sup>3</sup> The term compulsory heterosexuality was used by Butler in *Problemas de Género*, to address the regime of gender norms. Cisheterosexuality is a combination of cisgenderism and heterosexuality. The word cisgenderity indicates the conformity of expression with the gender assigned at birth.

Such vectors normalize and expropriate the creative possibilities of existence, creating hierarchies between subjects, in which the white, cisheterosexual, adult, European descent man, endowed with all physical abilities, guides social policies and practices, from its representation of what it is to be human. We consider, therefore, that in addition to interventions focused on behaviors, it is necessary to produce ruptures in this integrated system of forces that produces subjectivities and hierarchizes them, moving us away from our ability to create existence and outputs from encounters.

Behavioral transformations have supported the reduction of violence, producing positive impacts on health, in the division of parental responsibility and in the distribution of housework, as has been mentioned by studies that evaluate changes in behavior in projects involving men in the promotion of equity of gender (PEACOCK and BARKER, 2012). Non-sexist models, considered positive, have been used as a way of encouraging men to change their behavior. However, it is important to be aware of the reproduction of moralizing standards, when we do not question how such models are defined, in addition to being taken as new norms to be followed by men who wish to fit into the boxes of the “deconstructed” or “transformed”.

Judith Butler's studies have been useful for thinking about gender transformations beyond male and female behaviors. Gender can be thought of as a compulsory and constant heteronormative order that requires coherence between genitals and desire (BUTLER, 2014). According to Butler (2008), gender is itself a norm, which means that it is not the same as a mold in which individuals seek to approach, but it is a form of power that creates an intelligible field of subjects, defining them (not definitively, but maintained by repetitive processes). In social practice, the norm is realized and re-idealized, reinstituting itself through daily social rituals that cross our bodies. In this sense, standards govern practices and are not the same as practices (BUTLER, 2008). Standard is not the same as a law or a rule, but it is the regulatory force of laws, whose effect is to normalize people. In this text, we draw attention to looking at this normalizing principle when we try to produce transformations aimed at equity.

Based on what has been exposed in this introduction, I take a look at the construction of interventions with men crossed by an individualizing bias, not critical of identity reductionism and the way gender norms operate, as well as the articulation of patriarchy with cisheteronormativity, capitalism, racism and coloniality. Such interventions, which began to develop in the 1970s, have been highlighted in

international studies and debates for the inclusion of men in the promotion of gender equity and are shared through projects and networks in different countries.

### **Masculinities: contours of a domain of interventions**

The fight against the effects of gender is not just a fight for women, but for the whole of society (HOOKS, 2019a). Raewyn Connell (2016) ponders that because they are passed over by current social standards, the fight for equality between men and women was inserted by women. But men are necessarily involved, since a deep institutional transformation is urgent, in addition to changes in daily life and behavior, so that we can promote fairer social relations. Furthermore, according to the author, men control most of the resources useful to the implementation of women's claims, from economic, political, cultural and coercive means.

In fact, in the last decades, men began to be included in the gender agenda in different ways, in the production of studies on masculinities and in the creation of interventions that aim to involve them in the construction of new ways of being a man. The 1970s have been marked by masculinity researchers as the consecrator of this field of studies (MEDRADO DANTAS, 1997; HEILBORN and, CARRARA, 1998; PEASE, 2000; SOUZA, 2003; CECCETTO, 2004; OLIVEIRA, 2004; RODRÍGUEZ and VÁZQUEZ, 2008). Before that period, articles such as *The Gang* (1927) or *Street Corner Society* (1943), which studied male universes, were more concerned with the issue of social maladjustment (OLIVEIRA, 2004), than with the construction of men as men, an issue that would only become possible after the rise of gender studies.

Still in the field of psychology and sociology, Connell and Messerschmidt (2013) claim that, even before the women's liberation movement occupied these areas of knowledge, there was already an amount of literature that recognized the “social nature of masculinities and the possibilities of transformation”. of the conduct of men” (CONNELL and MESSERSCHMIDT, 2013, p. 243). The authors, however, confirm that it is in the 1970s, the moment of the explosion of studies, in which the criticism of the norms that define the masculine as a source of oppression over women becomes clearer. What is new in the research carried out from that period, therefore, is to think of men “as subjects of gender, agents of a space of inequality in which the universality of the masculine as a symbol of the human person was increasingly contested” (ABOIM, 2018), p. 11).

It should be noted that marking the beginning of the studies of men and

masculinities in this period does not mean that they were not omnipresent in the social and human sciences, from politics to psychology, also as objects of study. As Sofia Aboim (2018) suggests, it is a mistake to say that classical sociology was not interested in men. Such interest, however, focused on the association of men, especially whites and adults, with the universal representation of the human species or in the search even to legitimize their domination over women (ABOIM, 2018). In yet another trap of patriarchy, the white man, especially since the 19th century, with the institutionalization of the social sciences, started to be treated exclusively or mainly as a synonym for human being (CARBALLO, 2017), whose specificities served as axes for understanding of the species, on which standards of normality were forged. Thus, there was no interest in the deconstruction of masculine ways of being. On the contrary, the effort to analyze men and masculinities “was to legitimize the alleged superiority of a white male model, in charge of the imperialist design underlying the European project of modernity” (ABOIM, 2018, p. 12). On the other hand, women and colonized peoples, treated as others of this white male, were controlled and dissected in order to build their subaltern condition (CONNELL, 2009).

The criticism of the naturalization of male behavior and its privileged place in social spaces gained momentum after the effervescence of the movements who questioned the constitution of identities in the 1970s (OLIVEIRA, 2004). This period is crossed by the post-structuralist debate in the social and human sciences, which allowed the emergence of a different path from the hegemonic sociological perspectives (Marxism, functionalism, structuralism), and influenced feminist, gay, anti-racist and post-colonial movements, in the questioning the way identities are conceived (PETERSEN, 2003). Within this context, the article by Gayle Rubin, *A circulação de mulheres: notas sobre a ‘economia política’ do sexo*<sup>4</sup>, from 1975, is cited as one of the first to question both the very understanding of women and men, as categories given and universal (OLIVEIRA, 2004; ASSIS CLÍMACO, 2009).

We cannot fail to remember that, after the Second World War, the revival of social movements, especially feminist, was favored by the possibility of middle-class women, mainly European and American, to occupy spaces beyond the domestic. The occupation of women in areas previously considered exclusively masculine has challenged social roles conceived as natural, also allowing a look at men in gender

---

<sup>4</sup> The original title was *The straightmind*.

relations and the social mechanisms that enable their privileges<sup>5</sup>, which were previously invisible. In this way, men also began to pay attention to the social production of their roles and their effects and, thus, began to discuss changes that accompanied those achieved by women (OLIVEIRA, 2004), or that readjusted them in the social reconfigurations caused at that time.

Affirming the influence of the movements of politically silenced groups (women, homosexuals, blacks) in opening a way for men to rethink who they are does not mean that they have necessarily listened to such groups, nor that it has been the main factor of sensitization of men. into actions for their own transformation. Kimmel (1986) states that the strength of the organized feminist movement, as well as the modernization of Western society, has created a crisis in masculinities that made men have to seek ways to deal with such a crisis<sup>6</sup>. According to the author, the closing of borders, industrialization, urbanization and the increase of bureaucracies resulted in the decline of physical strength to perform certain tasks. In addition, the insertion of women in the labor market, as well as the fact that many boys grew up separated from their parents in the white middle classes, caused fear of a “feminization” of society among men from these strata. In this way, European and American white and middle-class men felt threatened their position of power in relation to women and the senses that support an idea of hegemonic masculinity. I also include that it is reasonable to say that the fear of loss of power was not addressed only to women, but also to black and homosexual men, representatives of other movements that challenged dominant models of being a man. Thus, it was not only because of the conviction of the need for an anti-sexist world that men mobilized to rethink their place in society, but also because of the discomfort generated by the new social configurations and the demands of women. We cannot fail to mention the increase in the number of divorces in the 1980s and 1990s, compared to previous periods, which made men need to deal with child custody issues and alimony for ex-wives. This situation fueled the discourse

---

<sup>5</sup> From now on, it is important to mention that privilege is not simply a right. According to the Online Dictionary of Portuguese, privilege would be a right, advantage or special immunities enjoyed by a person and/or group of people to the detriment of others (available at: <http://michaelis.uol.com.br/busca?id=laidO> Accessed April 12, 2017). In the case of men, violence against their partners without being questioned or interdicted, their favoring in the distribution of tasks at home, among others, can be considered privileges.

<sup>6</sup> Or perception and a new discourse on such a crisis, since Oliveira (2004) points out that the narratives about the crisis of masculinities go back to other times. In the 18th century, for example, the notion of a general degradation of moral values, including the inadequacy of certain masculine behaviors, was formulated in France and England. At the turn of the 19th to the 20th century, the emergence of gay meetings and a women's movement aroused fears among the population (OLIVEIRA, 2004).



about the suffering of men by the work of psychotherapists concerned with the care of this public.

On the other hand, there is a history of occasional support from men for equality between men and women (CONNELL, 2016). In the 19th century, Said Ahman Khan (India) and John Stuart Mill (Great Britain) are examples of intellectuals who defended the emancipation of women. Juan Bautista Cubié, an official at the Royal Library of the Palacio de Oriente, in Madrid, launched in the 18th century the book *Em defesa das mulheres das calúnias dos homens: com um catálogo das espanholas que mais se destacaram nas Ciências e nas Armas* (published in 2012 by the Unesp). Ferdinand-Valère Fanneau de La Cour, son of Alexandre Dumas, takes the medical notion of feminism, created in 1871, as a way of qualifying men in solidarity with the women's movement in its struggle for political equality (PRECIADO, 2014). In Brazil, the participation of men in the fights for women's rights between the second half of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century has also been remembered (AZEVEDO, 2012; AZEVEDO, MEDRADO and Lyra, 2018). However, beyond the limits of such occasional support in subverting the male-female relationship by the intellectual and material resources of their time, it was from the 1970s onwards, as we have pointed out in this article, that the most robust actions were constituted, in that groups of men gathered and theories about men as gender subjects were produced, being able to influence international human rights frameworks, in addition to the formation of intercontinental alliances and the global dissemination of social interventions with men.

The beginning of the gender debate with men was marked by the analysis of the privileges and costs of gender norms also for men (MESSNER, 2017). The analyzes presented on the established social changes and their role in the crisis of masculinities make us understand this direction. The commitment, on the part of some groups, to the criticism of gender inequality relations, in which men are privileged, was accompanied by the mobilization around the damage caused by gender norms, also suffered by men, such as not being able to demonstrate their pain, not having custody of children most of the time and suffering from urban violence, for example.

The concern with a critical engagement with male privileges or with the suffering of men generated by gender norms, as discussed below, appears in the approaches of the first groups of organized men, and which influence other groups to this day. Such approaches reveal a more individualizing concern with the required transformations, focused on men, their pains and benefits, offering positive behaviors



as a solution; leaving aside, many times, structural transformations, which do not lose sight of the construction of exits in the daily life of relationships.

### **From pro-men's rights to pro-feminists: critical perspectives of masculinities under analysis**

Discussing the different biases of interventions with men, critical to the effects of hegemonic masculinities, aims to highlight their complexity, inheritances, convergences and divergences with current works carried out in Brazil with the feminist production regarding the confrontation of the effects of gender and patriarchy. This is not about exhausting the history of actions with this group, but to raise elements that help us to reflect on the need and possibilities of promoting more structural changes, which also affect the logic of the functioning of gender relations.

Authors (MESSNER, 2000; OLIVEIRA, 2004) classify the perspectives of men's engagement critical to the effects of masculinities divide the different groups between: 1- liberationists or pro-men's rights; 2- the mythopoetic movement; 3- the antisexist or pro-feminist. Before discussing the approach of these lines, I make the reservation that the responses of men to the transformations provided by the political context presented in the previous section were not just criticisms of masculinities. There were groups that reacted negatively to the changes promoted in the lives of men and women. Such conservative groups are often typified as “antifeminists” or “masculinists”.

Unlike an explicitly conservative orientation<sup>7</sup>, which values “to maintain male hegemony as something socially legitimate” (OLIVEIRA, 2004, p. 150), men's rights groups, or liberationists, seek transformations in masculinities that can reduce the damage of traditional gender behaviors for men (MESSNER, 1997). While conservative groups react to female conquests, interpreting gender differences as a result of sexual anatomy, and justifying men's dominant position for the tasks they perform

---

<sup>7</sup> Raewyn Connell, in his article *Change among the Gate keepers: Men, Masculinities, and Gender Equality in the Global Arena*, 2005, reprinted in “Gender in Real Times,” 2016, states that the explicitly reactionary male groups, while they existed, did not exert much influence. More relevant in maintaining gender inequalities would be institutions in which men's interests are indirectly promoted (conservative parties, churches, nationalist and pro-family movements). In fact, the main obstacles for women in defending their rights were always those institutions, which defended the *status quo*, without explicitly declaring male sovereignty. Today, however, we are witnessing the strength of groups that openly attack women's claims or women directly. In any case, my interest lies in the analysis of groups capable of mobilizing support from organizations that defend human rights and promote health and development. The discourses that recognize the costs of gender norms for men, with regard to the absence of affective paternal bonds, the difficulty of expressing emotions, for being victims of urban violence and for having a lower life expectancy, have strength and manage to fundraising with organizations of this nature.

(OLIVEIRA, 2004), men's rights groups are inspired by female conquests to look at the ills that also affect men. According to Messner (1997), the question that mobilized these men was: what does this have to do with us? But the answer was to match women in relation to gender oppression, proposing changes in masculinities that were restricted to solving injustices and male pain.

The main focus of men's rights groups has been to expand definitions of masculinities to include the expression of emotions, often not allowed by men, such as the possibility of crying and being afraid. There was a clear confrontation with the ways in which the socialization of men induces them to success and competition, overshadowing their emotional and relationship skills<sup>8</sup>. Many of the creators of these groups were psychologists who used sex role theories, developed between 1950-1970, to show that, contrary to a biological root, male and female behaviors were socially inscribed and could be transformed (MESSNER, 1997). Connell (1987) argues that the men's liberation movement was based on a theory of sexual behaviors, which focuses more on an individualized psychology of gender than on promoting institutional analyses<sup>9</sup> with an emphasis on power relations.

Gender oppression was, therefore, perceived by liberationists as acting equally on men and women, producing a false idea of symmetry, so that the work consisted in freeing each individual from repressive social manifestations, without analyzing the inequalities and responsibilities in the maintenance of power relations. One of the arguments of this men's movement is that the feminist movement, by blaming men for gender oppressive relations, treated women as victims, exempting them from their responsibility and ability to change their condition. Thus, liberationists claimed that the feminist movement produced the disempowerment of women<sup>10</sup> (PEASE, 2000). Although the feminist production that criticizes the possible places of victims in

---

<sup>8</sup> The film *The mask you live in*, released in 2015, clearly expresses, under the analysis of specialists and academics in American sociology and cognitive social psychology, the need for men and boys to hide their feelings and fragility to adapt to the ideals of the American man. The documentary is available through the link <http://therepresentationproject.org/film/the-mask-you-live-in-film/>. Accessed on June 19, 2019.

<sup>9</sup> Connell does not refer here to the Institutional Analysis movement created by Guattari. Although Institutional Analysis references are dear to my work to present the complexities involved in training-intervention actions that aim to deconstruct oppressions, at this moment, when citing the Australian author, I refer to the concern with institutions in general, for the processes of production of subjectivity.

<sup>10</sup> This criticism has been observed by me, in the interventions I have participated in to call on men to join pro-gender equality movements. In an event organized by a network of men in training, a participant asked about the role of women in the transformation of relationships and gender and criticized what he considered female victimhood.

gender oppression is extensive and complex, marking the superficiality and injustice of the analyzes of liberationist men regarding the position of the feminist movement, many authors consider that the movement liberationist movement of men produced challenges to the actions of pro-feminist men, especially at the beginning of this movement, in their conceptions of guilt, victimization and female complicity in patriarchal relationships. Another position of the men's rights movement, according to Pease (2000) is that one man cannot be responsible for the bad behavior of another.

The essentialization of men as bad was one of the concerns highlighted by male liberationists in their critique of pro-feminist men (PEASE, 2000). Furthermore, according to Pease (2000), it was argued that it is more productive to understand the reasons why men behave as such, than to condemn them for their behavior. The claim was that no one has ever been seen to change constructively by being blamed, shamed, or self-loathed. There was the premise that no ethical approach could be created if men were treated as guilty and impelled to ask for forgiveness. The change would therefore be false.

With this, Pease (2000) mentions that it was common for male liberationist authors to emphasize the difference between guilt and responsibility. From this point of view, guilt would be related to complaining that someone would go back to the past and transform it, which would be fruitless or even impossible. Considering this definition, Pease (2000), who assumes himself as a pro-feminist, criticizes the excessive blaming of men, which, according to him, would interfere in the proposition of changes, in addition to legitimizing a moral. However, the author believes that it is precisely because the accusations use moral *standards* that they can influence behavior and contribute to putting an end to oppression. Pease (2000) suggests that the moral approach or reintegrative shame would prevent crime and violence, emphasizing the usefulness of persuading men to internalize an aversion to oppression in order to be proud to respect women's rights.

In another critique of the pro-men's rights or liberationist movement, regarding its discourse on the equal responsibility of women in maintaining patriarchy, Pease (2000) considers it legitimate to ask about the contribution/complacency of the oppressed, but only when the of the oppressors has been deeply and honestly examined, which still needs a long way to go. In the case of the men's liberation movement, the emphasis on the mutuality of domestic violence takes them away from this journey. In other words, they contribute little to a balance in the gender balance

or a critique of male power.<sup>11</sup>

Another of the movements most cited by scholars in the history of men's engagement in the promotion of gender equity is the Mythopoetic (MESSNER, 1997; PEASE, 2000; OLIVEIRA, 2004; CONNELL, 2005, 2016; AZEVEDO, 2012). The beginning of this movement is marked by important milestones, in which one of the most emblematic scenes was the interview of the two main reference poets, Robert Bly and Keith Thompson, in 1982. In such an interview, Bly states that one of the problems of Western society is depriving men of rites of passage. This would be one of the reasons why men would find it difficult to access their masculine side. The mythopoetic movement, however, was only named that way in 1986, by Shepherd Bliss. In the 1990s, in the United States, the book by Robert Bly (s/a), entitled *Iron John*, became a bestseller and main reference publication for the movement. Thus, the Mythopoetic movement gained popular discourse, although it was not the only one, nor the first movement organized by men related to gender issues.

In and in subsequent works, Bly elaborates his mythical approach, clearly influenced by Jung's archetypal psychology. The mythical approach, says Bly (s/d), does not seek to regain the dominion of men over women, nor is it opposed to the feminist movement, but through the positive expression of the myths that constituted human formation, such an approach aims to retake important aspects of male initiation that were supplanted by the industrial revolution. Here, there is no appeal to biological and evolutionary reasons for male characteristics, but models inscribed in the collective unconscious are conceived, which can be unveiled through ancient mythology, legends and fables.

The movement, which also aims at transformation, has as its premise that men will change when they heal, from the rescue of pride in being men, through the recognition of their pain and abuse. The main recommendation of the mythopoetic movement is that men “seek to reach a state of balance and maturity, from the harmonization of their behaviors with the typical archetypes of masculinity” (OLIVEIRA, 2004, p. 161). One of the best-known groups that put mythopoetic theories into practice was the *Men Envolment Network*, founded in the 1990s decade. In the

---

<sup>11</sup> Feminist literature discusses the internalization of oppression by oppressed groups, which does not mean blaming such groups for their situation. The claim that there is machismo among women or that women contribute to the maintenance of patriarchy is not a consensus among feminists. Less powerful groups, precisely for this reason, have not created the social systems in which they live. Although women reproduce discourses that place women in a position of inferiority in relation to men, for a group of feminists, patriarchy was built with labels and concepts created by a white male intellectual elite.

groups, there was the summoning of the masculine spirit and the connection with the universal man, in a search for the masculine essence.

In relation to groups of anti-sexist men, the first appeared in 1975 (WELZER-LANG, 2001). A few years later, these groups were defined as pro-feminists, a term consensually adopted by men and women in 1996 at a colloquium in Quebec. Pro-feminists recognize themselves as being socially constructed as men and must problematize their oppression of women as well as men's alienation from their own pain. While acknowledging that the division between the pro-men's rights movement and the anti-sexist movement was not explicit or clear at first, Messner (1997) states that in the mid-1970s, however, with women's criticism of the men's liberation movement For men, some groups have shifted discourse from an emphasis on the costs of masculinities for men to a focus on how men acquire power and privilege in patriarchal society. Thus, pro-feminist groups try to confront internalized domination, aware of their privileges and of how male socialization legitimizes oppressive behaviors (PEASE, 2000).

Messner (1997) classifies early pro-feminist groups into two types: radical and socialist. The discourse of radical pro-feminist men is characterized by the notion that sexism is a system of male supremacy – patriarchy – rather than attitudes and values that men learn. In this system, men as a group dominate women, where sexual abuse and other forms of violence are seen as extreme forms of male dominance over women. Thus, instead of the liberation of men, radical pro-feminists created anti-sexist practices focused on issues related to gender violence, especially sexual violence. The “White Ribbon Campaign”<sup>12</sup> is classified by Messner as radical pro-feminist, although we find no mention of this position on the campaign's website or among its co-founders.

One of the criticisms made by Messner (1997) to radical pro-feminist groups is

---

<sup>12</sup> The *White Ribbon Campaign* is one of the greatest examples of pro-gender equality activism in the world. The campaign emerged in Canada after Marc Lépine, a guy who was not satisfied with the approval of women at the polytechnic school of engineering, invaded the institution, killed fourteen women, in addition to injuring ten others. The episode became known as the “Montreal Massacre” and mobilized public opinion, including a group of men who intended to show that if some do not conform to women's conquests, others support it. The White Ribbon campaign has gone international in its focus on the education of boys and men (Connell, 2016). More information about the campaign can be accessed through: <https://www.whiteribbon.ca/> or <http://lacobrancobrasil.blogspot.com/p/nossa-historico.html> Accessed on June 22, 2019.

directed at the emphasis given to violence in the analysis of patriarchy, which, according to the author, would lead to a very simplified debate on how anti-sexist practices should be created. The author also considers that the focus that the discourse of feminist men offers to political institutions and social organizations is also a limiting factor for two reasons: the almost exclusive emphasis on criticizing privileges and the almost total lack of looking at the consequences of masculinities for women. men contribute so that the militants of this movement are seen as altruistic in relation to women. In this sense, the debate proposed by this movement would help the men who are part of it to be seen as generous or benevolent, as if the fact of being willing to promote fairer, non-violent relationships and performing tasks seen as feminine was worthy of merit. greater than that of the women who perform them.

Another source of criticism concerns the universalization of men characteristic of this strand, which would obscure the understanding of how other systems of oppression (race, class) operate and force groups of marginalized men to pay the dividends of patriarchy (CONNELL, 2005). Furthermore, male sexuality is seen almost exclusively as the embodiment of power, while female sexuality would be subordinate, strengthening an essentialist position on gender difference. Such criticisms are similar to the criticisms that radical feminism has also received.

In turn, the so-called pro-feminist socialist groups had great influence from the feminists of this political strand. The academic arm of this movement was the *Men's Studies Association*<sup>13</sup>, with a journal called *Masculinities*. Despite being founded in 1991, the association's roots go back to the early 1980s, when a small group of American scholars formed the *Men's Studies Task Group (MSTG) of the National Organization for Men (NOM)*. Among such scholars are Martin Acker, Shepherd Bliss, Harry Brod, Sam Femiano, Martin Fiebert, and Mike Messner, author of *Politics of masculinities: Men in movements* (1997), one of the main references used here to discuss the movement of men who are critical of masculinities. The NOM was renamed the *[National] Organization for Changing Men (NOCM) and then to National Organization for Men Against Sexism (NOMAS), that became the Men's Studies Association (MSA)*.

In the United States, mainly, a factor pointed out as limiting this perspective was the inability to convert theoretical discourse into effective political action

---

<sup>13</sup> Membership information is available at: [https://mensstudies.org/?page\\_id=5](https://mensstudies.org/?page_id=5) [https://mensstudies.org/?page\\_id=5](https://mensstudies.org/?page_id=5) Accessed on, June 21, 2019).



(MESSNER, 1997). In short, despite socialist feminism electing the state as an arena of struggle for issues such as equal pay between men and women, or parental leave, the American political scene left little room for strategies that go beyond individualized discourse and focused on the private sphere of feminism. Liberal. Also, the proportion of unionized workers, especially women, is very low in the US. Such challenges would not, however, apply to the parliamentary democracies of Australia, Great Britain, France and the Scandinavian countries. The criticisms leveled at anti-sexist men's groups were diverse and originated from different sources. Left militants criticized the middle-class composition of the men who made up such movements, as well as their main concern linked to the private sphere. The LGBTQI+ movement has marked the reluctance of anti-sexist men's groups to confront their homophobia. Feminists criticized such groups, seeing them as yet another form of union between men, which would strengthen patriarchy.

Despite these reservations, antisexist groups were also considered important spaces by countless men for understanding their own sexist behavior and developing emotional support. Giddens, in *A Transformação da Intimidade* (1993), indicates that, if, on the one hand, men have been unable to construct self-narratives that allow them to reorder the sphere of their personal life, on the other hand, male awareness groups have offered good opportunities for men to achieve this aim.

Despite the different perspectives regarding the reasons for men's engagement in the transformation of masculinities, it is possible to observe that the path has been built, mainly, through strategies that aim to change their sexist behaviors to "deconstructed", "transformed" or "positive", as can be seen in campaigns and interventions with men. The formation of autonomous *consciousness-raising groups* has been a common practice in the inclusion of men in the confrontation of gender norms. The reorganization of private relationships, inspired by models built among men, has been the central theme of these groups.

Based on the assumption that norms associated with the masculine – which involve taking risks, enduring pain, among others (WHO, 2007, p. 7) – are harmful to the health of men and women, changes in masculinities were understood as necessary. by international organizations and bilateral agencies to combat gender violence, prevent HIV/AIDS and promote sexual and reproductive health, opening space for an important field of projects with men in different countries. The creation of instruments that prove the impact of interventions with men in changing attitudes and sexist



behaviors<sup>14</sup> also contributed to leveraging male engagement projects in their transformation. In this way, I emphasize that what has been considered gender transformative is related, above all, to the criticism of sexist attitudes and behaviors, based on the offer of models considered more equitable.

In the 1990s, the concern with how to engage men attracted the attention of multilateral cooperation bodies, such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)). The association between the transformation of masculinities and the reduction of HIV infection rates, prevention of violence against women and improvements in reproductive health favored the financing of projects, congresses and the production of alliances and exchanges of experiences to work with men in different areas countries.

### **International dissemination of works with men – exportation of individualizing changes**

Concerns about the effects of masculinities have generated interventions to change the behavior of men in countries as diverse as Canada, India, Germany, South Africa (CONNELL, 2016). Latin American countries have also been cradles of important references in the production of such interventions. In Mexico, for example, names like Matthew C. Gutmann (2017), Juan Guillermo Figueroa (2014), Juan Carlos Ramírez Rodríguez and José Carlos Cervantes Ríos (2013) have developed important studies that discuss forms of social transformation in which men can be involved in promoting greater gender justice. The studies by Gutmann (2017) still provide us with evidence on how global political and economic dynamics are integrated into the lives of groups of men in poor communities in Mexico.

The works with American men, however, were the first to promote a series of practices that involved men in the debate about the effects of their ways of being on their relationships with women, and that spread globally. Badinter (1993) attributes this situation to the fact that American feminism is more radical and powerful than in France, where, according to the author, the fact that male violence is less makes the

---

<sup>14</sup> The relationship between attitude and behavior has been dear to social psychology (LIMA and D'AMORIM, 1986). A concept that has become more complex over the years, attitudes indicate behavioral dispositions based on affections for or against certain objects. Studies of attitudes and behaviors have supported analyzes of social change, as well as being used by marketing strategies. Based on the creation of scales, the measurement of attitudes has served to attest to the impact of social projects, including those that transform gender.

problem of masculinity to be perceived with less acuity, although torment French men and women.

One of the hallmarks of work on masculinities in the United States is its behaviorist and individualizing focus. The interference in individual aspects of male subjectivity is also due to the fact that American social psychology was the discipline that most produced texts on men's studies (BENTO, 2012). Similar to the possibility of expression in self-help literature, it is possible to note that the terrain of interventions with men in the transformation of masculinities in the United States was favored by a set of practices engendered by the Anglo-Saxon culture, “through which people seek to discover, cultivate and employ their supposed internal resources and transform subjectivity, aiming to achieve a certain individual position” (RÜDIGER, 2010, p. 8).

The United States' international relationship with the export of goods, knowledge and technologies, including social ones, as well as its privileged position in the management and control of resources for social development and health promotion projects, facilitated the influence, mainly of militant researchers from that country – among others from Anglo-Saxon culture – in the production of discourses, practices and policies located in different parts of the globe. It is possible to observe how influential masculinity researchers from the Global North contributed to international agreements and conventions that recommend the inclusion of men in public policies and interventions to promote gender equity.

The United Nations relied on works such as those by Michael Kimmel and Micheal Kaufman (this Canadian) who, along with that of other authors, “are part of the of a remarkable group of 'men' who function as a reference of the North on masculinities” (ARILHA, 2010). Such masculinity scholars, in addition to collaborating with United Nations publications, guided documents and influenced interventions from different civil society groups, including an international alliance for the engagement of men in the promotion of gender equity, the *Men Engage Alliance*.<sup>15</sup> In 2000, Michael Kimmel co-authored an influential United Nations Development Program-UNDP study entitled *Men, masculinities and development: broadening our work towards gender equality* (GREIG, KIMMEL and LANG, 2000), working group

---

<sup>15</sup> The Men Engage alliance is made up of hundreds of non-governmental organizations, United Nations - UN agencies and dozens of networks from different countries from different regions of the globe, which together seek to affirm the need to involve men, adults and young people, in the scope of gender justice, as well as building a field of practice around this issue. *Information available at <http://menengage.org/>* Accessed on June 25, 2019.

result *UN Men's Group for Gender Equality*.

The United Nations system, as an important creator of discourses and approaches to issues related to human rights and social development, has been a great influencer of governmental and non-governmental policies and programs for the involvement of men in the promotion of gender equity (ARILHA, 2010). Such influence also includes the financial incentive of projects by civil society organizations.

Two themes were important in the dissemination of initiatives for the engagement of men, financed by bilateral agencies and international organizations. The emergence of AIDS raised questions regarding the effectiveness of preventive actions if the subordination relationships to which women and gay men were subjected were not discussed. As a result, there was a growing opportunity for funding for research and interventions aimed at improving men's knowledge and changing their behavior (HEILBORN and CARRARA, 1998). Another field of international interventions on masculinities was opened up through debates on globalization and development, which gained strength, including among feminist scholars, concerned with documenting the impact of international policies on women's lives. According to Connell (2016), the neoliberal ideology and politics of the 1970s guided the expansion of international trade and, in a way, standardized policies of different countries. In the 1990s, concern about its effects also extended to research on masculinities, where it was explored the relevance of working with men for public policies aimed at economic and social development.

The 1994 International Conference on Population and Development, in Cairo, and the IV World Conference on Women in Beijing, in 1995, are seen as fundamental milestones in the inclusion of a male role in actions related to sexual and reproductive rights and violence prevention. against women (KEIJZER, 2004; OLIVEIRA, 2004). In addition to being catalytic in the expansion of actions for gender transformation proposed by feminist movements, such conferences are considered milestones in the inclusion of men in the struggle for gender equity. With a strong presence of the feminist movement, it was considered that, since men are the ones who most commit violence against women and they also have greater decision-making power, engaging them in actions for population control and prevention of gender violence would be fundamental tactic.

In 2007, the World Health Organization (WHO) published a compilation of interventions with men in different areas of health – sexual and reproductive health,

HIV/AIDS prevention and care, and violence prevention – in which it classified health programs with men from its ability to address gender issues. The classification of programs was based on a *continuum* presented by Gupta (2000), at the 13th International AIDS Conference in Durban - South Africa. Programs with men and boys were then classified as negative, neutral, sensitive or transformative. From this perspective, the negatives would reinforce gender norms. In an example of this case, we can imagine traditional marketing strategies, which make use of stereotypes and social norms to sell a product or achieve a certain result. Neutral programs, when dealing with any topic, would not distinguish male or female roles, nor would they question the desires and behaviors of men and women. Sensitive programs, on the other hand, would recognize the effects of gender norms on inequality between men and women, but do not strive to transform these roles. Finally, a transformative approach is one that includes a deliberate debate on the construction of masculinities, in addition to analyzing institutional practices and social norms, which contribute to the inequity and vulnerability of men and women to violence and other issues of health.

Gender-transforming strategies were considered the most effective and sustainable in achieving results related to violence prevention and promotion of sexual and reproductive health through the review carried out by the WHO (2007), in which the transformations of masculinities are included as a prerequisite for a relational gender perspective. It is important to highlight that the classification of programs in the continuum profiles depends more on the final results achieved than on their characteristics. However, in the case of works considered gender transformative, changes in attitudes and behaviors have served as the main indication of such a change:

[...]. A recent review confirmed that programs that applied a gender-transforming approach were presumably those that could best lead to changes in attitudes and behaviors (including health behavior) on the part of men and women, as opposed to programs that they did not demonstrate explicit attempts to confront and challenge gender norms (PROMUNDO and MENGENGAGE, s/d, p. 14).

In this way, transformed male behaviors, established from parameters very well determined by activists, professionals and funding agencies, have defined the focus of actions aimed at the emancipation of men and women from the shackles of gender, without considering the circumstances that produced such parameters of change, nor the complexity involved in subjective transformations.

Without failing to recognize the importance that such strategies have had for the inclusion of men as gender subjects and necessary in the transformation of patriarchal power relations, as well as their effects on the reduction of violence rates, condom use and greater balance of domestic tasks<sup>16</sup>, the exposure of the dissemination of male inclusion practices poses the challenge of thinking about the possibility of changes beyond the content of the norms. In this sense, how is it possible to produce ruptures in the genre's normalizing process that, inserted in the modern colonial-capitalist regime, captures the very creative power of life? How to stimulate projects that make the daily production of human existence visible, instead of creating processes that homogenize and act by crystallizing human behavior?

### **By way of conclusion: for a transformation beyond behaviors**

Several feminist authors - Heleieth Saffioti (2015), Glória Anzaldúa (2005), Angela Davis (2018), bell hooks (2019), Nikki van der Gaag (2014), Raewyn Connell (2016) - recognize not only the importance of men in facing patriarchy, such as the fact that the gender system also harms them. Bell hooks (2019a) tells us that, before the contemporary movement was ten years old, "feminist politics were expanded to include the recognition that patriarchy stripped men of certain things, imposing on them a male sexist identity" (HOOKS, 2019a), p. 104). Nikki van der Gaag (2014), in *Feminism & Men*, also agrees that on gender issues, men are disadvantaged in a number of circumstances: suicide, homicide, reproductive health care, child custody.

However, men have dedicated themselves mainly to thinking about their behavior, especially in their private relationships. Carballo (2017) recognizes that in the

---

<sup>16</sup> Peacock and Barker (2012) cite some of the main results of projects that are based on models of masculinity transformation. According to the authors, in Nicaragua, a study of approximately 150 men who participated in workshops on masculinity and gender equity revealed a positive impact on the use of violence, sexual relationships, parental responsibility and domestic activities. In a South African initiative, participating men reported having fewer partners, increasing condom use and using fewer drugs. Also in South Africa, participants in the campaign, in the following weeks, reported taking action regarding violence in their community, 25% voluntarily accessed HIV testing services and 61% reported having increased condom use.

Global North, men have thought of gender as a symptom that needs to be cured quickly. According to the author, in the face of the feminist contestation of male power, especially on the gender axis, the answer was: to make them not have heard the question; make them hear the question, but not consider it relevant; listening to the question, but thinking that it is not with them; try to return the question with a similar question; try to respond as quickly as possible and leave quietly. In other words, men have applied antibiotics to the question of gender and power, treating it as a symptom. In this way, men either sought to deal with their pain or worked on their guilt, feeling worthy of merit for engaging in a noble cause (PEASE, 2000). The result has been the concentration on individualized changes, of behaviors that can be harmful to themselves and their companions, but that interfere little in the subjective capture regime, maintaining the production of models and knowledge of the Global North.

A similar movement can also be noticed in Brazil. When masculinities were no longer just a matter for gay and black men, more recently, debate and reflection groups as well as social campaigns about toxic masculinities and their effects on men have been increasingly common. It is not a question here of belittling the importance of these actions in the deconstruction of chauvinism, but of posing the question about the possibility of men engaging in structural transformations of the patriarchal regime, beyond their behavior.

Gender norms, as they are configured in our patriarchy, articulated to colonialism and compulsory cisheterosexuality, act in an attempt to capture our possibilities of producing singular existences, moving us away from the relationship with the means that act in the processes of production of subjectivities. With this, they give us the impression that subjectivities are characterized by fixed identities, closing us within the borders that name us, producing, in fact, harmful effects in the lives of all people. Because we believe in the strength of the borders that mark our ways of being, we fail to observe possibilities of creating ways out of depotentiating situations. This process affects all people, men and women, who find it difficult to get out of the limits that these identities place on us.

It happens, however, that some people find it more difficult to fit into the borders that have been circumscribed to them, and such identity borders mark contacts between asymmetrical zones, producing quite different effects, so we need to be aware of how borders are marked, so we need to be attentive to how borders are marked, inside and out, displacing them, reconfiguring them. Race, sexual orientation,

social class, age group are factors that make it difficult to comply with hegemonic masculinities.

The effects considered negative of masculinities, such as the repression of certain emotions, the demand for risk, the absence of spaces and incentives for preventive health care or the approximation of children, have different connotations when it comes to black masculinities, homosexuals, or other variants. Young blacks from interventions conducted by me, for example, did not need to learn that being a “man” or being “brave”<sup>17</sup> is not being violent. Many were sweet and even had submissive relationships with their wives. However, they had to deal with the fear that his black body inflicted on the streets.

Thus, assessing the acquisition of new, non-sexist behaviors has been shown to be insufficient. Reflecting on racism, capacitism, capitalist exploitation, ageism and colonialism have been shown to be essential in solving the harmful effects of gender for women and men. If there are losses in the attempt to adapt to the idea of what it means to be a man, it is necessary to associate them with the deliberate attempt to universalize men in models of specific reference. Furthermore, said costs, such as the alienation of parental care and emotions, or competitiveness in public life, are part of a set of attributes created by men themselves to be at the forefront of a system of economic production that, in order to establish itself it also depended on women's free labor in household and care tasks (RUBIN, 1975), in addition to the exploitation of colonies (FEDERICI, 2017).

Thus, there is a process of producing domination that needs to be considered. This process involves the centralization of all aspects that make up social practices in Euro-Western white masculinities, producing hierarchies that favor these groups, although the classification systems also delimit the boundaries of meaning of the groups taken as a reference. However, we cannot forget that these groups are the ones that usually have the tools of subjective definition. If something suffocates the creative process of themselves, we cannot do without an analysis of the articulation of gender relations with other social hierarchies, at the risk of reproducing power relations. When the examination of the damages of patriarchy for men does not include the different marks of power, it is possible to observe some dangers, as bell hooks (2019b)

---

<sup>17</sup> Alluding to the initiative “The brave is not violent”, by UN Women. Available at: [http://www.onumulheres.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/valente\\_inventario.pdf](http://www.onumulheres.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/valente_inventario.pdf)[http://www.onumulheres.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/valente\\_inventario.pdf](http://www.onumulheres.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/valente_inventario.pdf) Accessed on October 7, 2020.



mentions:

It is primarily white male feminist policy advocates who do the scholarly work that shows how contemporary patriarchy has a crippling impact on men, especially those groups of men who do not receive the maximum profits from this system. In writing about how patriarchal masculinity undermines men's ability to construct a *self* and identity as their own well-being in mind, creating a dangerous masculinist sensibility, these works rarely address black men (HOOKS, 2019b, p. 195).

The oppressions characteristic of the patriarchal regime today need to be thought of as part of a dynamic system, which articulates a set of power relations: social class, sexual orientation, ethnicity, age group, among other factors. In this sense, resistance to the norms that produce social hierarchies must be a process that promotes the integrated problematization of such relationships and the socio-political-economic systems that produce them, that is, their way of functioning. Otherwise, advances will be limited to the limits of some privileged lives or may even reinforce other asymmetries. In another example of this issue, cited by bell hooks (2019a, p. 21), “given the reality of racism, it made sense that white men were more willing to take women’s rights into account, when the guarantee of these rights could serve the white supremacy”. In this way, according to the author, at the very moment when black men began to compete for jobs, with the close end of racial discrimination, white women occupied them, while black women took care of domestic tasks.

Rita Segato (2017) offers more tools for understanding inequalities among men by mentioning that the mandate of masculinity is characterized by having to constantly prove to be a man and not having the means to do so. The author reminds us that this power is exercised by a very small group of people who, I would add, hold the privileges of race, language, political and economic power. Perceiving themselves as victims for men would mean the absence or lack of masculinity. In other words, the difficulty of adapting to the hegemonic models of masculinity or understanding oneself outside of these models is what would bring them suffering, exclusion and violence. In the words of the author, “in the sprouting of the violence that we have [...] the first victim is the men themselves, but they do not know it because they cannot see themselves as a victim, which would be their virile death” (SEGATO, 2017, s/p). In this

way, the restoration of authority, morality, and sovereignty of people, in the absence of spaces to work on them, would mainly take place through the use of violence, in the same way that being outside the hegemonic standards of masculinity makes them the target of situations of violence. violence, as in the case of black men and homosexuals, or any other men in which traits of homosexuality are associated, for example.

When considering that violence is exercised as an attempt by men to restore their economic and political power, we can conclude with Rita Segato (2017) that, if there is no questioning of these forms of power, of some men over others, and of masculincentrism in general, which can be reinforced by projects that seek “alternative” or “positive” masculinities, it will not be possible to produce a transformation that fact leads us to a more equitable society, because, according to bell hooks,

The more women walked away from destructive relationships with men, the easier it was to see the bigger picture. It became obvious: even if individual men gave up patriarchal privilege, the system of patriarchy, sexism and male domination would still be intact and women would still be exploited and/or oppressed. (HOOKS, 2019a, p. 103-104).

The patriarchy transformation cannot just be a matter of adjusting the scales, in which we weigh masculine and feminine content. Thus, if, as mentioned earlier, there was recognition by women that patriarchy also deprived men of certain things, this does not free us from a fierce criticism of male domination (HOOKS, 2019a), which includes not only the expression of machismo in behaviors and attitudes, but to dismantle the gears of the machine that sustains universalist worldviews, in which only a small part of the world fully recognizes itself. It includes radically changing the sentiment and position of men from the center in relation to the peripheries, and not just loving their new masculinities. It is not just about treating women well, but thinking about a society that is open to us, without this meaning or generating exploitation/manipulation of other bodies.

In the interventions on masculinities presented, it is common for men to limit their work to thinking about themselves, among themselves, without listening to women and the effects of their privileged places on them. Thus, thinking about their

place of domination with a view to getting rid of it cannot be done based only on their pains and joys, but requires looking at places overshadowed by the positions they assume. The debate on how men should question gender, through the analysis of the costs to themselves, has been anchored in an individualized perspective of the solutions sought, without paying attention to the lines that are sewn in the making of patriarchy.

It is not about denying the right of men to redefine and articulate themselves. But there are power devices that continue to act and guarantee privileges not only directly associated with masculinities, behaviors and expressions that define them. We call attention here to the relationship between gender norms and the universalization of worldviews based on references established from a naturalized axis, dictator of normality, glued to the way colonial modernity produced knowledge and is sustained until today. Far from listing causes for the reactions to the gender equity agenda, what I would like to emphasize is the multiplicity of relationships that surround the theme, involving a set of factors that call into question the privileges of certain groups based on their economic power, political and epistemic. Men, as part of this social structure that needs to be transformed, are undoubtedly essential for the eradication of violence and inequities. Here, we reinforce the invitation that the debate on possibilities of transformation does not erase – from ready-made formats – the daily ruptures of the genre, which occur in meetings and in the frequent production of outlets for the different oppressions of our society.

### **Bibliographic references**

ABOIM, Sofia. Masculinidade hegemónica e pluralidade no masculino: rumo a novos hibridismos do género. *In: ABOIM, Sofia et al. O que é masculinidade?* Lisbon: Escolar Editora, 2017.

ABREU, Ana Maria do Rego Menteiro de; COIMBRA, Cecília Maria Bouças. Quando a clínica se encontra com a política. *In: MACIEL JÚNIOR, Auterives; KUPERMANN, Daniel; TEDESCO, Silvia. Polifonias Clínica, Política e Criação.* Rio de Janeiro: Contracapa, 2005.

ARILHA, Margareth. *Nações Unidas, população e gênero: homens em perspectiva*. Jundiaí, SP: Editora in House, 2010.

ASSIS-CLIMACO, Danilo. *Tráfico de Mulheres, Negócios de homens. Leituras Feministas e Anti-coloniais sobre os Homens, as Masculinidades e/ou o Masculino*. Dissertação (Mestrado em Psicologia) - Programa de Pós-Graduação em Psicologia, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, 2009.

AZEVEDO, Mariana. *Homens feministas: a emergência de um sujeito político entre fronteiras contingentes*. Dissertação (Mestrado em Sociologia). Programa de Pós-Graduação em Sociologia. Universidade Federal de Pernambuco. Recife, p. 92, 2012.

AZEVEDO, M.; MEDRADO, B. e LYRA, J. Homens e o Movimento Feminista no Brasil: rastros em fragmentos de memória. *Cadernos Pagu*, v. 54, [S.I.], 2018. Available at: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/cpa/n54/1809-4449-cpa-18094449201800540014.pdf>.

Accessed on Saturday, July 13, 2019.

BADINTER, Elisabeth. *XY: sobre a identidade masculina*. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 1993.

BENTO, Berenice. *Homem não tece a dor: queixas e perplexidades masculinas*. Natal, RN: EDUFRN, 2012.

BLY, Robert. *Iron John: A Book About Men*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., [S/I].

BUTLER, Judith. *Problemas de Gênero: Feminismo e subversão da identidade*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2008.

\_\_\_\_\_. Regulações de Gênero. *Cadernos pagu*, v. 42, p. 249-274, jan/jun. 2014.

CARBALLO, Jokin Azpiazu. *Masculinidades y Feminismo*. Barcelona: Virus, 2017.

CECCHETTO, Fátima Regina. *Violência e estilos de masculinidade*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora FGV, 2004.

CONNEL, Raewyn. La organizacion social de la masculinidad. In VALDEZ T & OLAVARRIA, J. (org.) *Masculinidad/es, poder e crisis*. Chile, Isis Internacional, 1997, p. 43-47.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Southern theory: the global dynamics of knowledge in social science*. London: Polity, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_. A iminente revolução na teoria social. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*. n. 80, p. 9-20, 2012.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Gênero em termos reais*. São Paulo: nVersos, 2016.

CONNELL, Robert W. e MESSERSCHMIDT, James W. *Masculinidade hegemônica: repensando o conceito*. Estudos Feministas, Florianópolis, n. 21, v. 1, p. 241-282, jan-abril/2013.

CUBIÉ, Juan Bautista. *Em defesa das mulheres das calúnias dos homens: com um catálogo das espanholas que mais se destacaram nas Ciências e nas Armas*. São Paulo: Editora Unesp, 2012.

FEDERICI, Silvia. *Calibã e a bruxa: mulheres, corpo e acumulação*. São Paulo: Elefante, 2017.

FIGUEROA, Juan Guillermo. *Paternidad, espacios laborales, salud y educación*. México, D. F.: El Colégio de México, Centro de Estudios Demográficos, Urbanos y Ambientales, 2014.

FONSECA, V. N. *“Precisamos falar com os homens?”: uma análise das intervenções nas masculinidades do Norte para o Sul*. Tese (Doutorado em Psicologia) – Instituto de Psicologia, Universidade Federal Fluminense. Niterói -RJ, p. 264, 2019.

GAAG, Nikki van der. *Feminism & men*. Londres: Zed Books, 2014.

GIDDENS, Anthony. *A Transformação da Intimidade: Sexualidade, Amor e Erotismo nas Sociedades Modernas*. São Paulo: Editora da Universidade Estadual Paulista, 1993.

GUTIÉRREZ AGUILAR, Raquel. La lucha de las mujeres contra todas las violências em México: reunir fragmentos para hallar sentido. In: GAGO, Veronica et al. *8M Constelación feminista*. Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires: Tinta Limón, 2018.

GUTMANN, Matthew G. *Os significados de ser homem em uma Colônia Popular na Cidade do México*. Niterói: CEAD/UFF, 2017.

HEILBORN, M. L. & CARRARA, S. Em cena, os homens... *Revista de Estudos Feministas*, 6(2), p. 371-374, 1998.

HOOKS, bell. *O feminismo é para todo mundo: políticas arrebatadoras*. Rio de Janeiro: Rosa dos Tempos, 2019a.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Olhares negros: raça e representação*. São Paulo: Elefante, 2019b.

KEIJZER, Beno de. Masculinidades: resistance and change. In: Oxfam GB. *GenderEquality and Men: learning from practice*. Oxford: Oxfam, 2004.

KIMMEL, Micheal. Toward men's studies. *American Behavioral Scientist*, ano 29, v.5, 517-529, 1986.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Angrywhitemen: American masculinity at the end of an era*. New York: Nation, Books, 2013.

LIMA, Vera Maria Leal Moreira e D'AMORIM, Maria Alice Magalhães. A relação atitude-comportamento à luz da Teoria da Ação Racional. *Arquivos Brasileiros de Psicologia*. Rio de Janeiro, ano 38, v.1, p.133-142, jan./mar 1986.

MEDRADO DANTAS, Benedito. *O masculino na mídia. Repertórios sobre masculinidade*

na propaganda televisiva brasileira. São Paulo. 148 p. Dissertação. Mestrado em Psicologia Social. PUC/SP, 1997.

MESSNER, Micheal A. *Politics of masculinities: Men in movements*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997.

\_\_\_\_\_. How did the Men's Rights Movement Beginning? *The red pill*. 2017. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4EZWAKdzk8E>. Accessed on October 8, 2020.

OLIVEIRA, Pedro Paulo. *A Construção Social da Masculinidade*. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG; Rio de Janeiro: IUPERJ, 2004.

PAREDES, Julieta. *Hilando fino. Desde el feminismo comunitário*. La Paz: Creative Commons, 2010.

PAULON, S. M. A Análise de Implicação como Ferramenta na Pesquisa-intervenção. *Psicologia & Sociedade*, n. 17, v. 3, 18-25, set-dez: 2005.

PEACOCK, Dean. e BARKER, Gary. Working with men and boys to promote gender equality: A review of the field and emerging approaches. *Expert Group Meeting/ Prevention of Violence Against Women and Girls*, v. 13. Bangkok, 2012.

PEASE, Robert. *Recreating Men: Postmodern Masculinity Politics*. London: Sage, 2000.

PETERSEN, Andersen. Research on Men and Masculinities: Some Implications of Recent Theory for Future Work. *Men and Masculinities*. v. 6, n. 1, 2003. Available at: <http://jmm.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/6/1/54>

PRECIADO, Paul B. Féminisme amnésique. *Liberación*. 2014. Available at: [https://www.liberation.fr/france/2014/05/09/feminisme-amnesique\\_1014052](https://www.liberation.fr/france/2014/05/09/feminisme-amnesique_1014052). Accessed on October 08, 2020.

RODRÍGUEZ, Juan Carlos R. e VAZQUÉZ, Griselda Uribe. El gênero de los hombres: un subcampo de estudios em expansión. In: RODRÍGUEZ, Juan Carlos R. e



VAZQUÉZ, Griselda Uribe (org). *Masculinidades: el juego de género de los hombres en el que participan las mujeres*. Colonia San Rafael México, D. F. e Madrid: Plaza y Valdés, 2008

RODRÍGUEZ, Juan Carlos R. e RÍOS, José Carlos C. Estudios sobre la masculinidad y políticas públicas em México. Apuntes para uma discusión. In: ODRÍGUEZ, Juan Carlos R. e RÍOS, José Carlos C. *Los hombres em México: Veredas recorridas y por andar. Una mirada a los estudios de género de los hombres, las masculinidades*. México: Universidad de Guadalajara – CUCEA-AMEGH, A. C 2013.

RÜDIGER, Francisco. *Literatura de auto-ajuda e individualismo: contribuição ao estudo da subjetividade de massa contemporânea*. Porto Alegre: Gattopardo, 2010.

RUBIN, G. A Circulação de Mulheres: notas sobre a “economia política” do sexo. In REITER, R. (ed.) *Towards an anthropology of women*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975, p 157-210. (Tradução de Edith Piza, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Psicologia Social/ PUC/SP).

SAFFIOTI, Heleith. *Gênero patriarcado violência*. São Paulo: Expressão Popular: Fundação Perseu Abramo, 2015.

SEGATO, Rita L. Por qué la masculinidad se transforma en violencia. *La voz*. 2017. Available at <http://www.lavoz.com.ar/ciudadanos/por-que-la-masculinidad-se-transforma-en-violencia>

SOUZA, Rolf Ribeiro de. *A confraria da esquina: o que os homens de verdade falam em torno de uma carne queimando*. Etnografia de um churrasco de esquina no subúrbio carioca. Rio de Janeiro: Bruxedo, 2003.

**Received: October 14, 2020.**

**Approved: November 3, 2020.**