The Engaging Men Project
Portland, Oregon
From "Engaging Men" To "Men Engaging"
April 20, 2013

The Engaging Men Project members have been:
Armin Tolentino
Choya Adkison-Stevens, YWCA of Greater Portland
Ethan Young
Mario Olivares, Clackamas Women's Services
Nick Guerrero, Raphael House of Portland
Patrick Lemmon
Rachel Rustad
Ray Shellmire
Ron Clark, Agape Church of Christ
Tim Logan, Sovalti

NOTE:

We want this document to be a resource for anyone interested in gender justice – and engaging men as allies specifically. To that end, we suggest that readers use this paper in the manner that suits them best. Some may want to read it cover to cover; others may simply skim. Some may use the table of contents provided to read the sections most relevant to their work and interests. However you choose to read it, we hope you are challenged and inspired by this material, as we continue to be.

CONTENTS:

SECTION I

Introduction

In February 2010, Shelly Massarello (then of YWCA of Greater Portland) and Ethan Young initiated a gathering of community members interested in discussing options and implications of engaging men in the work to end men's violence against women. More than forty people came together for a two hour conversation. From this discussion a core group of individuals formed with the goal of meeting regularly and moving this work forward in the Portland metro area. Our group began meeting regularly in May 2010, and soon coined the name The Engaging Men Project, or TEMP.

In fall 2010, TEMP identified and initiated a project to learn more about:
- The community's prevailing attitudes and beliefs regarding engaging men
- The work that was being done in this arena
- Risks and opportunities for ongoing work, expansion, and collaboration

This paper is a major result of what we have researched. We intend to provide a reflective overview of the efforts to engage men at this time in our local community. In recognition of specialized language used, a Glossary is provided at the end of the paper (Appendix A, page 23).

Methodology

Let us begin with the recognition that this is a subjective, qualitative paper presented by a diverse group of individuals (some volunteer, some compensated for work herein by their places of employment) actively engaged in the work to address gender-based violence. Our biases and personal/professional approaches to this work are present in our discussions as well as in this paper. The group has struggled from the outset to think, work and convene in a manner conscious of institutionalized and interpersonal oppression (sexism, racism, classism most notably for this project), and to make visible our own struggles with these issues. It is our belief that objectivity is unrealistic, and that we're better off being honest about our perspectives – in efforts to challenge them and to grow – rather than denying them out of an academic desire to conform to elitist and falsely rational points of view.

TEMP agreed to pursue needed information through interviews; we identified several individuals and organizations doing related work in this geographic area including women's organizations, men's organizations, mentorship programs, faith-based groups, and culturally specific programs. Significantly, this list consisted mainly of people and groups we knew, or had heard of. Although we believed it was a reliable list, there is no doubt we missed important stakeholders simply through lack of knowledge or connection, and due to insufficient time and resources. From a master list of over two hundred potential contacts, we prioritized twenty-five agencies that we were able to interview. Due to time, schedules and logistics, our TEMP team focused on this sample as schedules allowed. They are listed as Interviewees, Appendix D, page 31.

We designed **eleven questions** (see Interview Questions, Appendix B, page 25). The first four questions identified the interviewee's name, organization, clientele, and nature of work. Remaining questions focused on the issue from a variety of angles. These have been considered and analyzed in aggregate, and our reflections on the responses form the body of this paper. Quotes are used sparingly and anonymously out of respect for the interviewees, and with recognition that many of these perspectives were shared widely, therefore quotes are symbolic and representative rather than atypical.

Gendered Language

In this project, we have encountered challenges regarding language; some of the most poignant hardships center on the language of gender. We intend to address these challenges directly for transparency and credibility; however, we acknowledge that our treatment of gender issues will of necessity be overly simplistic at times and will rely unrealistically on what we recognize is a false binary. We are in search of and welcoming new language that more adequately addresses gender spectrum and complexity.

We recognize that the female/male binary is false; gender is a spectrum, or indeed something far more complex than even this. However, the dominant understanding of gender as binary is also clear. In light of this knowledge, we are frustrated at the gendered language that persists in the discourse on violence and oppression. For while sexism is real – privileging men at the expense of all non-male people – we know it is but one manifestation of broader intersecting oppressions, the roots of which are violence, domination, exploitation, power-over, and hierarchy. This system is not fundamentally gender based, though it appears so after millennia of patriarchy and misogyny. We use the language we hear most commonly used, but with the recognition that it is inadequate and needs revision; that effort must wait for a different project.

In an effort to speak accurately about gender variation, we have intentionally used the phrase "people of all genders" in place of the more common "people of both genders." **For the sake of this paper, "men" means people self-identified as male and/or socialized as male. "Women" means people self-identified as female and/or socialized as female**. While there is a massive gulf between socialization and identity, we believe this is an important nuance to leave open, given the nature of our project. For example, some self-identified women, were they socialized men, may experience aspects of this work related to women *and* those related to men, depending on context and time/place in their lives.

SECTION II – WHAT WE LEARNED

Process as Part of Work

Some of the most significant observations we made were those regarding our own process. We frequently found ourselves stuck, distracted, or simply not meeting at all. Given that we each volunteered for this project and all repeatedly expressed interest and enthusiasm for moving it forward, why did we find it so hard to do? We did not identify any certain answers,

but we did come up with several possibilities or notes on why we (and possibly by extension, the movement to engage men) have gotten stuck:

- **This area is not identified as urgent, a crisis, in the same way that responding to survivors is, and, therefore, this work could be seen as optional or at least not a necessity.**
- We may have significant uncertainty about how we actually envision success or even progress, and so we don't know how to move; we **don't know how to measure or recognize** when we *have* made progress.
- We may feel that, despite lack of clarity, the stakes are incredibly high; that if we do not do this right we will disappoint the women we work with and reduce the likelihood that we will succeed in engaging men.
- **Those of us who identify as men already working in the movement may relish our "specialness" among the few special men, and fear that by expanding the pool of men, we will lose our uniqueness.**

Another, and possibly more central, observation we made was about the fact that, even in this group of deeply involved and experienced people, we still at times (and possibly often) allowed ourselves to expect women to take care of the logistics and details, and to attend to the "process" side of our meetings. **We did seek to confront this – and to remedy it – when we noticed it, but the fact that it arose on several occasions (which we did not always notice or notice quickly) speaks to the very deep and ongoing nature of this struggle to unlearn sexism.** We even experienced that the few women among us felt compelled to bring this dynamic to our attention (at times before the men among us noticed what was happening), which points to a depressing pervasiveness of sexist biases, expectations, and overall approach to the work and to the world in which we operate.

Roles for Men

Our interviews were consistent with our own experiences, that most people and agencies in the movement to end men's violence against women want more male engagement. "I want my organization to be specifically aligned with energies to **neutralize patriarchy** and neutralize racism." Many even explicitly agreed with TEMP's belief that men's violence against women cannot end without men's active engagement: "I don't believe we will really ever be able to end male violence against women until men stand up to other men and speak out against that type of behavior."

In the interviews, several themes emerged regarding the roles men most appropriately hold within this movement. The most significant trend reinforced a belief that **it is generally more appropriate and helpful for men to be engaged in prevention work** (role modeling healthy masculinities, raising healthy children of all genders – both as parents and as secondary caregivers/teachers etc, holding each other accountable for problematic beliefs, doing activism/norms change work, legislative advocacy and policy change, being accountable to women's leadership and experience, etc). This is reflected in the following quotes:

"We need men to serve as role models and help other men listen."

"Men have a huge role in changing family dynamics and pushing back against misinterpreted religious texts that support oppression."
"Men need to be strong in interrupting sexism in ways that are authentic for them."
"Men need to be having discussions with other men in the coffee shops, bars, and wherever guys hang out."
"Holding each other accountable, shifting societal norms."
Men have a role in educating other men, "since rape-supporting attitudes exist within male peer groups."
"Put political pressure on institutions that oppress women."

There seemed to be more uncertainty about men engaging in crisis intervention work with – especially female – abuse survivors. If we believe that all men are liable to play out patriarchal beliefs toward women because of their socialization, this position is logical: Don't put men, who are likely to do or say harmful things even if unintentionally, in roles of being responsive to women's trauma, especially trauma caused directly or indirectly by men. Despite this, in the aggregate of our experiences many female abuse survivors do not experience generalized fear of all men. Further, there is research indicating many survivors seek support from clergy who, in large part due to patriarchy and sexism, remain mostly male in almost all cultures.[1] We believe it is potentially empowering for survivors to have the choice of whether, how and to what extent to work with men; and the choice to refuse, if they feel inclined. Given all of this, there may in fact be more roles for men working in crisis intervention, provided they are prepared to respect the boundaries survivors set, and prioritize the healing of survivors over their own healing or desire to be helpful.

Interestingly, a belief in true gender separatism – that men *shouldn't* be doing this work alongside women – was rare in these conversations. This could indicate a generalized readiness for gender integration in the movement. But we also want to acknowledge that it could equally be due to project/group bias; the practice isn't very popular among TEMP members, and so might not be popular among the groups to which we had access. Perhaps in gravitating toward interviewing folks we know, we subconsciously left out separatism supporters. It's also possible interviewees were inclined to express opinions they knew or sensed were favored by TEMP. When gender separatism came up in one interview and an either/or conversation ensued, a moment of brilliance seemed to strike: Perhaps it isn't either/or – as with many false dichotomies such as good man/bad man – but instead, that the potential for positive gender integration we are encountering at this time may be built on the solid and necessary foundation of several decades of gender segregation in this movement. Could it be that women, as a social group and a collective consciousness, needed time apart to develop leadership, agency and courage in facing internal trauma and external threat; and now that the movement has proliferated, gender segregation has done its work and can give way to new structures and strategies? We find this idea immensely hopeful, even emblematic of the both/and thinking that may be integral to our movement – *together* – from oppression to liberation.

---

[1] Carol J. Adams, *Woman-Battering* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1994), 31; Ron Clark, *Freeing the Oppressed: A Call to Christians Concerning Domestic Abuse* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2009), 135; Nancy Nason-Clark, *The Battered Wife: How Christians Confront Family Violence* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 41.

We also observed some fascinating threads regarding men's *current* involvement and the kinds of roles men tend to hold, within the movement and within specific organizations. Often, men hold positions of power or authority, sometimes because it is presumed they shouldn't work directly with survivors. In other situations, implicit sexism and male privilege are more apparent. For example, some roles men are playing in current organizations are finance managers, board presidents, board members, and even armed security guards. The reality of these roles may sit at odds with our ideas about appropriate work for men to be doing: the organization with a male armed guard and a male board president verbalized that the roles available to men in their organization are "behind the scenes" types of work including cooking, cleaning, planning events, offering education. So is this a pie-in-the-sky belief? Are we defining the roles men should play, only to have trouble finding an adequate supply of men who are willing to become involved in those ways? Do we adapt our practices of where we place men within the movement, but retain our beliefs which then may not match reality?

All of this highlights and returns to the common belief that the movement needs men to be more involved, and more broadly involved, in this work. It is clear we struggle with knowing when/how to structure men's engagement, particularly with regard to a clear goal of minimizing risks. Before discussing this topic further, we would like to explore the motivations behind men's desire to engage.

Men's Motivations to Engage

When we think of reasons for engagement in other movements or causes, it is often a matter of altruism and volunteerism. For example, engagement in education may involve volunteering as a tutor at a school. Often these movements don't specifically require a change in lifestyle. During the holidays people can get involved in food and toy drives, without any deeper self-reflection. This generally stems from a charity model rather than a social justice or solidarity model.

In the movement to end men's violence against women, however, something else is required. Many interviewees cited the vital need for men to self-reflect, be accountable, recognize their socialization and privilege, and be willing to feel uncomfortable. These imperatives are far different than the "feel good about myself for helping" nature of other causes men might get behind, like breast cancer awareness. This movement demands a deeper commitment and willingness to change than many other causes require.

Why then do men put in the work, the self-reflection, and the accountability necessary to effectively engage in the movement to end violence against women? What do men perceive they have to gain, or expect to gain? Perhaps a good place to start is to examine why men who are currently in the movement have chosen to engage. Many of our interviewees cited personal experience as a common reason men have contacted them to become involved in this work: men have close relationships with women who have been affected by catcalling, stereotypes, rape and sexual assault, stalking, intimate partner violence and other forms of gender-based abuse. Getting involved may come from a strong personal desire to prevent this violence — which has touched a loved one in some way — from happening to others. This could be seen as one degree of separation from the survivor who herself wants to help end violence, but is much different than the simple altruism of a well-to-do man who wants to help end homelessness even though his

peers and family are unlikely to be affected by it. Exposure and awareness in this case are key. It is our belief that all men know someone who has experienced violence against women; and yet many men persist in believing that this is not the case.

Interviewees also suggested men might get involved because of a ==concern for social justice==. Men who participate in any type of anti-oppression work more than likely will come to the realization that all oppressions are interconnected. These men see the importance of engaging themselves and others to end intimate partner violence. As one interviewee commented, "men need to be involved in engaging other men and supporting females in this work. We need to partner with women to stand together and protect vulnerable others and hold oppressors accountable." Furthermore, the idea of "helping" can be seen as part of a sexist, chivalric attitude. Therefore, men who are striving towards greater social justice often work towards embodying and enacting the spirit and message in the following quote: "If you have come to help me, you are wasting your time. But if you have come because your liberation is bound up with mine, then let us work together."[2]

Of course, we know that "helping women" or "helping society" may not be sufficient motivation for men to feel the urgency to engage. Therefore, another exciting possibility several interviewees suggested is that men might become engaged because their own personal growth and healing are at stake: "Men and boys might get involved due to a desire in every man to learn how to use the emotional side of themselves; to help themselves look at feelings that they don't get to express without ridicule from other men; to reclaim an aspect of their lives they have not been able to express since childhood." Several participants in TEMP related their experience that most men, when approached in small groups or individually, are not just receptive and connected but deeply relieved by the idea that there is an alternative to the traditional, abusive masculinity that they were raised to enact. "I want to end men's violence so I can **not** be afraid of myself, and genuinely trust my own desires… Feeling like you're a potentially unsafe person and that your wants might be dangerous" is a terrible experience. A great motivation for men to self-reflect is that "attachment to and entrenchment in traditional gender roles/power dynamics may prevent men from engaging in truly loving relationships." Men have much to gain – not only safety for women but wholeness and humanness for themselves. Some believe that "our inability to be human is a result of patriarchy." This reminder could be crucial to increasing and strengthening men's involvement, because rape culture defines men, causes many women to be afraid of them or question their motives, but also because men have the opportunity to be healthier, more completely who they are.

A related motivation for men may be that men's violence against women confines men. The fact that some men choose to be violent tags all men as dangerous, or at least potentially so. This tag can foster an understandable mistrust of any man, and creates significant barriers for men in developing relationships with women *and* with other men. So a man who wants to have open, honest, and healthy friendships or other relationships may find it in his interests to become involved in dismantling the common cultural connection between manhood and violence.

It should be obvious that men's violence against women harms women. The damaging effects on men, however, can also be profound. Even men who are neither abuse perpetrators

---

[2] Aboriginal activists group, Queensland, Australia, 1970s.

nor survivors may find incredible motivation and benefit in seeking to end men's violence against women because they are unwilling and unhappy participants in a social system designed to make them feel incomplete and inadequate. One interviewee expressed, "It is joyous to come together with men who have a grip on reality and have self-awareness. It's hard, joyous work." This may guide us toward the very balance we are seeking: providing men the space to address their own personal healing and examination of male socialization, and also encouraging them to support the work already being done to provide healing space for survivors and to create a world in which gender-based violence no longer exists.

Complications of Involving Men

Throughout our work together – and reflected in the interviews – it has become apparent that, in some significant ways, the work feels simpler when men are not involved. Not **easier**, mind you, and certainly not more achievable or more effective; but less complex. So long as men are not involved, we do not feel compelled to determine each individual man's worthiness for being present alongside women. We don't have to assess his level of self-awareness, his analysis, his commitment and general goodness. Simultaneously, when men are not involved, we may continue laboring under the imaginary division of good men versus bad men or helpful men/allies versus perpetrators; or even, good women/bad men. In language common to the field, we *other* men who have used any tactic of abuse; that is to say, potentially most men. The work we do with survivors and even with the general public needs our attention in other arenas, and does not absolutely require us to be mindful of nuance in terms of men's perspectives, behaviors, histories or context. Our capacity for complexity is often spent elsewhere.

A related challenge that came out in several interviews is the idea that men often struggle in the absence of concrete steps or actions (see Risks section, page 10, for more on this). However, as one interviewee noted, ending men's violence against women does not have an easy fix with specific action steps to take, and involves men acknowledging and changing their participation and complicity in this socialized oppression and violence. Trying to offer concrete steps could attract more men, but it runs the risk of oversimplifying the issue, and all men's complicity in men's violence against women. This challenge is illustrated by an early reader's response to this part of the paper:

> That's hard to swallow. I think engaging men while also saying "you are to blame for this problem" is a problem. I was the subject of bullying from the first grade through middle school, every day, because I didn't fit in. Some of that was gender related (not masculine enough). Some of it was just because I'm kind of a spaz… I understand the importance of addressing privilege, and I understand that I benefit from it, but I feel like as much a victim of men's violence as anything. I didn't choose my privilege, and a term like "complicit" makes me feel judged and blamed for something that I find (and have always found) disgusting. And that I've spent most of my life on the victim end. On the other hand, maybe the fact that I'm having this strong reaction means that I've still got some work to do.

As men become involved, individual women and groups of women often feel the need to parse men's readiness for engaging in nuanced and self-reflective ways in order to helpfully

contribute and move efforts forward, rather than undoing work for which women have struggled long and hard. The more men who become involved, the greater this challenge becomes, simply in terms of statistical likelihood of problematic engagement by men. Some in the movement have shifted from an either/or paradigm (a man, or even his behavior, is either good OR bad) to a belief that all men are impacted by internalized misogyny and male supremacy; in this way, all men have done harm to women, whether intentionally/overtly or subconsciously/covertly. Furthermore, all men benefit from patriarchy and sexism. It is part of the air we breathe, in one respect. While on the one hand it is understandable to question men's motivations, we also do not expect unrealistic perfection in what a man might say and do when he is honestly trying to engage in this work. Men are going to make mistakes. Mistakes can be experienced as learning opportunities. However, men who do decide to be engaged in this work will be most effective if they adopt a position of humility, receptivity, self-awareness and analysis. In fact, perhaps it is not so much the air we breathe as how we breathe. Maybe getting engaged is actually more analogous to meditating or doing yoga: looking at your breathing, how you breathe, and how that affects your whole life. Basically, it is committing to re-learn how to breathe.

Risks of Involving Men

There are myriad risks involved with men's increasing engagement. For the sake of simplicity, we delineate several of the most common concerns that arose in our conversations.

- Reinforcing sexism: when men talk, and – due to internalized sexism – people of all genders listen more readily than they might to women. "Men can have a strong influence for the positive. For example, our pro bono attorney tells survivors they aren't at fault for the abuse they've endured, and they listen to him differently than they listen to female advocates. This message is received differently when a lawyer or cop says it's not their fault." This process can accord more credibility to men, even about women's experiences or collective good: "Males listen more to other males." Another interviewee shared the belief that "sometimes men's involvement can be even more effective in working with women. In some cases having older men work with females in a safe environment can help heal parent wounds that they received from a father or other male." This raises the question: is it possible to leverage existing sexism for the greater good, using men as messengers or propagators of a broad feminist/egalitarian/cooperative worldview?
- Men's traditional/socialized action orientation: often men want to DO things, fix things; this may lead to a lack of needed reflection, listening, receptivity. "It is important to give men concrete tasks and specific ways to address the issue," said one interviewee. Will men defect due to a lack of immediate gratification when, in a month/year/whenever, the big picture of men's violence against women hasn't visibly changed?
- Men's discomfort or unwillingness to address, acknowledge and learn from their own privilege: men may be eager to contribute to this good work, but may be coming to it with such internalized sexism that they have in mind to rescue women, or simply bring a lack of self-awareness; men may not respond well to attempts to bring them into awareness of their own privilege. Both this and reinforcing sexism also relate to over-crediting men within the movement; perpetuating male privilege; setting the bar for male participation/success much lower than that for women, and celebrating their presence or involvement inappropriately.

- Cooptation: men may take over, redirect or reinterpret the work in less survivor-centered, woman-centered ways. There is a concern among some in the movement that men will come to this work with their own agenda, not honoring or prioritizing the history or needs of the women around whom the work has been centered. For example, the early history of men's involvement was often related to police response and the development of anger management programs for domestic violence offenders, both of which were far from survivor-centered and often condoned or excused men's behavior as opposed to addressing root causes. Many college campuses encourage mediation or student judicial boards in response to allegations of domestic violence or sexual assault, which have many of the same weaknesses as other male-initiated or male-centered interventions.
- Collusion: men doing this work will often collude, at least unconsciously, with sexism/misogyny as expressed or acted out by other men. Some in the movement feel a concern that "analysis will become steeped in male privilege," that there won't be a complete, nuanced analysis, that it won't address sexism and therefore won't really hold men accountable. Further, there is the very real risk of some men using their presumed safety as participants in this movement as a means to abuse and exploit people they meet through the work.

Barriers to Men's Engagement

It has become common for many people, regardless of gender, to cite *women's failure to warmly invite or welcome men* as the foremost barrier to male involvement. There are several problems with this treatment, as one of our interviewees observed. It perpetuates victim blaming; it makes the lack of male engagement women's fault, further perpetuating sexism; it suggests that men, socialized to be tough and strong, are somehow suddenly fragile and require women's care with regard to their engagement. This interviewee posited an alternate view of primary barriers to men's involvement, which we have expanded on here:

- Social work and activism don't pay: these fields are severely underpaid. People entering the field may have little hope of financial gain or increase over a lifetime career. Men often have access to career options women do not have, they have more doors open to them so may be less likely to choose this one. Additionally, men are socialized, and often feel pressure, to have high-income, high-status "breadwinner" careers. When they do work within social service or nonprofits, men often inhabit higher-paid leadership or finance related roles, rather than lower-paid direct service roles.
- Women's work: the history of this movement combines with entrenched sexist gender roles to define supporting victims and survivors as "women's work." Women are socialized and encouraged to be our society's "care-givers." Of course, "care-giving" professions are usually identified with and dominated by women, and therefore low-paid. As we further considered historical trends, we noted how much of 2nd wave feminism has its roots in women's homes. For example, consciousness raising groups and early shelters were often in homes. In fact, many DV shelters have been refurbished houses. Furthermore, historically the home has been identified as the "female sphere," as opposed to the outside, business world of men. Since many DV shelters and women's centers are modeled on the idea of "the home," could it be that men perceive this space as the female sphere and therefore either by its nature unwelcoming and/or encouraging men to expect women to take care of them in certain ways, especially emotionally? Also, as these

intense emotions come up within men, they may worry – rightly – about whether their feelings are appropriate or even possibly harmful to women survivors as well as staff/volunteers. Men may often not know where and how it is most appropriate to process these emotions.

- Doing this work requires that men challenge their own privilege/power, analyze their role in oppressions: some men may not have the willingness and/or the emotional tools to navigate their own engendered barriers to engagement with this work. According to interviewees: "forfeiting privilege, the perception of loss is a difficult barrier to overcome;" and "men DO need to be willing to be uncomfortable, to be in traditionally women's spaces." Men have to question/interrogate and become accountable for their own privilege. Is this easier – for lack of a better word – for men who have been targeted by oppression, eg men of color, disabled men, gay men? Or not necessarily; can experiences of oppression galvanize our attachment to any positions of privilege which we occupy, when we are following socialized scripts of dominance/hierarchy rather than moving toward equality?
- Misogyny and homophobia: though these words were seldom used by interview respondents, most of them described intense culturally internalized misogyny and homophobia as significant barriers. One interviewee described the goal of his work with men as "encouraging pro-social choice-making," which recognizes this is a particular challenge for men within our society's current gender roles. "Men who do not do the work may perceive men in this work as soft, effeminate and weak. They may see the women in this work as man haters, dykes, and as a challenge to their manhood." "A good portion feel we are angry women with an agenda, on our own soapbox, and man haters. They might view men who are involved as weak." Interestingly, while women involved in this work get portrayed as "hard," men often get portrayed as "soft:" sissies, mama's boys, faggots, etc. "They ask 'why are you doing women's work?' Males in the field may be perceived as gay, not manly, weak, or emotional."
- Perceived threats to masculinity: it seems clear that men often experience people of all genders who participate in anti-violence work as somehow threatening to their traditional understanding/experience/expression of masculinity. One person noted that some men may develop "king syndrome" where they feel the need to be the master of the home and family. Even men who may not subscribe to more traditional expressions of masculinity often nonetheless experience peer pressure to conform. In this way, sexism clearly damages men to a very significant degree. For example: "Men may be threatened or intimidated by women, or by other men, involved." Men outside the movement may view men within the movement as "sell-outs and suckers… because they do not teach the hard way of living as cool." This may come from a deep sense of shame, which has been socialized onto boys at having any feminine or woman-associated traits, interests, characteristics. According to one interviewee, we need to "expand boys' emotional and relational repertoire," to make "vulnerability not just ok but actually a strength." It is important to note a degree of backlash from various communities, most notably the Christian faith communities, against feminism; and a desire to return to "1950s gender roles where women stay at home."
- The word "violence" is a barrier: it may communicate only physical violence, depending on cultural context. Men/people "need to understand that violence has been done long before physical violence has occurred." There are, as well, general barriers presented by

language, and they cut many ways. For some, anti-violence could be seen as anti-male. For others, the resistance could be more subtle, less direct; "a lot of men aren't feminists because they haven't been exposed to it. Men think they can't be feminists, so training them that they can be is important. They need to be taught it's not just about women, that it's about families and communities being healthy."

- Men may feel guilt/shame over participation/complicity within the system of sexism and patriarchy. This is often expressed as defensiveness or resistance: 'I didn't create this problem, why should I have to deal with it?' Men may be reluctant to do the work of recognizing their own privilege and participation in misogyny. If one of the first experiences that men have when they enter this work is of feeling guilt or shame, it is not a tremendous surprise that they may not come back, either because they want to avoid that feeling or because of a belief that, being part of the problem, they cannot also be part of the solution. This highlights a central challenge of the effort to engage men: to help them see and acknowledge their privilege and misogyny while simultaneously supporting them to chart a path through guilt to being present and effective allies in ending men's violence.

- Lack of awareness by men: an important function of privilege is that it's invisible to those who have it. This invisibility propagates the opportunity for men not to notice when there is abuse or oppression going on, even (or maybe especially) when they are engaged in it or benefitting from it. This experience makes it relatively easy not to become involved, because the issue is not identified as important or meaningful.

In conclusion, we want to touch again on the topic of "welcoming." Besides men often not identifying this issue as important, men might not perceive the many invitations that do exist. The focus can shift from women not welcoming men toward men committing to do something and finding one of many ways to get involved. Another complicating factor, though, that plays into this dynamic is that historically men have not been good at earning women's trust. It is men's responsibility to realize and understand this important factor, and to be conscious of and upfront about their motivations and behavior when working with women. Humility is very important.

Benefits to Involving Men

These risks and barriers do present formidable obstacles to men becoming engaged. However, there are significant benefits that can inspire and sustain women's and men's motivations for men's involvement.

- We end men's violence by working with men: There are at least two parts to this. First, it is men's responsibility since they, as a group, are the ones perpetrating this violence. Second, some men are more likely to listen to other men, at least at first. One outcome to this might be a shift away from seeing this kind of support and activism as "women's work."

- Involvement can breed social change over time: As more men engage themselves in this work, social and cultural values and attitudes (such as gender expectations and power relations) will change over time. To do this work appropriately and effectively, men will challenge their own power and privilege. Therefore, as more men do this, there will be

greater and greater potential for revolutionary changes within individuals, relationships, and society.
- Reaching others: Not only do men often have unique access to other men, but engaged men can serve as positive role models for young people who have experienced gendered-based violence.
- New ideas and options: Bringing in more types of people means diversifying ideas and tactics. Engaged men might be able to bring different options (like our idea of a "bridging group"), new energy, and new ways of doing things (like innovative approaches to dealing with batterers) to the table.
- Contributing to critical mass, to the tipping point: as more men engage, numbers of people involved in making these crucial social changes increase and the movement becomes stronger.

SECTION III – COWS ANALYSIS

COWS is our interpretation of SWOT (traditionally, Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats). We have instead used Challenges, Opportunities, Weaknesses, Strengths (COWS) as a set of filters through which to sort, analyze and understand the content of interview responses. We treat challenges and opportunities as loosely external to our group/movement; we have examined weaknesses and strengths in regard to more internal dynamics in the effort to engage men as allies.

COWS Table

CHALLENGES	OPPORTUNITIES
- Men are hesitant to deal with or sometimes even acknowledge their own privilege. - Sexism and homophobia inhibit men from showing up. - Men have earned women's skepticism and distrust. - Social work typically pays less than other fields men inhabit. - Men do not feel welcomed or that there is space for them. - Women sometimes feel expected to take care of or educate men who engage. (internal and external) - Women sometimes feel that this is <u>their</u> issue, and that men's involvement changes that dynamic. - There's a lack of appropriate space for men to try out being helpful, to make mistakes, to get frustrated, etc.	- Men have unique access to and credibility with other men. (But, can we use patriarchy to overcome patriarchy? Or is there another way to leverage this, that doesn't reinforce sexism?) - The process of working through these questions helps to make the project of engaging men more successful. - There's plenty of space for men to become involved in Portland (especially in prevention and as volunteers), and lots of opportunity for enhancing accountability. - Models exist for men to develop greater cultural humility (as contrasted with cultural competence). - Could develop a "bridging group" for men who want to become more involved, allowing for the space to struggle.

• Institutions often reflect the oppressive systems within which they are built. • Society values "rationality" over other ways of thinking or being. • Feminism is understood socially as about and for women. • It's difficult to go through the process of engaging men without significant human contact. Efforts to be more efficient through technology, for example, have limited effectiveness. • It's easy/common to get caught in trap of doing nothing for fear of stepping on toes or making mistakes.	
WEAKNESSES • Lots of moments, but not much sustained movement; ebbs and flows. • Apparent lack of consideration of how men's presence in survivor services would impact organizational culture. • Lack of resources, including time and funding, for existing organizations to work on this. • Lack of roadmap for men to get involved. Unclear path. • Lack of structured opportunity for men to support one another and hold themselves and one another accountable as they work through their privilege.	**STRENGTHS** • Seems to be a strong belief in the good intentions of most men. • Substantial history of volunteerism in our community. • Huge amount of willingness to struggle through this among organizations and women in the work. • Committed core of TEMP folks as resource for what comes next. • Some leading national figures in engaging men are in Portland.

Challenges

In carrying out the COWS analysis, the longest list belongs to the "challenges." This is not surprising: in our patriarchal society, in which men perpetrate such an alarming number and scope of violent acts against women, and in which "gender" is a key lens and structuring agent in looking at and dealing with such things as intimate partner violence, domestic violence, rape, and sexual assault, of course "engaging men" to help end this violence will be a highly complicated as well as a hotly contested topic.

The first challenge involves men being hesitant to deal with or even acknowledge their own privilege. Some men might be completely unaware of their male privilege and how this privilege affects dynamics with other people, especially women in this kind of work (e.g. female survivors and female co-workers, categories which certainly overlap to a greater degree than most of us realize). To be clear, this challenge highlights the importance of "well-meaning" men

to actively and honestly acknowledge, understand, and challenge patriarchal and sexist beliefs and practices, in the world and within themselves. Though good intentions may precipitate action, intention doesn't necessarily translate into positive impact, the latter of which is measurable. Therefore, although it is a start, it is not enough to say, "I mean well"; it is critical that men work on what "meaning well" looks and sounds like. Intent isn't measurable; impact is measurable, perceptible. Furthermore, real progress will come only when men are open to the far greater importance of impact than intention: accepting feedback/critique and being held accountable, by women and by other men. In a painful display of irony, it may be fundamentally more difficult for men to receive feedback in this regard precisely because their male socialization dictates initiative and action at the expense of receptivity and listening. This point connects to two other challenges: the lack of space for men to try out being helpful, to make mistakes, and to get frustrated; and the challenge of getting caught in the trap of doing nothing because of the fear of stepping on toes or making a mistake.

Men need a space to work through their own struggles and experiences as well as try out what it means to help end men's violence against women. But where should this space exist – in established women-staffed and women-centered victim/survivor support and services organizations, or in some sort of safe space for men to explore and/or male-centered agency? It has become clear to us that, in the former, a focus on men's struggles can be not only distracting but harmful to women and to the work. These settings are not optimally designed to meet this need. Connected with this challenge is the pitfall of men not doing anything for fear of stepping on toes or making a mistake; well-meaning men might feel stuck. Since men are socialized with an expectation of having all the answers, feeling stuck may be particularly frustrating.

Because certain aspects of the DV/SA movement have been co-opted by the state, in particular the way supporting survivors and "ending domestic violence" have been mainstreamed into the non-profit industrial complex, the idea of a "rational" approach (or "best practices") to dealing with this type of violence has become the standard. Given this history, these institutions often reflect the oppressive systems in which they are formed and operate. Valuing other types of "intelligences" in addition to "rationality" moves us closer to ending men's violence against women.

In addition to this sort of re-thinking and re-imagining, there is the question of who is involved in educating and engaging men. In particular, this highlights another challenge: women sometimes feel expected to take care of and/or educate men who are or want to become involved. Men expecting women to be "caretakers" plays into sexist gender roles. This emphasizes the importance of men bringing awareness to the conversation so that issues involving sexism and internalized oppression can be addressed.

Technology has created new, diverse communication options; however, efforts to be more "efficient" through the use of various technologies can end up limiting the actual physical human contact and interaction where so much learning (conscious and unconscious) occurs. For example, body language is not part of an email. Therefore, if we are to work on new ways for men and women to be together, technology as a strategy can, in fact, limit our efficacy.

Several interviewees mentioned that another challenge involves men not feeling welcomed in their organizations and in this movement in general. How do we go about "welcoming" men? Further, why do we feel the need to welcome men? If men want to be engaged, part of their work requires feeling uncomfortable – uncomfortable with how patriarchy and sexism are foundations of violence as well as how they as men benefit from patriarchal society. This discomfort is tied to another key challenge: men have well-earned women's skepticism and distrust. It is not up to women to make men feel comfortable and welcomed (see Section II for more on the issue of inviting or welcoming men).

It is important to note that the essential question of how we overcome the barrier of men's discomfort remains, and is beyond the scope of this paper. We are unlikely to succeed in attracting men to the work if our only response is to tell men that they simply need to be ok with feeling uncomfortable, but we risk collusion, distraction, and failure of accountability if we focus primarily on ensuring men's comfort. Finding that balance will be a key ingredient in any effort that is ultimately successful. One of our early readers did suggest what this might look like: "It is possible to feel uncomfortable and welcome in a situation, and that's a place someone will stay. It is not possible to feel both uncomfortable and unwelcome for any sustained length of time. Men who show up to this work are likely to be in some process where they are taking on discomfort, taking on the difficult questions of privilege and oppression. Being met with open hostility for the work they have not done yet makes the work they have done feel like it was not worthwhile, and makes them less likely to continue in the work. Encouragement, including "tough love," can be done in ways that are both harshly realistic and loving/caring." Our thanks for this contribution.

Another uncomfortable dynamic with regard to engaging men stems from history, or rather her-story. The current movement to end men's violence against women is rooted in second wave feminism; women were the ones who fought for and created victim/survivor support and services, in a radical grassroots Civil Rights era context. Women have been at the forefront in this work, and men may feel and appear a bit "Johnny-come-lately." And yet, when men do show up, they are all too often automatically and overly praised. Understandably, many women feel that this is their issue, and that men's involvement changes support and services. Furthermore, women may have mixed feelings about how men may change their work environment and culture. Having more men involved, especially in victim/survivor services, links back to women's skepticism and distrust of men – can we trust men's motivations for being involved in this work, and their internal growth processes?

While some women as well as men might think this is "women's work," there are others – TEMP among them – who believe men's violence against women will not end until men end it. There are two obvious challenges here: negotiating what men's engagement looks like, all the while carefully taking into account the her-story of this work; and negotiating what "feminism" is and who it is for. Indeed, all feminists do not share the same universally agreed upon, monolithic definition of feminism. Furthermore, since victim/survivor support and services have been incorporated into non-profits, these agencies themselves can perpetuate harmful power dynamics within their own policies and practices towards survivors as well as within the hierarchy of volunteers, paid staff, supervisors and administrators, and boards of directors. This highlights the last major challenge: institutions often reflect the oppressive systems within which

they are built. Thus, in this non-profit context, adding men into this mix makes for an even more potentially problematic situation.

Opportunities

In the face of the challenges described above, we also see at least five distinct opportunities for movement and progress, in terms of both engaging men and ending men's violence against women. First, many of the people we interviewed strongly agreed that men have unique access to other men, they can reach other men in ways women cannot. This perspective is not unique to Portland, of course, but is one of the underlying components of many efforts globally to end men's violence against women (Promundo, A Call to Men, Men Can Stop Rape, Engender Health, among others). This opportunity is not without complications. As one of the TEMP members put it repeatedly, can we use sexism and patriarchy to overcome sexism and patriarchy? Do we run the risk of reinforcing the very systems of devaluing women by bringing men in to so other men will hear the message more effectively? This is a key place for ongoing conversation, attention and critique, but it appears that there is a lot of energy focused on trying this tactic as an approach for reaching men. Part of the intent of this approach is that men who do use their credibility this way can also model healthy and respectful interactions with women and the existing movement to end men's violence against women, in hopes that the men they reach will be able to internalize this as part of their learning.

TEMP sees the meta-process work of engaging in these discussions and struggles as a necessary and valuable component of solving the problem of men's violence against women. The overlap between process and outcome is substantial, so the fact of initiating and working through these conversations in an accountable and considered manner means that we are already creating the new context in which we want to live. It is not true, unfortunately, that any conversation about ending men's violence against women takes us down this path, but we believe that any conversation entered openly and honestly, with sincere and ongoing attention paid to process and power dynamics, will do so. In fact, given that the path we are seeking does not entirely exist yet, it seems that these conversations are not just moving us along but actually making the path itself.

Along the lines of more concrete opportunities, there appear to be many options for men to get involved in the Portland area, especially as volunteers. To name only a few, there are faith-based efforts such as Man Up and the work of Agape Church of Christ, private efforts such as Boys Advocacy and Mentoring, college efforts at Portland State University and Portland Community College among others, informal gatherings such as TEMP, and opportunities within survivor service organizations such as Raphael House and Clackamas Women's Services. Some of these focus specifically on men working on their own experiences of violence or on defining manhood/masculinity in more holistic and healthy ways that make sense in men's lives. Others are focused on serving survivors of men's violence against women, and still others seem to have a focus on visioning what comes next and how we can build a movement of people of all genders working together to create a new paradigm. Most importantly, though, many of these efforts seem to take issues of accountability very seriously. They are not acting independently or in secret – rather, most are convened in connection with well-respected women's organizations or

groups, and with a multitude of women's voices at the table – and they seem open to questions and concerns about their efforts.

We also noticed that there are a number of groups in the Portland area that can serve very effectively as models for men to engage with cultural humility, as contrasted to cultural competence. The idea of cultural humility is that we can strive to understand a culture of which we are not a part, but we are unlikely ever to be fully competent in regard to cultures other than our own – or even including our own! However, we all can make an honest effort to understand, interact with individuals from various cultures in respectful ways, and recognize that we are going to make mistakes both large and small. Cultural humility, then, will allow us to either notice our own mistakes or be open to and appreciative of those who point them out to us. Organizations such as SoValTi address this kind of work, and we can adopt the philosophy of humility to great effect in our efforts to engage men more effectively in ending men's violence against women.

A final opportunity that we identified does not currently exist as such, but our community may be ripe for its development. Many of the people we interviewed expressed significant concerns about welcoming men who have not yet done the deep work of struggling with what it means to have unearned privilege and power, and how to interact in the world in ways that do not reinforce dynamics of oppression. Those concerns (addressed more fully in the Challenges section above) are very real and understandable, and currently there does not seem to be a place where well-meaning men (to borrow A Call to Men's phrase) can go to work through these challenges, get frustrated, make mistakes, and feel resentful without disrupting others' work or feeling like they are just being jerks. This kind of "bridging" group does not appear to exist as such here or elsewhere in the states, to our knowledge. If the Portland area could create something along these lines, we believe it would be a great service here and could serve as a model elsewhere as well.

Note that we strongly recommend that anyone attempting to form such a group would do well to ensure that the group both honors and benefits from the lengthy and inspiring history of women's leadership in this arena. Finding ways to recognize that history, and to ensure that the new group's work both seeks and is receptive to feedback from a multitude of women, can only make its work more effective and productive.

Weaknesses

As we consider the experience and possibility of men's engagement, we note several weaknesses that we will want to overcome, in order to be most effective. First, there seems to be a history of efforts being undertaken, but without a lot of follow through. These efforts come and go without making a significant impression on the landscape, and then a new effort begins all over again. This recurrence could be related to the reasons for TEMP's own struggles with keeping on task that we discussed in the Process as Part of Work section above (not having sufficient clarity about success or a sense of urgency) or it could be for other reasons, such as a lack of resources or sense of connectedness to make this a sustainable project. Part of our hope in developing this paper is to ensure that our experience can support future efforts.

One of the most significant weaknesses we identified is a substantial lack of resources, including time and money, for existing organizations to do the work of engaging men. Most if not all of these organizations are already under-resourced, and they do not have the ability to take on the additional efforts it would take to engage men most effectively. Those that are engaging men are making their best efforts, under conditions that are far from ideal. In addition, though several survivor service programs do work with men and use men as staff and volunteers, there does not seem to have been significant discussion about how working with men in this way may impact organizational culture. To be clear, we are only able to say that this was our impression, as these conversations may well have happened without our knowledge. However, it seems that there was some surprise and distress about how men's involvement has changed things. This is a weakness in the current system, but it is one that could be addressed by taking the time to engage in the conversation as we consider whether and how to involve men. The conversation may be uncomfortable at times, but it would likely significantly reduce conflict and tension that arise later. It is this kind of courageous conversation itself that we believe is central to the work of ending men's violence against women.

Another weakness that we have identified is that there does not seem to be a clear roadmap generally for men's involvement. Nationally and even globally, there have been a number of efforts to engage men, but there does not seem to be a set of best practices or even recommendations; and in the development of such, we expect to prioritize multiple ways of knowing, multiple intelligences, and a multitude of tactics. We would like to see Portland help to address this absence.

Finally, we see it as a weakness that there is not a place where men can support and challenge one another as they work to understand male privilege. As discussed in the Opportunities section above, a "bridging" group could fill this gap very well.

Strengths

Despite challenges such as the skepticism and distrust that men have earned, there remains a strong belief in the good intentions of most individual men. This conviction is supported by the substantial history of male volunteerism in victim/survivor services and prevention education here in Portland. Though "engaging" men has had lots of moments, as noted in the Weaknesses section, there nonetheless seems to be a sustained, loose and de-centered culture of male involvement here – not only in survivor/victim services and education, but also within local city and county governments as well as within institutions such as Portland State University. In addition, among organizations and women in this movement, there is a huge amount of willingness to work through what "engaging men" means. This openness to the struggle is a key strength. Indeed, as the saying goes, where there is a will, there is a way. However, this "will" cannot embody the usual patriarchal, forceful, sexist "push through anything" sort of will that is all too typical of how men are socialized to operate in a group.

Fortunately, we identified two remaining strengths that can help facilitate and navigate new ways of engaging men and working together. The first is a committed core of TEMP (The Engaging Men Project) members who can serve as a resource for potential next steps. One of the early, founding convictions of TEMP was to somehow assess the current status of men's

involvement and engagement here in the Portland metro area. TEMP did not want to form and then immediately attempt to "take command" or set ourselves up as the "experts." Thus, we did our best to carefully make this assessment; now we humbly believe we can serve as a resource for interested parties. Furthermore, as a TEMP member recently noted, Portland possesses another rather unique resource – some of the leading national figures in engaging men (Keith Kaufman, Jack Straton, Eric Mankowski, Patrick Lemmon, as well as people and organizations with strong connections to Tony Porter) are located here in Portland. These men come from diverse backgrounds and experiences, and could potentially serve not only as a resource, but as a sort of accountability team for possible next projects (such as a "bridging group," as mentioned in the Opportunities section).

SECTION IV

Focusing Questions

In trying to find answers to the multi-pronged conundrum of "engaging men," we soon realized how many more questions remained unanswered. We have included a substantial list of outstanding questions in Appendix C (page 27). From this exhausting list, we have distilled the following open-ended inquiries that highlight the complexity of this topic. These were some of the primary questions that served as the impetus for the formation of TEMP.

- In what, exactly, are we engaging men?

- If we're inviting men to participate, how important is it for us already in this work to agree upon what to name it? Are we asking men to engage in anti-violence work, feminism, gender equity or justice, some other distinction of movement or cause?

- What is the difference between engaging men in existing organizations/agencies and engaging men in "the movement?" Many of our interviewees made it clear that they weren't just looking for men as volunteers or employees. They wanted men to be engaged in their own personal, professional and communal circles.

- How far does being "against" things get us, including "prevention"? Would reframing to "gender justice" allow us room to be *against* gender oppression while being *for* gender equity?

Next Steps

After performing the interviews, and processing them into this paper, a core question remains: What next? Through this experience, we have developed insights and ideas that provide some possible pathways and guidance. Based upon our work, we humbly offer the following strategy as one possible route forward:

- Develop criteria on what an "engaging men" program would involve or have
- Brainstorm ideas on what these programs or opportunities might be

- Evaluate ideas based upon criteria
- Use community input to prioritize specific idea(s)
- Implement idea(s)
- Evaluate, rinse, repeat

Since we have spent much time processing the interviews and our experiences with and around this project, TEMP drafted the following lists of potential criteria and ideas:

➢ Criteria
   o Is based in strong understanding of oppression and power dynamics
   o Seeks to meet need(s) of our communities and foster justice
   o Incorporates leadership by a diverse group of people of all genders
   o Seeks and is receptive to women's leadership as well as men's
   o Includes an action plan
   o Maintains a local (Portland metro area) focus
   o Develops materials
   o Attends to and identifies audience(s)

➢ Ideas
   o Blog series
   o Zine series
   o Performance project
   o TV show on local channel
   o Reference book
   o Consciousness-raising groups
   o Opportunities to discuss outstanding questions (such as those listed in Appendix C, page 27)
   o Some type of "bridging" group or organization which men can go to before continuing further into this work

Call to Action

The members of TEMP do not claim any sort of ownership over "engaging men"; nor do we wish to position ourselves as experts. Because of this, our next step is to present this paper to Portland communities and then ask folks to join us at a gathering. In the presentations and at the gathering, we want to see where we can support already existing "engaging men" strategies and programs as well as potentially develop new ones. We sincerely look forward to working together!

APPENDIX A

Glossary

Ally, allyship – An ally works in partnership with others to overcome oppression, recognizing that it also directly affects their life and relationships. Allyship involves humility and lifelong growth.

Crisis intervention work – Ongoing systems of oppression lead to crisis states in personal lives. Intervention work (often called "tertiary prevention" in the public health framework) seeks to help people (as populations or individuals) overcome crisis and transition out of survival mode into a focus on thriving.

Engaging men – A process of working with men and masculinities to develop allies in overcoming sexist oppression. Through The Engaging Men Project, we have come to an understanding that the engaging men process must be open, include active invitation and accountability through ongoing, guided participation. Outstanding questions include what it takes for an engaging men process to be effective and healthy.

Feminism – An understanding that women and femininities are important and inherently deserving of respect; that men and masculinities have absolutely no right or claim to ownership and control of any aspect of women's bodies or lives. An understanding that the personal is (the basis for the) political. An intellectual component includes a developing focus on broader systems of gender politics (e.g., the relationship between masculinities, femininities, queer identities and other gender and sexual identities within and across societies and through history). An activist component includes any work to overcome systems of sexist oppression (including but not limited to sexual and gender violence and misogyny).

Intersectionality – An understanding that different forms of oppression interlock and reinforce one another, creating a system of oppression. Therefore, working against one form of oppression is most effective when also actively struggling against other oppressions.

Male supremacy – The idea that men and masculinities can claim ownership, privilege, and control of femininities, including but not limited to women's lives, behaviors, thoughts, activities and bodies.

Masculinities – The diverse, socially- and culturally-situated expressions of what it means to "be a man."

Misogyny – The hatred and fear of women and/or anything considered feminine. For example, considering any phrase using women or feminine concepts as insults, such as, "you throw like a girl."

Movement – A coherent although not always coordinated effort to achieve social justice.

Other (verb) – A way of making people seem alien, less familiar, or different, often to facilitate fear, hatred, control and abuse (e.g., when men "other" women and strip them of their personhood, such as calling a woman a "girl"); to avoid personal accountability (e.g., when men pretend that the sexist or domineering actions of "other" men seem different and disconnected from their own behavior, or that such actions have no bearing or impact on them); or to serve as a coping mechanism against a pervasive sense of hopelessness, powerlessness, or fear for safety (as when people blame victims of violence in order to perceive themselves as different, and therefore, more safe).

Patriarchy – A system of sexist oppression where men exercise political and domestic, public and private control over women and, by extension, femininities.

Portland metro area – The region of Portland, Oregon, including outlying cities and suburbs such as Beaverton, Gresham, Hillsboro, as well as Vancouver, WA. Counties included: Clackamas County, Columbia County, Multnomah County, Washington County, Yamhill County, Clark County (WA), and Skamania County (WA).

Prevention – Effort to ensure something never comes to pass. In public health, it is divided into "primary," "secondary," and "tertiary" prevention. Colloquial talk of "prevention" often focuses on secondary and primary prevention. Dedicated prevention workers and activists often push for increased focus on primary prevention.

Privilege – In societies of social inequality, various people have (by virtue of their perceived group identity) increased credibility, legitimacy, ability to meet basic needs, ease of mobility and other positive attributes opposite of those who experience a correlated oppression. Often occurs with oppression as "two sides of the same coin."

Rape culture – An entrenched set of beliefs, attitudes, habits, behaviors and language that facilitate, minimize, mask, excuse, protect, and even provoke sexual violence specifically targeting women, youth, people with disabilities or any other member of an accessible, vulnerable population who lacks privilege and credibility; also specifically targeting their allies or perceived allies.

Sexism – An essentialist social belief in a feminine/masculine dichotomy of gender and sexual norms that exists to predict and control members of a population based on their perceived gender and sexual identities (e.g., the "man box," the "woman box," and also the "straight box" and the "gay/queer box"); also to marginalize and punish members when they are perceived as deviating from those norms (e.g., when a man escapes the "man box" or a woman escapes the "woman box" or any open queer identity).

Survivor – Someone who has encountered and lived through oppression, often referring specifically to physically, psychologically, or sexually aggressive violence and control.

Victim – A negative, albeit more inclusive, framing of "survivor." The victim is typically the target of oppression or an oppressor. All survivors are, or were once, victims, but not all victims are survivors, due to varying levels of support, tolerance and the level of hostility they have had to survive.

Violence against women – An instrument of sexist control of women serving to enforce and reinforce patriarchal gender politics. At least 1 in 3 women are the victims of rape; 1 in 4 of intimate partner violence. One man's abuse of one woman makes it easier for all men to oppress any women by decreasing the level of direct violence they must use to achieve control.

Victim blaming – a process of ignoring the need to hold an aggressor accountable by disproportionately focusing accountability and scrutiny on the victim or survivor (e.g., fetishizing the survivor's life or behavior leading up to their victimization).

APPENDIX B

Interview Questions

Impetus: Involve agencies and agency individuals in the engaging men as allies planning process; help ascertain needs, challenges, assets and opportunities specific to engaging men in the PDX-metro area

Action: Invite PDX-metro agencies to participate in an open and safe brainstorm and conversation regarding men in the movement to end men's gender-based violence.

Anonymity: The results of this project are NOT confidential. We will compile information from questions 1-4 about your mission, services, and collaborative relationships into a public resource on engaging men. All other information (e.g. from questions 5-11) will remain separate and anonymous.

Brainstorm Questions:

1. What is the *mission* of your agency?
2. What are the *services* you provide?
    1. How do you refer to the people who seek or receive your services? (e.g., clients, consumers, participants, etc)
    2. To what population(s) do you provide your services? (specify age groups)
    3. Does your work involve men/boys as staff, volunteers, or clients/consumers/participants?
3. How do you work with boys/men?
    1. Do you have *plans* to involve boys/men as staff/volunteers/clients?
    2. What are your main *goals and objectives* in working with boys/men as staff/volunteers/clients?
4. Do you collaborate with *others* who work with boys/men as staff/volunteers/clients? Who?
5. Do you see the involvement of more boys/men as an important part of advancing
    1. the mission of your agency?
    2. the mission of ending men's violence?
6. Why might boys/men not get involved?
    1. Why might agencies not involve men/boys?
    2. Why might men/boys get involved?
7. What does boy's/men's involvement look like and feel like?
    1. What is men's work and responsibility on ending men's violence?
    2. Does this change for different individuals, programs or agencies? How?
8. What experiences or perspectives do you have on boys/men who are involved in ending men's violence?
    1. What concerns do you have about:
        a. boy's/men's current involvement?
        b. having more men/boys involved?

9. How do you think men perceive people who work to end men's violence? (women, feminists, other men, survivors, etc.)
10. Do you have policies regarding men working with your agency (e.g., limitations/procedures)
    1. Do you have policies regarding sexual/romantic relationships between staff/volunteers/clients involved with your agency?
    2. If so, would you mind sharing?
11. How do we keep the communication going?
    1. How do we stay engaged with you?
    2. Who else should we have this conversation with?

APPENDIX C

Outstanding Questions

TEMP chose a very specific path: we set out to take a "snapshot" of the current state of affairs regarding male engagement in the Portland Metro area. We accomplished this through our interview process; the interview itself was composed of 11 questions. Of course, there are many questions still to explore. The following questions are presented for further consideration by individuals or groups. We imagine some may be useful as discussion starters or group exercises. Furthermore, from our own experience, we know this list may feel overwhelming; please know our intention is to inspire dialogue and spark insights.

We suggest interpreting the word, "outstanding," in the following ways: 1) "remaining" "unaddressed" or "still needing attention" and 2) "notable" "interesting" "extraordinary" "important" "conspicuous" etc. This list of "outstanding questions" contains in the spirit of both definitions all the questions we captured in our work to date.

- Do we need [consensus on] clear definitions of key concepts? Do we have any (consensus/clear definitions)? What are the key concepts? Can we engage men as we create them? (We have given a beginning, in our glossary section.)
  - What do we mean by power?
  - What do we mean by ally? What is a partner? (Public vs private definitions…)
  - What is a "good role model?"
  - What do we mean by "engage?" EG:
    - Open, active invitation
    - Ongoing, guided participation
    - Effective, healthy accountability
  - What is "accountability?"
  - What does healthy and effective accountability look like?
  - What are personal and social accountability, and how do they relate to one-another?
- Do we speak the "same language" as the people we want to engage?
- Who do we mean when we say, "men?"
  - What role does acceptance (of men/masculinities) play in engaging men?
  - How do we account for, accommodate or even encourage diverse masculinities?
  - How do stereotypes about men/masculinity (both perceived as men "should be" and lived out by men) affect whether and how men (can) become involved?
  - What must we adapt or change to accommodate or integrate men/masculinities?
  - How effective are we at articulating men's interests and potential benefits of engagement in gender justice?
  - How do masculinities affect whether/where/how men become allies for gender justice?
  - Where or in what ways are men and masculinities best suited or most appropriate or most welcome to participate? (How does gender affect suitability for different roles?)
- How is feminism useful for engaging men?

- How might a focus on "engaging men" to the exclusion of other people disempower or marginalize others?
  - EG "men have the power..." zero-sum comments reproduce offender/victim dichotomy
  - (How) can we (continue to) empower women without implicitly blaming them?
  - How do we honor and appreciate the hard work and progress that us gotten us this far, as we proceed further?
  - What are the "next steps" of the movement?
  - How important is it to engage men vs engage more of the general public of any gender?
    - [note, this was from a few interviews stating that the movement still seems very insular with the general public regardless of gender identity; that while it is appropriate to say that not many men are involved, we can also ask whether that really means much considering how many people aren't really involved at any level]
  - Is the focus really on engaging more men, or engaging more people (perhaps with a focus on men/positions of privilege) to develop active bystander and leadership capacity for gender justice?
    - could have broader appeal as "leadership development," "bullying prevention," etc
- What are the tactics of oppression? How do we defend against, mitigate or even leverage them?
  - Can we leverage extant sexism for a good outcome (i.e., use sexism to undo itself)?
  - e.g., [how] can we use the oft-stated male-to-male credibility ultimately to build women's/gender minorities' credibility with men?
  - How many/which men are disturbed by the status quo (violence, inequality, [hetero]sexism, man box, etc)?
- What are the "core issues" of gender justice vs "tangents?"
  - i.e., violence vs oppression (when "violence" doesn't culturally translate)
- How do men gain or earn each-others' and women's/gender-minorities' trust in the context of be(com)ing allies in gender justice?
- Is it true that "everyone has a role to play" in the movement?
- How do we identify and prioritize outreach/engagement targets?
- What are the major roles in the movement for gender justice?
  - What roles and responsibilities are there in engaging men or the general public in gender justice?
  - What are the criteria for being good at each? (e.g., "what makes a good advocate? crisis responder? active bystander? trainer? community or organizational leader? $fundraiser? institutional/political activist?")
- What sort of leadership is needed to engage men as allies in gender justice?
  - How do we engage men/people as leaders in their own cohorts or peer groups?
  - how do we identify "promising leaders" and develop leadership capacity in anyone?
- Who really wants to engage men vs who wants to see men engaged (by others)?

- How must people (including men) who are already engaged change in order to effectively engage (more) men as allies?
  - [e.g., men must relinquish privileges obtained from being the only few, therefore valuable, men currently engaged]
- What is "getting it" – both as a static goal and process of "getting there" – and how do men "get there?"
- What are we engaging men in?
  - What are we calling it? Anti-violence work? (is violence really the issue)? feminism (and is the root of that word really conducive to engaging masculinities?)?
  - How far does only "being against" things get us? (including "prevention") Would reframing as "gender justice" allow us room to be against gender oppression while being for gender (what? enlightenment? collaboration?)
  - Is this a movement? Is it self-defined to any extent, or do we still need to do that work? Do we need to define and found a movement for gender justice that encompasses -- but is not limited to -- the work to-date? (e.g., see http://www.engagingmen.net/, menengage.org, xyonline.net)
  - What is the difference between engaging men in existing organizations/agencies and engaging men "in the movement?"
- To what extent should agencies focusing on response also be responsible for prevention?
  - Where are the needs for separation and integration of prevention and response?
  - How do we ensure coordination, collaboration and accountability for both prevention and response?
- How are agencies/organizations already trying to engage men as allies?
  - What more can be done from those points? (EG $donors$)
  - What other opportunities to engage men are un(der)explored? (EG prevention work, indirect services, advocacy)
  - (How) are we engaging men outside of an agency/non-profit context?
- How do masculinities relate to the development of safer spaces?
  - What risks do men post to existing agencies/organizations that
    - are new and unique to the expression of masculinities?
    - already exist in some form?
  - What steps to take to manage/mitigate those risks?
- How do we activate men/masculinities in gender justice to the same proportional degree as women/femininities?
  - How do we measure? % of population? Hours contributed?
- Do we have a sense of where PDX stands on a historical continuum of movement progress/development?
  - It seems like the movement is stuck largely at service provision due to a PR problem stemming in part from a crisis of identity
  - So much "negative thought" – against, anti, stop, prevent, respond to, etc – but what are we FOR? What is our vision of gender justice? Do we even know? Does it resonate with the general public?
  - Stigma on gender violence and everything around it – no way through this except reframing (see above)
  - Successful smear campaign(s) on the "f-word" (feminist/m)

- o Martyr myths – it's horrible, lacks rewards, and you must be altruistic or masochistic to do it
- Assumption: When the movement knows what it stands for, it will have a strong vision that will engage more of the general public as allies in service provision and beyond
  - o What do we give men/public to say "yes" to in order to become involved in gender justice?
  - o What are the different opportunities and challenges across generations? (e.g., youth vs adult vs elderly)
- (How) can survivor-centered perspectives help vs hinder efforts to engage men/public?
- Is there a true need for dedicated DVSA services for men? If so, how to cooperate vs compete (e.g., limited $$)
- Is funding available for non-mandated BIP services for men who want to change? (with accountability stipulations/conditions)
- How important are boundary/relationship policies and ethical standards to successfully integrate more men in agencies?
- How do we incorporate intersectionality based on the assumption that gender oppression often – if not always – has company of other oppressions?
  - o Typically, oppression (and esp. intersecting) can divide and conquer or otherwise make the challenge of justice seem insurmountable.
  - o How can we frame "intersecting justices" that unite people and provide a clear pathway forward? (EG "decolonizing masculinities" for aboriginal justice)
- What should TEMP do with the "Who else should we involve?" info?
- What does "interrupting sexism" look like when done effectively?
- Best means for invitations, training/preparation and ongoing accountability?
- What is the appropriate use of communications technology?
  - o What role should it play?
  - o What roles shouldn't it play?
  - o How do we maximize the accessibility and magic of in-person gatherings? ("oxytocin" quote from Gloria Steinem)
- What can we do to foster companion/partner concepts and frameworks?
- How do we identify and address "collusion?"

APPENDIX D

Interviewees

Abuse Recovery Ministry and Services (ARMS)
- Contact: Stacey Womack, Executive Director, stacey@armsonline.org
- www.armsonline.org
- 503.846.9284 or 866.262.9284
- Offers support and services for victims and survivors of domestic violence; support for men struggling with anger and controlling behavior; support and education for youth around healthy relationships

Agape Church of Christ
- Contact: Ron Clark, rclark@agapecoc.com
- www.agapecoc.com
- 503.313.5329
- Open to all members of the community. Agape offers clergy trainings to address IPV and other forms of abuse while seeking to establish a safe space for healing, accountability, and support. Agape is committed to partnering with local agencies to help address oppression and aid survivors in healing.

Allies in Change
- Contact: Chris Huffine, chuffine@pacifier.com
- www.alliesinchange.org
- 503.297.7979
- The mission of *Allies in Change Counseling Center* is to raise awareness of, educate about, and encourage the practice of healthy, loving and respectful relationships with oneself, one's partner and family, and the community

Boys Advocacy and Mentoring (BAM!)
- Contact: Stephen Grant, steven@claritycounseling.com
- www.bamgroups.com
- 503.234.6972
- Offers consultation services and facilitated BAM! Groups

Bradley Angle
- Contact: Missy Kloos, Community Based Services Manager, missyk@bradleyangle.org
- www.bradleyangle.org
- 503.232.1528 (office)
- Offers emergency shelter, 24-hour crisis line, youth programs, transition services, community-based services, LGBTQ services, economic empowerment program, Healing Roots Program, and awareness raising

Bridges to Safety

- Contact: Ryan Alonzo, ryan@bridges2safety.com
- www.bridgestosafety.com
- Toll free 847.235.9516, or 503.364.2016
- Offers county approved groups for: women's domestic violence intervention, domestic violence intervention for fathers, father's parenting program, mother's parenting program, and family violence intervention for men

Gresham Intimate Violence Education (GIVE)
- Contact: Don Voeks, donvoeks@hotmail.com
- 503.465.6656
- Batterer intervention, specializes in LGBT/female perpetrators

Men's Resource Center
- Contact: Paul Lee, paullee@portlandmrc.com
- www.portlandmrc.com
- 503.235.3433
- Offers anger management, domestic violence counseling, therapy for gay men, and therapy for individuals who were sexually abused as children

Oregon Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence (OCADSV)
- Contact: Vanessa Timmons, Executive Director, vanessa@ocadsv.org
- www.ocadsv.org
- 503.230.1951
- Provides technical assistance, training, public education to local crisis centers and their communities; engages in systems advocacy; and supports multi-disciplinary efforts to develop agency protocols

Portland Women's Crisis Line (PWCL)
- Contact: Rebecca Nickels, Executive Director, rebecca@pwcl.org
- www.pwcl.org
- Offers 24-hour crisis line, sexual assault program, sex worker outreach project, and volunteer and outreach program

Portland State University Community Psychology
- Contact: Eric Mankowski, emankowski@pdx.edu
- www.pdx.edu/psy/psu-department-of-psychology

Portland State University Women's Resource Center
- Contact: Jessica Amo, jamo@pdx.edu
- www.pdx.edu/wrc
- 503.725.2795
- Offers interpersonal violence program, leadership in action program, and the empowerment project

Rahab's Sisters

- Contact: Mary Dettmann
- www.rahabs-sisters.org
- Offers meals and hospitality, outreach to women in bars and clubs, support to mothers who are trafficked or in prostitution

Raphael House of Portland
- Contact: Emmy Ritter, Director of Program and Services, eritter@raphaelhouse.com and Nick Guerrero, Youth Advocate, nguerrero@raphaelhouse.com
- www.raphaelhouse.com
- Offers emergency shelter, advocacy center, transitional housing, response advocacy (DVERT and DVRU), and community education and outreach

Scarlet Cord
- Contact: Amanda Gerke
- www.mysistershand.org
- Offers street outreach, free dinner and hygiene items

Sexual Assault Resource Center (SARC)
- Contact: Erin Ellis, Executive Director
- 503.626.9100 (office)
- www.sarcoregon.org
- Offers 24-hour crisis line and response, prevention, case management, Latina services, and mental health services

SoValTi
- Contact: Tim Logan, sovalti3@gmail.com
- www.sovalti.manageattendance.com
- Offers parenting education, batterer's intervention groups for men, biracial identity process group, family therapy, and individual therapy

VOA Home Free
- Contact: Samantha Naliboff, snaliboff@voaor.org
- www.voaor.org
- 503.235.8655 (administrative office)
- Offers support and services for survivors of domestic violence, treatment programs, senior programs, and public safety programs

YWCA of Greater Portland
- Contact: Choya Adkison-Stevens, choyaa@ywcapdx.org
- www.ywcapdx.org
- 503.294.7480
- Offers support and services for survivors of domestic violence, senior services, youth services, and social change program/advocacy training

Individuals:
- Christina Bondurant, formerly of Clackamas County
- Jack Straton, PSU Assistant Professor, straton@pdx.edu
- Ray Shellmire, formerly of Self Enhancement, Inc.
- Robin Jackson