Masculinity and Male Survivors of Wartime Sexual Violence: A Bosnian Case Study

Introduction

Despite an abundance of scholarly research on conflict-related sexual violence, we still know relatively little about male survivors. They are often only briefly acknowledged, and typically within the context of broader discussions and documentation about sexual violence against women. A recent report by the United Nations (UN) Secretary-General, for example, notes that between January and December 2016, the UN Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic (MINUSCA) recorded 179 cases of conflict-related sexual violence. Offering further details, it states that: ‘These incidents included 151 rapes, of which 54 were gang rapes, as well as six forced marriages and four cases of sexual slavery. The victims included 92 women, 86 girls and one boy…’. ¹ Frequently reduced to mere statistics, male survivors and their experiences rarely take centre stage. ² Particularly illustrative in this regard is the fact that more than 20 years after the Bosnian war ended, little attention has been given to the men who suffered diverse forms of sexual violence during the conflict. The present article contributes to addressing this gap, by focusing on a group of 10 Bosnian Muslim men who survived the infamous Čelopek camp in north-east Bosnia-Herzegovina (BiH). The men were interviewed in 2014. To protect their identity, the location will be called simply Selo – the Bosnian word for ‘village’.
Discussing her own research in BiH, Helms observes that ‘The women victims are praised for their courage, yet they are expected to want to remain silent because of the shame of what has happened to them’.3 There is often an even greater expectation that male survivors wish to remain silent, and indeed my contacts in the field repeatedly insisted that I would not succeed in finding any men who were willing to speak to me. They were partly right. While I was able to interview male survivors, they said very little about what they had personally experienced in Čelopek. Fundamentally, they used ‘avoiding narratives’,4 which necessarily created silences within the data. Overall, they spoke far more about the present – about their problems, disappointments and various ‘daily stressors’5 – than about the past and their trauma.

There is a growing body of scholarship that is critical of ‘the medicalization of distress’6 and of the concomitant over-use of trauma discourse. It has been argued, inter alia, that such discourse ‘pathologizes war-affected populations as psychologically dysfunctional’7 and neglects local cultures, as well as wider psycho-social processes.8 As a midway option between narrow-focused trauma approaches and broader psycho-social approaches, both of which have individual limitations, the ‘partial mediation model’ emphasizes that daily stressors partly mediate the relationship between war exposure and psychological distress.9 This partial mediation model, in turn, finds resonance within this research. The article explores how the men’s trauma has intersected with their ongoing everyday problems, and it specifically examines how past and present are filtered through the lens of masculinity.
While the use of sexual violence against men is commonly viewed as an attack on masculinity, this article goes further by empirically analyzing the functionality of masculinity as a framing device. Defining masculinity as ‘the widespread social norms and expectations of what it means to be a man, or the multiple ways of “doing male”’, it explores the operationalization of these norms and expectations – which can themselves be conceptualized as a daily stressor – by examining how they shape male survivors’ stories, coping strategies and prioritization of current needs.

This use of a masculinity lens, in turn, has wider implications for transitional justice – the ‘full range of processes and mechanisms associated with a society’s attempt to come to terms with a legacy of large-scale past abuses’. In particular, it problematizes the narrow focus within existing transitional justice scholarship on violent and militarized forms of masculinity. It thus highlights the need for transitional justice processes to engage with more diverse forms of masculinity – and with ‘the multiple dimensions of masculinity practices and men’s lived realities’.

A note on terminology

For the purposes of terminological clarity, it is necessary to briefly explain the use of two particular terms that are used throughout this article, namely ‘sexual violence’ and ‘survivors’ of sexual violence. Regarding the first of these, the words ‘rape’ and ‘sexual violence’ are frequently used interchangeably. However, while rape entails penetration of the vagina or anus with a penis/object – or penile penetration of the mouth – sexual
violence is a much broader term that encompasses a wide variety of crimes. According to a recent report by the UN Secretary General, for example, it refers to ‘rape, sexual slavery, forced prostitution, forced pregnancy, forced abortion, enforced sterilization, forced marriage, and any other form of sexual violence of comparable gravity perpetrated against women, men, girls or boys that is directly or indirectly linked to a conflict’.

The UN Commission on Human Rights, moreover, has stressed that sexual violence ‘covers both physical and psychological attacks directed at a person’s sexual characteristics, such as forcing a person to strip naked in public, mutilating a person’s genitals, or slicing off a woman’s breasts’. It is also important to emphasize that sexual violence does not have to involve a perpetrator and a victim. Two or more individuals (typically those held in camps, prisons and other places of detention) can be forced to perform sexual acts on each other, or on a third party.

None of the interviewees who participated in this research talked about the violations that they had personally suffered in Čelopek. Hence, this article uses the term sexual violence to encompass the diverse and varied forms that such violence can take, rather than to refer to specific types of sexual violence. In her research (life history interviews) with female Iranian refugees in the United States and the Netherlands, Ghorashi found that ‘Often, the memories were too painful to completely relive them’. It was clear that the 10 interviewees in Selo, similarly, did not wish to relive the horrors of their time in Čelopek. The information that they gave was therefore brief and fragmented, consisting of small pieces rather than detailed wholes. According to Carpenter, ‘Perhaps the most prevalent form of sexual violence against men and older boys involves a combination of
rape and sexual mutilation’. A couple of the men did indeed state that acts of sexual mutilation had occurred in Čelopek, but they did not elaborate further.

Turning to the second terminological issue, individuals who have endured sexual violence are typically referred to either as ‘victims’ or, less commonly, as ‘survivors’. This article’s preference for the latter term thus necessitates a brief explanation. Some situations inexorably force those who have suffered into a clearly demarcated victim mould. Ticktin, for example, has explored how male and female asylum seekers in France are required to assume a defined victim role in order to be taken seriously and to receive help. In her words, ‘…the process of claiming a place in the juridical realm involves evoking compassion, being exceptional, and inhabiting the subject position of victim’. This victimological process, moreover, has a critical health component; the greatest understanding and compassion is reserved for asylum seekers who are ill. Hence, the ‘genuine’ asylum seeker is essentialized not only as a victim, but as a sick victim. Illustrating this point, Fassin has observed that ‘In legitimizing illness to the point where it becomes the only justification for their presence in France, society condemns many undocumented foreigners to exist officially only as people who are ill’. In other words, the concepts of legitimacy and victimhood are inexorably inter-linked. By extension, thus, the political usage of the term victim is less a reflection of an individual’s experience than a judgement about whether s/he meets the requisite ‘victim criteria’. As Helms notes, ‘The claim to victimhood is ultimately not about the wretched position of actual victims but about moral purity. And so moral purity must be absolute; innocence cannot be compromised’. 
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This article is not about the meaning of victimhood, and nor is its focus solely victimological. It is about a group of men who suffered acts of sexual violence during the Bosnian war and who, in their own individual ways, had found ways to cope. They repeatedly stressed that ‘život ide dalje’ (life goes on), and all of them wanted to build a better life for themselves and their families. In short, their victimhood, while real, did not define them. This article accordingly uses the term ‘survivors’ rather than ‘victims’, and indeed the men themselves wished to be referred to as survivors. Similarly, an important study of 51 female survivors in BiH found that the women did ‘not like hearing themselves described as victims, and preferred to see themselves in positive ways such as being strong, active, fighters, sensible, caring, fair, correct and persistent’.26

Methodology and fieldwork in Selo

The fieldwork upon which this article is based was conducted as part of a broader project – funded by the Leverhulme Trust – on the long-term consequences of the widespread sexual violence committed during the Bosnian war.27 From the outset, I wanted to ensure that the project gave a voice to neglected male survivors and did not focus solely on the experiences of female survivors. Gaining access to male survivors, however, was extremely challenging. While there are various women’s non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in BiH that support female survivors, there are no equivalent men’s NGOs. I contacted several camp inmates’ associations, but I was frequently told that they did not have any male members who had experienced sexual violence; or that those who had were unwilling to speak about this and/or had moved abroad. I never knew whether the
heads of these organizations were telling the truth or whether they were simply trying to protect their members. As Sivakumaran emphasizes, men are simply ‘not conditioned to think of themselves as potential victims of sexual abuse or potential targets for perpetrators in the same way as women’.\(^{28}\)

I first travelled to Selo in August 2014, as part of a month-long scoping visit to BiH to establish vital contacts in the field. During a visit to the Savez Logoroša BiH (Association of Camp Inmates BiH) in Sarajevo, I was given the name and contact details of a man in Selo. I was given no information about this individual, whom I will refer to simply as X, other than the fact that he had spent time in a camp. After calling X and explaining that I was interested in speaking to individuals who had experienced sexual violence, we arranged that I would visit Selo the following weekend. When I arrived in the village a week later, X had already spoken to some of his fellow ex-camp inmates and five of them, in addition to X himself, were ready to speak to me. I spent three hours with a group of four men on the first day and two hours with a further two men the following day. Upon returning to BiH in October 2014, I went back to Selo and conducted an additional four interviews. All of the ten men interviewed had been imprisoned in the Čelopek camp, before subsequently being transferred to the Batković camp near Bijeljina. The interviewees were of mixed ages, some had lost family members in Čelopek and all except one of them were unemployed. The interviews were semi-structured and I conducted all of them in the Bosnian language.
Due to the sensitive nature of the research, interviewees did not want their stories to be recorded. Instead, I made extensive notes and typed these up immediately after the interviews, adding further details and observations (I shredded the hard copies of the interview notes). The typed notes were stored on two encrypted USB pens (one as back-up), and for added security I used only codes instead of names. A list matching codes with names was saved in a separate encrypted file. I analyzed the data using a combination of open and closed coding to identify common themes and sub-themes. The lack of existing scholarship on Selo and Čelopek made triangulation very difficult.

Wherever possible, however, the article draws upon additional sources – and in particular relevant judgements from the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY), which was created by the UN Security Council in 1993 – to enrich and complement the interview data. Although the Tribunal has not prosecuted any of crimes committed in Čelopek, as will be discussed, some of its judgements nevertheless provide valuable insights into the depravities that occurred in the camp. While these judgements thus constitute a vital resource, it is also important to acknowledge their limitations. Legal trials are quintessentially about facts – who did what to whom, when, where, how? Hence, while they create a space for witnesses to recount their stories, this story-telling is strictly controlled and driven by the needs of the court. This means that legal judgements necessarily contain silences. As Finley powerfully argues,

There are some things that just cannot be said by using the legal voice. Its terms depoliticize, decharge, and dampen. Rage, pain, elation, the aching, thirsting, hungering for freedom on one’s own terms, love and its joys and terrors, fear, utter frustration at being contained and constrained by legal language—all are diffused by legal language.²⁹
The fieldwork process is partly about enabling more expansive and unrestricted forms of story-telling, but this is rarely straightforward. Dickson Swift et al. note that ‘Qualitative researchers must initiate a rapport-building process from their first encounter with a participant in order to build a research relationship that will allow the researcher access to that person’s story’. In Selo, however, I struggled to build rapport with the 10 interviewees. Speaking to female survivors was also challenging, but in most cases I connected with them and felt that I had won their trust. The fact that they frequently asked me personal questions – was I married, did I have children, did I want children – significantly helped to erode any barriers between us. In contrast, it was striking that male interviewees never asked such questions and were always more reserved. Certainly, it was also not ideal that I interviewed six of the men in groups of two; they often seemed to be talking to each other rather than to me directly. However, interviewee X had chosen this group format and it is unclear how many of the men would have agreed to participate in one-to-one interviews. As Kitzinger points out, there is safety in numbers, and this makes ‘some people more likely to consent to participate in the research in the first place (“I wouldn’t have come on my own”)’. Although I would have preferred to interview all of the men individually, it must be acknowledged that even when I did interview four men in Selo on a one-to-one basis (when I returned to the village in October 2014), they too were very guarded in their answers and spoke relatively little about the past.

While qualitative interviews typically ‘provide depth and detail through direct quotation and careful description of situations, events, interactions and observed behaviours’, the data from Selo is – in one sense – noticeably ‘thin’. Yet in qualitative research, it is not
only what is *said* that is important but also what is *not* said. As Poland and Pedersen underline, ‘Silences are profoundly meaningful’. In Selo, the men’s silences about their own war experiences – and about their feelings regarding those experiences – significantly enriched the interview data and created their own layers of depth and meaning.

**Čelopek, silences and coping strategies**

Early in the Bosnian war, Serb tanks and paramilitary forces entered the town of Zvornik in north-east BiH. In its judgement against Momčilo Krajišnik, one of the wartime Bosnian Serb leaders, the ICTY described how:

> On 3 April 1992…a long convoy of Serbs left Zvornik town. On 5 April 1992 the Serb TO [territorial defence] was mobilized pursuant to an order of the Serb crisis staff. Around this time, paramilitary forces, including the White Eagles, the Yellow Wasps and the Red Berets, began to arrive in the municipality. They had been invited by Branko Grujić, president of the crisis staff of Zvornik, who later became a member of the Zvornik war commission on 17 June 1992 by decision of the Bosnian-Serb Presidency.

After launching an attack on Zvornik on 8 April 1992, Serb forces quickly took control of the town. By this stage, the situation had become increasingly precarious for Bosnian Muslims living in Selo and they received repeated warnings to surrender their weapons and leave the village. One of the paramilitary groups marauding the area was the Žute Ose (Yellow Wasps), led by Vojin (Žućo) Vučković from Belgrade and his brother Dušan (a.k.a. Repić). On 26 or 28 May 1992, ‘The Yellow Wasps took women, children,
and the elderly to Crni Vrh, where they were released and allowed to depart on foot. The Muslim men were first detained for two days in a building of the Novi Izvor company, in Zvornik. After spending two days at Novi Izvor, 175 men were taken to the Dom Kulture in Čelopek. Only 83 of them ultimately survived.

Inside the camp, the men were severely mistreated. They were given no food or water for three days, and they were subjected to extreme physical and psychological abuse. Local Bosnian Serb policemen worked as camp guards, but it was paramilitaries from nearby Serbia who ruled the camp and committed innumerable atrocities against the prisoners, including attacking them with spiked metal bars and chains, forcing them to beat each other and making them eat severed body parts. The detainees were also subjected to brutal forms of sexual violence and degradation. On 11 June 1992, for example, during the Muslim holiday of Bajram, Dušan (Repić) Vučković entered the camp and forced all of the prisoners to strip. According to the ICTY, ‘Repić and his men sexually abused inmates, obliged them to perform sexual acts on each other, and cut off their penises in some cases and their ears in others. These acts caused serious bodily and mental harm to the detainees’. Men from Selo were held in Čelopek for just over a month. At the end of June 1992, they were transferred to the much larger Batković camp and made to undertake hard labour. Twenty men who were badly injured were forced to remain in Čelopek and only one of these men survived. In total, 99 men from Selo were killed during the war, mainly in Čelopek.
The men who were interviewed in groups talked in very general terms about some of the crimes that had occurred, including fathers and sons being forced to perform sexual acts on each other. In so doing, however, they spoke as detached onlookers who had dissociated themselves from the violence and brutality that they had witnessed. As Schauer and Elbert note, ‘Experience of overwhelming threat may interfere with the process of integrating active elements of sensation, emotion, and cognition into the particular declarative memory of the event…’. The men’s declarative memories of the crimes committed in Čelopek, in short, appeared limited and devoid of emotion. What was especially striking, however, was the fact that none of the interviewees spoke about what they had personally experienced. This deeply intimate part of their stories remained shrouded in silence. One of the men explicitly stated that he could not talk about what he went through, and would never talk about it. The others simply spoke around the issue. According to Douglas, who recently wrote a book about his experience of being raped at the age of 18, ‘For a significant proportion [of rape victims], myself included, it’s simply impossible to speak of these things, however much they might want to’.

Although the interviewees’ silences surrounding their own suffering in Čelopek necessarily created gaps in the interview data, Pereira insists that ‘…we should understand periods of silence as integral parts of speaking strategies’. This underscores that silences themselves are strategic because they fulfil a variety of functions. In his work with violent young men (aged 16 to 29) in north-east Medellín in Colombia, for example, Baird found that ‘Despite the candour of some paramilitaries about certain parts of their lives, they often used vague language around acts of violence they had committed
rather than talking about them explicitly’. In this case, such vagaries served, inter alia, to mask emotions such as fear and shame, and they also had a protective function linked to the men’s security concerns. In a very different context, Vas encountered silence in her work with women in India who had experienced violence during the Partition. Again, the women’s silence was strategic and had a specific purpose. As Vas explains, ‘Rather than bearing witness to the disorder that they had been subjected to, the metaphor that they used was of a woman drinking the poison and keeping it within her’. The ‘poisonous knowledge’ of what they had gone through could not be shared, and silently ingesting it was a form of protection and self-preservation.

In Selo, the men’s silence regarding the sexual violence that they had endured in Čelopek can be viewed as similarly strategic and linked to self-preservation. The penis is not only ‘a biological marker of maleness’, but also a symbolic marker. Hence, any attack on the organ, or more broadly on a man’s genitalia, constitutes a concomitant attack on his ‘manliness’. It is therefore unsurprising that none of the men in Selo spoke about their own personal experiences in the camp. As Eastmond and Selimovic argue, ‘…silence conveys a broad range of social meanings that, like speech, is always situated and can only be understood in its proper social context’. The men’s silence needs to be understood in the context of masculinity, and more specifically hegemonic masculinity – ‘the socially dominant conceptions, cultural ideals, and ideological constructions of what is appropriate masculinity’. Socially constructed ideas of what it means to be a ‘real’ man leave little scope for men to acknowledge and to talk about their own vulnerability, and in particular the vulnerability of their manhood.
Relatedly, men may struggle to find the right words to describe acts of sexual violence inflicted on them. As Edkins underlines, ‘…the language we speak is part of the social order, and when the order falls apart around our ears, so does the language. What we can say no longer makes sense; what we want to say, we can’t’.57 Fundamentally, in a social order where men are not supposed to suffer sexual violence, how can these experiences be easily put into words and articulated? The men’s silences raise broader questions regarding the extent to which pain can be narrated and communicated. While some have argued that it cannot be,58 the crucial point is that masculinity – and the pressures that men experience to be ‘masculine’ – can critically constrain what is narrated and how.

Sparkes and Smith, for example, interviewed 14 white heterosexual men who had suffered spinal cord injuries through sport. They found that the men ‘were reluctant to communicate their experiences of pain to others and preferred to keep their feelings “private” as part of a stoic and “heroic” way of dealing with the situation they found themselves in’.59

As an extension of the previous point, it was also striking that the men in Selo offered few insights into their emotions and feelings.60 Female interviewees were far more forthcoming in this regard.61 Not only did they speak about how their rapists made them feel – powerless, humiliated, ashamed, detached from their own bodies – but they were emotionally demonstrative. They cried; they laughed; they expressed anger. The interviewees in Selo (and indeed all of the men whom I interviewed in BiH) were markedly different. One of them let down his guard when interacting with his grandchild. Overwhelmingly, however, they gave the impression of simply wanting to ‘carry on as
normal’. Normality, for them, was ‘being a man’; and the ‘“ideal man” is silent, strong and in charge of his emotions…’. The men, in other words, were performing their masculinity by shielding and remaining strongly in control of their emotions.

Yet emotions can be unconsciously expressed through gestures, demeanour, body language and so on. These are important examples of what Fujii has termed ‘meta-data’ – namely ‘the spoken and unspoken expressions about people’s interior thoughts and feelings, which they do not always articulate in their stories or responses to interview questions’. Two of men, for example, appeared to be speaking through clenched teeth; one of them continually tapped on the table with his fingers; several of them had a far-away look in their eyes and appeared to be ‘somewhere else’. Their bodies and bodily reactions, in short, were repositories of meta data.

As the interviews were undertaken as part a larger project on the enduring legacies of sexual violence, I wanted to explore how the men’s war experiences had affected them in the long-term. However, they did not discuss this in any detail, in contrast to female interviewees who gave far more expansive answers. Some of the men mentioned that they experienced occasional or regular flashbacks, all of them talked about difficulties sleeping at night and six of them disclosed that often felt anxious and on edge. In some cases, their anxiety was strongly focused on their families. Implicitly raising the issue of trans-generational transmission of trauma, one interviewee explained that ‘When I feel anxious and nervous, I need to be alone, and I worry that my own problems are affecting my children’. Another interviewee insisted that he was not the same person that he was
prior to the war, and he questioned whether he was a good role model for his sons. The youngest interviewee voiced his fears that if he were to visit a psychologist or psychiatrist, people might think that he was mad; ‘And then I would lose my driving license and this would be bad my family’.

According to Appleyard and Osofsky, ‘Following trauma and exposure to violence, parents can experience symptoms of depression and over-whelming anxiety which can affect their parenting’. The interviewees’ own concerns regarding parenting can additionally be viewed as reflecting deeper fears relating to masculinity. Majstorović notes that ‘Motherhood is an extremely important aspect of women’s lives in BiH…’. Men, however, are very much the head of the household, and in this regard fatherhood and masculinity closely intersect. If sexual violence against men constitutes an attack on masculinity, men can ‘actively formulate and redefine the parameters of their masculine identity through fatherhood’. This helps to contextualize the strong importance that some of the interviewees (those who spoke about it) attached to being a good father.

Masculinity emerged as a clear sub-theme when the interviewees spoke about their coping strategies. There are a small number of NGOs in BiH that are providing psycho-social support and assistance to survivors of conflict-related sexual violence (although their focus is overwhelmingly on women). These include Snaga Žene and Vive Žene, both in Tuzla, and Medica in Zenica. The civil society sector, however, cannot cover the whole of BiH, and in some places – particularly in rural areas – there is no help available. State institutions, moreover, are doing little to aid survivors of sexual violence. Amnesty
International, for example, notes that, ‘The psychological care system in BiH is organized so that on average there is one Centre for Mental Health for every 40,000-50,000 people’. Given BiH’s highly ‘fragile economy’ and the fact that it is ‘increasingly lagging behind others in the Western Balkans region’ in respect of economic reforms, this lack of investment in the psychological health of its citizens is hardly surprising.

As previously noted, an over-emphasis on the meta theme of trauma can be unhelpful, reductively distilling the complexities of human experience and suggesting that ‘the pathological effects of war are to be found inside a person (between the ears)…’. At the same time, the significance of trauma as a part of the multi-layered and holistic legacy of conflict should not be minimized, and my fieldwork in Selo highlighted some of the complex issues involved in addressing trauma that extend beyond simply resource issues. For example, although a medical team (including a psychologist) visits Selo once a month, the men rarely took advantage of this. While some had concerns about privacy, the majority opined that such interventions were too little, too late. One interviewee emphasized that ‘Psychological help was needed at the end of the war, but it didn’t come and so we’ve had to find our own ways of dealing with everything’. Some of the men, for example, went fishing regularly; and almost all of them were self-medicating, using a mixture of anti-depressants, sedatives and/or sleeping pills. One interviewee disclosed that he takes six different types of tablets every day and spends 100 Bosnian Marks (£43) a month on medication; and the youngest interviewee described his daily ‘diet’ as consisting of tranquilizers, large amounts of coffee and two to three packets of cigarettes.
Fundamentally, while none of the men explicitly spoke about feeling ‘less of a man’ as a result of their war trauma, they had sought to develop their own ways of coping, as men. This meant that they concealed their emotions, did not speak about their feelings and saw no reason to seek help. All of this supports the fact that men are ‘more likely to use avoidant coping strategies such as denial and distraction to defend their position…’. 79 Although the men acknowledged that the crimes committed against them had left deep psychological imprints, they also subscribed to the notion that, as men, they needed to be strong, to support their families and to move forward. The use of avoidant coping, however, carries a greater risk of depression and mental health issues, 80 and this alone creates a strong imperative for giving greater attention to male survivors of sexual violence.

In Selo, while the men spoke little about the past, they focused heavily on the present and on the issues that personally mattered to them. As will be discussed in the final section, they repeatedly spoke about the economic situation and underlined their practical need for jobs. Concomitantly, they also accentuated a more symbolic need for justice. They wanted the crimes committed in Čelopek to be prosecuted. More specifically, they wanted the perpetrators to stand trial at the ICTY. The fact that this had not happened was a source of deep disappointment.

**Demands for Justice**

Historically, impunity for wartime acts of sexual violence was the norm. Over the last two decades, however, there have been major developments in the international
prosecution of this scourge of war. It is now recognized, for example, that rape can constitute genocide,\textsuperscript{81} an act of torture,\textsuperscript{82} a crime against humanity\textsuperscript{83} and an act of terrorism.\textsuperscript{84} Furthermore, while rape was once viewed as an ‘inevitable product of war’,\textsuperscript{85} it has now been internationally re-conceptualized as a weapon – the use of which must be prosecuted and punished. Speaking in Colombia in 2012, for example, the then UN Special Representative on Sexual Violence in Conflict underlined that ‘Failure to hold to account those responsible means that survivors are even less likely to come forward to report these crimes. Impunity must never be an option’.\textsuperscript{86}

For some scholars, however, and in particular feminist scholars, such developments are not sufficient to assuage their concerns about the role of women – and more precisely the marginalization of women – in international law and transitional justice. Charlesworth, for example, has insisted that ‘Permeating all stages of the excavation of international law is the silence of women’.\textsuperscript{87} This silence, she maintains, is ‘an integral part of the structure of the international legal order, a critical element of its stability’.\textsuperscript{88} More recently, Bell and O’Rourke have argued that ‘Both the legal standards which transitional justice mechanisms draw on, and the processes by which they have been designed, have tended to be exclusionary of women’;\textsuperscript{89} and Harris Rimmer submits that ‘…the exclusion of women and non-integration of a gender perspective in transitional justice processes reinforces existing power asymmetries between women and men…’.\textsuperscript{90} This emphasis on the exclusion of women has necessarily marginalized the issue of male exclusion.
One element of this exclusion is the fact that international criminal law has tended to give greater attention to acts of sexual violence perpetrated against women rather than men. For example, although a number of ICTY trials have involved the prosecution of sexual violence against men, Campbell notes that ‘there is an underrepresentation of cases in which sexual violence against male victims forms the sole basis of the charges…In this gendered pattern of cases, women are visible victims of sexual violence, while men remain the invisible victims’. As a further dimension of exclusion, sexual violence against men is not always recognized for what it actually is. Kapur and Muddell, for example, stress that the ICTR, the SCSL and the International Criminal Court (ICC) ‘each failed in varying ways to explicitly recognize the sexual dimension of various forms of violence committed against men, instead opting to characterize such acts exclusively as torture or cruel or inhumane treatment’. What remains crucially underexplored, however, is the fact that male survivors may also subjectively feel excluded from the ambit of international law.

The ICTY, which will be completing its work this year, is an ad hoc (temporary) tribunal that was set up to deal with mass crimes and human rights abuses committed on the territory of the former Yugoslavia since 1991. Difficult prosecutorial decisions necessarily had to be made, which, in turn, unavoidably created gaps in the Tribunal’s work. One of these gaps is precisely the absence of any prosecutions relating directly to Čelopek. Although the crimes committed in the camp are discussed in the ICTY’s Krajina judgement, as well as in the Stanišić and Župljanin judgement and, most recently, in the Karadžić judgement, the direct perpetrators have all been tried in...
Serbian courts (some defendants have also been tried, or are being tried, in local Bosnian courts). During my fieldwork in Selo, the interviewees consistently and repeatedly expressed a deep sense of anger and frustration that their tormenters had not faced justice in The Hague.

Although they were critical of the Tribunal, most frequently complaining that its trials take too long and that its sentences are too lenient, the interviewees nevertheless attributed a special significance to its work. If, as Henry underlines, ‘[a]n international criminal trial has moral and emotional symbolism’, the interviewees strongly believed that only if their abusers were prosecuted at the ICTY would this fully convey and do justice to the gravity of the crimes committed in Čelopek. Few people have shown any interest in the men’s stories, and, as they saw it, the documentation of their suffering within an international setting could have helped to change this. The absence of ICTY prosecutions had thus left them feeling cheated and wronged. ‘What sort of justice can we expect now?’ asked one interviewee. Indeed, the men had many unanswered questions. In the words of another interviewee ‘The Hague Tribunal has evidence, pictures, testimony, so why hasn’t it prosecuted anyone? War criminals are living freely in Belgrade, so how can we live normally?’

The men’s strong desire for international prosecutions also reflected their lack of confidence in Serbian courts and profound scepticism regarding the possibility of fair and impartial trials. In this regard, they repeatedly referred to the trial of the aforementioned Branko Grujić, a leading municipal official whom they described as
‘overseeing everything’ in Zvornik at the beginning of the war. They recalled how Grujić had visited them just before they were taken to Čelopek, giving assurances that they would be well looked after and exchanged as prisoners of war. The ICTY initially investigated Grujić, but subsequently referred the case to the Office of the War Crimes Prosecutor of the Republic of Serbia in 2004. Following a five-year trial, Serbia’s War Crimes Court in Belgrade convicted Grujić of hostage taking and inhumane treatment, sentencing him to a prison term of six years (affirmed on appeal a year later).  

Despite this, Grujić was able to stand as the Serbian Democratic Party (SDS) candidate in the 2012 local elections in Zvornik, winning a large share of the votes; and he testified as a defence witness in the trial of the former Bosnian Serb leader, Radovan Karadžić. One interviewee angrily described Grujić’s sentence as deeply insulting, and questioned what sort of ‘justice’ had been done. In his words, ‘I am still suffering and every day is a struggle. How is it possible that Grujić has returned to live in Zvornik and now owns a local bakery?’

While interviewees insisted that they were the ones paying the price for the crimes committed against them, rather than the perpetrators, the biggest injustice for them was the fact that Repić himself never stood trial at the ICTY. After being tried in Serbia in 1996, Repić was sentenced to seven years’ imprisonment (increased on appeal to 10 years). In 2006, however, shortly before he was due to stand trial for a second time in Serbia for crimes that were not known at the time of his first trial, he committed suicide in detention. The interviewees unanimously maintained that Repić was the ringleader in Čelopek and that his crimes warranted the harshest punishment. In their eyes, his suicide
was thus a devastating blow and left a huge justice gap. Looking to somehow try and fill this lacuna, at least in part, they were insistent that there are still many others who need to stand trial for their involvement in the camp. According to one interviewee, ‘The main camp guard must face justice because his job was to look after the prisoners, not to allow paramilitaries to attack and mistreat us’. Another stressed that the driver who transported the prisoners to Čelopek to meet their fate is also culpable and needs to stand trial.

From the interviewees’ perspective, thus, there has been little justice during the more than 20 years that have passed since the horrors of Čelopek. In this context, Franke’s word of caution is noteworthy. She maintains that ‘Even where law’s masculinity has been constrained, as in for instance the adoption of special procedural and evidential protections related to the prosecution of sexual violence, we must be realistic in our expectations of the kind of gendered justice that it can deliver’. The concept of ‘gendered justice’, however, is often heavily slanted towards women, reflecting how the very notion of using a ‘gender lens’ is commonly conceptualized in a gender restricted way. Barker and Ricardo, for example, point out that ‘…most gender analyses of conflict in the Africa region focus on how sexual violence is used against women and girls…’. The result is that the justice needs and concerns of male survivors of sexual violence are often overlooked, and this exposes gendered dimensions of exclusion that have received little attention. Beyond the need for international and national courts ‘to address both the scale and the nature of gender-based violence in mass atrocity by explicitly recognizing the multiplicity of victimization of men and women’, there is also a critical need to
explore men’s own sense of exclusion from international legal processes – and the relationship between exclusion and masculinity.

Critical to this relationship is the concept of dignity. Henry notes that ‘Although it is generally assumed that victims desire punishment and retribution, many victims may be more concerned about whether or not their human and civic dignity is restored…’.\textsuperscript{109} None of the men in Selo expressly spoke about dignity. Dignity, however, is an important component of justice, and the deep sense of injustice that the men expressed – due to the absence of ICTY prosecutions and the (in their view) failures of the Serbian criminal justice system – can partly be viewed as evidence of unrestored dignity. Isaksen points out that ‘the balance between dignity and shame is fragile’.\textsuperscript{110} The critical challenge is to tip this balance towards dignity and away from shame, and to thus realign the concepts of dignity and masculinity. In order to do this, it is essential that courts clearly communicate their decisions to affected populations on the ground.\textsuperscript{111} Knowledge is power, and this can help to reverse or lessen exclusion, thereby fostering dignity. For the realization of real gendered justice, it is also imperative that greater attention is given – by courts themselves, as well as by legal scholars and policymakers – to how male and female survivors experience criminal justice; and to how they interpret the gaps that inevitably form from the incompleteness and imperfections of justice.\textsuperscript{112}

Justice, moreover, is not only about criminal prosecutions. It is a holistic and multi-stranded concept, and it has an important socio-economic dimension. Highlighting this is the emphasis that the men in Selo placed on economic themes. They did not want
counselling or therapy. What they wanted was job opportunities and the chance to be productive.

The importance of jobs

According to Fernando, Miller and Berger, there is a growing body of evidence suggesting that ‘stressful social and material conditions caused or exacerbated by armed conflict and natural disasters may predict mental health status as well as, or better than, actual degree of exposure to war or to other disaster-related events’.\textsuperscript{113} These stressful conditions – or ‘daily stressors’\textsuperscript{114} – can, in turn, mediate the effects of war trauma. That is to say that trauma among war-affected populations is not only causally correlated to the war itself, but also to the daily stressors – such as poverty, hunger, displacement – to which war gives rise. These stressors constitute a critical intervening variable. In their research with youth in war-torn Ampara district in Sri Lanka, for example, the authors found that while the psychological distress of the students (aged between 11 and 20) was significantly linked to war and tsunami exposure, ‘[t]he daily stressors taken together were stronger predictors of PTSD…’\textsuperscript{115}

The theme of daily stressors emerged strongly during my fieldwork in Selo. As the research was qualitative rather than quantitative, it does not allow me to attach any specific weight to these stressors, and indeed this was never the aim. The data, however, lend strong support to the idea that war trauma exists within, and is exacerbated by, a wider social context of persistent daily stressors linked to war. The men’s ongoing search
for justice, and their deep sense of disappointment and frustration that none of the individuals directly involved in Čelopek have stood trial at the ICTY, constitute one such stressor. What the men especially emphasized, however, was the stagnant economic situation – in both Selo and BiH more broadly – and their need for jobs. This emerged as a particularly salient daily stressor.

Prior to the war, all of the interviewees in Selo had been employed, mainly in factories and local businesses. Today, only one of them had a (part-time) job. The lack of job opportunities in Selo and the surrounding area was a major concern for the men. ‘If I had a job’, one of them stressed, ‘I would feel like I had a purpose and I would have less time to think about the past’. 116 Another explained that ‘When you don’t have a job and you don’t have money, every day is the same. You can’t plan anything and during the winter months, you feel like a prisoner in your own home’. 117 Implicitly, thus, the interviewees highlighted ‘rich patterns of association between resources and resource loss [including income and income loss] and diverse trauma outcomes’. 118 They viewed the creation of job opportunities – and more broadly opportunities simply to have an occupation and to utilize their time constructively – as an indispensable step in enabling them to re-build their lives.

It is important to note that the men in Selo were far from exceptional in expressing a need for jobs. Unemployment is high across BiH, 119 and during my fieldwork in the country between 2014 and 2015, all 79 interviewees – even the 21.5 per cent who were in their 60s and 70s – underlined the critical importance of employment. 120 As they saw it, the
lack of employment opportunities and their unmet socio-economic needs were serious impediments to healing. How could they move forward when they continually had to worry about putting food on the table, making ends meet and finding the money to pay for the medicines they needed? As Pedersen accentuates, the indirect effects of war, including its economic effects, ‘have profound implications in the health and well-being of survivors’.  

What emerged from the interviews in Selo, however (and from interviews with male survivors more generally) was that the men’s desire for jobs had a masculinity-related component. Quintessentially, jobs can be viewed as facilitating the ‘performance’ of masculinity.

Baird submits that ‘‘doing’’ masculinity depends on the options available for each individual…’. These options include socio-economic choices, which are closely linked to what Baird terms ‘masculinisation opportunities’ – and the absence of such opportunities can itself constitute a daily stressor. Jobs represent an important masculinization opportunity in two key ways. Firstly, they enable men to fulfil their traditional role as the family breadwinner. From the economic-related concerns and worries that they expressed, it was clear that the men in Selo felt under strong pressure to provide for their families, and the despondency that they expressed reflected the gap between what they wanted to do and the options available to them.

Secondly, jobs can enable a re-masculinization of the body. According to Fassin and d’Halluin, ‘The body is the place, par excellence, on which the mark of power is imprinted. It is an instrument used both to display and to demonstrate power’. One way
in which the body can exhibit power is through work, and in particular physical work. After my first visit to Selo in August 2014, for example, I put X in contact with *Snaga Žene*, a NGO based in Tuzla that uses occupational and horticultural therapy as part of its holistic approach to rehabilitation. The NGO is now working with some of the men in the village and has provided them, inter alia, with seeds and *plastenici* (a type of greenhouse made of nylon). During my final visit to Selo in September 2015, some of the men described how *Snaga Žene*’s investments in them and their community have given them a new lease of life and sense of purpose. They now had a reason to get up in the morning and something constructive to do that would benefit their families. They also enjoyed the physicality of this outdoor work; they felt reinvigorated and re-energized.

The emphasis that the men placed on jobs has wider implications for transitional justice. If people do not have opportunities and options within their everyday lives, if they are preoccupied with existential survival and finding ways to get through each day, this can critically restrict the grassroots impact of transitional justice processes. In the words of Vinck and Pham, ‘As long as basic survival needs are not met and safety is not guaranteed, social reconstruction programs, including transitional justice mechanisms, will not be perceived as a priority and will lack the level of support needed for their success’. The point is not simply to respond to these needs in ways that entrench a passive victimhood. Rather, what is crucial is to provide individuals with opportunities to re-build their own lives and to go forward. Sen specifically underlines ‘the opportunity to achieve valuable combinations of human functionings – what a person is able to do or be’. In the case of male survivors, masculinity is a crucial part of doing and being, and
what remains notably under-explored is the relationship between transitional justice and masculinity.

When scholars speak about masculinity in the context of transitional justice, they frequently focus on masculinity and violence. Illustrative of this emphasis on ‘militarized masculinity’, Theidon suggests that ‘...both DDR [disarmament, demobilization and reintegration] programs and transitional justice initiatives could benefit from exploring the ways in which militarized men are produced and militarized masculinities are performed’.\textsuperscript{130} In a similar vein, Baines argues that ‘In the context of war, available masculinities are reduced to aggressive, physical, and heterosexual attributes and achieved through the exercise of violence’.\textsuperscript{131} For their part, Cahn and Ni Aolain explore ‘the myriad of ways in which masculinities transform, adapt and reformulate in the post-conflict environment’.\textsuperscript{132} Their particular concern is with how ‘transitioning’ masculinities impact on women in post-conflict societies. This, in turn, is part of wider pattern wherein masculinity is seldom treated as significant in its own right, but only in the more relative sense of what it means for women. Illustrative of this is Hamber’s claim that ‘...masculinity should be seen as central to how we conceptualise the outcomes that transitional justice processes can deliver in terms of gender justice more broadly and women’s security in particular’.

It is therefore unsurprising that little attention has been given to the relationship between \textit{victimized} men, masculinity and transitional justice. As a further example of exclusion, the common juxtaposition of masculinity and violence has narrowed the space for any
serious analysis of the intersectionality of masculinity and pain/suffering. According to Hamber, ‘…ongoing attention is required to the continued exploration of the ability for violent masculinities to linger…long after the formal political conflict is over’. Yet attention should also be given to the fact that masculinities affected and impaired through acts of sexual violence against men can also persist and endure. In this regard, transitional justice has a vital role to play. The ambitious goals associated with transitional justice – including justice, truth, peace and reconciliation – require a long-term and holistic approach to dealing with the past that extends beyond ad hoc institutional processes. To accentuate this, some scholars have used the term ‘transformative justice’. If transformative justice ‘not only deals with the past but also establishes conditions and structures in order to ensure justice in the present and the future’, it can be argued that a more transformative approach to transitional justice is also about positively transforming and repairing conflict-affected identities, and in particular helping to restore male survivors’ sense of masculinity.

According to Hamber, ‘We…need to guard against a focus merely on the expressions of masculinity, however critical these are, which do not address structural factors such as unemployment and living conditions that exacerbate violent masculinities’. However, rather than reductively associating these structural factors with violent masculinities, they can be usefully linked to wider transitional goals. The emphasis, in short, should not be simply on curbing violent expressions of masculinity. It should also be on developing ways of using transitional justice to foster positive expressions of masculinity, such as confidence, self-worth and self-respect, which themselves can potentially contribute to
the realization of peace and reconciliation. In this regard, a greater focus within transitional justice on socio-economic issues would be a crucial starting point.

**Conclusion**

Reflecting on her experience of interviewing Burundi refugees in Tanzania during the 1980s, Malkki notes that ‘the success of the fieldwork hinged not so much on a determination to ferret out “the facts” as on a willingness to leave some stones unturned, to listen to what my informants deemed important, and to demonstrate my trustworthiness by not prying where I was not wanted’. Based on Malkki’s criteria, my fieldwork in Selo was a success. Many stones were left unturned and I allowed them to remain so. It was clear that the men did not wish to speak about their time in Čelopek or about the abuses that they had suffered. Similarly, they did not want to talk about their feelings or emotions. I respected their silences, which themselves were pregnant with meaning. I also listened to what the men themselves deemed important, and in this regard the interviews gravitated around two key themes – namely justice (or rather, from the men’s perspective, the lack of it) and the importance of jobs. The strong emphasis that the men placed on their current problems and concerns supports Fernando et al.’s partial mediation model and the notion that persistent ‘daily stressors’ intermesh with war trauma. If the two are closely inter-linked, this in turn renders overly reductionist the idea that ‘war collapses down in the head of an individual survivor to a discrete mental entity, the “trauma”, that can be meaningfully addressed by Western counselling or other talk therapy…’.

Counselling and talk therapy, if they are appropriate, should be used as
part of holistic approach to trauma that views individuals in the context of their wider socio-economic milieu. Masculinity, and more specifically the demands of hegemonic masculinity, forms a crucial part of this milieu.

This research specifically contributes to existing scholarship in three important ways. Firstly, the focus on male survivors contributes to addressing a persistent gap in literature on the Bosnian war. Secondly, the article’s use of a gender lens to analyze and explore the men’s silences, concerns and priorities provides new insights into the relationship between sexual violence against men and masculinity. Such violence is not simply an attack on masculinity. It also has enduring effects on masculinity as a framing device. If, as Chan asserts, ‘Gender…applies restrictions to people in terms of their thoughts and feelings’, sexual violence can amplify the way in which masculinity shapes thoughts and feelings. Thirdly, the article has shown that this shaping process has wider implications for transitional justice. Hamber rightly argues that ‘masculinity should be considered a cross-cutting issue in transitional justice’. The starting point, however, should not be violent masculinities, but rather masculinities affected by violence – and particularly sexual violence. This is an important avenue for future transitional justice work and scholarship.
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