

Human Security: Does Gender Matter?

By Diana Sarosi

Introduction

“O Lord why have you not given woman the right to conquer her destiny – why does she have to wait, head bowed by the roadside, waiting with tired patience, hoping for a miracle on the morrow? Rabindranath Tagore said this at the beginning of the millennium. The millennium has drawn to a close – today we are not waiting for a miracle, the miracle is within us.”¹

Rather than diminishing threats to world peace, the end of the Cold War has brought about new and complex ones. Over the past decade, major global forces have emerged that are undermining peace and security. The neo-liberal model and market-driven policies have exacerbated poverty, food insecurity and exclusion of the majority, while increasing the wealth and economic opportunities, and thus over-consumption, of the privileged few. At the same time, the world is becoming increasingly dangerous due to unilateral military intervention and communal and ethnic violence. Increasingly, human security, particularly that of groups traditionally considered excluded from combat both as participants and targets, namely women and children, has become threatened. Today, it is claimed that approximately 75 percent of all war-deaths are civilian and in part this is because they have become targets of war activities.² The conflict in Southern Thailand proves as a valuable example to highlight the change in nature of today’s conflicts and its impact on civilians, including women and children. In the South of Thailand, civilian casualties constitute nearly 90 percent of the total of more than 2400 deaths and 4000 injuries since January 2004.³

The concept of human security emerged from a shift in the nature of the modern security system from the nation-state as both an actor and guarantor of peace and security towards a more comprehensive and multi-layered framework of various actors and levels of action. While this framework termed around notions of participation and empowerment can open up opportunities for innovative efforts to deliver security by reducing risks and vulnerability, sustainable peace requires a more permanent transformation of social norms around violence, gender and power. While it is important to include women into the analysis of insecurities and corresponding responses, especially during and after violent conflicts, it is equally important to understand the impact of gender differences on the origins and dynamics of these insecurities. There is a need to question how belief and myths around gender play an important part in creating, maintaining and ending discriminatory relationships fuelling insecurity, violence and war. The focus on gender should not only be limited to programs set out to augment human security but should also take the gendered nature of the international system and its agents and frameworks into account.

Women and Conflict

In situations of conflict, women’s lives can be reshaped by several aspects. In regards to their victimization, women suffer extremely high rates of injury and death

through systematic violence and displacement. Men and women die different deaths and are tortured and abused in different ways due to physical differences and the different meanings culturally ascribed to the male and female body. The brutality to the body in wars is where the most marked sex difference occurs.⁴

Besides being victims, women take on a variety of roles in conflicts. To name a few, women live through wars as fighters, community leaders, social organizers, workers, farmers, welfare providers, household heads, teachers, and peacemakers. These diverse women's activities and new experiences in the course of conflict have social, political, and economic consequences. They have an empowering effect as women gain more social and political skills and may also challenge traditional gender stereotypes as they take on non-traditional roles.

For some women, war can be experienced as liberating and may start a feminist awakening which leads them to demand changes in post-war societal constructions. Many women yearn for public identities serving ends that take them beyond the borders of private lives.⁵ Involvement in women's cooperatives or movements to manage basic survival needs has the positive effect of encouraging political subjectivity and empowerment.⁶ Women become civic beings through their involvement in women's organizations. Women in these organizations often speak of how their participation has changed their lives, expanded their awareness of unjust structures of society and given them new self-esteem.⁷

It is a paradox that war offers opportunities for women to transform their lives in terms of their image of themselves, their behaviour towards men and towards their elders, and their ability to live independently.⁸ Women exercise agency, in various ways, in the pursuit of self-identified goals, demonstrating that their lack of formal power does not deprive them of their capabilities and resilience.⁹ They are a heterogeneous group of social actors, who on the one hand are determined to take on certain positions and roles in conflicts, but on the other hand deliberately choose to fulfill certain roles based on their strategies and goals. Women must thus not only be seen as passive victims of armed conflict, but as capable actors as well. In spite of their suffering, women have benefited from the windows of opportunity that conflict situations offer them as positions have improved during conflict as a result of an expansion of their economic and political responsibilities.

In the case of Southern Thailand women's lives have been shaped in profound ways. In terms of victimization, women and children have been targets of attacks, particularly school teachers and health workers. Reports of rape and sexual violence are on the rise. Violence has destroyed families. Men, who are generally household heads and income generators, have fallen victim to violent attacks, recruitment by militant groups and arbitrary arrests. Many more have fled to avoid these situations. This has forced women to take on the role of household heads. Income generation poses problematic for single mothers or widows who either do not have the skills and resources needed to generate income for their families or are reportedly being shunned from communities due to suspicion and fear. The brunt of poverty has therefore been felt the most by widows and in turn has led to increased displacement leaving them dependent and without protection. At the same time, poverty restricts their freedom to advocate for their rights and needs. As survival becomes of highest priority, little time and energy is left to pursue other activities.

Women have chosen to take on certain positions and roles in the conflict based on their self-identified strategies and goals. While some women have chosen to fill the ranks of militant groups, others were determined to facilitate and assist nonviolent peace and reconciliation efforts. One consequence of the conflict has been the creation of specific civil society organizations empowering locals, strengthening their capacity, and mobilizing efforts to advocate for peace, nonviolence and demilitarization. In many cases women play a central role in these activities. Moreover, networks of women have formed at the community level providing assistance to victims of the conflict to better cope with new and old hardships and insecurities. Women extend support to various individuals and groups to deal with legal, economic and psychosocial challenges.

Individual and groups of women have actively pursued the defense of human rights. Whether in the form of public protest or negotiations with local and national authorities, women have transcended their private sphere of activity, previously prescribed to them. Women face greater and different risks when defending their rights. Social pressures to remain in the private sphere threaten their space and right of activism. Moreover, the politicization of religion has enforced a group mentality where people are no longer humans with individual needs and rights but rather part of a certain essentialist identity group, Malay Muslim or Thai Buddhist, in need of defense further exacerbating division and undermining human rights and reconciliation.

Gender and Patriarchy

Gender refers to the social roles and relations between men and women. Hence, gender is not only about women as is sometimes wrongly assumed, but in fact denotes all qualities of what it is to be either a man or a woman.¹⁰ Reiman identifies three aspects of gender: individual gender identity, the symbolism of gender, and the structure of gender.¹¹ The first aspect refers to the construction of meanings determining one's individual identity based on social norms. Masculinity is often linked with violence as it denotes egotistical, aggressive, and dominant behaviour. Femininity, on the other hand, entails the opposite qualities of peacefulness and selflessness. Hence, an assumption prevails that women seek non-confrontational methods of conflict resolution, are willing to work for the good of the collective or are simply passive. Norms are often unexamined as they are represented as natural, biological, and confirmed in history.¹² Hence, it is presumed true that all men and women possess the above qualities. However, in reality, gender relations do not only vary across history and culture but also amongst women and men within a society. Gender relationships are always affected by other sources of identity and inequality such as ethnicity, class and race.

The symbolism of gender leads to the "classification of stereotypical gender-dualisms by different dichotomies."¹³ This means that men and women are assigned different gender roles based on their gender identity. Gender roles are determined and in turn reinforce the public/political and private/home divide. The perpetuation of this division is maintaining the differentiation between men and women where only men are perceived as abstract and political individuals. Women, on the other hand, are confined to the private sphere which is assumed apolitical. The fact that the political sphere is defined as masculine in a profound sense, aids the exclusion of women from that sphere. Women are prescribed roles typical of the home, i.e. mothers, carers, nurturers.

Lastly, the structure of gender defines the organization and institutionalization of social action in the public and private spheres based on the above gender dualism.¹⁴ Ultimately, gender identities and roles are embedded in institutions and practices. Gender is a relationship of power which affects all areas of human/societal life. It includes the way in which society differentiates access to power for women and men.¹⁵ What this means for our understanding of gender is that gender relations have to be understood as complex hidden and open power symmetries that result in unequal power relations between men and women.¹⁶ In practice, the power symmetries result in patterns in which women are generally disadvantaged in comparison to men. All of the three categories are closely connected and interwoven. A change in any one of the three categories will result in changes of the other two.

In all societies the gender relations between women and men tend to be clearly to the disadvantage of women.¹⁷ They encompass different scopes for action, as for example, different possibilities for making choices, different rights and decision making powers. As gendered actors, individuals shape the very norms, values, and societal structures which restrict their autonomy of action. Therefore it is important to notice that not only individuals' identities are gendered, but also cultural norms and values, as well as social institutions and organizations.

The seminal theoretical contribution of feminist scholarship to social theory has been to place patriarchy firmly as a central category in social theorizing and analysis. Miller defines patriarchy as "that system of reciprocal social obligations in which final authority rests with the older men of the kinship collective who exercise that authority over its individual male and female members in the overall interest of the collective."¹⁸ This definition includes genealogy, gender and generation and holds that recognition of genealogy is critical to understanding the complexities of patriarchy and gender. While the gender and generation elements relate mainly to internal relations of the collective, the genealogy element defines its external boundaries and relations. Within patriarchy, women are marginalized in the internal relations of the kinship collective.

This definition brings home the point that the essence of patriarchy involves not only the marginalization of women within the kinship collective, but also that of men of unrelated collectives. The genealogy element explains why non-kin men are seen as potential threats and possible enemies.¹⁹ This definition of patriarchy implies that gender cannot be understood or interpreted solely in terms of men's domination of women. To understand gender as being synonymous with women is to misconstrue or misinterpret the concept of patriarchy. Gender operates in conjunction with the other social criteria according to which societies are organized.

State bureaucracies, security services and international bodies all tend to be structured and function according to norms of masculinity.²⁰ They tend to be hierarchical in structure, and to militate against cooperative and consultative working patterns, and to encourage individualistic, competitive behaviour. They also typically have top-down leadership and management styles to match. Such institutions are also seen to depend on differences between women and men's economic and political roles remaining in place. Moreover, they are being reinforced by the active use of symbols of masculinity and femininity, where the images of success and achievement tend to be those associated with masculine images of force and strength.

The dominance of patriarchy is evident in most societies, particularly those that are in conflict. There, importance is placed on mastering fear, training to fight and defend, and increasingly looking towards military-based solutions to conflict.²¹ The conflicts describe violent struggles for resources (land, trade, women, children, labour, natural resources, cultural identity and access to state power). Violence leads to and is generated by poverty, humiliation, frustration, loss of livelihood, failures of governance, political manipulation, and breakdown of inter-communal relations (trade links, shared labour/production arrangements, intermarriage). Gender differences, within and between groups, are threaded through all these and the distorted, threatened gender ideologies used to justify these differences generally encourage aggressiveness and revenge.²²

The Discourse of Violence

Dominant groups maintain hegemony for the most part by discursive means rather than by direct force, mobilizing consent by inclining us towards particular identifications.²³ According to Fetherston “the power of discourse is to render ‘right,’ ‘legitimate,’ ‘taken-for-granted,’ ‘natural’ specific ways of knowing, acting and organizing social life. More precisely, ‘it makes real’ that which it prescribes as meaningful.”²⁴ This rendering of ‘right’ silences other possibilities. Discourse sets the limits of critique especially in the sense, that it “... constructs narratives that tell us unambiguously, what the varied and changing events of history must be taken to mean.”²⁵

Theories and practices of conflict and conflict resolution are constituted within a problematic discourse of violence. According to Fetherston, this discourse of violence is central to the functioning of an “unproblematized discourse of modernity.”²⁶ The knowledge this discourse produces is rational, universal and permanent as “the end project of modernity is total knowledge, total power, total enlightenment, the end of history, and simultaneously the end of difference. Thus such work as Fukiyama’s *The End of History* proclaims among other things, the triumph of liberalism/democracy/capitalism as the way to organize social life.”²⁷

The modern project privileges the rational knowing subject and in doing so a world of the ‘other’ is both generated and silenced.²⁸ ‘Rational’ is legitimized at the same time that everything else, labeled ‘irrational’, is othered, deligitimized, and set outside the bounds of discourse. The unknown and uncontrollable, are made separate from our own lives. Jabri has argued “that this ‘othering’ of violence makes its practice separate from ourselves, thus, silencing ways in which we are part of a discourse of violence that supports, legitimizes, and normalizes war.”²⁹ War and other forms of violence, from Jabri’s perspective, are rational, part of our everyday lives, of social activity, institutions, structures, and are constituted and constituting of social meaning. Violence lives and becomes fixed into social meanings. The irrationality of violence and the psycho-social effects it inflicts do not just come and then go. Instead, the irrationality of violence becomes part of everyday life. The fear, insecurity, and violence of death, torture, disappearances, and rape become ‘normal’ and ‘natural.’³⁰

Violence is hidden behind complex discussions of institutional policies, formal strategies, and ultimate goals. Violence is marginalized to arenas removed from the dynamics of daily life. Violence is thus effectively ‘othered’.³¹ But violence is a cultural

construct, as are the theories intended to explain it. In understanding cultures of violence, or discourses of violence, we need to understand the broader context. Networks of institutions, structures, social meanings need to be analyzed in a globalized/globalizing sense.³² What this perspective provides is a means of seeing the ‘everydayness’ of a war zone as not a special case outside the norm but rather as an outcome of international and domestic structures, institutions, and ways of life that are fundamentally based on repression.

Cultures of Militarization

Violent conflicts we label ‘internal’ or ‘regional’, far from being particular expressions of unique conditions and specific tensions, are strongly influenced by cultures of militarization operating throughout the world. A significant amount of information, strategy, supplies, weapons, and personnel is transferred among like-minded military and paramilitary organizations.³³ Wars are dependent on these international networks – public and private; political, military, and civilian; legal and illegal.

The linchpins of the majority of today’s armed conflicts are the legacies of colonialism and Cold War rivalries, and the presence of adaptive political economies and war economies.³⁴ The formal economies of weak or disintegrating states are increasingly vulnerable to challenges and replacement by adaptive political economies. These economies are extra-legal, violent and have gender specific impacts. As the economic power of those controlling extra-legal economies grows, new economic and political networks arise, including warlords, powerful heads of armed forces, dictators, international mafias and ethno-nationalist regimes. In such situations, it is the presence of instability, armed conflict and control through violence, fear and selective reward systems that enable certain individuals and groups to maintain economic and political power. Instability, mass displacement and ethnic and gendered forms of violence are not unfortunate by-products of today’s conflicts, but the tools and the goal.

The impact of war on future generations, with the vision of a permanently militarized society as children grow up in violence, is a massive challenge. Conflict exacerbates tensions and inequalities between communities and between generations. Cycles of violence perpetuate themselves over generations. The enactment of violence is itself modal and transformative as it is a practice that transforms society as it takes place. Violence carries extensive social, political, economic and cultural ramifications that permeate not only the military, but the whole of civil life. Torturing or killing one person is not an act intended to destroy one body, but one intended to destabilize a whole body politic.³⁵

Militarization is a package of ideas consisting of assumptions, values and beliefs.³⁶ Militaristic core beliefs are a) that armed force is the ultimate resolver of tensions; b) that human nature is prone to conflict; c) that having enemies is a natural condition; d) that hierarchical relations produce effective action; e) that a state without a military is naïve, scarcely modern and barely legitimate; f) that in times of crisis those who are feminine need armed protection; and g) that in times of crisis any man who refuses to engage in armed violent action is jeopardizing his own status as a manly man. Occasionally these beliefs are put under public scrutiny and examined; often though, they are left unproblematized, as if they were ‘natural.’ But militarization is not in itself an

ideology. It is a socio-political process based on the perpetuation of certain masculinities and the roots of which are driven deep down into the soil of a society, a NGO, a governmental department, an ethnic group or international agency. The forms of violence used and the ways in which perpetrators carry out these violent acts are all dependent on the gender of the victim, the gender of the perpetrator and the gender relations in the society and culture. Sexual torture, rape, sexual slavery and enforced pregnancy are used as weapons to attack the women and men individually, and their cultural identity as a whole. These actions are not ‘unnatural,’ ‘irrational,’ or ‘barbaric,’ but are deliberate, calculated strategies.³⁷

The relationship between gender, patriarchy, violence and militarization can be illustrated by looking at the case of Southern Thailand. The population of Southern Thailand has increasingly been left out of the gains in global trade and investment. As the economy has weakened, even while becoming more integrated into the global economy, the capacity of and rationale for government leaders to respond to the people’s needs and implement effective governance diminished. New forms of political and social structures emerged led by militant separatists, heads of criminal networks and paramilitary forces, often working in complicity with government authority. These forces pay little respect to norms of accountability, international standards of human rights or participatory or representative processes and institutions. They deliberately create unstable situations in order to consolidate power and gain maximum economic profit from unregulated and uncontested access to legitimate assets such as rubber, gas and daily needs of living. Profitable trafficking in illicit goods, such as human beings, drugs and small arms, flourishes under these circumstances. These are the new forms of mal-governance where protection and access to resources are distributed according to allegiances to militia groups or extorted in exchange for protection from other predatory forces. Evidently, under these conditions of instability women and children suffer the most.

The impact of militarism on communities in Southern Thailand, exacerbated by the availability of small arms, has had serious consequences for women and children. Families are destroyed through death and injuries, robberies and raids have become more deadly, and traditional forms of community authority have been undermined as young members acquire arms and can set themselves up independently from the disciplining and governance of elders. One of the most compromised categories of women are widows. Culture, traditions and national legislation help to reinforce certain behaviours and discriminatory practices against widows. Widows of all ages form an invisible underclass of asset-less, unprotected and often exploited individuals.

As struggles of power and authority exacerbate communal division among religious lines, the means and goal of the creation of instability, the danger arises that gender based violence becomes a critical weapon of warfare. Women are subjected to specific forms of violence in war because, as women, they are viewed as cultural bearers and reproducers of “the enemy.” Rape, forced impregnation, sexual slavery and other forms of humiliation take on powerful political and symbolic meanings.

Engendering Human Security

A gendered and generational perspective of human security entails a more nuanced understanding of what people’s own perspectives of human insecurity might

encompass. It emphasizes addressing how women, children, adolescents, and the elderly, disabled and socially marginalized groups in any given society experience insecurity and risk. While human security's emphasis on the individual is laudable, it requires a more radical understanding of the complexity of today's crises and the ways in which both local and international factors are shaping the particular risks that communities and especially women are facing. Most specifically, it entails recognizing where and why new forms of power, control and authority are taking shape and how they are expressing themselves.

The almost exclusive focus of NGO work and academic research on the impact of conflict on women has obscured the complex nature and dynamics of gender and its relevance to conflict and human security.³⁸ There is a need to consider how the women, peace and security agenda is produced and located in the global networks of bureaucratic power. Women are governed – they are included or excluded, assimilated or appropriated, depending on the varying needs of the peace and security projects as defined by the intervening agencies. Little notice has been given to the idea of these agencies and particularly state agencies as “cultural producers that create aspects of the worlds that they act on.”³⁹ Thus, it must be examined how the women and security agenda is being formed and reformed into the already constituted and historically specific project of peace and security. Instead of trying to figure out how we can make intervening agencies do their jobs better by incorporating gender, we need to ask a larger set of questions.

Not only are women's needs and threats to security continually ignored, in actuality, the fundamental problem of the women and security agenda is that it embodies women as a resource evident through references made to women as “the untapped resources.”⁴⁰ The Women, Peace and Security agenda proposes that women are an international, national and local resource in the context of the global economy of peace and security. Framed as a ‘resource,’ the skills of women are selected out and the relevant points about women are highlighted as the kinds of skills and requirements the intervening agencies specified in their larger project for peace and security.

The problem with this framing is that women's involvement is based on their use value (i.e., as peacemakers) rather than on their basic human right.⁴¹ The framing of women as peacemakers and therefore as a resource influences the conditions for women's participation and creates a criterion for involvement. In the growing market of peace and security, women are being organized according to their skills. They become a commodity that can be used and/or exchanged. This way the human security of women may not start to be determined by what they want as by what the intervening agencies require for their project of peace and security. In this sense, it is important to be aware when the implicit requirements of the agencies come to take precedence over women's practices and needs.

The framing of women as a ‘resource’ is fundamentally problematic in that women are now in danger of becoming the new “practical solutions” to peace and security ‘problems.’⁴² In this framework women can be understood not just as resources with certain capacities and skills but also as “resources in need of modification, adaptation and change over time, depending on the demands.”⁴³ The key is that despite the proliferation of ideas of including women, the power to define, limit and include women still lies in the hands of the dominant group. In many cases today, the power and the choice whether or not to accept certain women, to include them or not, still lies in the

hands of the few. Thus women are being managed where particular women are being allowed into the social space but at the same time limiting and defining who, when and how women will be included.⁴⁴

Although gender mainstreaming has become common practice within the international peace and security community, evidence indicates that many of the institutional frameworks and their implementation continue to fail to address underlying gender roles and associated power dynamics that lay the basis for institutionalized gender discrimination.⁴⁵ While special programs might be an important interim strategy to safeguard women's rights to participate and to access resources where mainstream programs and agencies exclude women, it is important that such strategies be accompanied by a gender mainstreaming strategy to transform mainstream institutions so that men and women, girls and boys, have equal access to resources, ability to control resources and the right to participate.

Gender mainstreaming was intended to serve as a radical intervention rather than to simply "add and stir."⁴⁶ Gender as a term was supposed to make explicit various power relations, between women and men, among women, and among men. But a concept that had been intended to privilege analyses of power has been transformed into an apparatus to render power relations invisible. For this reason, gender mainstreaming is in desperate need of re-evaluation.⁴⁷ The power of gender mainstreaming is that it allows individuals to ask questions, which can transform approaches. Gender mainstreaming challenges the notion that programs can operate without addressing gender and then set aside a minute percentage of funding to deal with women's issues. Gender mainstreaming is not the goal in and of itself.⁴⁸ While gender mainstreaming was supposed to be informing, alerting and challenging, it is true that individuals have turned it into a technical exercise.

Closing the gender gap will be important for the uplifting of half the population, but in itself it cannot end the kind of economic and social oppression which gives rise to conflicts. Women can be as effective in conflict resolution as they can be in promoting militarism and conflict.⁴⁹ Better gender balance among decision-making personnel, unless accompanied by major structural, ideological and social psychological changes, might only displace the pacific characteristics of women by militarist ones, especially if militarism and nationalism are dominant ideologies.

While closing the gender gap is important, it cannot in itself be expected to be a solution to conflictual problems. Merely advocating a rise in the status of women through quantitative gain in representation is in reality a superficial victory resulting in a false sense of progress.⁵⁰ Human security strategies need to forego a narrow focus on women's autonomy and instead adopt broader, more inclusive parameters to unravel the bearing of patriarchy on human security. This would permit context-specific analysis of masculinity alongside femininity, and of the relationship of both to violence and militarization.

A strategy of human security must include a strategy of change in patriarchy. Human security policies and programs remain superficial, if they fail to challenge and dismantle the structures that caused and fuelled the violent conflict and the conditions of insecurity. As long as the human security agenda is being defined by mostly masculinist state constructs with a corporate-military agenda of globalization, it will allow the world order to remain intact and perpetuate the root of human insecurity worldwide.

Human security should be about addressing injustice and enabling people to deal with the new forms of power and subjugation that are shaping their lives. A gendered approach disaggregates the cultural, social, economic and political mechanisms for the distribution of power and control and recognizes who is affected and how and what specific forms of protection or assistance are needed by whom. Security must be defined by those who are least secure. Women must be given their right and space to question and transform patriarchal and unjust social structures and their dominant discourses of violence and militarization. Seen that human security could easily become another slogan employed by intervening agencies seemingly tackling the complex problems of global poverty, women need to question how and by whom human security policies and strategies were conceptualized and how these policies fit into the larger global context – ‘whose security is emphasized and how?’

Ultimately, a fundamental shift is needed in the concept of security. While politicians, policy makers, the think tanks and bureaucrats may give the illusion of defining and controlling security, it is people walking the frontlines who belly up to the table and create systems of response, who are the real and unseen font of security, dynamic and adaptive to constantly changing environments. It is here that the notions of safety are crafted; here security is given shape, here the responses to vulnerabilities will emerge. People cope and survive. Rather than intervention and management, women need the freedom and space to assert their right to security and develop strategies to do so. Intervening agencies should merely assist them in the realization of their survival strategies. And what this means would be nothing less than a paradigm shift in politics itself.

“Another world is not only possible, she’s on her way. Maybe many of us won’t be here to greet her, but on a quiet day, if I listen carefully, I can hear her breathing.”⁵¹

¹ Dr. V. Mohini Giri quoted in Johnston, Nicola. UNSC Resolution 1325: South Asian Women’s Perspectives. London: International Alert Gender and Peacebuilding Programme, 2003, p. 5.

² Sikoska, T. & Solomon, J. *Introducing Gender in Conflict and Conflict Prevention: Conceptual and Policy Implications*. UN INSTRAW, 2002, p. 1.

³ Human Rights Watch. *No One is Safe*. Vol. 19, No. 12, August 2007.

⁴ Cockburn, C. The Gendered Dynamics of Armed Conflict and Political Violence. In: Moser, C.O. N. and Clark, F.C., eds. *Victims, Perpetrators or Actors? Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence*. London: Zed Books, 2001, p. 22.

⁵ Elshtain, J.B *Women and War*. Brighton, UK: Harvester Press, 1987, p. 9.

⁶ Craske, . *Women and Politics in Latin America*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999, p. 136.

⁷ Jaquette, J. S. From Transition to Participation – Women’s Movements and Democratic Politics. In: Jaquette, J. S., ed. *The Women’s Movement in Latin America*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1994, p. 225.

⁸ Meintjes, S. et.al., eds. *The Aftermath: Women in Post-Conflict Transformation*. London: Zed Books, 2002, p. 7.

-
- ⁹ El-Bushra, J. Transforming Conflict: Some Thoughts on a Gendered Understanding of Conflict Processes. In: Jacobs, S. et. al. *States of Conflict: Gender Violence and Resistance*. London: Zed Press, 2000, p. 80.
- ¹⁰ Pankhurst, D. *Women, Gender and Peacebuilding*. Working Paper no. 5. University of Bradford, 2000, p. 8.
- ¹¹ Reiman, C. *Opening up Spaces: Engendering Protracted Social Conflict and Conflict Transformation*. PhD Thesis. University of Bradford, 2002, p. 79.
- ¹² Cockburn, 2001, p. 13.
- ¹³ Reiman, 2002, p. 79.
- ¹⁴ Reiman, 2002, p. 79.
- ¹⁵ Pankhurst, 2000, p. 8.
- ¹⁶ Reiman, 2002, p. 80.
- ¹⁷ Reiman, Cordula. *Towards Gender Mainstreaming in Crisis Prevention and Conflict Management*. Eschborn: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit, 2001, p. 6.
- ¹⁸ Miller, E. Gender, Power and Politics: an Alternative Perspective. In: Skjelsbæk, I. & Smith, D. eds. *Gender, Peace and Conflict*. London: Sage Publications, 2001, p. 82.
- ¹⁹ Ibid., p. 83.
- ²⁰ Pankhurst, 2000, p. 9.
- ²¹ Conference on Canadian Perspectives on Security, Conflict and Gender: Advancing Research, Advocacy and Policy. Toronto: York University, 25-26 August 2003. *Session Five: Gender Mainstreaming*. Organized by The Gender and Peacebuilding Working Group of the Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee and the Canadian Consortium on Human Security. Available online: <http://action.web.ca/home/cpcc/attach/CanPersFinal.pdf>. From here on referred to as: CCPSCG.
- ²² Ibid.
- ²³ Cockburn, C. *The Space Between Us: Negotiating Gender and National Identities in Conflict*. London: Zed Books, 1998, p. 213.
- ²⁴ Fetherston, A. B. (A) Peacekeeping, Conflict Resolution and Peacebuilding: A Reconsideration of Theoretical Frameworks. In: Woodhouse, T. & Ramsbotham, O. *Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution*. London: Frank Cass, 2000, p. 190.
- ²⁵ Ibid.
- ²⁶ Ibid.
- ²⁷ Ibid.
- ²⁸ Fetherston, A. B. (B) *From Conflict Resolution to Transformative Peacebuilding: Reflections from Croatia*. Working Paper No. 4. University of Bradford: Centre for Conflict Resolution, 2000, p. 11.
- ²⁹ Ibid.
- ³⁰ Fetherston, (A), 2000, p. 195.
- ³¹ Nordstrom, *Warzones: Cultures of Violence, Militarization and Peace*. Working Paper no. 145, Australian National University Peace Research Centre, 1994, p. 6.
- ³² Fetherston, (B), 2000, p. 9.
- ³³ Nordstrom, 1994, p. 19.
- ³⁴ Ibid., p. 8.
- ³⁵ Ibid, p. 12.
- ³⁶ Enloe, C. Demilitarization – or more of the same? Feminist questions to ask in the postwar moment. In: Cockburn, C. & Dubravka, Z. eds. *The Postwar Moment: Militaries, Masculinities and International Peacekeeping*. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 2002, p. 23.
- ³⁷ International Alert, *Gender Mainstreaming in Peace Support Operations: Moving Beyond Rhetoric to Practice*. London: International Alert, 2002, p. 9.
- ³⁸ Reiman, C. *The Field of Conflict Management: Why Does Gender Matter?* Bonn: Arbeitsstelle Friedensforschung, 1999, p. 17.
- ³⁹ Ibid., p. 7.
- ⁴⁰ Gibbings, S. *United Nations Women, Peace and Security Agenda: Opportunities and Challenges*. Ottawa: Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee, 2004. Available online: http://action.web.ca/home/cpcc/en_resources.shtml?AA_EX_Session=ab0a2776161694553d8bc0018a18a99f&x=60007, p. 8.
- ⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid., p. 9.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 10.

⁴⁵ Strickland, R. & Duvvury, N. *Gender Equity and Peacebuilding: From Rhetoric to Reality*. Washington, DC: International Center for Research on Women, 2003, p. 2.

⁴⁶ CCPSCG

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Chenoy, A. M. & Vanik, A. Promoting Peace, Security and Conflict Resolution: Gender Balance in Decisionmaking. In: Skjelsbæk, I. & Smith, D. eds. *Gender, Peace and Conflict*. London: Sage Publications, 2001, p. 137.

⁵⁰ Chew, P. G. L. The Challenge of Unity: Women, Peace and Power. *The International Journal on World Peace*. Vol. 15, No. 4, 1998, p. 32.

⁵¹ Roy, A. *The Ordinary Person's Guide to Empire*. London: Flamingo, 2004, p. 40.