

# 7

## Feminist Interventions in International Relations

*Elisabeth Prügl*

Does feminist International Relations (IR) have anything to say about development? Twenty years ago the question would have been purely rhetorical: feminists working in the field of IR were deeply informed by literature on gender and development, and they contributed to this literature. However, in the wake of the militarisation of international politics in the new century, feminists in IR shifted their attention to studying security and to critiquing the traditional core of the field. The same seemed true for development as development practitioners recognised that countries embroiled in violent conflict ranked at the bottom of measures of development. Concepts such as risk-reduction, conflict prevention, conflict resolution, peace building and state-building joined the vocabulary of development. In this context, feminist IR scholarship became relevant for development in a new way. It put at the centre of attention two propositions. First, there is a relationship between war and gender and second, processes of peace-making and post-war reconstruction are thoroughly gendered.

For the field of International Relations, the question “why war?” has been field-defining. It has provided the rationale for establishing a separate discipline, and through the course of the 20th century, answers have proliferated. In his seminal book on the matter, Kenneth Waltz (1959) groups such answers according to levels of analysis. At the first level are answers that pertain to individuals. They suggest that education and changing people in various ways is necessary to stop war-like behaviour. Second, the state level of analysis involves answers that address the political organisation of a society, suggesting for example that democracies are less likely to go to war than autocracies. Finally, there is the systemic level of analysis, which Waltz favours. He suggests that war is an inevitable outcome of an anarchically organised international

system in which states are sovereign, and in which one state securing itself induces insecurity in other states. Since it is impractical to create a world government, the only way to limit war is by establishing a balance of powers.

In Waltz's classification, women and their politics are firmly placed at the individual level of analysis, a residual category for explanation. They include, for example, the Greek and Spartan women in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, who come together for a sex strike in order to end the Peloponnesian War; such individual-level interventions, Waltz argues, are bound to fail in the context of a system of warring city states. Sex and gender have thus been banned from consideration in international affairs, with the creative writings on women and peace relegated into marginalised netherworlds and labelled reductionist.

But the marginalisation of gender in International Relations did not stop feminist activists from organising against war and militarism. In the local chapters of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), in the anti-nuclear activism of Women Strike for Peace, in the dialogues between Israeli and Palestinian women, and in the activism of the West African Mano River Women's Peace Network, women committed themselves to the cause of ending wars. For them it mattered that it was men who made war, and they knew that women's exclusion from war provided them with unique legitimacy to demand an end to war. Women's activism has kept alive ideas about the relationship between women and war, and feminist scholars in IR have gradually succeeded in amplifying these ideas about how gender mattered in the conduct of war.

This chapter reviews feminist interventions in IR, with an emphasis on the traditional core of the field, that is security studies, in relation to development. Two strands of literature can be distinguished. The first explores the *logic of war* and expands the feminist argument that gender is constitutive of war because it constructs a dichotomy between male protectors who see themselves called upon to engage in violence for the sake of those needing protection (the nation, the weak, "women and children"), because of the interweaving of masculinism and militarism, and because of the mutually constitutive constructions of war-like men and life-giving women. A second strand of literature explores the *logic of peace* and the role of women and gender in the context of post-Cold War multilateral efforts of peace-making. Probing the possibilities for change, these writings empirically investigate the impact of various Security Council resolutions on women, peace and security, the participation and effectiveness of women in peace negotiations, and the issue

of sexual violence in war. I hope to illustrate that different understandings of gender produce different kinds of insights in feminist IR.

A few words may be in order to address the apparent blurring of the terms war, peace, and security in this chapter. I use these terms strictly to reflect the discourses that have been produced around them. Finding an objective definition of war and peace is tricky because the two terms cannot exist apart from each other – they are mutually defining: peace is the absence of war, and war refers to an absence of peace. Thus to the extent that we are speaking a language of peace we are also speaking a language of war. This blurring of categories is forcefully expressed in the dictum of Carl Clausewitz (1984[1832], p. 87), the Prussian general, who famously defined war as a continuation of politics by other means. Conversely, Michel Foucault (2003, p. 9) has described politics as a continuation of war. Both move at the centre of attention, the pervasive role of conflict in human political organisation.

## Gender and the logic of war

For feminists, assertions that war-making has nothing to do with gender has always sounded hollow in light of the predominance of men in the security apparatus. The masculinity of war thus is a starting point for a number of feminist studies, yet there is contestation about what exactly the relationship is between gender and war. It is possible to identify three fault-lines in the feminist literature. The first focuses on the premise that associates men with war and women with peace: Is it correct to say that men for the most part support war and that women are more likely to favour peace? The second divide pertains to levels of analysis and addresses causality: Does the relationship between gender and war belong at the individual or systemic/structural level? Finally, the third fault-line pertains to the relationship between hegemonic masculinity and war: Does militarist masculinity have a substantive content or are masculinity and war empty signifiers that derive their potency from their formal qualities?

The first disagreement amongst feminists is *whether women should be thought of as outside war or inside war*. On the surface, the evidence is striking: historically and cross-culturally men have accounted for the vast majority of soldiers and fighters. Women have participated in fighting wars, but they have invariably made up only a small minority of fighters (Goldstein, 2001). While this puzzle has given rise to interesting theorising, feminists have been uncomfortable with universalist assertions that reproduce the association of women with peace and men

with war and that fail to take into consideration historical and cultural contexts.<sup>1</sup>

Against the empirical record that associates men with war and women with peace, feminists thus have put forward evidence that contradicts the idea that women do not fight. In part they have done so by broadening the types of militarised conflicts they look at to include non-state actors, and by taking seriously the various supporting roles that women play in conflicts. This has allowed them to bring into view the fact that women participate in violence and wars extensively: they cheer on men to engage in violence and shame them into participation (Goldstein, 2001); they have appeared as suicide bombers in the Middle East, in terrorist activities in Chechnya, and as participants in the Rwandan genocide (Sjöberg and Gentry, 2007); they have a long record of fighting in liberation movements and militias, in African, Asian and Latin American revolutions of the 20th century, in loyalist militias in North Ireland, in militant movements in Kashmir and Sri Lanka, and in recent African conflicts from Sierra Leone to the Congo (Tétreault, 1994; Puechguirbal, 2003; Sjöberg and Gentry, 2007; McEvoy, 2009; Parashar, 2009; MacKenzie, 2009). Women do not constitute a majority of fighters in these contexts, but they make significant contributions, accounting for over 30% of insurgents in some instances. Moreover, women increasingly are integrated in regular militaries; they now account for almost 15% of the US military (The Women's Memorial, 2011), the highest amongst NATO member states.<sup>2</sup>

The second disagreement amongst feminists focuses on the question of the *causal or constitutive relationship* between gender and war, and whether this relationship needs to be explored *at the individual or the systemic/structural level of analysis*. In other words, is masculinity a cause of war or are war and masculinity co-constituted? And do these causalities arise from socialisation and individual identities or from the masculinisation/militarisation of societies, cultures and global structures? These are amongst the most contested issues with far-reaching implications for how feminist scholarship can connect to security studies more broadly. The difference between approaches largely hinges on the understanding of gender.

A series of quantitative studies has made a link between a country's propensity to go to war and the degree of gender equality within a country. They have shown a strong and consistent correlation between domestic gender inequality and a tendency of states to resolve conflicts violently. Using different indicators for gender equality (such as the percentage of women in the labour force and in parliament) and for

violent conflict (militarised interstate and intrastate disputes and a “global peace index”) and drawing on different databases, these studies agree that gender inequality is a significant predictor of conflict that in some models even outweighs the key explanatory variable of democracy (Tessler and Warriner, 1997; Caprioli, 2000, 2003, 2005; Caprioli and Boyer, 2001; Regan and Paskeviciute, 2003). Although empirically operating at a state level of analysis, scholars have drawn on arguments at the individual level to explain this correlation, evoking evolutionary biology and psychology. They have argued the adaptive advantage of male violence and its diffusion over time and drawn a causal relationship between resulting male characteristics and war fighting (Hudson et al., 2008).

But the argument is difficult to sustain. Goldstein’s comprehensive survey of evidence finds no support for simplistic causalities based on human biology and psychology, emphasising the interaction of biology with culture. Ultimately, he explains, the cross-cultural uniformity in the association of warfare with men is a result of “small, innate biological gender differences in average size, strength, and roughness of play” which combine with the “cultural modeling of tough, brave men, who feminize their enemies to encode domination” (Goldstein, 2001, p. 406). Biology and culture interact to produce a universal pattern and, in a startling reversal of general wisdom, biology emerges as more malleable than culture.

Goldstein’s survey thus gestures towards levels of analysis beyond the individual. A more thoroughly constructivist understanding than his leads to explanations at systemic or structural levels. A long tradition of feminist literature has located the relationship between war and gender at the systemic level and postulated a connection between patriarchy and “the war system” (Reardon, 1985). This type of literature has found the reasons for militarism in various forms of misogyny and suggested that fighting patriarchy is imperative in order to overcome war (e.g., Wasmuht, 2002; Mathis, 2002; Zwingel, 2003; Sjoberg, 2012). Cynthia Cockburn (2010) recently has provided a re-statement of this argument that takes into consideration new developments in feminist theory, including a focus on intersectionality. Taking the standpoint of anti-war feminist movement activists, she suggests that gender relations are one important root cause of war. She rejects individual-level arguments, emphasising that this causality cannot be put on the backs of what individual men and women do. Instead, war is a system in which everyday violence operates on a continuum with military violence, in which militaries and governing ideologies are systemically intertwined,

and in which economic power and ethnic and national power intersect with gender power. She conceptualises militarised masculinities and femininities as emerging from social practices and discourses, insisting that these constructions can be thought of as causal.

Similarly operating on a systemic and structural level, Cynthia Enloe (1989, 1993, 2000, 2010) has perhaps most extensively explored the structuring logic of masculinity and militarism in her large body of writings, making both causal and constitutive arguments. Relentlessly pursuing the question “where are the women” in international affairs, she provides a forceful narrative of the power that is necessary to keep women in their subordinate place and enable militarist and exploitative international politics. Like Cockburn, Enloe takes her cues from feminist anti-militarist networks and talks about patriarchal social orders as “engines of militarization” (2007, p. 15). Yet her single-minded focus on women also leads her beyond simple causality to observe the parallel imbrications of economic and political orders with masculinist and militarist values and the perverse effects of these on marginalised populations.

Taking gender as a social construct has led scholars to explore the specific features of masculinity associated with militarism and war. In his examination of the creation of modern masculinity, George Mosse (1996) diagnoses the entanglement of notions of nationhood, respectability and war with manly virtues such as strong will power, honour and courage. Aggression, ability to suppress emotions, physical strength and risk-taking are other attributes often associated with militarist forms of masculinity, and scholars describe how military training seeks to instil these virtues in soldiers (Goldstein, 2001; Whitworth, 2004). Militarist manliness also is a resource for national identity and for legitimising particular kinds of foreign policy. 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). Canada saw its image as a peacekeeping middle power, shaken by revelations of its troops being involved in human rights violations in Somalia, unveiling peacekeeping missions as race wars that establish the superiority of white nations facing the fear of a feminised Other (Whitworth, 2004; 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; Dudink, 2002). Militarised masculinity thus comes in different forms with an elective affinity and co-constituted with different forms of war, from the nationalist wars of the early 20th century to peacekeeping at century's end (Kronsell and Svedberg, 2012).

But does it make sense to postulate masculinity as contextually produced while at the same time making a causal or constitutive argument about war? If war is the same, then how can changing masculinity explain it? Or, if war isn't the same, what exactly does masculinity explain? These questions give rise to a third fault-line identified in feminist writings about gender and war, that is the problem of *whether militarist masculinity has content or is an empty signifier*. Kimberly Hutchings (2008) suggests that the link between masculinity and war cannot be based on some kind of substantive meaning but must be thought of as purely formal. The link exists because of the relational qualities of the notion of militarist masculinity (standing in opposition to subordinate masculinities and to femininities). The figure of militarist or hegemonic masculinity is thus available to help make war intelligible.

The relational logic that Hutchings suggests, becomes apparent in the opposition between male protectors and feminine "protectees" that feminists have identified as crucially intertwined with military ideology (Stiehm, 1982), fuelling a "logic of masculinist protection" (Young, 2003). In the context of the post-9/11 US, the logic not only served to create new masculine and feminine identities but also a security state "that wages war abroad and expects obedience and loyalty at home" (Young, 2003, p. 2). The logic also has informed humanitarian interventions as international organisations – for example in Srebrenica – have used "women and children" as a proxy for "civilians", legitimising their evacuation although this had disastrous consequences for the men that were left behind as targets for Serb militias (Carpenter, 2003). Helen Kinsella (2005) makes a constitutive argument: the logic of masculinist protection produces the distinction between combatant and civilian through operations of power. Thus, "the structural and productive power of sex and sex difference" is embedded in the laws of war, visible as much in the writings of Grotius as in the Geneva Convention. But this productivity no longer derives from some kind of substantive masculinity; it is powered instead by the relational qualities of gender.

Conceiving of the masculine/feminine and protector/protected oppositions as a priori empty, allows these feminists to move their arguments to a structural level of analysis, in which states are treated as persons, as

is common in International Relations, albeit in a relatively unreflected manner (Wadley, 2010). The interstate system is culturally poor, making it difficult to flesh out meanings of masculinity and femininity at this level. But the empty figures of gender and protection inform performances of statecraft and are productive of state identities developed in the conduct of foreign policy (Campbell, 1998; Weber, 1995). Given these inroads to theorising gender in interstate relations, Elshtain's (2009) argument that feminists have nothing to say beyond the individual level of analysis needs to be firmly rejected.

In sum, feminist writings on the logic of war disagree on whether to focus on the uniformity of women's exclusion from warfare or on making women's agency visible. While some adduce explanations at an individual level of analysis, most feminist writings put forward systemic, structural and post-structural arguments that importantly speak to explanations beyond Lysistrata's sex strike.

## **Gender and the logic of peace**

Security practices changed in the post-Cold War era. Whereas the bi-polar balance of power was the main point of reference for security politics during the Cold War, civil wars and domestic conflicts emerged as primary threats in international relations after the collapse of the Soviet Union. International military interventions under UN auspices proliferated – war was now conducted in order to bring peace. UN peace-making raised the question of how to create the conditions that would preclude a recurrence of destructive conflicts and build the foundations for sustainable development and lasting peace. It also created a space for talking about gender and women in war and peace, making possible a series of Security Council resolutions on the issue. As gender became a matter for security policy, the question of how to change militaries and security apparatuses animated feminist research.

Again I will review three controversies in feminist literature about peace-making, teasing out differences in approaches. The first controversy focuses on the implementation of various Security Council resolutions on women, peace and security, and the extent to which these have generated change or co-opted feminist ideas. The second body of literature investigates the participation of women in peace negotiations and the inclusion of women's needs and rights in peace agreements, making a distinction between research that focuses on women and research that focuses on gender. The third body of literature addresses the issue of sexual violence during war, its reasons, and the ways to



address such violence. This literature opposes those who seek to find the causes for sexual violence by identifying key variables in place during war and feminist researchers who insist that sexual violence in war is a result of patriarchy and a continuation of sexual violence outside war.

The SC resolutions on women, peace and security spawned a body of scholarship monitoring their impact. These studies brought to light the way in which international institutions were gendered, resisting implementation. A recurring theme was to suggest that far-reaching institutional change needed top-level commitment, which was particularly rare in the early years after the adoption of SC 1325 on women, peace and security in 2000. But gender mainstreaming began to be included in peacekeeping mandates, and there were incipient efforts to train militaries. Missions with strong civilian components (that typically included more women) tended to be particularly successful in integrating women (Carey, 2001, Mazurana, 2002). For example, an unusually large number of women participated in the mission in Namibia as a result of a long planning period and of a commitment to professionalism on the part of the mission's leadership, facilitating a highly successful stabilisation process (Olsson, 2001). Beyond adding women, there was also some success in terms of content. In East Timor 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% of seats in the Constituent Assembly and made up 40% of the commissions charged with preparing a new constitution (Whittington, 2003). The mission to Rwanda after the genocide is often cited as particularly successful in terms of including women in post-conflict reconstruction – though there were few at the table during peace negotiations. However, more often, women and gender issues found little resonance in peacekeeping missions, as for example in the mission in Sierra Leone (Hudson, 2009).

Women also remained marginal in peace negotiations. Although references to women increased after the adoption of SC 1325, they were at an unacceptable low rate of just 16% of all agreements analysed between 1990 and 2010, and in many instances the references included reproduced highly stereotypical gender images (Bell and O'Rourke, 2010). Ten years after the adoption of SC 1325 there was considerable critique of efforts to mainstream gender into the security sector. Scholars found a tendency to instrumentalise women and gender for other purposes and for the conversion of feminist knowledge into technologies of power

intended to administer populations and normalise gender and racial identities (Reeves, 2012; Prügl, 2013). They also have documented the re-inscription of traditional gender identities, even in situations where women's inclusion in reconstruction efforts was otherwise successful, such as in Rwanda (Hudson, 2009). In many contexts women were constructed primarily as victims and women fighters systematically excluded from demobilisation programmes (MacKenzie, 2009; Jennings, 2009). But against these critiques some cautioned patience, suggesting that the ideas in SC 1325 amounted to a "norm in the making" that already had made a difference (Tryggstad, 2009).

Feminist literature on *women and gender in peace-making and negotiations* shifts the focus of change from institutions to society more broadly, emphasising in particular the role that women's organisations can play. A study of the peace processes in Burundi and Northern Ireland isolates the causal mechanisms that need to be in place for women's rights to be included in peace agreements: amongst other conditions in place favouring women's inclusion were social movement mobilisation and connections to international feminist networks; women using "strategic essentialism" to overcome ethnic and political divides; and high-level actors supporting women's demands (Anderson, 2010). More broadly, strong women's organisations are a resource for peace. Gizelis (2009) shows that post-conflict peace building under UN auspices was generally more successful in countries where women had higher levels of empowerment before conflict. She argues that this allows them a stronger voice in the peace-making process and allows peacekeepers to tap into greater social capital. Her evidence linking women's empowerment to easier peace-making connects to findings from quantitative studies cited earlier that have demonstrated a consistent correlation between the level of gender inequality in a country and a country's propensity to solve conflicts violently.

Although the focus of these studies is on women, there is an implicit message about gender in the findings. Women's empowerment in a society is a function of gender relations, of the relative positioning of women versus men. Accordingly, understanding the role of women in peace-making requires an understanding of gender relations.

But gender relations also operate directly in peace negotiations, structuring performances, affecting the relative effectiveness of women and men, and influencing the success of negotiations. Men dominate most negotiations. When women enter negotiations they disturb established performances of masculinity and make visible patterns that are otherwise hidden. Some creative new studies have begun to examine these

performances. For example, Maoz designed an experiment amongst her Israeli students to probe the impact of gender in a simulated peace negotiation. She found that when a woman offered a compromise proposal, the opposing party was likely to consider the proposal as more beneficial to its own side than when a man offered the same proposal. The woman offering the proposal was considered to be warmer and more trustworthy, but also significantly less assertive. The perception of lower assertiveness also existed on the side of the woman negotiator, however, explaining why it may be more difficult for women to be entrusted with negotiations (Maoz, 2009).

Another study of the Oslo peace accords explores the role of women in these negotiations empirically. Here women were absent from negotiations about ending violence and drawing boundaries, but they had a strong presence in negotiations about economic arrangements and other “low politics” issues that are typically framed as less important although they are crucial sources of conflict and discontent (Aharoni, 2011). The peace negotiations in this sense interlinked gender constructions with constructing a hierarchy of issues, and continued to associate masculinity with leadership and protection. Women were there in the negotiations but the broad understanding of those interviewed was that there were no women. These studies illustrate that peace negotiations are a significant terrain for “doing gender” (West and Zimmerman, 1987).

The third body of literature linked to the new types of war in the post-Cold War era focuses on the issue of *sexual violence*, an issue that received considerable attention in the aftermath of large-scale systematic rapes in Bosnia and Rwanda.<sup>3</sup> Here as well differences exist between scholars over approaches. Feminists produced much of the early literature on sexual violence in war, emphasising that wartime sexual violence needed to be considered in a continuum with everyday non-war violence against women. Feminist literature on violence in war thus often interrogates how pre-war constructions of masculinity make possible war atrocities and how post-war reconstructions re-inscribe militarism into states and societies (see recently Seifert, 2009; Freedman, 2011). 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 masculinisation/militarisation (Enloe, 2002; Rees, 2002).

Scholars using diverse perspectives have sought to discern patterns of sexual violence in war with very different findings. While Farr (2009)

argues that “extreme war rape” is ubiquitous, Wood (2009) emphasises that not all armed groups engage in sexual violence. She finds endless variation in the forms of violence, in who is targeted, in whether it is perpetrated in groups or by individuals, in private or public, and whether it is symmetric or not, that is whether both parties engage in sexual violence equally (Wood, 2006). While Wood finds no immediate regularities, Farr identifies four preliminary patterns depending on whether the violence is state-led and centralised or field-based and dispersed, and on who is being targeted.

Scholars also have put forward propositions explaining the causes of sexual violence in war, including the fact that such violence is absent in some cases. Wood (2006) joins others to suggest that sexual violence results in part from a loss of control by the leadership of armed forces and in part from norms held by combatants. Her argument complicates that of others who have explained sexual violence amongst government forces through a principal-agent model, suggesting that where arrangements are in place to hold soldiers accountable and where there is control from superiors (i.e., the “principals”), soldiers will be less likely to engage in sexual violence (Butler et al., 2007). Against this idea of losing control, Leiby (2009) recalls in addition that sexual violence may be a matter of strategy, that is, an instrument of war deployed to weaken the opposition, gather intelligence or organise genocide and ethnic cleansing.

An interesting feature of all these explanations is that they entirely disregard feminist arguments about the continuity between wartime and peace-time violence. Wood (2006, p. 328) dismisses the argument because she finds that it cannot account for variation in the behaviour of armed groups: whereas masculine notions of honour are pervasive, sexual violence is not. But her reasoning misunderstands the feminist argument. In this approach militarist masculinity is not an accomplished identity that causes sexual violence. Instead it is an ideal that men are encouraged to aspire to and that they seek to perform. As Skjelsbaek (2001) has argued, gender matters in explaining sexual violence, not because of some essentialist characteristic of men or because of some structurally static position that women find themselves in. Sexual violence is perpetrated on both women and men, and in the process the victim is feminised and the perpetrator masculinised. The point is illustrated in a study of members of an armed group involved in mass rapes in the Democratic Republic of Congo (Baaz and Stern, 2009), which explains these rapes as linked to an inability to live up to various “impossible” masculinities. Men are expected to be sexually potent

fighters and they are expected to be family providers; yet a dearth of resources prevents them from being either. Though the men interviewed recognised that at least some rapes are “evil”, they were able to explain them away by reference to their lack of money, necessary to gain access to women either as girlfriends or as wives. Rapes in this way prop up certain idealised masculinities; gender becomes an effect rather than a cause of sexual violence.

## Conclusion

Although this review is partial and excludes much, I hope I have shown the large variety and richness of feminist interventions in International Relations and their relevance for development. I also hope to have shown that feminist interventions are not cut from one cloth. There is considerable variety in approaches: in the conceptualisation of gender and in the level of analysis targeted. It also should have become clear that feminist arguments about the way in which gender matters to logics of war and peace are most convincing when gender is understood as a grid for performance, and masculinity and femininity as empty signifiers that need to be filled with meaning in contexts. As soon as gender is essentialised, as soon as masculinities and femininities are made static, gender analysis in IR runs into trouble.

Ironically, it is precisely studies that freeze gender and treat it as a variable that have had the most impact in development practice and IR. Quantitative research showing a correlation between gender equality and peaceful conflict resolution, and comparative studies isolating the causes of sexual violence neatly map onto the positivist mainstream of IR. They also offer a ready-made prescription for development interventions: increase gender equality and you will reduce the likelihood of violent conflict. Gender equality then becomes an instrument for other goals, the intensely conflictual character of gender politics reduced to a technical problem.

Feminists seeking to contribute to IR and development thus face a number of challenges: they need to overcome the methodological barrier that prohibits taking into account the performative character of gender; they need to face squarely the pernicious tendency in development to make gender into an instrument for the reduction of conflict; and they need to resist the taming of gender politics into a matter of governmental administration. The richness of feminist contributions to understanding the relationship between security and development is promising in light of these challenges.

## Notes

1. Universalising assertions have favoured false propositions about women being unfit for international politics, such as Francis Fukuyama (1998) arguing that women cannot run the world because as long as there are men, women's peaceful inclinations cannot counter manly aggression (for critiques see Tickner, 1999; Ehrenreich et al., 1999).
2. Some have speculated that militaries will change "if service is no longer a way to demonstrate manhood" (Stiehm, 1989, p. 7). But Eifler (2002) suggests that both the US and Russian militaries have found new ways of "doing gender" that have secured women's exclusion and marginalisation, the Russians by locking women into short-term labour contracts that supposedly are to be applied to men as well in the future, and the Americans through combat exclusion.
3. The revelation that peacekeepers were involved in sex trafficking in Bosnia brought attention to the problem. Sex trafficking and prostitution in peacekeeping contexts remain rampant (Prügl and Thompson, 2013).

## References

- Aharoni, S. 2011. Gender and "Peace-work": An Unofficial History of the Israeli–Palestinian Formal Peace Negotiations, *Politics and Gender*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 391–416.
- Anderson, M. J. 2010. Transnational Feminisms and Norm Diffusion in Peace Processes: The Cases of Burundi and Northern Ireland, *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, Vol. 4, No. 1, March, pp. 1–21.
- Bell, C. and O'Rourke, C. 2010. Peace Agreements or Pieces of Paper? The Impact of UNSC Resolution 1325 on Peace Processes and Their Agreements, *International Comparative Law Quarterly*, Vol. 59, October, pp. 941–980.
- Butler, C. K., Gluch, T. and Mitchell, N. J. 2007. Security Forces and Sexual Violence: A Cross-National Analysis of a Principal-Agent Argument, *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 44, No. 6, pp. 669–687.
- Campbell, D. 1998. *Writing Security: United State Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*, 2nd edn. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Caprioli, M. 2000. Gendered Conflict, *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 53–68.
- Caprioli, M. 2003. Gender Equality and State Aggression: The Impact of Domestic Gender Equality on State First Use of Force, *International Interactions*, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 195–214.
- Caprioli, M. 2005. Primed for Violence: The Role of Gender Inequality in Predicting Internal Conflict, *International Studies Quarterly*, No. 49, pp. 161–178.
- Caprioli, M. Boyer, M. 2001. Gender, Violence, and International Crisis, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 45, No. 4, pp. 503–518.
- Carey, H. F. 2001. Women and Peace and Security: The Politics of Implementing Gender Sensitivity Norms in Peacekeeping. In L. Olsson and T. L. Trygggestad (eds), *Women and International Peacekeeping*. London: Frank Cass, pp. 49–68.
- Carpenter, R. C. 2003. Women and Children First: Gender, Norms and Humanitarian Evacuation in the Balkans 1991–95, *International Organization*, Vol. 57, No. 4, pp. 661–694.

- Clausewitz, C. von 1984[1832]. *On War*, M. Howard and P. Paret (eds) New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Cockburn, C. 2010. Gender Relations as Causal in Militarization and War: A Feminist Standpoint, *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Vol. 12, No. 2, June, pp. 139–157.
- Cockburn, C. and Zarkov, D. (eds) 2002. *The Postwar Moment: Militaries, Masculinities and International Peacekeeping. Bosnia and the Netherlands*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- De Leeuw, M. 2002. A Gentlemen's Agreement: Srebrenica in the Context of Dutch War History. In C. Cockburn and D. Zarkov (eds), *The Postwar Moment: Militaries, Masculinities and International Peacekeeping*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, pp. 162–182.
- Dudink, S. 2002. The Unheroic Men of a Moral Nation: Masculinity and Nation in Modern Dutch History. In C. Cockburn and D. Zarkov (eds), *The Postwar Moment: Militaries, Masculinities and International Peacekeeping*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, pp. 146–161.
- Ehrenreich, B., Pollit, K., Ferguson, R. B., Tiger, L. and Jaquette, J. S. 1999. Fukuyama's Follies: So What, if Women Ruled the World? *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 78, No. 1, pp. 118–122.
- Eifler, C. 2002. Soldatin – ein neuer Job für Frauen? Geschlechterkonstruktionen im Vergleich USA, BRD und Russland. In C. Harders and B. Roß (eds), *Geschlechterverhältnisse in Krieg und Frieden: Perspektiven der feministischen Analyse internationaler Beziehungen*. Opladen, Germany: Leske and Budrich, pp. 163–172.
- Elshtain, J. B. 2009. Woman, the State, and War, *International Relations*, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 289–303.
- Enloe, C. 1989. *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Enloe, C. 1993. *The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Enloe, C. 2000. *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Enloe, C. 2002. Demilitarization – Or More of the Same? Feminist Questions to Ask in the Postwar Moment. In C. Cockburn and D. Zarkov (eds), *The Postwar Moment: Militaries, Masculinities and International Peacekeeping*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, pp. 22–32.
- Enloe, C. 2007. *Globalization and Militarism: Feminists Make the Link*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Enloe, C. 2010. *Nimo's War, Emma's War*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Eriksson Baaz, M. and Stern, M. 2009. Why Do Soldiers Rape? Masculinity, Violence, and Sexuality in the Armed Forces in the Congo (DRC), *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 53, No. 4, pp. 495–518.
- Farr, K. 2009. Extreme War Rape in Today's Civil-War-Torn States: A Contextual and Comparative Analysis, *Gender Issues*, No. 26, pp. 1–41.
- Foucault, M. 2003. *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–76*. New York: Picador.
- Freedman, J. 2011. Explaining Sexual Violence and Gender Inequalities in the DRC, *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice*, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 170–175.

- Fukuyama, F. 1998. Women and the Evolution of World Politics, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 77, No. 5, pp. 24–40.
- Gizelis, T.-I. 2009. Gender Empowerment and United Nations Peacebuilding, *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 46, No. 4, pp. 505–523.
- Goldstein, J. 2001. *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hudson, H. 2009. Peacebuilding Through a Gender Lens and the Challenges of Implementation in Rwanda and Côte d'Ivoire, *Security Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 287–318.
- Hudson, V. M., Caprioli, M., Ballif-Spanvill, B., McDermott, R. and Emmett, C. F. 2008/09. The Heart of the Matter: The Security of Women and the Security of States, *International Security*, Vol. 33, No. 3, Winter, pp. 7–45.
- Hutchings, K. 2008. Making Sense of Masculinity and War, *Men and Masculinities*, Vol. 10, No. 4, June, pp. 389–404.
- Jennings, K. M. 2009. The Political Economy of DDR in Liberia: A Gendered Critique, *Conflict, Security & Development*, Vol. 9, No. 4, December, pp. 475–494.
- Kinsella, H. 2005. Securing the Civilian: Sex and Gender in the Laws of War. In M. N. Barnett and R. Duvall (eds), *Power and Global Governance*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kronsell, A. and Svedberg, E. (eds) 2012. *Making Gender, Making War: Violence, Military and Peacekeeping Practices*. New York: Routledge.
- Leiby, M. L. 2009. Wartime Sexual Violence in Guatemala and Peru, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 53, No. 2, pp. 445–468.
- MacKenzie, M. 2009. Securitization and Desecuritization: Female Soliders and the Reconstruction of Women in Post-Conflict Sierra Leone, *Security Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 241–261.
- Maoz, I. 2009. The Women and Peace Hypothesis? The Effect of Opponent Negotiators' Gender on the Evaluation of Compromise Solutions in the Israeli–Palestinian Conflict, *International Negotiation*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 519–536.
- Mathis, S. 2002. Ein- und Aus-Blicke feministischer Friedensarbeit. In C. Harders and B. Roß (eds), *Geschlechterverhältnisse in Krieg und Frieden: Perspektiven der feministischen Analyse internationaler Beziehungen*. Opladen: Leske & Budrich, pp. 105–119.
- Mazurana, D. 2002. International Peacekeeping Operations: To Neglect Gender is to Risk Peacekeeping Failure. In C. Cockburn and D. Zarkov (eds), *The Postwar Moment: Militaries, Masculinities and International Peacekeeping*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, pp. 41–50.
- McEvoy, S. 2009. Loyalist Women Paramilitaries in Northern Ireland: Beginning a Feminist Conversation about Conflict Resolution, *Security Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 262–286.
- Mosse, G. L. 1996. *The Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Niva, S. 1998. Tough and Tender: New World Order Masculinity and the Gulf War. In M. Zalewski and J. Parpart (eds), *The "Man" Question in International Relations*. Boulder: Westview Press, pp. 109–128.
- Olsson, L. 2001. Gender Mainstreaming in Practice: The United Nations Transitional Assistance Group in Namibia. In L. Olsson and T. L. Tryggestad (eds), *Women and International Peacekeeping*. London: Frank Cass, pp. 97–110.



- Parashar, S. 2009. Feminist International Relations and Women Militants: Case Studies from Sri Lanka and Kashmir, *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, Vol. 22, No. 2, June, pp. 235–256.
- Prügl, E. 2013. Gender Expertise as Feminist Strategy. In G. Caglar, E. Prügl and S. Zwingel (eds), *Feminist Strategies in International Governance*. London: Routledge, pp. 57–73.
- Prügl, E. and Thompson, H. 2013. The Whistleblower: Interview with Kathryn Bolkovac and Madeleine Rees, *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 102–109.
- Puechguirbal, N. 2003. Women and War in the Democratic Republic of Congo, *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, Vol. 28, No. 4, Summer, pp. 1271–1281.
- Razack, S. H. 2004. *Dark Threats and White Knights: The Somalia Affair, Peacekeeping and the New Imperialism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Reardon, B. 1985. *Sexism and the War System*. New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Rees, M. 2002. International Intervention in Bosnia-Herzegovina: The Cost of Ignoring Gender. In C. Cockburn and D. Zarkov (eds), *The Postwar Moment: Militarities, Masculinities and International Peacekeeping*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, pp. 51–67.
- Reeves, A. 2012. Feminist Knowledge and Emerging Governmentality in UN Peacekeeping, *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 348–369.
- Regan, P. M. and Paskeviciute, A. 2003. Women's Access to Politics and Peaceful States, *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 40, No. 3, pp. 287–302.
- Seifert, R. 2009. Armed Conflicts, Post-War Reconstruction and Gendered Subjectivities. In C. Eifler and R. Seifert (eds), *Gender Dynamics and Post-conflict Reconstruction*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 21–48.
- Sjoberg, L. 2012. Gender Hierarchy, International Structure, and the Causes of War, *International Theory*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 1–38.
- Sjoberg, L. and Gentry, C. E. 2007. *Mothers, Monsters, Whores: Women's Violence in Global Politics*. New York: Zed Books.
- Skjelsbaek, I. 2001. Sexual Violence and War: Mapping Out a Complex Relationship, *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 211–237.
- Stiehm, J. H. 1982. The Protected, the Protector, the Defender, *Women's Studies International Forum*, Vol. 2, No. 3–4, pp. 367–376.
- Stiehm, J. H. 1989. *Arms and the Enlisted Woman*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Tessler, M. and Warriner, I. 1997. Gender, Feminism, and Attitudes toward International Conflict, *World Politics*, Vol. 49, No. 2, pp. 250–281.
- Tétreault, M. A. (ed.) 1994. *Women and Revolution in Africa, Asia, and the New World*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- The Women's Memorial 2011. Statistics on Women in the Military. <http://www.womensmemorial.org/Press/stats.html>. Accessed 30 August 2012.
- Tickner, J. A. 1999. Why Women Can't Run the World: International Politics According to Francis Fukuyama, *International Studies Review*, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 1–12.
- Tryggestad, T. 2009. Trick or Treat? The UN and Implementation of Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace, and Security, *Global Governance*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 539–557.

- Wadley, J. D. 2010. Gendering the State: Performativity and Protection in International Security. In L. Sjöberg (ed.), *Gender and International Security: Feminist Perspectives*. London: Routledge, pp. 38–58.
- Waltz, K. N. 1959. *Man, the State, and War: A Theoretical Analysis*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wasmuht, U. C. 2002. Warum bleiben Kriege gesellschaftsfähig? Zum weiblichen Gesicht des Krieges. In C. Harders and B. Roß (eds), *Geschlechterverhältnisse in Krieg und Frieden: Perspektiven der feministischen Analyse internationaler Beziehungen*. Opladen, Germany: Leske and Budrich, pp. 87–103.
- Weber, C. 1995. *Simulating Sovereignty: Intervention, the State, and Symbolic Exchange*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- West, C. and Zimmerman, D. H. 1987. Doing Gender, *Gender and Society*, Vol. 1, No. 2, June, pp. 125–151.
- Whittington, S. 2003. Gender and Peacekeeping: The United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor, *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, Vol. 28, No. 4, Summer, pp. 1283–1288.
- Whitworth, S. 2004. *Men, Militarism and UN Peacekeeping: A Gendered Analysis*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Wood, E. J. 2006. Variation in Sexual Violence during War, *Politics & Society*, Vol. 34, No. 3, September, pp. 307–341.
- Wood, E. J. 2009. Armed Groups and Sexual Violence: When is Wartime Rape Rare? *Politics & Society*, Vol. 37, No. 1, March, pp. 131–162.
- Young, I. M. 2003. The Logic of Masculinist Protection: Reflections on the Current Security State, *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 1–25.
- Zarkov, D. 2002. Srebrenica Trauma: Masculinity, Military and National Self-Image in Dutch Daily Newspapers. In C. Cockburn and D. Zarkov (eds), *The Postwar Moment: Militaries, Masculinities and International Peacekeeping*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, pp. 183–203.
- Zwingel, S. 2003. Männer und Kinder zuerst. Über die Notwendigkeit von Geschlechterkonstruktionen zur Legitimierung und Durchführung von Kriegen. In S. Albrecht, W. Goldschmidt and G. Stuby (eds), *Die Welt zwischen Recht und Gewalt: Internationale Sozialordnung, Völkerrecht und Demokratie*, Hamburg (Germany): VSA-Verlag.