capable of affecting health and safety of the worker in his working environment, and taking into consideration new insights in health and safety needs of workers.
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MANSPLAINING, MANTERRUPTING AND BROPROPRIATING

Men and women have roles – their roles are different, but their rights are equal. ~ Harri Holkeri

While the past few decades have seen an improvement in the treatment of females in the struggle for their rights and for opportunity to be equal with men, it would be premature to declare victory and dismiss issues of all gender bias and gender inequality.

There are plenty of neologisms going around sparking online gender wars. Women accuse men of everything from mansplaining to manslamming, and men counter them by calling women feminazis and man-haters, saying they are hallucinating bad behaviour by men everywhere.

On the way of this struggle, women have repeatedly faced with the fact that they have not been heard or have been interrupted by men. Researchers have been exploring and writing about how often women get interrupted by men in
academic and professional conversations. As a result, new concepts and terms, such as *mansplaining, manterrupting* and *bropropriating* were introduced in the scientific circulation [2].

*Mansplaining* is when a man explains something to a woman in a patronizing way and it often begins with a man completely disregarding a woman’s opinions by interrupting her mid-sentence [1]. Mansplaining is a relatively new word. It was coined shortly after a comic and scathing essay entitled “*Men Explain Things to Me*” by Rebecca Solnit appeared [3]. The author wrote about what often goes wrong in conversations between men and women, how men wrongly assume they know things and wrongly assume women don’t, about why this arises, and how this aspect of the gender wars works.

*Manterrupting* is unnecessary interruption of a woman by a man. The term was coined by writer Jessica Bennett in a *Time* magazine article titled “*How Not to Be ‘Manterrupted’ in Meetings*” published on January 14th, 2015. In the article, Bennett coined the terms *manterrupting*, a portmanteau of *man* and *interrupting*, and *bropropriating*, a portmanteau of *bro* and *appropriating*, which are respectively defined as unnecessary interruption of a woman by a man.

Numerous studies support the claim of women in the workforce who argue that men interrupt them far more often than the reverse. A study titled “*Sex Roles, Interruptions and Silences in Conversations*” by Don Zimmerman and Candace West, sociologists at the University of California, Santa Barbara, found that “…there are definite and patterned ways in which the power and dominance enjoyed by men in other contexts are exercised in their conversational interaction with women” [4]. In this study, the authors analyzed 31 two-party conversations that they had tape recorded in public places. Of the 31 conversations, 10 were between two men, 10 between two women, and 11 between and man and a woman. In the two same-sex groups combined, the authors found seven instances of interruption. In the male/female group, however, they found 48 interruptions, 46 of which were instances of a man interrupting a woman.

This means that when it comes to making the decisions that most affect us all, women’s voices are not heard equally. Consequently, the blunt truth is that men still run the world. A truly equal world would be one where women ran half our countries, and companies and men ran half our homes.
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INVALIDITY OF MARRIAGE

To start with, invalidity of marriage is a form of the refusal of a state from recognition of marriage validity because of the violation of conditions stated by legislative acts. This refusal is established in the court decision. It is a way of protection of the rights and legal interests of a spouse.

Marriages which could be annulled are called void marriages and voidable marriages. These marriages are fundamentally flawed in some way. A void marriage is invalid ab initio. Its invalidity does not require recognition by the court. A voidable marriage is valid until it is annulled by the court[3, p. 47].

Generally, a marriage is void if:

— The parties' degree of consanguinity is too close – for example, a brother and sister or a parent and a child. Different jurisdictions have different lists of prohibited incestuous relationship.