Chapter 7
Feminist International Relations – The State of the Field

Elisabeth Prügl

> There are many indicators that feminist IR is becoming an established subfield, including panels at major academic conferences, sections in professional organizations, single-authored and edited books as well as journal articles … While the field initially exhibited a need to justify feminist approaches, scholars are now pursuing their work alongside or despite mainstream IR – they are getting on with it, often redefining IR in the process.[1]

Annick Wibben's assessment bears witness to the remarkable accomplishments of feminist scholars in International Relations (IR) who, only twenty years ago, began to scale the ramparts of this thoroughly masculinist field. At the time, these scholars, often at the beginning of their careers, began to question the subtexts of a field that largely had excluded women and that was blind to its own masculinist biases. Women began to meet in their own conferences, started to write against the grain, founded the Feminist Theory and Gender Studies (FTGS) section of the International Studies Association (ISA) in 1990, and the ISA Women's Caucus in 1993.[2] In the course of the decade, the feminist IR network broadened and progressively institutionalized. In spring of 1999, the first issue of *International Feminist Journal of Politics* (IFJP) was published, becoming a major outlet for scholarship of feminist international relations. Today, feminist IR is well-established: FTGS regularly features more than 50 panels at ISA meetings, IR textbooks include sections on feminist approaches, and feminist IR produces a steady stream of scholarship.

Writing against an exclusionary bastion, the first generation of feminist IR scholarship took on conceptual underpinnings that functioned to sanitize the field from the disturbances of feminism. This included epistemological critiques questioning positivist premises as well as biases in the theoretical construction of self-interested, autonomous state actors (Grant and Newland

1 Wibben 2004, 98.
2 Karen Erickson (2004) recounts the story of the origins of the Women's Caucus and of the increasing participation of women in ISA.

1991; Tickner 1992; Peterson 1992a and b; Sylvester 1994). Feminist scholars also sought to make visible women in international politics and argued for the relevance of gender as an analytical lens (Enloe 1989; 1993; Peterson and Runyan 1993). These critiques defined feminist scholarship in IR, establishing its legitimacy and preparing the grounds for feminist empirical research.

The relationship of feminist IR to the mainstream remains "troubled," however, and much of the field untouched by feminist critiques. Some have considered this a matter of concern (e.g. Tickner 1997; 2001; Locher and Prügl 2001); yet others have warned against "yearn[ing] to be a tight IR insider" and argued for going on with the business of feminist scholarship untied from the strictures of the discipline (Sylvester 2004, p. 59; Zalewski 1998). While there have been "promising" (Wibben 2004) engagements with feminist work by the mainstream (e.g. Jones 1996 with responses by Carver, Cochran and Squires 1998; and Carpenter 2002 with responses by Carver 2003; Zalewski 2003; Kinsella 2003; Goldstein 2001 discussed by Evangelista 2003; Prügl 2003; Kier 2003), more importantly there has been a proliferation of empirical work as feminists produce knowledge on pressing issues of our times (Tickner 2004, 50). In what follows, I review a part of this literature, namely that which addresses itself to issues of security and political economy, and summarize major strands of argument.

Feminist Security Studies

The disjuncture between feminist approaches and the IR mainstream is perhaps most pronounced in the subfield of security studies, long considered one of the most exclusionary domains of IR.[3] The disjuncture stems from profoundly different ontologies: Where mainstream IR focuses on unitary states and their security, feminists are concerned with individuals and their bodily security. Where the normative inclination of mainstream IR is to stabilize systems and orders, feminists are concerned with changing oppressive structures. Where mainstream IR imagines autonomous, rational actors, feminists see gendered and militarized identities constructed relationally (Tickner

3 While I am concerned with the exclusion of feminist ideas, the dearth of women's participation in ISA sections focusing on security is telling. Between the 2002 and 2004 ISA conferences women's participation on panels sponsored by the International Security Studies section dropped from 29.6 to 23.9 percent, and from 15.5 to 12.2 percent on panels sponsored by the Diplomatic Studies section. However, women's participation increased from 17 percent to 26 percent in the Scientific Study of International Processes panels, and from 11.8 to 16.7 percent in the Intelligence Studies section. Yet, this compares to an overall participation rate of women at the conference of 33.2 percent in 2002 and 34.1 percent in 2004. See Sarkees 2004.

2001, 48; 1992; Steans 1998; Enloe 1993; 2000; Locher and Prügl 2001; Youngs 2004). Spike Peterson makes clear the threat that these feminist critiques pose to the IR mainstream:

> ... analytically and structurally exposing how gender operates to constitute the theory and practice of IR is thoroughly disruptive. It disturbs foundational concepts, conventional dichotomies, familiar explanations, and even the discipline's boundaries. It effectively demasculinizes the discipline. I believe that many who sense these systemic implications resist feminism not because they deny its truths but because they prefer their investment in the current arrangements of sex, gender, IR, and theory (2004, 42).

Despite these incompatibilities, feminists have made important inroads in security studies. Some have adopted positivist language to appeal to the mainstream. This includes proliferating scholarship on the role of gender in democratic peace that has found a correlation between domestic norms of gender equality and a tendency of states to go to war (Caprioli 2004; Caprioli 2003; Caprioli and Boyer 2001; Regan and Paskeviciute 2003; Tessler and Warriner 1997). Others have latched on to constructivist critiques that have gained a foothold in security studies, and yet others have refused the mainstream. The issues they have sought to address include why men dominate in war-fighting, how international practices co-produce women's subordination and war, and how feminist movements produce change in institutional contexts, including peacekeeping operations and militaries.

Men and Women – Protectors and Protected

Joshua Goldstein's book on *War and Gender* (2001) compiles a vast range of evidence from different disciplines exploring the reasons for men's predominance in war fighting. Employing a positivist format of hypothesis-testing, he finds that "small, innate biological gender differences in average size, strength, and roughness of play" combine with the "cultural modeling of tough, brave men, who feminize their enemies to encode domination (Goldstein 2001, 406)" to explain the cross-cultural uniformity in the association of warfare with men. Biology and culture interact to produce a universal pattern, but in a strikingly novel suggestion, culture is stubbornly stable while biology emerges as comparatively malleable. Goldstein's book has received considerable attention and critique. It provides a much needed corrective to the biology is destiny argument revived by Francis Fukuyama when he suggested that women cannot run the world because it is dangerous and their peaceful inclinations cannot counter manly aggression (1998; for critiques see Tickner 1999; Ehrenreich *et. al*. 1999). It also constitutes a rich compilation of empirical findings from biology, anthropology, psychology, history, and women's studies. Critics have bemoaned Goldstein's focus on the individual

studies. Critics have bemoaned Goldstein's focus on the individual level of analysis, his tendency to attach gender to individuals (men and women) and his blindness to gender as a construct that informs a variety of social forms (including institutions and discourses). They also have disagreed with his static, binary, and implicitly heterosexist understanding of gender that presupposes cultural uniformities between women and men (Evangelista 2001; Prügl 2001; D'Amico 2003).

More commonly, feminists have rejected positivism and employed constructivist and post-structuralist approaches to the question of men's predominance in war. These approaches lead them to ask not so much about what causes men to go to war as about the places of women in war, the entwining of masculinism and militarism, and the construction of masculinity through war. Feminists have probed the strange debate around gays in the military, the way in which gays pose a threat not to the effectiveness of militaries but to the construction of militarist masculinities (Cohn 1998; Kier 1998). Feminists also have explored the way in which military interventions produce gendered national identities. Thus, the first Gulf War projected an image of the United States as "tough and tender," taking on a new responsibility in a unipolar world while establishing a "new world order" masculinity (Niva 1998). In contrast, the war on terror has employed gender in order to reinforce mutual hostilities, and the association of men with war fighting renewed their legitimacy as actors in world politics while devaluing the agency of women (Tickner 2002). Women in this war again were relegated to the role of victims – victims and relatives of victims of 9/11; victims of the Taliban regime, whose plight served to justify war (Pettman 2004). Apparently the war system and sexism, militarism and patriarchy, continue to be firmly intertwined (Reardon 1985; Enloe 2000).

When probing patriarchy and the war system, feminists often have described the way in which male protectors and feminine "protectees," masculine warriors and feminine "beautiful souls" constitute each other in political theory and public discourse (Stiehm 1982; Elshtain 1987). Iris Marion Young (2003), in an article informed by a deep concern about the militarization of the United States, has reformulated this argument as "the logic of masculinist protection." She documents the appeal of the concept of the masculine protector not only in the creation of masculine and feminine identities, but also for the creation of a security state "that wages war abroad and expects obedience and loyalty at home." She urges us to deny leaders the role of the masculine protector lest we end up accepting "a more authoritarian and paternalistic state power, which gets its support partly from the unity a threat produces and our gratitude for protection (Young 2003, 2)." Internationally, feminists have observed a silencing of critique not only in the US but also by the US. Haideh Moghissi (2003, 595) professes her horror in the face of "President Bush's war cry that 'you are either with us or with the terrorists' and John Ashcroft's unambiguous condemnation of all criticism of the

John Ashcroft's unambiguous condemnation of all criticism of the administration as 'giving ammunition to America's enemies.'" For her, this language evoked Iranian politics under Ayatollah Khomeini, the empowerment of "right-wing forces" and the unleashing of "violent patriarchal religious zealots," which forced her to flee her home country.

Feminists around the world also have bemoaned the new racism asserting itself in post-9/11 policies, "the privileging of white-Western suffering over and above everyone else's political concerns (Abood 2003, 577; also Couani 2003)." African feminists have recalled the terror attacks in Kenya and Tanzania and the disproportionate number of Africans that died in those attacks. At the same time, the US government acted as if African lives did not matter (Ajayi-Soyinka 2003). "What Africans are asking," Obioma Nnaemeka (2003, 602) points out, "is that humaneness be stretched to the point where an American life is equal to a Kenyan, Sudanese, or Tanzanian life." Feminists also have professed a sense of powerlessness in the face of the proliferation of warfare, the killing of civilians in Afghanistan "at a rate four times higher than that of the NATO bombardment of Kosovo and Serbia three years earlier (Kostash 2003, 591)," but also a coming together in new global movements such as Women in Black.

The gendered protector/protected logic also informs humanitarian interventions and the construction of "the civilian" as the one to be protected. Charli Carpenter (2003) has shown how international organizations have used "women and children" as a proxy for "civilians." Thus, in the former Yugoslavia, evacuations of civilians excluded fighting-age males although they were the explicit target of Serb massacres and most in need of international protection. Carpenter in part blames feminists who have argued that women and children suffer disproportionately in war. But Helen Kinsella (2004) suggests discourses of gender do not merely denote the distinction between combatants and civilians in an arbitrary fashion, but actually produce this difference through operations of power. Thus, "the structural and productive power of sex and sex difference" is embedded in the laws of war, visible in the writings of Grotius and in the Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Times of War, producing the gendered categories of combatant and innocent (or civilian) while constructing gender inequality. Carpenter's observations in the Balkans thus can be interpreted as an outcome of the way gender produces actors and targets in international law.

Women, Gender, and United Nations Peacekeeping

In addition to these discursive analyses, in the post-Cold War era, feminists have begun to explore the role gender plays in the United Nations and in in-

stitutions more broadly (Cohn and Enloe 2003). The institutionalization of gender mainstreaming and the adoption of Security Council resolution 1325 (on mainstreaming gender into peacekeeping operations) in October 2000 provided additional impetus for scholarly attention to the role of gender in UN peacekeeping. Feminists have scrutinized the peacekeeping missions of the 1990s, intrigued by the association of masculinized militaries with creating "peace," a category often discursively constructed as the feminine counterpart to masculine war-making. What was one to make of this cross-dressing of militaries as peacekeepers and peacemakers? Not surprisingly, studies have found contradictions in abundance.

Whitworth (2004) vividly illustrates the contradictions that emerge when soldiers, trained to become "killing machines," are entrusted with peacekeeping operations that require them to keep under tabs precisely the characteristics that they have been taught to excel in, *i.e.* the capability and willingness to employ violence. In Cambodia, peacekeeping facilitated a transition to democracy and civilian peacekeepers supported women's increased political participation, while at the same time peacekeepers were engaged in sexual abuse and created a flourishing market in prostitution involving Cambodian women returning from refugee camps. For Canada, peacekeepers functioned as a source of pride and identity helping construct the country as a good global citizen; they threw the country into a crisis of identity when reports surfaced from Somalia implicating Canada's elite troops with torturing and killing Somalis and with racist, homophobic, and misogynist practices (see also Razack 2004).

The role of peacekeeping for the formation of Dutch national identity figures in a collection of European scholarship on the experiences in Bosnia-Herzegovina (Cockburn and Zarkov 2002). Like the Canadians, the Dutch draw on their peacekeeping military as a source of national pride, and the Dutch press evoked notions of national trauma when Dutch troops failed to prevent the slaughter of Muslim civilians in Srebrenica (Zarkov 2002; De Leeuw 2002; Dudnik 2002). This literature emphasizes the continuity between wartimes and pre- and post-war situations, interrogates how pre-war constructions of masculinity make possible war atrocities and how post-war reconstructions inscribe militarism into states and societies. The lack of attention to issues of gender inequality in reconstructing Bosnia-Herzegovina, and the disregard for the plight of trafficked women who fed the peacekeepers' appetite for prostitutes all were extensions of masculinist and militarist practices into post-war situations, urging us to pay attention to apparently uninterrupted processes of masculinization/militarization (Enloe 2002; Rees 2002). Indeed, feminist interrogations of war have linked militarism and patriarchy, locating the reasons for militarism in various forms of misogyny and leading to an imperative of fighting patriarchy in order to overcome war (e.g. Wasmuht 2002; Mathis 2002; Zwingel 2003).

Part of this scholarship examines how peacekeeping missions have paid attention to gender (or not), finding little commitment on the part of leaders, but also documenting incipient efforts to train militaries and showing that missions with strong civilian components (that typically include more women) have tended to be particularly successful (Mazurana 2002; Carey 2001). Louise Olsson (2001) describes this dynamic in the UN mission in Namibia, where an unusually large number of women participated as a result of a long planning period and of a commitment to professionalism on the part of the mission's leadership. Henry Carey (2001) provides a comprehensive overview of gender mainstreaming in a range of peacekeeping operations, from Namibia to Burundi, finding successes in the fact that gender mainstreaming is included in many mandates, but also reporting difficulties with the prosecution of rape crimes both when the violators are in-country nationals and when they are peacekeepers. Sherill Whittington (2003) recounts the fascinating story of mainstreaming gender into the UN mission fostering the transition in East Timor. Here commitment by the leadership enabled extensive gender training, data collection, a campaign against domestic violence, and work on gender issues with East Timorese civil society actors. The result was an election in which women took 27 percent of seats in the Constituent Assembly and made up 40 percent of the commissions charged with preparing a new constitution.

Feminists also are reporting on the successes and constraints of efforts to mainstream gender into the operations of civilian intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations involved in post-war reconstruction and conflict prevention. For example, while Oxfam has had a gender policy since 1993, its implementation has been patchy. In humanitarian relief situations, a series of dichotomies, such as the distinction between "hard" technical interventions (such as providing water) and "soft" interventions (such as awareness-raising, education, group formation), short-term and long-term programming, has functioned to marginalize women and their skills (Williams 2002). Similar dichotomies existed in the OSCE mission to prevent ethnic conflict in Estonia, where the linguist and social science competence of female diplomats was considered less valuable than the legal competence of the men (Birkenbach 2002).

Peacekeeping missions and post-war reconstruction efforts also have raised questions about how peacekeeping militaries should be changed to account for gender more extensively. In interviews, Bosnian women active in NGOs have emphasized that they valued peacekeeping militaries for providing security. But they also wished for a change in military culture, creating an "international military regime" in which peacekeepers recognized and respected the contribution of women's organizations to building democracy, in which militaries were accessible and ready to cooperate with women's organizations, in which militaries were sensitive to local culture, and which

izations, in which militaries were sensitive to local culture, and which would allow soldiers to show their humanity (Cockburn and Hubic 2002). Cockburn and Hubic report anecdotes of women soldiers reaching out to local groups, but also of those unresponsive to local efforts. Kari Karamé (2001) similarly tells of meetings and friendships between women in Southern Lebanon and women soldiers in the Norwegian battalion of the peacekeeping operation.

Overall, however, little scholarly attention has focused on what women's increasing presence in militaries means for war or post-war reconstruction. Scholars have noted a change in the public status of militaries: they are no longer just "war machineries" but also public employers required to submit to the same laws as all other employers (Eifler 2002). The development has been particularly pronounced in Europe, where the European Court of Justice has ruled against the exclusion of women from European militaries on the grounds of non-discrimination. But while some have speculated that militaries will change "if service is no longer a way to demonstrate manhood (Stiehm 1989, 7)," Eifler has suggested that both the US and Russian militaries have found new ways of "doing gender" that have secured women's exclusion and marginalization, the Russians by locking women into short-term labor contracts that supposedly are to be applied to men as well in the future, the Americans through combat exclusion. In both cases, there is an enormous struggle over the threatened loss of military masculinity.

Feminist Political Economy

Rationalist approaches dominate the subfield of International Political Economy with a focus on negotiations and inter-state cooperation. Feminists have made few inroads into this type of IPE. Instead, they have contributed to a critical IPE that embeds economic processes in society and interrogates the relationships of power that constitute economic interaction. Because critical IPE is a multi-disciplinary endeavor, it more easily resonates with the extensive literature on gender and development and with feminist writings in the social sciences more broadly.

Feminist interventions in critical IPE have centered in particular on making visible women's paid and unpaid labor and on integrating understandings of that labor into theoretical approaches to political economy. Feminists have brought post-structuralist, post-colonial, and neo-Marxist orientations to this purpose. With the surge to prominence of gender mainstreaming, some interventions also have begun to focus on the way in which institutions reproduce gender, broadening the emphasis from a focus on women's labor to gendered economic regulations, and employing organizational and institutionalist ap-

proaches to highlight the gendered underpinnings of neo-liberal economic regimes.

Making Women's Labor Visible: From Manufacturing to Services and Care

Globalization has brought into relief women's labor in new ways. Feminist interventions in the 1980s and 1990s described the emerging role of women as assembly line workers under a new international division of labor in manufacturing (Fernandez-Kelly 1983; Tiano 1994; Cravey 1998), the ambiguous impacts of neo-liberal policies from free trade to structural adjustment (summarized in Benería 2003; Çatağay, Elson and Grown 1995), and the dual and interrelated processes of the flexibilization and feminization of labor (Ward 1990; Mitter 1992; Boris and Prügl 1996). At the turn of the 20th century, feminists also turned their attention to the burgeoning and increasingly globalized services industry that organizes women's care labor into transregional "care chains" (Yeates 2004).[4]

Feminists have become alarmed about a newly emerging international division of labor in services. Third World women increasingly migrate to work as nannies, maids, and sex workers in Europe, the US, East Asia and the Middle East. They enable women in Europe and the US to work outside the home and women in Taiwan to mitigate the traditionally tense relationship with their mothers in law. They also allow men to continue to evade their "second shift." Migrating women send remittances to give their children a basic standard of living and an education. At the same time, the new globalized services economy has created a "deficit of care" in sending countries; global economic inequality is being extended to reproductive labor and the labor of love (Ehrenreich and Hochschild 2002; Lan 2002; Parreñas 2002; 2001).

Sex work is one aspect of the new international division of labor in services, emerging together with proliferating inequalities and with the expansion of international tourism (Cabeza 2004; Outshoorn 2004). The phenomenon of internationalized sex work has spawned a rich and sometimes contentious literature. Activists and scholars fight and argue against coercive practices in the sex industry, including the enslavement of sex workers and international trafficking of women and girls for the purposes of prostitution (Bales

4 This does not mean that concern with practices in manufacturing has ceased. One major area of investigation is highly exploitative flexible forms of manufacturing enabled by international globalization and their regulation (Prügl 1999a; Chowdhry 2001). For an overview of the gendered impacts of globalization in manufacturing, services, and agriculture, and of the gendered impacts of global governance practices see Wichterich 2000.

2002; Hanochi 2001). In parallel, prostitutes increasingly have organized, redefined themselves as sex workers and are attacking the "old tired ethics" that have painted all forms of prostitution as exploitation. Scholars have documented this movement and criticized international discourses on prostitution for their cultural imperialism and for denying agency to Third World prostitutes (Kampadoo and Doezema 1998). Furthermore, they have highlighted the racism embedded in global desire industries.

Post-colonialist feminists have expanded this line of argument to International Relations more broadly, describing the relationship between Westerners and Third World women service workers as an enactment of post-colonial relations of conquest and desire (Ling 2002). In the neo-liberal economic order, an "economy of desire" constitutes reproductive labor as an extension of sexual relations that makes racialized and naturalized Third World women available to men, both in the West and within the Third World (Agathangelou 2002; 2004). The work of women, migrants, and children sustains a "techno-muscular capitalism" – global market competition driven by technology – by providing the "intimate labor" that complements the work of a largely male, techno-managerial elite (Chang and Ling 2000). The masculinist states of newly emerging economies are implicated in these processes. Here, foreign maids enable the constitution of middle-class identities and of nationalist state identities as modern within the context of Western hegemony (Agathangelou 2002; Chang and Ling 2000; Chin 1998; Han and Ling 1998; Ling 2002; Jeffrey 2002). The approach interweaves a theorization of post-colonial relations with gender relations, making visible the complex interactions of privatized and public forms of power in the international economy, while providing an inroad to understanding relations between "the West" and "the rest" in the area of security as well (Agathangelou and Ling 2004).

The post-colonial literature identifies gender not only in women's and men's labor power, but also in the relationship between North and South, East and West. This approach facilitates an understanding of not just people but economic orders as gendered, sexed and racialized. The practice of gender mainstreaming latches on to this more structural (if not post-structural) understanding of gender and other status dichotomies, taming it for institutionalist purposes.

Gender and Global Economic Governance

The feminist emphasis on political practice has led many to question prevailing images of globalization as unavoidable and unstoppable. Georgina Waylen (2004, 558) has argued forcefully that "globalization is not an immutable

and irresistible force" (see also Bergeron 2001). Acknowledging this fact makes processes of globalization amenable to political intervention. Accordingly, Waylen argues, it is necessary for feminist practice to understand the ways in which global economic processes are constructed and regulated. She emphasizes the need to probe not only women's labor in workplaces and households, but also neo-liberal policies and the gendered norms, discourses, and ideologies surrounding globalization. Feminist scholars have examined such governance from different perspectives. They have employed discursive and institutionalist approaches to highlight the gendered underpinnings of neo-liberal economic regimes.

Focusing on gendered discourses in the global media, Charlotte Hooper (2001; 2000) has explored constructions of bourgeois-rational and citizen-warrior models of hegemonic masculinity in *The Economist*. Patricia Price (2000) has identified a rhetorical similarity between discourses of female slenderness promoted in magazines and self-help writings, and free-market reforms promoted by the Bretton Woods institutions and popularized in business journals such as *The Economist*. The corporeal effects of these discourses are similar: they produce hunger and renew borders between femininity and masculinity, between have-nots and haves.

The transition to capitalism in Eastern Europe has served as a quasi-experiment for scholars probing the gendered construction of markets. While most feminists are critical of the claim that socialism entailed gender equality, comparative research on the economic status of women in East and West during the Cold War has found more gender equity under communism. For example, Éva Fodor (2004) argues that "the state socialist emancipation project" in Hungary was successful in that it enabled women to participate in various forms of "workplace authority." By comparison, Austrian women had many fewer chances of career advancement. The transition to capitalism has entailed significant losses for women in Eastern Europe in terms of employment, social services, reproductive rights, and representation in parliaments (Einhorn 1993).

Jacqui True (2003) describes the gendered construction of consumer markets in the Czech Republic. Here sex and gender were newly employed in marketing and advertising campaigns, producing women as sex objects and Western products as providing virile potency. True connects the creation of gendered consumer markets to the creation of differently gendered labor markets (2000), an increasingly feminized public sector and masculinized private and foreign enclave sectors. And she connects them to the creation of a gendered civil and political society, the masculinization of politics and the feminization of the civic sphere. She concludes that "globalization and gendering processes are inextricably bound (2003, 175)."

The transition to capitalism in Eastern Europe has involved changes not only in the area of production, but also in reproduction. Feminist sociologists and anthropologists have studied these changes. They have analyzed the intense struggles over women's reproductive rights (abortion in particular) and described pervasive redefinitions of everyday gender relations. Shifting gender divisions of labor in the household; new rules guiding sexual relations and friendships; new economic roles and opportunities together with new wage inequalities, all bear witness to the restructuring of gender orders that economic restructuring has entailed (Gal and Kligman 2000).

Fodor, True, and the studies reported in Gal and Kligman all, to some extent, link the gendering of political economies to state institutions. Feminists in International Relations have extended this understanding to the "internationalized state," arguing that global economic governance also (re)produces gender. Shirin Rai (2004) has suggested that the notion of global governance is an ideology that has "constitutionalized" neo-liberalism, privileging discourses of efficiency over the common good, separating economics from politics, and ignoring the degree to which markets are socially embedded and gendered.

Interestingly, much feminist literature exploring international institutions (the internationalized state) has focused on human rights, and less on economic governance, and has documented the emergence of a "global gender equality regime" (Kardam 2004; Berkovitch 1999; Joachim 1999; 2003; Zwingel 2005; Inglehart and Norris 2003). To the extent that feminists have studied international economic governance, they have investigated the gendered rules of (neo-)liberal economics rather than policy-making in international institutions. Feminist political economists (Elson 2000; Elson and Çatağay 2000; Ferber and Nelson 1993; 2003) have provided a reconceptualization of economics that accounts for the regulative values produced by states and the care values produced in a reproductive economy. Spike Peterson (2003; 2002) suggests a new framework for seeing the global political economy as consisting of a productive, reproductive, and virtual economy. This allows her to shed light on the production of value in areas typically considered marginal in mainstream economics (households, informal sector, but also virtual space) and on the processes of biological and social reproduction accomplished through socialization. Isabella Bakker (2003) similarly foregrounds processes of social reproduction to argue that the shift in the international economic order from "embedded liberalism" to "disciplinary neoliberalism" also has entailed a shift in gender order. Following Brigitte Young (2001), she suggests that this has involved the reprivatization of production, the decline of the family wage model, and the renegotiation of private and public spheres. These models constitute an important correction to the production-focused masculinist bias of liberal economics.

As gender mainstreaming has become a preferred strategy for advancing gender equality in the UN system, the European Union and in governments around the world (Mazey 2001; True and Mintrom 2001; True 2003; Rai 2003), there is an increasing demand for studies that probe ways in which international institutions perpetuate gender biases in all kinds of issues areas, including economic policies. A few studies have begun to address gender politics in economic institutions, often drawing on the discursive critiques of neo-liberalism. Anne Sisson Runyan (1999) identified a neo-liberal "framing" of women's economic and political advancement in the Economic Commission on Europe's regional discussions leading up to the Beijing Women's Conference. Focusing on international labor rules, Prügl (1999a and b) documented the way in which ILO Conventions constructed the category "worker" as masculine by disregarding work that takes place in the home. Feminists in International Relations are now moving beyond these engagements with the internationalized state, exploring gender in policy sectors that have remained largely untouched by feminist critiques. They are interrogating the way in which finance, trade, agricultural, and transportation policies are gendered and are proposing ways in which these policies could address gender inequalities (Sen 2000; Bisnath 2001; Prügl 2004a; Polk 2004). In this way they are adding to the extensive existing literature on the significance of gender in employment, social and development policies (e.g. Sainsbury 1999; Lewis 1998; Mazur 2002; Benería 2003; Rai 2002).

Gender mainstreaming, the systematic incorporations of gender considerations into all stages of policy, program, and project cycles, has had ambiguous outcomes. Governments and international organizations increasingly have adopted the rhetoric of gender mainstreaming and the strategy has spawned innovative changes in public management. One of these changes is the introduction of "gender budgets" spearheaded by UNIFEM (now UN Women) that have found imitators in various countries (Elson 2004). Yet gender mainstreaming sometimes has become an excuse for cutting women-focused programs and has entailed the incorporation of equality goals under institutional agendas. The World Bank in particular has been faulted for instrumentalizing gender equality, making it a tool to further economic growth (Bessis 2001; Prügl and Church 2006). Furthermore, gender mainstreaming has run up against patriarchal organizational cultures and against the constraints of macro-economic and macro-political environments (Braunmühl 2002).

Considerable debate exists among feminists about the value of gender mainstreaming. Rai (2004) cautiously argues that feminists need to engage with state institutions that enable global governance. Similarly, Ruth Pearson (2004) urges feminists to generate workable policy proposals directed towards states, translating feminist economic analysis into "effective political

action." But others have been wary, seeing dangers of cooptation and the suppression of difference among women as typical for engagements with the state (Rai 2004; Wood 2004; Bessis 2001). Bergeron (2001; 2004) further cautions that "state-centric" approaches tend to take global capitalism as given, as an outside force that can be moderated but not fundamentally changed. Focusing on the state limits the feminist imagination from envisioning more radical alternatives. But feminists working in international institutions and others have refused this dichotomous framing, emphasizing the need to combine gender mainstreaming approaches with women's empowerment and the need for femocrats to work in conjunction with movement actors (Zaoudé and Sandler 2001; Prügl 2004b).

Conclusion

This review of the state of a field is incomplete, both because of the size of the field and of the limitations of the author. Here I took on two well-defined, large subfields in International Relations, i.e. security studies and international political economy, and probed feminist interventions. There are other important areas where internationally oriented feminist scholars have made important contributions. In particular, there is a proliferating literature on democratization both at the state level and at the international level. Literatures on global civil society, the role of international advocacy networks and of women's movements fit into this body of literature, as do writings on feminist strategy. They are a central part of contemporary feminist International Relations and my lack of attention to these writings here should not distract from their centrality to the field (*e.g.* Jaquette 2003; Naples and Desai 2002; Molyneux and Razavi 2002; Braig and Wölte 2002; Liebowitz 2002; Eschle 2001; Kelly et al. 2001; Ackerly 2000).

The purpose of this essay is to document the considerable richness of feminist scholarship in International Relations. It is a self-confident scholarship that has moved from talking at the mainstream to constituting itself as a distinct body of knowledge that the mainstream ignores at its own peril. Feminist analyses of masculinity, war- and peace-making provide trenchant answers to understanding IR's classic question – why war? Feminist studies of women's work in all economic sectors and in reproduction complete the partial picture of globalization offered by liberal economics. And feminist explorations of gendered, racialized, and sexed messages in economic conduct help answer questions about the causes of poverty and inequality. Feminist International Relations thus has emerged as a field of scholarship central to understanding the pathologies of our global world.

References

Abood, Paula, 2003. "The Day the World Did Not Change." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society.* 29, 2: 376-578.

Ackerly, Brooke, 2000. *Political Theory and Feminist Social Criticism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Agathangelou, Anna, 2004. *The Global Political Economy of Sex: Desire, Violence, and Insecurity in Mediterranean Nation States.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

– 2002. "Sexing" Globalization in International Relations: Migrant Sex and Domestic Workers in Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey." In *Power, Postcolonialism and International Relations*, edited by Geeta Chowdhry and Sheila Nair. London: Routledge: 142-169.

– and L.H.M. Ling, 2004. "Power, Borders, Security, Wealth: Lessons of Violence and Desire." *International Studies Quarterly.* 48, 3: 517-538.

Ajayi-Soyinka, Omofolabo, 2003. "The Fashion of Democracy: September 11 and Africa." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society.* 29, 2: 603-607.

Bakker, Isabella, 2003. "Neo-liberal Governance and the Reprivatization of Social Reproduction: Social Provisioning and Shifting Gender Orders." In *Power, Production and Social Reproduction*, edited by Isabella Bakker and Stephen Gill. Houndsmill and New York: Palgrave: 66-82.

Bales, Kevin, 2002. "Because She Looks Like a Child." In *Global Woman*, edited by B. Ehrenreich and A. R. Hochschild. New York: Metropolitan Books: 207-229.

Benería, Lourdes, 2003. *Gender, Development, and Globalization: Economics as if All People Mattered.* New York, London: Routledge.

Bergeron, Suzanne, 2004. *Fragments of Development: Nation, Gender, and the Space of Modernity.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

– 2001. "Political Economy Discourses of Globalization and Feminist Politics." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society.* 26, 4: 983-1006.

Berkovitch, Nitza, 1999. *From Motherhood to Citizenship: Women's Rights and International Organizations.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bessis, Sophie, 2001. "The World Bank and Women: Instrumental Feminism." In *Eye to Eye: Women Practising Development Across Cultures*, edited by Susan Perry and Celeste Schenck. London: Zed Books: 10-24.

Birkenbach, Hanne-Margret, 2002. "Geschlechterverhältnisse in der Konfliktprävention." In *Geschlechterverhältnisse in Krieg und Frieden: Perspektiven der feministischen Analyse internationaler Beziehungen,* edited by Cilja Harders and Bettina Roß. Opladen (Germany): Leske + Budrich: 189-198.

Bisnath, Savitri, 2001. "Towards a Feminist Analysis of the Politics of 'Free Trade.'" Paper presented at the *International Studies Association* Annual Convention, Chicago, IL: February 21-24.

Boris, Eileen and Elisabeth Prügl, eds.1996. *Homeworkers in Global Perspective: Invisible No More.* New York: Routledge.

Braig, Marianne and Sonja Wölte, eds. 2002. *Common Ground or Mutual Exclusions? Women's Movements and International Relations.* London: Zed Books.

Braunmühl, Claudia von, 2002. "Mainstreaming Gender – a Critical Revision." In *Common Ground or Mutual Exclusions? Women's Movements and International*

Relations, edited by Marianne Braig and Sonja Wölte. London: Zed Books: 55-79.

Cabeza, Amalia L., 2004. "Between Love and Money: Sex, Tourism, and Citizenship in Cuba and the Dominican Republic." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society.* 29, 4: 987-1015.

Caprioli, Mary, 2004. "Feminist IR Theory and Quantitative Methodology: A Critical Analysis." *International Studies Review.* 6, 2: 253-269.

– 2003. "Gender Equality and State Aggression: The Impact of Domestic Gender Equality on State First Use of Force." *International Interactions.* 29, 3: 195-214.

– and Mark Boyer, 2001. "Gender, Violence, and International Crisis." *Journal of Conflict Resolution.* 45, 4: 503-518.

Carey, Henry F., 2001. "Women and Peace and Security: The Politics of Implementing Gender Sensitivity Norms in Peacekeeping." In *Women and International Peacekeeping*, edited by L. Olsson and T.L. Tryggestad. London: Frank Cass: 49-68.

Carpenter, R. Charli, 2003. "Women and Children First: Gender, Norms and Humanitarian Evacuation in the Balkans 1991-95."*International Organization.* 57, 4: 661-694.

– 2002. "Gender Theory in World Politics: Contributions of a Nonfeminist Standpoint?" *International Studies Review.* 4, 3: 153-165.

Carver, Terrell, 2003. " Gender/Feminism/IR." *International Studies Review.* 5, 2: 288-290.

– Molly Cochran and Judith Squires, 1998. Gendering Jones: Feminisms, IRs, Masculinities. *Review* of *International Studies.* 24, 2: 283-297.

Çağatay, Nilüfer, Diane Elson and Caren Grown, eds. 1995. *Growth, Trade, Finance, and Gender Inequality.* Special Issue of *World Development.* 23, 11.

Chang, Kimberly A. and L.H.M. Ling, 2000. "Globalization and Its Intimate Other: Filipina Domestic Workers in Hong Kong." In *Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites and Resistance*, edited by Marianne H. Marchand and Anne Sisson Runyan. London: Routledge: 27-43.

Chin, Christine B.N., 1998. *In Service and Servitude: Foreign Female Domestic Workers and the Malaysian "Modernity" Project.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Chowdhry, Geeta, 2002. "Postcolonial Interrogations of Child Labor." In *Power, Postcolonialism and International Relations: Reading Race, Gender and Class*, edited by Geeta Chowdhry and Sheila Nair. London: Routledge: 225-253.

Cockburn, Cynthia and Meliha Hubic, 2002. "Gender and the Peacekeeping Military: A View from Bosnian Women's Organizations." In *The Postwar Moment: Militaries, Masculinities and International Peacekeeping.* London: Lawrence and Wishart: 103-121.

– and Dubravka Zarkov, eds. 2002. *The Postwar Moment: Militaries, Masculinities and International Peacekeeping. Bosnia and the Netherlands.* London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Cohn, Carol, 1998. "Gays in the Military: Texts and Subtexts." In *The "Man" Question in International Relations*, edited by Marysia Zalewski and Jane Parpart. Boulder: Westview Press: 129-149.

– and Cynthia Enloe, 2003. "A Conversation with Cynthia Enloe: Feminists Look at Masculinity and the Men Who Wage War." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society.* 28, 4: 1187-1207.

Couani, Anna,. 2003. "From Penal Colony to Police State?" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society.* 29, 2: 579-581.

Cravey, Altha, 1998. *Women and Work in Mexico's Maquiladoras.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

D'Amico, Francine, 2003. "Review of Joshua S. Goldstein, War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa." *H-Minerva, H-Net Reviews* (September). URL: http: //www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.cgi?path=23735106 7805773. Accessed 21 October 2004.

De Leeuw, Marc, 2002. "A *Gentle*men's Agreement: Srebrenica in the Context of Dutch War History." In *The Postwar Moment: Militaries, Masculinities and International Peacekeeping,* edited by C. Cockburn and D. Zarkov. London: Lawrence and Wishart: 162-182.

Dudink, Stefan, 2002. "The Unheroic Men of a Moral Nation: Masculinity and Nation in Modern Dutch History." In *The Postwar Moment: Militaries, Masculinities and International Peacekeeping,* edited by C. Cockburn and D. Zarkov. London: Lawrence and Wishart: 146-161.

Ehrenreich, Barbara and Arlie Russell Hochschild, eds. 2002. *Global Women: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy.* New York: Metropolitan Books, Henry Holt and Company.

Ehrenreich, Barbara, Katha Pollit, R. Brian Ferguson, Lionel Tiger, and Jane S. Jaquette, 1999. "Responses: Fukuyama's Follies: So What, if Women Ruled the World?" *Foreign Affairs*. 78, 1: 118-129.

Eifler, Christine, 2002. "Soldatin – ein neuer Job für Frauen? Geschlechterkonstruktionen im Vergleich USA, BRD und Russland." In *Geschlechterverhältnisse in Krieg und Frieden: Perspectiven der feministischen Analyse internationaler Beziehunge,* edited by Cilja Harders and Bettina Roß. Opladen (Germany): Leske + Budrich: 163-172.

Einhorn, Barbara, 1993. *Cinderella Goes to Market: Citizenship, Gender and Women's Movements in East Central Europe.* London, New York: Verso.

Elshtain, Jean Bethke, 1987. *Women and War.* New York: Basic Books.

Elson, Diane, 2004. "Engendering Government Budgets in the Context of Globalization(s)." *International Feminist Journal of Politics.* 6, 4: 623-642.

– 2000. " Gender at the Macroeconomic Level." In *Towards a Gendered Political Economy*, edited by Joanne Cook, Jennifer Roberts and Georgina Waylen. Houndsmill, UK: Macmillan Press. 77-97.

– and Nilufer Çağatay, 2000. "The Social Content of Macroeconomic Policies." *World Development.* 28, 7: 1347-1364.

Enloe, Cynthia, 2002. "Demilitarization – Or More of the Same? Feminist Questions to Ask in the Postwar Moment," In *The Postwar Moment: Militaries, Masculinities and International Peacekeeping,* edited by C. Cockburn and D. Zarkov. London: Lawrence and Wishart. 22-32.

– 2000. *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

– 1993. *The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
– 1989. *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
Erickson, Karen, 2004. "The Status of Women: An Organizational Retrospective in Relation to the Discipline." Presented at the *Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association.* Montreal, (15-21 March).
Eschle, Catherine, 2001. *Global Democracy, Social Movements, and Feminism.* Boulder: Westview.
Evangelista, Matthew, 2003. "Rough-and-Tumble World: Men Writing about Gender and War." *Perspectives on Politics.* 1, 2: 327-334.
Ferber, Marianne A. and Julie A. Nelson, eds. 2003. *Feminist Economics Today: Beyond Economic Man.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
– 1993. *Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Theory and Economics.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
Fernandez-Kelly, Maria Patricia, 1983. *For We are Sold, I and My People: Women and Industry in Mexico's Frontier.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
Fodor, Éva, 2004. "The State Socialist Emancipation Project: Gender Inequality in Workplace Authority in Hungary and Austria." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society.* 29, 3: 783-813.
Fukuyama, Francis, 1998. "Women and the Evolution of World Politics." *Foreign Affairs.* 77, 5: 24-40.
Gall, Susan and Gail Kligman, eds.. 2000. *Reproducing Gender: Politics, Publics, and Everyday Life after Socialism.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Gill, Stephen, 2003. *Power and Resistance in the New World Economy.* New York: Palgrave.
Goldstein, Joshua, 2001. *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Grant, Rebecca and Kathleen Newland, eds. 1991. *Gender and International Relations.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Hanochi, Seiko, 2001. "Japan and the Global Sex Industry." In *Gender, Globalization, and Democratization,* edited by Rita Mae Kelly, Jane H. Bayes, Mary E. Hawkesworth, and Brigitte Young. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield: 22-32.
Hooper, Charlotte, 2001. *Manly States: Masculinities, International Relations, and Gender Politics.* New York: Columbia University Press.
– 2000. "Masculinities in Transition: The Case of Globalization." In *Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites and Resistances*, edited by Marianne M. Marchand and Anne Sisson Runyan, London and New York: Routledge: 59-73.
Inglehart, Ronald and Pippa Norris, 2003. *Rising Tide: Gender Equality and Cultural Change around the World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Jaquette, Jane S., 2003. "Feminism and the Challenges of the 'Post-Cold War' World." *International Feminist Journal of Politics.* 5, 3: 331-354.
Jeffrey, Leslie Ann. 2002. *Sex and Borders: Gender, National Identity, and Prostitution Policy in Thailand.* Vancouver: UBC Press.
Joachim, Jutta, 2003. "Framing Issues and Seizing Opportunities: The UN, NGOs, and Women's Rights." *International Studies Quarterly.* 47, 2: 247-274.

– 1999. "Shaping the Human Rights Agenda: The Case of Violence against Women." In *Gender Politics in Global Governance*, edited by Mary K. Meyer and Elisabeth Prügl. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield: 142-160.

Jones, Adam, 1996. "Does 'Gender' Make the World Go Round?" Feminist Critiques of International Relations." *Review of International Studies.* 22, 4: 405-429.

Kempadoo, Kamala and Jo Doezema, eds. 1998. *Global Sex Workers: Rights, Resistance, and Redfinition.* New York and London: Routledge.

Karamé, Kari H., 2001. "Military Women in Peace Operations: Experiences of the Norwegian Battalion in UNIFIL 1978-98." In *Women and International Peacekeeping*, edited by I L. Olsson and T.L. Tryggestad. London: Frank Cass: 85-96.

Kardam, Nüket, 2004. "The Emerging Global Gender Equality Regime from Neoliberal and Constructivist Perspectives in International Relations." *International Feminist Journal of Politics.* 6, 1: 85-109.

Kelly, Rita Mae, Jane H. Bayes, Mary E. Hawkesworth, and Brigitte Young, eds. 2001. *Gender, Globalization, and Democratization.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Kier, Elizabeth, 2003. "Uniform Justice: Assessing Women in Combat." *Perspectives on Politics.* 1, 2: 343-347.

– 1998. "Homosexuals in the U.S. Military: Open Integration and Combat Effectiveness." *International Security.* 23: 2, 5-39.

Kinsella, Helen, 2005. "Securing the Civilian: Sex and Gender in the Laws of War." In *Power and Global Governance,* edited by Michael N. Barnett and Raymond Duvall. Cambridge University Press.

– 2003. "For a Careful Reading: The Conservativism of Gender Constructivism." *International Studies Review.* 5, 2: 294-297.

Kostash, Myrna, 2003."Visible Silence: Women in Black in Edmonton." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society.* 29, 2: 591-593.

Lan, Pei-Chia, 2002. "Among Women: Migrant Domestics and Their Taiwanese Employers Across Generations." In *Global Woman*, edited by B. Ehrenreich and A. R. Hochschild. New York: Metropolitan Books: 169-189

Lewis, Jane, ed. 1998. *Gender, Social Care and Welfare State Restructuring in Europe.* Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Liebowitz, Debra J., 2002. "Gendering (Trans)National Advocacy: Tracking the Lollapalooza at 'Home'." *International Feminist Journal of Politics.* 4, 2: 173-196.

Ling, L.H.M., 2002. *Postcolonial International Relations: Conquest and Desire between Asia and the West*. Houndsmill, UK: Palgrave.

Locher, Birgit and Elisabeth Prügl, 2001. "Feminism and Constructivism: Worlds Apart or Sharing the Middle Ground." *International Studies Quarterly.* 45, 1: 111-129.

Mathis, Sibylle, 2002. "Ein- und Aus-Blicke feministischer Friedensarbeit." In *Geschlechterverhältnisse in Krieg und Frieden: Perspectiven der feministischen Analyse internationaler Beziehungen,* edited by Cilja Harders and Bettina Roß. Opladen (Germany): Leske + Budrich: 105-119.

Mazey, Sonia, 2001. *Gender Mainstreaming in the EU – Principles and Practice*. London: Kogan Page.

Mazur, Amy G., 2002. *Theorizing Feminist Policy.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Mazurana, Dyan, 2002. "International Peacekeeping Operations: To Neglect Gender is to Risk Peacekeeping Failure." In *The Postwar Moment: Militaries, Masculinities and International Peacekeeping,* edited by C. Cockburn and D. Zarkov. London: Lawrence and Wishart: 41-50.

Mitter, Swasti, ed. 1992. *Computer-aided Manufacturing and Women's Employment: The Clothing Industry in Four EC Countries.* London: Springer Verlag.

Moghissi, Haideh, 2003. "September 11 and Middle Eastern Women: Shrinking Space for Critical Thinking and Oppositional Politics." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society.* 29, 2: 594-597.

Molyneux, Maxine and Shahra Razavi, eds. 2002. *Gender Justice, Development, and Rights.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Naemeka, Obioma, 2003. "African Voices on September 11: Introduction." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society.* 29, 2: 601-603.

Naples, Nancy A. and Manisha Desai, eds. 2002. *Women's Activism and Globalization: Linking Local Struggles and Transnational Politics.* New York: Routledge.

Niva, Steve, 1998. "Tough and Tender: New World Order Masculinity and the Gulf War." In *The "Man" Question in International Relations,* edited by Marysia Zalewski and Jane Parpart. Boulder: Westview Press: 109-128.

Olsson, Louise, 2001. "Gender Mainstreaming in Practice: The United Nations Transitional Assistance Group in Namibia." In *Women and International Peacekeeping*, edited by L. Olsson and T.L. Tryggestad, London: Frank Cass. 97-110.

Outshoorn, Joyce, ed. 2004. *The Politics of Prostitution: Women's Movements, Democratic States, and the Globalization of Sex Commerce.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parreñas, Rhacel Salazar, 2002. "The Care Crisis in the Philippines: Children and Transnational Families in the New Global Economy." In *Global Woman*, edited by B. Ehrenreich and A. R. Hochschild. New York: Metropolitan Books: 39-54.

– 2001. "Transgressing the Nation-State: The Partial Citizenship and 'Imagined (Global) Community' of Migrant Filipina Domestic Workers." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society.* 26, 4: 1129-1154.

Pearson, Ruth, 2004. "The Social is Political: Towards the Re-politicization of Feminist Analysis of the Global Economy." *International Feminist Journal of Politics.* 6, 4: 603-622.

Peterson, V. Spike, 2004. "Feminist Theories Within, Invisible To, and Beyond IR." *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*. 10, 2: 35-46.

– 2003. *A Critical Rewriting of Global Political Economy: Integrating Reproductive, Productive and Virtual Economies.* London, New York: Routledge.

– ed. 1992a. *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory*." Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

– 1992b. "Transgressing Boundaries: Theories of Knowledge, Gender and International Relations." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies.* 21, 2: 183-206.

– and Anne Sisson Runyan, 1993. *Global Gender Issues.* Boulder: Westview Press.

Pettman, Jan Jindy. 2004. "Feminist International Relations After 9/11." *The Brown Journal of World Affairs.* 10, 2: 85-96.

Polk, Merritt. 2004. "Gender Mainstreaming in Transport Policy in Sweden." Kvinnor, Kön och forskning (Denmark). 21, 4: 43-54.

Price, Patricia L., 2000, "No Pain, No Gain: Bordering the Hungry New World Order." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space.* 18: 91-110.

Prügl, Elisabeth, 2004a. "Gender and the Institutions of Global Markets: An Exploration of the Agricultural Sector." Presented at *Workshop on Gender, Governance and Globalisation,* University of Warwick. (17-18 September).

– 2004b. "International Institutions and Feminist Politics." *The Brown Journal of World Affairs.* 10, 2: 69-84.

– 2003. "Gender and War: Causes, Constructions, and Critique." *Perspectives on Politics.* 1, 2: 335-342.

– 1999a. *The Global Construction of Gender: Home-based Work in the Political Economy of the 20th Century.* New York: Columbia University Press.

– 1999b. "What is a Worker? Gender, Global Restructuring, and the ILO Convention on Homework." In *Gender Politics in Global Governance*, edited by Mary K. Meyer and Elisabeth Prügl. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield: 197-209.

– and Audrey Church, 2006. "The Institutional Road Towards Equality: Mainstreaming Gender in International Organizations." In *Institutions, Resources, and Mobilization: Women and Gender Equity in Development Theory and Practice*,. edited by Jane Jaquette and Gale Summerfield. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Rai, Shirin M., 2004. "Gendering Global Governance. *International Feminist Journal of Politics.* 6, 4: 579-601.

– 2002. *Gender and the Political Economy of Development: From Nationalism to Globalization*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

– ed. 2003. *Mainstreaming Gender, Democratizing the State? Institutional Mechanisms for the Advancement of Women.* Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press.

Razack, Sherene H., 2004. *Dark Threats and White Knights: The Somalia Affair, Peacekeeping and the New Imperialism.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Reardon, Betty, 1985. *Sexism and the War System*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Regan, Patrick M. and Aida Paskeviciute, 2003. "Women's Access to Politics and Peaceful States." *Journal of Peace Research.* 40, 3: 287-302.

Rees, Madeleine, 2002. "International Intervention in Bosnia-Herzegovina: The Cost of Ignoring Gender." In *The Postwar Moment: Militaries, Masculinities and International Peacekeeping,* edited by C. Cockburn and D. Zarkov.London: Lawrence and Wishart: 51-67.

Runyan, Anne Sisson, 1999. "Women in the Neoliberal 'Frame.'" In *Gender Politics in Global Governance*, edited by Mary K. Meyer and Elisabeth Prügl. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield: 210-220.

Sainsbury, Diane, ed. 1999. "*Gender and Welfare State Regimes."* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sarkees, Meredith Reid, 2004. "Women's Participation at ISA Conference." Presented at the *Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association*. Montreal (15-21 March).

Sen, Gita, 2000. "Gender Mainstreaming in Finance Ministries." *World Development.* 28, 7: 1379-1390.

Steans, Jill, 1998. *Gender and International Relations: An Introduction.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Stiehm, Judith H., 1989. *Arms and the Enlisted Woman.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

– 1982. The Protected, the Protector, the Defender. *Women's Studies International Forum* 2, 3-4: 367-376.

Sylvester, Christine, 2004. "Woe or Whoa! International Relations Where It's Not Supposed to Be." *Brown Journal of World Affairs.* 10, 2: 57-68.

– 1994. *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tessler, Mark and Ina Warriner, 1997. "Gender, Feminism, and Attitudes toward International Conflict." *World Politics.* 49, 2: 250-281.

Tiano, Susan, 1994. *Patriarchy on the Line: Labor, Gender and Ideology in the Mexican Maquila Industry.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Tickner, J. Ann, 2004. "The Growth and Future of Feminist Theories in International Relations: An Interview with Sarah Buchwalter, Jesse Finkelstein, and Louise Sherman." *Brown Journal of World Affairs*. 10, 2: 47-56.

– 2002. Feminist Perspectives on 9/11. *International Studies Perspectives* 3: 333-350.

– 2001. *Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post-Cold War Era.* New York: Columbia University Press.

– 1999. "Why Women Can't Run the World: International Politics According to Francis Fukuyama." *International Studies Review.* 1, 3: 1-12.

– 1992. *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security.* New York: Columbia University Press.

True, Jacqui, 2003. *Gender, Globalization, and Postsocialism: The Czech Republic After Communism.* New York: Columbia University Press.

– 2003. "Mainstreaming Gender in Global Public Policy. " *International Feminist Journal of Politics.* 5, 3: 368-396.

– 2000. "Gendering Post-socialist Transitions." In *Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites and Resistances*, edited by Marianne M. Marchand and Anne Sisson Runyan. London and New York: Routledge: 75-93.

– and Michael Mintrom, 2001. "Transnational Networks and Policy Diffusion: The Case of Gender Mainstreaming." *International Studies Quarterly.* 45, 1: 27-57.

Ward, Kathryn, ed. 1990. *Women Workers and Global Restructuring.* Ithaca: ILR Press.

Wasmuht, Ulrike C., 2002. "Warum bleiben Kriege gesellschaftsfähig? Zum weiblichen Gesicht des Krieges. In *Geschlechterverhältnisse in Krieg und Frieden: Perspektiven der feministischen Analyse internationaler Beziehungen,* edited by Cilja Harders and Bettina Roß. Opladen (Germany): Leske + Budrich: 87-103.

Waylen, Georgina, 2004. "Putting Governance into the Gendered Political Economy of Globalization." *International Feminist Journal of Politics.* 6, 4: 557-578.

Whittington, Sherill, 2003. "Gender and Peacekeeping: The United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society.* 28, 4: 1283-1288.

Whitworth, Sandra, 2004. *Men, Militarism and UN Peacekeeping: A Gendered Analysis.* Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Wibben, Annick T.R., 2004. "Feminist International Relations: Old Debates and New Directions." *Brown Journal of World Affairs.* 10, 2: 97-114.

Wichterich, Christa, 2000. *The Globalized Woman: Reports from a Future of Inequality* translated by Patrick Camiller. London: Zed Books.

Williams, Suzanne, 2002. "Conflicts of Interest: Gender in Oxfam's Emergency Response." In *The Postwar Moment: Militaries, Masculinities and International Peacekeeping,* edited by C. Cockburn and D. Zarkov,. London: Lawrence and Wishart: 85-102.

Wood, Cynthia, 2004. "Different Commonalities: Gender Mainstreaming and Development." Presented at the *International Studies Association* Annual Convention, 19 March, Montreal, Canada.

Yeates, Nicola, 2004. "Global Care Chains: Critical Reflections and Lines of Enquiry." *International Feminist Journal of Politics.* 6, 3: 369-391.

Young, Brigitte, 2001. "Globalization and Gender: A European Perspective." In *Gender, Globalization, and Democratization,* edited by Rita Mae Kelly, Jane H. Bayes, Mary E. Hawkesworth, and Brigitte Young. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield: 27-47.

Young, Iris Marion, 2003. "The Logic of Masculinist Protection: Reflections on the Current Security State." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society.* 29, 1: 1-25.

Youngs, Gillian, 2004. "Feminist International Relations: A Contradiction in Terms? Or: Why Women and Gender are Essential to Understanding the World "We" Live In." *International Affairs.* 80, 1: 75-87.

Zalewski, Marysia, 2003. "Women's Troubles Again in IR." *International Studies Review.* 5, 2: 291-294.

– 1998. "Where is Woman in International Relations? To Return as a Woman and Be Heard.". *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. 27, 4: 847-67.

Zaoudé, Aster and Joanne Sandler, 2001. "International Organizations: Women's Rights and Gender Equality." In *Eye to Eye: Women Practising Development Across Cultures*, edited by Susan Perry and Celeste Schenck. London: Zed Books: 25-44.

Zarkov, Dubravka, 2002. "Srebrenica Trauma: Masculinity, Military and National Self-Image in Dutch Daily Newspapers." In *The Postwar Moment: Militaries, Masculinities and International Peacekeeping,* edited by C. Cockburn and D. Zarkov, London: Lawrence and Wishart: 183-203.

Zwingel, Susanne, 2005. "From International Regime to Transnational Implementation Network: How the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) Has Impacted Women's Lives." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 7, 3: 400-424..

– 2003. "Männer und Kinder zuerst. Über die Notwendigkeit von Geschlechterkonstruktionen zur Legitimierung und Durchführung von Kriegen." In *Die Welt zwi-*

schen Recht und Gewalt: Internationale Sozialordnung, Völkerrecht und Demokratie, edited by Stephan Albrecht, Werner Goldschmidt and Gerhard Stuby. Hamburg (Germany): VSA-Verlag.