<http://www.diva-portal.org>

Postprint

This is the accepted version of a paper published in *Women's Studies: International Forum*. This paper has been peer-reviewed but does not include the final publisher proof-corrections or journal pagination.

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Olivius, E. (2016)

Refugee men as perpetrators, allies or troublemakers?: Emerging discourses on men and masculinities in humanitarian aid

Women's Studies: International Forum, 56: 56-65

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2015.12.004>

Access to the published version may require subscription.

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

© 2016. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:umu:diva-121062>

Refugee Men as Perpetrators, Allies or Troublemakers? Emerging Discourses on Men and Masculinities in Humanitarian Aid

Elisabeth Olivius

Department of Political Science, Umeå University

elisabeth.olivius@umu.se

Introduction

Throughout the past decades, approaches to gender in humanitarian policy and practice have evolved significantly. In 1990, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) adopted its first *Policy on Refugee Women* (UNHCR 1990), and twenty years later all UN actors, many government donors and many larger humanitarian NGOs had developed their own gender policies (Buscher 2010; Edwards 2010). Thus, humanitarian aid in general and international refugee protection in particular have left gender-blindness behind, and a considerable collection of policy documents, field handbooks and programmatic responses aiming to take gender into account has been developed.¹ The goal of gender equality is now widely endorsed as an intrinsic aspect of the humanitarian imperative to save lives and relieve suffering in situations of emergency and displacement. This change represents substantial steps forward and testifies to the success of long-term feminist advocacy (Baines 2004; Hyndman 2004; Buscher 2010; Edwards 2010; Freedman 2010).

Until today, however, the promotion of gender equality in humanitarian operations has primarily been understood as equivalent to special measures to ensure women's protection and access to assistance. While this may be explained as a reasonable response to women's subordinate position in many contexts where humanitarian aid is delivered, feminist scholars have also critiqued the way in which women-focused humanitarian policies represent and approach women. The overwhelming focus on women as vulnerable victims in need of special protection has been problematized as contributing to reinforce women's marginalization (Manderson et al. 1998; Kneebone 2005; Szczepanikova 2010). Efforts to increase refugee women's participation have often been driven by a desire to increase aid effectiveness rather than to realize women's rights, and have not necessarily contributed to change in existing gender relations (El-Bushra 2000, Olivius 2014; Hyndman and de Alwis 2008). Further, representations of refugee women as victims of "backward" non-western cultures have reproduced cultural and racial hierarchies (Macklin 1995; Razack 1995).

However, recent years have seen a shift in humanitarian policy and practice. Increasingly, the importance of including men in gender equality efforts is emphasized. This shift can be seen as a logical effect of the previous change in policy terminology from "women" to "gender," and the more recent trend towards recognizing multiple forms of diversity and vulnerability, exemplified by the Age, Gender and Diversity Mainstreaming (AGDM) approach of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (Edwards 2010). In the Age, Gender and Diversity Policy, gender equality is defined as "the equal enjoyment of rights, responsibilities and opportunities of women, men, girls and boys. Gender equality implies that the interests, needs and priorities of each gender are respected" (UNHCR 2011:1). "Promoting and supporting the positive engagement of men and boys" is further described as "a fundamental step towards ensuring access to protection and equality for all" (UNHCR 2011:4). Increasing attention to the

role of men and boys in the promotion of gender equality is, however, not a phenomena unique to the humanitarian field, but can be seen in wider UN policy discourse (UN Commission on the Status of Women 2004, Connell 2005) and in the growth of masculinity studies as an academic field of research (Kimmel et al. 2005).

These developments beg the question of whether the growing emphasis on men and masculinities in gender equality policies represents a welcome shift away from a narrow understanding of gender as equivalent to women that can foster more complex analyses of gender relations, or, as some feminists suggest, it represents a diversion of attention and resources away from the yet unfinished struggle for women's rights towards instead addressing men's needs (White 2000). Will the shift towards men and masculinities encourage a critical deconstruction of masculinity as well as femininity, or will the desire to include everyone in equal measure, "regardless of disadvantage, patriarchy, or hierarchy" obscure the power relations at issue (Edwards 2010:39)?

This article contributes to a critical examination of the implications of the shift towards men and masculinities in global gender equality policies through focusing on how men and masculinities are represented in humanitarian gender equality policy and practice. The inclusion of men and masculinities in approaches to gender equality is arguably still in its infancy in this field, and has not previously been systematically analyzed. This article thereby sheds new light on an understudied aspect of humanitarian policy and practice. It does so through an analysis of two types of material: policy texts on gender from key United Nations (UN) humanitarian agencies, and interviews with humanitarian workers assisting refugees in camps in Thailand and Bangladesh.

The analysis presented here identifies three main representations of the role of refugee men in relation to the promotion of gender equality. First, refugee men are represented as perpetrators of violence and discrimination against refugee women. Refugee men are thereby actively creating women's vulnerability and subordination, and must be made to stop if gender equality is to be possible. Second, refugee men are represented as gatekeepers who, as power holders and decision makers in their families and communities, can both obstruct and enable change towards gender equality. The potential role of men as partners and allies for gender equality and the importance of convincing them to act as such are therefore strongly emphasized. Third, refugee men are represented as emasculated troublemakers. In this representation, their inability to perform masculine roles as providers and protectors due to the constraints of situations of emergency and displacement, in combination with aid agencies' efforts to empower women, is said to leave men disempowered, emasculated, frustrated and bored. Male violence against women, alcohol abuse and criminality are represented as consequences of this situation, and gender equality policies that better respond to the needs of men are offered as the solution.

While consciously conceptualizing and addressing men and masculinities is no doubt indispensable for the pursuit of more equitable gender relations in refugee situations and other contexts, I argue that the currently dominant ways of representing refugee men are problematic in ways which severely limit their usefulness to a project of gender equality and liberation: refugee men's masculinities are pathologized through a representation of refugee communities as primitive; the power relations constitutive of gender differences are obscured; and the representation of refugee men as emasculated is frequently employed to make an anti-feminist

argument against the empowerment of women and the transformation of unequal gender relations.

The article is structured as follows. Next, I introduce discourse-theoretical analysis, the analytical approach used in this article. Then I present the material for the study, consisting of six humanitarian policy texts on gender, and 58 interviews with humanitarian aid workers in Thailand and Bangladesh. The analysis then follows, exploring the three main representations of men and masculinities that I have identified in the material and discussing their political implications. In conclusion, given the limitations of these ways of conceptualizing and approaching men and masculinities in humanitarian aid to refugees, I consider how these could be done in ways more conducive to the transformation of gender inequality.

Discourse, power and representation

The analytical approach used in this article can be described as a discourse-theoretical analysis (DTA), a method which seeks to demonstrate the contingency as well as the political implications of dominant discursive constructions (Shepherd 2008:19). Like Shepherd, I argue that “DTA provides me with analytical strategies that allow me to identify, problematize and challenge the ways in which ‘realities’ become accepted as ‘real’ in the practices of international relations” (2008:20). It is therefore suitable for an analysis of how men and masculinities are given meaning in the humanitarian field, and what the implications might be when these meanings come to inform humanitarian aid practices in sites such as refugee camps.

DTA builds on an understanding of discourses as “practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak” (Foucault 1972: 49). The conceptualization of discourse as practice underlines that discourses do not only comprise language, but are embedded in institutions, technical processes, and general ways of working or behaving in a particular context. In Doty’s apt phrase, “[a] discourse delineates the terms of intelligibility whereby a particular reality can be known and acted upon” (1996: 6). Thus, discourses shape how we perceive the world and how we seek to govern it. How concepts such as men, women, gender and power are discursively constructed thus determine how humanitarian policies and programs will seek to act upon them, which in turn have consequences in the lives of refugees who are the subjects of these policies and programs. However, discourses are inherently open-ended and fluid, and thereby the discursive fixing of meaning is only ever temporary and partial, and always open to contestation and negotiation (Laclau and Mouffe 2001: 107). As expressed by Shepherd, “[d]iscursive practices maintain, construct and constitute, legitimize, resist and suspend meaning, and it is these practices that theorists can analyze using DTA” (2008:21).

Moreover, as discursive practices shape how we experience ourselves and our reality, creating certain possibilities while excluding others, discursive practices are always practices of power. Power, Foucault argues, is not only repressive but also productive, enabling as well as restricting the agency of subjects. Power is omnipresent; “it is exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of nonegalitarian and mobile relations” (Foucault 1978: 94). Importantly for the purposes of this analysis, a Foucauldian conception of power directs attention to the relationship between power and knowledge, revealing how the production of “truth” and knowledge about a category of people, such as refugee men, constitutes this category and makes it available as a target for governmental interventions aiming at controlling it, empowering it or changing it (Foucault 1991: 102-104). Further, this understanding of power and knowledge

suggests that subject positions are products of power relations. Practices of representation (Shepherd 2008:25), where different qualities, capacities, behaviors and attributes are assigned to individuals and groups, shaping how they can speak and act, can thereby be understood as continuous and provisional processes of meaning-making infused with power (Bacchi 2009: 40-42). However, practices of representation do not determine subjectivities, they elicit them, enjoining individual and collective subjects to embody particular positions (Dean 2010: 43-44).

Drawing on this theoretical framework, this analysis focuses on identifying, problematizing and challenging representational practices which link men and/or masculinities to the project of promoting gender equality. The main analytical strategy for so doing is to scrutinize the construction of subject positions (Bacchi 2009: 40-42). Thus, I seek to identify how the category of refugee men and its role in relation to gender (in)equality is constituted, contested and negotiated in the material under analysis. What subject positions are created for refugee men? Why and how are they consequently to be included in gender equality efforts? What power effects are generated by these representational practices?

Empirical data

This article is based on an analysis of two types of materials; humanitarian policy texts on gender, and interviews with humanitarian workers engaged in the delivery of humanitarian aid to refugee camps in Thailand and Bangladesh. The combination of policy texts and interviews makes it possible to identify patterns in the practices of representation that inform emerging approaches to men and masculinities in the humanitarian field, and examine how international policy discourses are taken up in humanitarian field practices.

The six selected policy texts analyzed here arguably represent the current normative framework regarding gender in relation to refugee situations, and function as crucial modes for the construction and dissemination of knowledge about gender and the way it should be addressed. Produced by central humanitarian policy makers within the UN system, these texts inform the work of UN agencies as well as international and national NGOs. While some policy texts are concerned with humanitarian emergencies broadly more than with refugee situations specifically, they are all relevant and widely influential in the context of humanitarian aid to refugees.

The first three texts are produced by the UNHCR, the central organization of the international refugee regime: the *Age, Gender and Diversity Policy*, subtitled *Working with People and Communities for Equality and Protection* (UNHCR 2011) *Guidelines for the Protection of Women and Girls* (UNHCR 2008); and *Sexual and Gender-Based Violence against Refugees, Returnees and Internally Displaced Persons: Guidelines for Prevention and Response* (UNHCR 2003). Two texts are produced by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), a coordination forum comprising all major UN humanitarian agencies and many NGOs, which has been a major source of humanitarian policymaking on gender. The broad spectrum of actors means that policies adopted by the IASC represent widely endorsed principles and positions. The IASC policy texts are the *Gender Handbook for Humanitarian Action* from 2006, subtitled *Women, Girls, Boys and Men: Different Needs – Equal Opportunities* (IASC 2006) and the *Guidelines for Gender Based Violence Interventions in Humanitarian Settings* (IASC 2005). The sixth text is the most recent version of the World Food Programme (WFP) gender policy, entitled *Promoting Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women in Addressing Food and Nutrition*

Challenges (2009). Managing the essential delivery of food aid, the WFP also acts as a major humanitarian agency in many refugee situations.

In all of these texts, men are primarily an “absent presence” (Shepherd 2008:121) or a “background category” (Connell 2005: 1806). Refugee men are the unmentioned norm in relation to which refugee women’s particular needs and vulnerabilities are discussed. However, there are also instances where refugee men and norms of masculinity are explicitly discussed in relation to the existence of gender inequality, violence and discrimination and the pursuit of gender equality. While analysing the meaning and implications of men’s absent presence is important, this analysis specifically focuses on those instances where men are explicitly discussed, named, and problematized. By doing so, the analysis contributes to shed light on the ongoing shift towards increased focus on and attention to men and their role in gender equality promotion.

The interview material consists of 58 interviews with humanitarian workers employed by UN agencies and NGOs, conducted by the author in 2010 and 2011. The interviewees consisted of women and men of various ages, representing both national and international staff members. Among the interviewees men slightly outnumbered women, and international members slightly outnumbered national staff members. With regards to how men and masculinities were represented, there were no systematic differences between male and female or international and national interviewees. Further, the interviewees worked in all sectors of humanitarian aid, with less than a handful occupying positions specifically focused on gender issues. Each interview lasted for approximately one hour.

For decades, Thailand and Bangladesh have both hosted large numbers of refugees who have fled armed conflict and ethnic persecution under military rule in Burma. Currently, 32,000 refugees belonging to the Rohingya Muslim minority are living in two refugee camps managed by the government in Eastern Bangladesh. In addition, an estimated 200,000 – 500,000 Rohingya who are denied recognition as refugees live in villages and in camp-like settlements in the vicinity of the official camps (Lewa 2003; UNHCR 2014). Humanitarian aid is provided to refugees in the official camps by UN organizations such as the UNHCR and the World Food Program (WFP) and a small number of international and national NGOs. In Thailand, nine camps along the Thai-Burmese border are hosting 120,000 refugees, a majority belonging to the Karen minority (TBC 2014).² Humanitarian aid and services are mainly provided by a network of about 15 national and international NGOs, and the UNHCR is present in a primarily monitoring role. Furthermore, services are coordinated and partly implemented by the refugees themselves through a system for community-based camp management (Banki and Lang 2008).

The interviews focused on how the promotion of gender equality was organized in the work of the interviewees, and on the meanings they ascribed to gender equality as a policy goal in the context of humanitarian aid in refugee camps. When discussing questions relating to the meaning of gender equality, the existence of gender inequality in the camps, and the strategies employed by humanitarian agencies to address it, a majority of the interviewees brought up themes related to the role of refugee men. The fact that many interviewees spontaneously spoke about men and masculinities in relation to gender equality supports the argument that a shift towards increased attention to men and masculinities is taking place in humanitarian policy and practice. This material thereby provides a fruitful opportunity to examine *how* men and masculinities are understood and included in humanitarian programming.

Representations of refugee men in humanitarian policy and practice

Through the analysis of policy texts and interviews, three distinct representations of refugee men and their relation to humanitarian gender equality policies and programs appear as dominant. Refugee men are represented as perpetrators of violence and discrimination; powerful gatekeepers and potential allies; and emasculated trouble-makers. Below, I examine each of these representations and consider their political implications.

Refugee men as perpetrators of violence and discrimination

Violence against women, generally termed sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) or gender-based violence (GBV), has become a priority issue in humanitarian operations, having received considerable attention, funding, and programmatic responses in the past decades (Buscher 2010). Responses have, as noted by the UNHCR, primarily focused on working with women subjected to violence or considered at risk of violence (UNHCR 2008:55). However, the fact that men constitute the absolute majority of perpetrators of violence is increasingly acknowledged. For example, the UNHCR guidelines state that “[m]ost cases of sexual and gender-based violence involve a female victim/survivor and a male perpetrator” (UNHCR 2003:14). In the interviews with humanitarian workers, refugee men frequently enter their narratives as perpetrators of violence and discrimination who actively create and uphold refugee women’s vulnerability and subordination. Men are explicitly named as the agents behind violence and discrimination against women:

The gender gap in the camps is very big. It is a male dominated community. Females very rarely have a voice in their family or community [...] Women refugees have also been subject to a lot of violence, from outside and from inside the community. Recently it is mostly from within their own community, from their male partners.³

Refugee men’s violence against women is described as “largely rooted in individual attitudes that condone violence” (UNHCR 2003:7). However, such attitudes are also represented as rooted in the culture, religion and traditions of the refugee communities. The Rohingya community is frequently described as a traditional, conservative and religious society, where the norms, beliefs and practices of the refugees are the main obstacles to increased gender equality. Explaining the persistence of male dominance and violence in the camps, an NGO representative remarked that:

The refugee’s religious and social background from their ancestral homes across the border is a very backward looking, orthodox Muslim society. The society, social norms, culture and tradition are the root, and they bring this along. It is a very male-dominated society. And an uneducated society in general...The scenario of gender inequality is very clear if you only walk through the camps. Women are less active, women are restricted to the house, the domestic sphere...It is a less progressive society.⁴

In accordance with this view, other NGO workers in Bangladesh state that “in the Rohingya culture, beating your wife is something normal,”⁵ and closely link violence against women and male dominance to the religious views of the refugees:

Women are controlled by men. Traditional leaders, religious leaders. They need permission from husband, father, brothers to do everything [...] Beliefs in ancestors and spirits are used to motivate rules and constraints on women. They believe it, it is in their religious views. And many think it normal that husbands beat their wife, and accept it. There is a belief that women have to be under male power.⁶

A representation of refugee men as patriarchal and oppressive can also be traced in international policy documents. For example, the UNHCR *Handbook for the Protection of Women and Girls* implied that in refugee situations “refusal by husbands to let their wives and daughter leave the home” is a common obstacle to the implementation of gender equality policies (2008:17).

The explicit naming of men as the causes and agents of gender inequality and violence shifts the emphasis on how solutions are imagined. If the attitudes and behaviors of men are the problem, this is what needs to change. As expressed by the UNHCR, “[f]ocusing only on women when addressing sexual and gender-based violence tends to place the responsibility for prevention and response on the victims/survivors” (2003:12). Instead, as suggested by an NGO worker in Bangladesh, “there has to be strong behavioral change advocacy. Strong action against male perpetrators of domestic violence and sexual violence.”⁷ Thus, men must be educated and convinced to change their attitudes and behaviors, for example in relation to domestic violence, if gender equality is to become possible:

Domestic violence is quite frequent and also quite accepted, you know, I think there is a perception that it's not the worst thing in the world to beat your wife, you know, it's not... it's not considered really bad. And, so, those sort of traditional views and perspectives, those are things we try to work with and try to change.⁸

Again, in this statement by a UN worker in Thailand, the link between problematic male attitudes and behaviors and a representation of refugee communities as “traditional” is clear. The UNHCR *Handbook on the Protection of Women and Girls* features a section on working with men and boys to promote gender equality and protect women and girls (UNHCR 2008:55-63). In this section, violent and oppressive masculinities are described as socially constructed and amenable to change. While refugee men are represented as perpetrators of violence and oppression, they are also seen as victims of the social structures and norms that have socialized them into this position. Thus, refugee men are represented as subjects in need of reform, or, as Shepherd puts it, “[m]en also need assistance in overcoming their (natural?) violent tendencies” (2008: 95). The role of humanitarian gender equality interventions is thereby to change male subjectivities to produce less violent and more “civilized” masculinities. To achieve this end, refugee men and boys should be educated and equipped to question gender norms and practices in their community; humanitarian agencies should “train them in critical thinking skills” and help them “unlearn” masculinity as they have previously perceived it (UNHCR 2008:60-62).

Further, the importance of demonstrating more desirable forms of masculinity is emphasized. To this end, the UNHCR calls on its staff to “identify role models – men or boys who already behave in ways in which we want more men and boys to behave – and persuade them to take part in programs addressing violence and abuse (2008:60)”. As previously argued by Eriksson Baaz and Stern (2013), this type of narratives about the construction and reform of violent masculinities is decidedly racialized and interwoven with a narrative of progress and

development. “Civilized,” gender-equal masculinities are contrasted with the violent, oppressive masculinities of the barbarian Other (Eriksson Baaz and Stern 2013:26). This developmental narrative of masculinity is linked to a representation of violence against refugee women as an expression of the “underdevelopment” or “backwardness” of refugee communities and societies, a representation that has gained prominence in humanitarian policy discourse and field practice (Olivius forthcoming). The shift to a focus on the perpetrators, not only the victims, of gender violence and discrimination in refugee situations is thereby problematically coupled with the (re)production of cultural and racial hierarchies.

Refugee men as powerful gate-keepers and potential allies

As discussed in the previous section, in humanitarian policy and practice refugee men are commonly represented as perpetrators of gender violence and discrimination, and thus as a category of people who actively create and uphold gender inequalities. However, another frequent representation that avoids directly identifying men as the cause of gender inequality emphasizes the role of refugee men as power-holders and decision-makers in their families and communities. Men are thus implied to be in a privileged position, enjoying the benefits of unequal gender relations, but not necessarily as active supporters of gender inequality. For example, in a discussion about the refugee leadership structures in Thai camps, an NGO representative noted that “the communities have become used to the idea of leaders being primarily male.”⁹ For this humanitarian worker, male dominance in leadership is not something that refugee men actively fight to sustain, but rather a result of long-standing social norms that men passively continue to benefit from. Due to men’s positions of relative power and privilege, it is frequently stressed, they have the ability to hinder or enable change towards gender equality; enlisting men as allies is therefore crucial if gender equality reforms are to succeed. For example, the UNHCR states that “[m]en must take a decisive stand against sexual and gender-based violence before real progress can be made. Men in leadership positions have the power and authority to influence change” (2003:38). The idea that the realization of gender equality depends on convincing men, in particular men in positions of leadership, to support it is reiterated by a UN employee in Bangladesh:

A good place to start is with the religious leaders, because they were definitely the ones who had a great influence and power in the camps... And also, just in general, with men and boys, because yeah, that's where a lot of the problems stem from, I think, their mentality. I mean it wasn't obviously not enough to work with women and show them what they're capable of, because without changing those mentalities and attitudes of the men and boys in the camp then we weren't gonna get anywhere.¹⁰

Thus, due to existing gender inequalities, men have the cultural, political and economic power and authority needed to affect changes in these very relations of inequality. Men are therefore important because they are powerful – if they are not convinced to act as allies in humanitarian efforts to increase gender equality they are capable of obstructing it. This representation of men’s role in the promotion of gender equality can be found in academic literature as well. As Connell notes, “[m]en and boys are thus in significant ways gatekeepers for gender equality. Whether they are willing to open the gates for major reform is an important strategic question” (2005:1802).

How, then, are refugee men to be won over to the fight for gender equality? Here, the importance of educational interventions by humanitarian organizations is strongly stressed. Gender equality education is described as key to progress, and such education targeting men is especially important precisely because “men are the ones making decisions.”¹¹ As an NGO worker in Thailand relates, educating men is essential to make them “open their eyes” and realize the benefits of gender equality, for example in leadership and camp management:

When we started, we asked the women’s organizations if they wanted to be involved in camp management or if they rather did something else. And they said that they wanted to be involved and they wanted to have a voice, but they wanted us to help them and work with the men, because the issue was sensitive. The men just thought of women as people taking care of the house, and needed to open their eyes to what they [women] can do and the capacities they can bring to the table.¹²

Furthermore, educating refugee men to become allies in the fight for gender equality is represented as a process of cultural modernization. Indeed, when men are seen as obstacles to gender equality, they are described as defenders of tradition and religion who thereby stand in the way of change. For example, in relation to distribution of modern contraceptives in the Bangladeshi camps, an NGO worker argued that “it is possible to motivate some married women to practice family planning, but often they are discouraged by their husbands.”¹³ Refugee men’s resistance to gender equality programs before these men are educated is also described as being expressed in cultural and religious terms: “initially it was like ‘This is our culture, this is our religion’ You know? So the initial resistance is there. And then after continuous awareness, you see there are some people who are becoming receptive, and understanding why it needs to be done.”¹⁴ In the face of such male resistance, humanitarian organizations seek to identify “the few who have understood, who are open to change,”¹⁵ or, as expressed by a Bangladeshi government official working in the camps, the “intellectual persons who are developing.”¹⁶ If a number of such refugee men can be recruited as partners, the task of convincing others is facilitated: “if they hear about these issues from other men, they are more relaxed, and [...] I think they can buy into it easily.”¹⁷

Moreover, winning refugee men over as allies for gender equality also depends on presenting gender equality in a way that makes it acceptable and attractive to them: “[e]ngaging men and boys in the process of achieving gender equality requires us to raise awareness about the positive effects that gender equality can have for them” (UNHCR 2008:58). In this context, UNHCR emphasizes that the physical and mental health of men and boys can be negatively affected “as they strive to live up to the male ‘norm’” (2008:57). More broadly speaking, policy texts and interviewees frequently represent gender equality as good for the entire community, and explicitly speak against the idea that gender equality means to increase the power of women and decrease the power of men. The UNHCR makes it clear that “the goal of empowering women is not to enable them to have power over men” (2008:55). This is reiterated by a UN employee in Bangladesh, explaining the importance of making “men realize that talking about gender equality is not to make women to take control of you, but where you and women can work as a team for the benefit of society.”¹⁸ Gender equality is not conceptualized in terms of gender justice but in terms of gender complementarity – a situation where men and women cooperate for the benefit of all. To be accepted by refugee men, humanitarian workers argue that they must frame

gender equality “in terms of tangible benefits to the community,”¹⁹ clarifying “what you benefit as a society when you’re involving both genders”.²⁰ Importantly, gender equality must not be presented as “a women’s issue” – and definitely not as a feminist issue. As a UN employee in Bangladesh argues, “there’s nowhere in these societies where feminism is accepted.”²¹

Thus, the price of targeting gender equality efforts to win the support of refugee men is apparently its de-politization. To recruit men as allies, male dominance cannot be named or explicitly challenged. While men are represented as a powerful and privileged group, it is not clear whether the pursuit of gender equality means that male privilege should be challenged or if the aim is merely to convince the powerful to work more effectively for the general good of the refugee community. The key question of why men would want to participate in dismantling gender inequality if they currently benefit from it is solved through the representation of gender equality as a project of modernization and development that is implied to mean progress for men and women alike.

However, another consequence of this representation is that gender inequality becomes a situation without any source, cause, or agent. This is clear in many descriptions of the problem of sexual and gender-based violence in policy texts. After mentioning in passing that most perpetrators of gender violence are male, men largely disappear from view throughout the IASC GBV guidelines. Gender-based violence (GBV) is described as “a serious, life-threatening protection issue primarily affecting women and children” (IASC 2005:1). When men are mentioned, it is primarily to emphasize the importance of their involvement in GBV programs, for example in the design of culturally appropriate information materials (IASC 2005:12). It is unclear if men should be involved because of their assumed positions of influence in the community or because they are implicitly assumed to be the perpetrators of GBV.

The removal of language that associates gender with power is taken even further in the most recent version of humanitarian gender policy, UNHCRs Age, Gender and Diversity (AGD) Policy (2011). The purpose of this policy is “to ensure that all persons of concern enjoy their rights on an equal footing” (UNHCR 2011:1). Through an analysis of “the AGD dimensions as interlinked personal characteristics, we are able to better understand the multifaceted protection risks and capacities of individuals and communities, and to address and support these more effectively” (UNHCR 2011:2). However, throughout the document there is no acknowledgement of the existence of unequal relations of power based on gender (or other dimensions of “diversity”). Women, men, children and persons who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual or intersexual are each discussed as groups with certain capacities and different vulnerabilities. Whether some of these categories suffer systematic discrimination and structural disadvantage more than others is a question that remains unanswered. As in other policy texts, SGBV is given particular attention. Here, women are described as vulnerable to SGBV, and men as key actors in preventing and responding to it: “[p]romoting and supporting the positive engagement of men and boys in the many issues related to their community, including in the prevention and response to the scourge of SGBV, is a fundamental step towards ensuring access to protection and equality for all” (UNHCR 2011:4).

No clue is provided in this document as to the causes or the perpetrators of SGBV. This take on “diversity” definitely raises questions about whether a move away from a focus on refugee women obscures power relations and sidelines the project of social justice and equality.

Refugee men as emasculated troublemakers

A third representation of refugee men that recurs frequently in policy texts and interviews problematizes the impact of displacement on men. Displacement is said to disempower and emasculate men by preventing them from performing masculine roles as providers and protectors:

So I'd say there's a lot of bored and frustrated men within the refugee population, and that manifests itself unfortunately in significant levels of gender-based violence. Frustration, you know, men from leftover rice rations brewing alcohol, rice whiskey and other things, drinking more than they would probably normally do within a typical normal village society... women are still quite busy with household [...] but the main role of men traditionally played is no longer played, and...that's creating lots of issues.²²

This NGO worker in Thailand expresses the common view that refugee women's gender roles are less disrupted by displacement than those of refugee men; women continue to perform reproductive responsibilities, managing households and caring for children, but refugee men are left bored and frustrated, without opportunity to fulfill their expected roles. This situation is frequently represented as a main cause of violence against women and a cause of male alcohol abuse. The UNHCR reiterates these causal arguments:

Forced displacement and violence can have a devastating impact on men and boys. When men lose their traditional role as provider and protector as a result of displacement, this loss of status, especially when combined with boredom, frustration, and a sense of powerlessness, can lead to increased violence, including domestic violence. It can also lead to alcohol abuse – a major problem contributing to violence against women and girls (2008:57).

Thus, the situation of displacement is seen as leading to “tensions within the households” due to “a breakdown of the gender roles.”²³ In crisis situations, the IASC states, “men often have great difficulty in dealing with their changed identities, the loss of their breadwinner role” (IASC 2006:5). As Turner demonstrates in a study on the Lukole refugee camp in Tanzania, refugee men lament that women no longer respect them because they are unable to provide for their families, claiming that women now think that “the UNHCR is a better husband” (1999:2).

Refugee men are described as the prime victims of social disruption, but women then become secondary victims of men's violence, caused by their disempowerment and frustration. This situation is further aggravated by humanitarian aid organizations' programs that focus on women. Humanitarian organizations' preference for including women in aid programs is partly due to perceptions of women as less corrupt, more reliable and more family-oriented, thereby constituting more useful partners in the delivery of aid than men (Olivius 2014). This perception is visible in the 2009 WFP gender policy. Despite an ambition to adopt “a more holistic approach to gender,” the policy remains largely focused on women as useful partners in addressing hunger and malnutrition (WFP 2009:3). This representation of women as useful partners leads to a representation of men as corrupt, selfish, and unreliable.

Further, the existence of many humanitarian programs that focus on women is also driven by an ambition to empower refugee women and increase their opportunities. Such strategies are, however, strongly questioned for their alleged impact on men:

Some focus very much on women, and thereby exclude men. That begins to create social imbalance and tension. [...] Women only approaches increase problems. Community workers are more female than male in education, health, nursery schools, for example. In addition, there are women's organizations initiating projects and giving women responsibilities. Almost all women are busy – not men. More and more men are unemployed. When they have a lot of free time, they go out and drink, gamble, etc. This leads women to look down on men. When only women are empowered, this leads to problems. When men are just floating around, this will decrease their status and value. Men have been disempowered, and that is the reason they harm and oppress women. Men must be empowered as well as women.²⁴

In contrast to the representation of men as powerful gatekeepers, men here emerge as the true victims who are disadvantaged in refugee camps. Interestingly, humanitarian organizations' focus on women is here described as the cause of male behaviors frequently cited as the reason why it is better to work with women. Thus, humanitarian organizations' neglect of men is seen as turning them into unreliable troublemakers. This view of refugee men's idleness as a cause of male troublemaking as well as male repression of women are clearly articulated by this NGO worker in Bangladesh. Refugee men, the interviewee argued,

Indulge in more and more vices, like involvement in criminal activities. They have time, nothing to do. They do unlawful activities, go outside, creating problems [...] Their good senses are being crippled and bad senses come in. This leads to repression of women...trouble.²⁵

A focus on women's empowerment is thus represented as emasculating men, causing them to engage in undesirable behaviors ranging from criminality to violence against women, and creating tension and stress within families. When gender equality is equated with women's rights, "the men feel ostracized and it sort of...it creates tension and conflict within the family unit."²⁶ Creating economic opportunities for women is argued not only to disrupt family relations, but also to reflect a systematic neglect of men's needs:

Once the woman is employed and the guy can't find employment, immediately he is looked at in a different light as well. So the societal pressures create a lot of stress within the family....the man should be the one working and bringing the income to the family, not the woman. Not the woman. [...] everyone forgets about the men and the boys, they can take care of themselves, whereas if you really analyze it there are many men also who need assistance.²⁷

Consequently, what is needed is gender policies and programs that focus more on addressing refugee men's needs. As the IASC states, "the humanitarian community is recognizing the need to know more about what men and boys face in crisis situations" (2006:1). WFP also emphasizes that implementing their gender policy means to "take action for men and boys if required" (2009:9). What, then, are the gender-specific needs of refugee men? While substantial responses to this question are not well developed, some examples can be found in the material analyzed for this study. Men and boys are more vulnerable to forced recruitment into armed forces than women (IASC 2006:5, 49, UNHCR 2011:4), and men and boys can also be victims of sexual

violence (for example UNHCR 2011:4).²⁸ Single men, their children, and unaccompanied boys are described as often lacking cooking skills and thereby being at risk of malnutrition (IASC 2006:71).²⁹ In addition, masculinity norms are described as preventing men from seeking health care when needed, thereby impeding their access to services and making them vulnerable. As an NGO worker in Thailand explains, “we don't get to see a lot of men who, you know, voluntarily come to seek mental health care [...] so in that case I would say that the men are more vulnerable.”³⁰

However, most calls to address men's needs do not focus on concrete areas of vulnerability or need. Indeed, the emphasis in representations of refugee men's problems and needs is on the frustration and suffering that allegedly result from having their roles as heads of household, providers and protectors undermined and challenged. The situation of displacement in combination with humanitarian programs that empower women are thereby represented as the causes of refugee men's problems. To help refugee men and address their needs, it is thus necessary to “redress the disempowerment felt by men as a result of displacement” (UNHCR 2008: 58). Problematically, the bottom line of this argument is often that since the disruption of traditional gender roles is the cause of men's problems, such change in gender relations is undesirable. Refugee men are victims because male privileges are challenged by displacement. In a deeply anti-feminist argument, transformation of gendered power relations is represented as destructive social disruption which leads to tensions, stress and violence within families and communities. In effect, the message is that humanitarian organizations should avoid disrupting existing social orders and relations of power within refugee communities – a step back to views that were common several decades ago (Baines 2004: 63).

There are, however, examples of more transformative and constructive approaches to managing changes in male roles, such as challenging stigma against asking for help and deconstructing and discussing notions of gender and power.³¹ In addition, as several interviewees point out, the opportunity structure of a refugee camp makes it beneficial for men and women to learn as many skills as possible, including ones that are traditionally considered to belong to the opposite gender.³² By offering skills training in a wide range of subjects to men as well as women it is thereby possible to encourage a widening of notions of masculinities and femininities rather than resorting to a defense of traditional gender roles.

Notably, it is not my purpose here to dispute the claim that men may also have legitimate gender-specific needs for assistance in situations of displacement. However, substantive examples of such needs are still few and poorly conceptualized. Thus far, it appears that the idea that gender is also about men has primarily been taken up by an anti-feminist project aiming at dismantling humanitarian organizations' efforts to address refugee women's systematic subordination and to contribute to the transformation of unequal gender relations.

Concluding discussion

The promotion of gender equality, understood as the transformation of unequal gendered relations of power, unavoidably requires an analysis of the positions of men and the construction of masculinities. The move towards increased attention to men and masculinities in international policymaking and governance is thereby a promising development. However, in this article I argue that in the field of humanitarian aid to refugees, the way in which men and masculinities have been included does not deliver on this promise. In contrast, current ways of representing

refugee men in humanitarian policy and practice are problematic in ways that severely limit their usefulness to a project of gender equality and liberation.

First, widening the understanding of gender to include refugee men and not only refugee women has tended to de-politicize gender and obscure the power relations that are constitutive of gender differences. Gender differences are represented as individual differences rather than effects of power, and approaches to gender increasingly emphasize the importance of taking the needs of men and women into account equally, rather than the need to transform unequal relations of power and disadvantage. This is especially prominent in the representation of men as emasculated troublemakers, where efforts to empower women are described as victimizing men. This conception of gender leads to an uncritical approach of identifying existing gender differences and using them as point of departure for the design of aid programs; an approach that can and often does exacerbate existing inequalities in refugee situations (Olivius 2014). Further, the strong emphasis on recruiting men as allies in gender equality promotion reinforces the tendency to de-politicize gender and obscures the power relations at issue. In the representation of men as powerful gatekeepers and potential allies, men are appealed to as key actors in achieving gender equality, but the role of men and the dominant norms of masculinity in sustaining gender inequality are not problematized.

In contrast, in the representation of refugee men as perpetrators of violence and discrimination men are named as agents of inequality. This naming relies on a construction of refugee societies as traditional and backward; refugee men are thus not agents of inequality because they are men, but because they are primitive. Refugee men's masculinities are thereby pathologized and they are constructed as subjects in need of modernization and reform. The existence of gender inequality among refugees thus becomes a marker of their inability to govern themselves properly (Olivius forthcoming, Reeves 2012). The understanding of gender equality as a symbol of modernity is also reflected in the representation of refugee men as gatekeepers and allies. The heavy reliance on education as a means to convince men of the merits of gender equality reform is based on the idea that more knowledge will lead refugee men to "accept development" and realize that gender equality means progress for all.³³ This idea rests on the construction of cultural hierarchies where refugee communities are deemed inadequate, and on temporal claims where refugee communities needs to be brought "up to date," leave their backwardness behind and defeat "the dark forces of 'untimeliness'" (Edenheim 2010:38). Following from this construction, humanitarian actors become the only legitimate agents of change towards gender equality, while the work of refugee advocates is neglected and devalued. Gender equality is also explicitly constructed as a foreign idea, which risks provoking resistance to what then becomes perceived as "westernization" (Olivius 2011).

Moreover, the representation of refugee men as emasculated trouble-makers is a deeply flawed attempt to recognize that gender is not equivalent to women. The construction of men as victimized by the very challenge to male authority and privilege that the pursuit of gender equality should rightly entail undermined the idea that humanitarian organizations should seek to transform, not reinforce, gender inequalities in the delivery of aid.

While insufficient attention to gendered relations of power and reification of cultural and racial hierarchies cut across the three representations of men and masculinities, there are also significant differences and tensions among them. Clearly, emerging discourses about men and masculinities in humanitarian aid to refugees are not uniform, but contradictory and incomplete.

In particular, there is considerable ambivalence with regards to the key issues of the desirability of refugee men's current masculinities and the desirability of changing these. The representation of refugee men as perpetrators depicts refugee masculinities as pathological, primitive and in need of change; the representation of refugee men as gatekeepers and allies is less confrontational because refugee men are to become allies through the modernization of their masculinities. In contrast, the representation of refugee men as emasculated constructs the disruption of existing masculine roles as destructive and undesirable. Evidently, the implications for the development of humanitarian gender programs are very different depending on whether refugee masculinities are seen as targets of reform or aspects of social order that should be preserved.

These contradictions, I suggest, can provide entry points for continued debate, contestation, and reformulation of currently dominant conceptions of men and masculinities. Discursive contradictions and tensions can thereby open up space to construct more fruitful ways of conceptualizing and addressing men and masculinities in humanitarian aid. To this end, I argue that humanitarian organizations and aid workers need to discard predominant assumptions about refugee communities as primitive and backward, and ensure that the goals of social equality and justice are placed at the center of gender policies and programs. As discussed in the analysis, practices that could inspire more promising approaches include programs where men are offered skills training in areas traditionally considered as female, and vice versa, as part of a strategy to expand conceptions of male and female work as well as to ensure equal economic opportunities for men and women.³⁴ Such practices can be one way of including men and women in efforts to promote gender equality without neglecting women's structural subordination, and destabilize dominant notions of masculinity (and femininity) without linking changes in gender relations to a hierarchical narrative of cultural evolution.

References

- Bacchi, C. L. 2009. *Analyzing Policy: What's the Problem Represented to be?* French Forest: Pearson.
- Baines, E. K. 2004. *Vulnerable Bodies: Gender, the UN, and the Global Refugee Crisis*. Hants & Burlington: Ashgate.
- Banki, S. and H. Lang 2008. "Protracted Displacement on the Thai-Burmese Border: The Interrelated Search for Durable Solutions". In *Protracted displacement in Asia: no place to call home*, ed. H. Adelman. Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing.
- Buscher, D. 2010. "Refugee Women: Twenty Years On." *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 29(2): 4-20.
- Connell, R. W. 2005. "Change among the gatekeepers: Men, masculinities, and gender equality in the global arena." *Signs* 30(3): 1801-1825.
- Dean, M. 2010. *Governmentality: power and rule in modern society*. London: Sage Publications.
- Doty, R. L. 1996. *Imperial encounters: the politics of representation in North-South relations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Edenheim, S. 2010. "Politics Out of Time – Historical Expertise and Temporal Claims in Swedish Governmental Reports." In *In Experts we Trust. Knowledge, Politics and Bureaucracy in Nordic Welfare States*, eds. Å. Lundqvist and K. Petersen. Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark.

- Edwards, A. 2010. "Transitioning Gender: Feminist Engagement with International Refugee Law and Policy 1950-2010." *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 29(2): 21-45.
- El-Bushra, J. 2000. "Gender and forced migration: editorial." *Forced Migration Review* 9: 4-7.
- Foucault, M. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock.
- Foucault, M. 1978. *The Will to Knowledge: History of Sexuality Volume I*. London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. 1991. "Governmentality". In *The Foucault effect: studies in governmentality: with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault*, eds. G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Freedman, J. 2010. "Mainstreaming gender in refugee protection." *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 23(4): 589-607.
- Hyndman, J. 2004. "Refugee Camps as Conflict Zones. The Politics of Gender." In *Sites of Violence. Gender and Conflict Zones*, eds. W. H. Giles, Jennifer Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Hyndman, J. and M. de Alwis 2008. "Reconstituting the Subject: Feminist Politics of Humanitarian Assistance." In *Not Born a Refugee Woman: Contesting Identities, Rethinking Practices*, eds. M. Hajdukowski-Ahmed, K. Nazilla and H. Moussa. New York & Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- IASC. 2005. "Guidelines for Gender Based Violence Interventions in Humanitarian Settings." http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/iasc/pageloader.aspx?page=content-subsidi_tf_gender-gbv (Accessed June 2, 2015).
- IASC. 2006. "Women, Girls, Boys and Men: Different Needs, Equal Opportunities. IASC Gender Handbook in Humanitarian Action." http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/iasc/documents/subsidi_tf_gender/IASC%20Gender%20Handbook%20%28Feb%202007%29.pdf (Accessed June 2, 2015).
- Kimmel, M. S., J. Hearn, et al. 2005. *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*. London: Sage publications.
- Kneebone, S. 2005. "Women Within the Refugee Construct: 'Exclusionary Inclusion' in Policy and Practice — the Australian Experience." *International Journal of Refugee Law* 17(1): 7-42.
- Laclau, E. and C. Mouffe. 2001. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.
- Lewa, C. 2003. "'We are like a Soccer Ball, Kicked by Burma, Kicked By Bangladesh!' Rohingya Refugees are Facing a New Drive of Involuntary Repatriation." Bangkok: FORUM-ASIA.
- Macklin, A. 1995. "Refugee women and the imperative of categories." *Human Rights Quarterly* 17(2): 213-277.
- Manderson, L. et al. 1998. "A Woman without a Man is a Woman at Risk: Women at Risk in Australian Humanitarian Programs." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 11(3): 267-283.
- Olivius, E. 2011. Humanitarian assistance and the politics of gender equality. A study of refugee camps on the Thai - Burma border. In: Fjelde, H. and Höglund, K. eds. *Building peace, creating conflict? Conflictual dimensions of local and international peace-building*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 149-168.
- Olivius, E. 2014. Displacing Equality? Women's Participation and Humanitarian Aid Effectiveness in Refugee Camps. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 33(3), 93-117.

- Olivius, E. forthcoming. Constructing Humanitarian Selves and Refugee Others: Gender Equality and the Global Governance of Refugees. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*.
- Razack, S. 1995. "Domestic Violence as Gender Persecution: Policing the Borders of Nation, Race, and Gender." *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 8: 45-88.
- Reeves, A. 2012. "Feminist Knowledge and Emerging Governmentality in UN Peacekeeping." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 14(3): 348-369.
- Shepherd, L. J. 2008. *Gender, violence and security: discourse as practice*. London & New York: Zed Books.
- South, A. 2008. *Ethnic Politics in Burma: States of Conflict*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Szczepanikova, A. 2010. "Performing refugeeeness in the Czech Republic: gendered depoliticisation through NGO assistance." *Gender, Place & Culture* 17(4): 461-477.
- The Border Consortium. 2014. "Refugee and IDP Camp Populations: May 2014." <http://theborderconsortium.org/media/34000/2014-05-may-map-tbc-unhcr.pdf>. (Accessed September 23, 2014)
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. 1990. "UNHCR Policy on Refugee Women". <http://www.unhcr.org/3ba6186810.html> (Accessed December 4, 2015).
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. 2003. "Sexual and Gender-Based Violence against Refugees, Returnees and Internally Displaced Persons: Guidelines for Prevention and Response." <http://www.unhcr.org/3f696bcc4.html> (Accessed June 2, 2015).
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. 2008. "Handbook for the Protection of Women and Girls." [http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendocPDFViewer.html?docid=47cfa9fe2&query=Handbook for the Protection of Women and Girls](http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendocPDFViewer.html?docid=47cfa9fe2&query=Handbook%20for%20the%20Protection%20of%20Women%20and%20Girls) (Accessed June 2, 2015).
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. 2011. 'Age, Gender and Diversity Policy: Working with People and Communities for Equality and Protection'. <http://www.unhcr.org/pages/4a6872836.html> (Accessed April 24, 2015).
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. 2014. "Bangladesh Fact Sheet September 2014." <http://www.unhcr.org/50001ae09.html> (Accessed October 13, 2014).
- United Nations Commission on the Status of Women. 2004. "The Role of Men and Boys in Achieving Gender Equality: Agreed Conclusions." <http://www.unwomen.org/en/csw/outcomes> (Accessed April 24, 2015).
- White, S. C. 2000. "'Did the Earth Move?' The Hazards of Bringing Men and Masculinities into Gender and Development." *IDS Bulletin* 31(2): 33-41.
- World Food Programme. 2009 "WFP Gender Policy: Promoting Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women in Addressing Food and Nutrition Challenges". home.wfp.org/stellent/groups/.../wfp195024.pdf (Accessed April 24, 2015).

¹ The six documents that are analyzed in this article are some of the most significant current examples.

² In addition, an estimated two million Burmese are in Thailand as "illegal immigrants", many of which have also fled political oppression and economic deprivation (South 2008:81).

³ Interview no. 45, NGO Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, 14 March 2011.

⁴ Interview no. 42, NGO Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, 12 March 2011.

⁵ Interview no. 49, NGO Dhaka, Bangladesh, 16 March 2011.

⁶ Interview no. 32, NGO Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, 3 March 2011.

⁷ Interview no. 45, NGO Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, 14 March 2011.

-
- ⁸ Interview no. 58, Mae Sot, Thailand, 11 November 2011.
- ⁹ Interview no. 6, NGO Mae Sot, Thailand, 4 May 2010.
- ¹⁰ Interview no. 53, UN Bangladesh, Telephone Interview, 30 August 2011.
- ¹¹ Interview no. 30, NGO Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, 3 March 2011.
- ¹² Interview no. 9, NGO Bangkok, Thailand, 10 May 2010.
- ¹³ Interview no. 45, NGO Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, 14 March 2011.
- ¹⁴ Interview no. 33, UN Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, 6 March 2011.
- ¹⁵ Ibid.
- ¹⁶ Interview no. 39, Government official Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, 10 March 2011.
- ¹⁷ Interview no. 33, UN Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, 6 March 2011.
- ¹⁸ Ibid.
- ¹⁹ Interview no. 51, UN Bangladesh, Telephone Interview, 31 May 2011.
- ²⁰ Interview no. 25, NGO Mae Sot, Thailand, 19 November 2010.
- ²¹ Interview no. 41, UN Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, 11 March 2011.
- ²² Interview no. 54, NGO Mae Sot, Thailand, 9 November 2011.
- ²³ Interview no. 14, NGO Mae Sot, Thailand, 29 October 2010.
- ²⁴ Interview no. 6, NGO Mae Sot, Thailand, 4 May 2010.
- ²⁵ Interview no. 42, NGO Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, 12 March 2011.
- ²⁶ Interview no. 14, NGO Mae Sot, Thailand, 29 October 2010.
- ²⁷ Interview no. 41, UN Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, 11 March 2011.
- ²⁸ Interview no. 34, UN Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, 7 March 2011.
- ²⁹ Interview no. 46, UN Dhaka, Bangladesh, 15 March 2011.
- ³⁰ Interview no. 56, NGO Mae Sot, Thailand, 10 November 2011.
- ³¹ Interview no. 56, NGO Mae Sot, Thailand, 10 November 2011 & interview no. 17, NGO Mae Sot, Thailand, 1 November 2010.
- ³² Interview no. 54, NGO Mae Sot, Thailand, 9 November 2011 & interview no. 6, NGO Mae Sot, Thailand, 4 May 2010.
- ³³ Interview no. 39, Government official Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, 10 March 2011.
- ³⁴ Interview no. 56, NGO Mae Sot, Thailand, 10 November 2011