PEACE IN PROGRESS

No 39 - JANUARY 2021

Redirecting security from feminism

ICIP

SUMARI

INTRODUCTION

Redirecting security from feminism

ICIP
International Catalan Institute for Peace

The notion of “security” is very complex. It can be understood as public policy, as a personal sensation, as a product to be bought and sold or as an unattainable ideal. As policy, security has several levels: local and global, national and international; and is conveyed from different spheres: personal and communal, symbolic and material. Its provision in each area is mostly state-centric, and often responds to the geopolitical and economic interests of the time.

The deployment of security that has been most prevalent historically is the one linked to sovereignty, territorial integrity and public order. States assess risks in the face of internal and external threats and pursue their protection by increasing their own political dominance. Through frameworks that are largely reactive, punitive and characterized by social control and armed action, a synonymy is often forced between security and “national defense” or between security and “presence of police and military forces” in public life. Thus, its definition is usually belligerent.

The world is currently experiencing several crises simultaneously: a “humanitarian crisis” in relation to the management of migration, settlement and asylum policies; a “climate crisis” due to global warming caused by human activity; an “economic and public health crisis” arising from the COVID-19 pandemic; and government crises that, although constant, are fueling emotional and violent polarization. All these phenomena have serious direct consequences on the sustainability of life itself; in other words, they pose great challenges for the security of the planet as a whole. However, political action in the name of security is proving to be limited to prevent and manage them.

By way of example, global military spending rose to 1,917 billion dollars in 2019, according to data from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI)[1]. This represents the largest annual increase in the last decade. The development and acquisition of more weapons, the creation of new militarized security forces and the strengthening of military cooperation is practically a global trend. However, these investments prove inefficient when they do not address the root causes of conflicts or aim at their transformation. Paradoxically, they often reinforce the culture of violence they seek to reduce and ignore the key issue: caring for people. This inclination to serve power and not life is far removed from the deployment of a system to safeguard human security as the main priority and raison d'état.

“ With this monograph we want to contribute to the definition of a security that is directly responsible for the management of human vulnerabilities and acknowledge feminism's contributions to the field of security ”

While each region, country and locality suffers from wars, violence and conflicts that deserve particular analysis, complexity is a common scenario that makes the contradictions, limitations and grievances of current security models more visible. However, we are seeing that opportunities often arise from the cracks that force us to delve deeper into the debate about the convenience of systemic change. In this regard, the fact that the concept of security has multiple angles facilitates its reinterpretation. While the current outlook is not very favorable to the deployment of models that put the needs of people and communities at the center, strong movements are emerging, such as feminism, which point out the weaknesses of current structures and standards with the aim of transforming them. That is why at ICIP we consider that, between oversimplification and idealism, there is room for new strategies and that now is the time to revitalize some of the hidden potentialities.

With this monograph in the Peace in Progress journal, we want to contribute to the definition of a security that is directly responsible for the management of human vulnerabilities. Our proposal is to learn about (and acknowledge) feminism's specific contributions to the field of security because we believe that they are essential to redirect the ambiguity of the term and reverse the limitations of current public security policies.

Thus, in the following pages, we highlight some of the challenges facing security from a feminist perspective. On the one hand, we refer to various determinants that simultaneously structure everyday life, define human vulnerability and shape (in)security: patriarchy and heteronormativity, racism and colonialism, militarism and imperialism, and capitalism and extractivism. On the other hand, we try to avoid a merely reactive plan. Beyond critical analysis, we express a proactive purposefulness that aims to reverse the imbalances and harm that these forces cause when they are fueled by acts of discrimination and relations of dominance-submission. In this way, in addition to identifying the weaknesses and gray areas of the current structures, we present proposals to overcome them.

In order to follow the theoretical thread of all the proposals presented here, one must bear in mind that in some articles security is conceived as a precondition for freedom and the real exercise of rights, while others interpret it as an ordinary personal or collective consequence of having guaranteed all rights – social, cultural, economic, civil and political. All these points of view, however, agree on one basic issue: the underlying problem is that the demand for new, pacifist security policies based on human rights has never been solid enough. This contrasts with the current threat that public security will expand at the expense of excluding many basic rights and even criminalizing human rights themselves. But those who read these lines may wonder: Why is ICIP, an institution working for peace, concerned about security? In 2020 we launched an action line that aims to bring together all alternative proposals, especially those that are feminist, because we believe it is important to find ways to end the binary divide between peace and security, making them non-antagonistic, transcending the gender binomial that considers peace to be feminine and security masculine, and that peace is expansive and security restrictive. We do not advocate a narrative replacement of peace for security, but the building of a security that assumes strategies of nonviolence and

has peace as its genuine aspiration. In short, we believe that the development of security with a feminist perspective entails the construction of pacifist initiatives and structures.

“ Development of security with a feminist perspective entails the construction of pacifist initiatives and structures ”

On the other hand, we would like to point out that the elaboration of this monograph has highlighted two imminent strategic challenges: the need to articulate thoughts and actions based on a new security model, and the urgency to diversify voices – or listen to others. First of all, while in this issue we focus on the main contributions of feminism, we also want to help facilitate dialogue between various proposals and actors that outline common goals for change. There are diverse and complimentary currents and visions that, akin to pacifism and environmentalism, propose a security paradigm that is radically different from the hegemonic model. From diversity, we believe that it is essential to build a common advocacy space that brings us closer to the possibility of dialogue with the current structures and the shared objective of conceiving a new security model.

Secondly, the predominance of Anglo-Saxon literature in feminist security theory poses a major constraint. A feminist approach to security must support the diversity of existing methodologies and ensure a leading role for the people and groups most knowledgeable and affected by violence, so as not to perpetuate the hegemonic narrative that determines their exclusion. Everyone should be able to be a subject with the possibility of agency. With the aim of approaching a contextual and disciplinary diversity, this issue includes the collaboration of eight women with outstanding careers.

The monograph begins with an article by researcher Nora Miralles that provides an overview of the political notion of security since the late twentieth century. The author

reflects on views that are critical of the predominant model and points out the main aspects that feminism has contributed to the understanding and management of security. In addition, she identifies some of the key questions that will guide the focus of the subsequent articles: Who decides what is a threat to our existence? Based on what? And, above all, how do we deal with it?

In the next article, Marissa Conway raises the question of how we can ensure national security that goes beyond the optimization of power as a goal and militarism and deterrence as a means. In response, she presents the “ethics of care” as a framework for examining the dynamics of power that exist between people, communities and states, and how a Feminist Foreign Policy can become a structure for reversing them.

For her part, Ana Velasco provides a critical reflection on the recent twentieth anniversary of the Women, Peace and Security Agenda, created through the adoption of UN Security Council Resolution 1325. The researcher raises the question of why the agenda has not led to a paradigm shift in how security is understood and obtained and whether there is still room for improvement. She points out how violence as a field of study and security as political management have historically been impervious to the importance of gender analysis. Gender – understood as one of the structural elements that categorizes and organizes human relations hierarchically – can bring us closer to understanding the causes and consequences of violence. Thus, Swati Parashar explains in her article how a genderized analysis of war allows us to understand and question the roles socially assigned to men and women and to investigate the current relationship between masculinity and militarism.

“ Rethinking security from a feminist perspective presents an important theoretical and practical challenge. Socially the contributions that feminism can make to transform social problems and injustices remain quite unknown ”

Next, Carme Colomina explains how Europe has militarized its politics. The journalist highlights how security policies are being expanded against people, and how state powers act – in the name of security – against individuals who question them. How then can we deal with the imposition of political agendas based on the proliferation of fear, the curtailment of rights and the stigmatization of otherness? Is the interconnected nature of current revolts perhaps an opportunity to redefine security from a perspective of care and protection?

To transform current security policy, Pinar Bilgin underlines the pending challenge of Eurocentrism and the analysis of the colonial footprint, especially entrenched in the capitalist economic system. Her contribution revolves around what she calls "postcolonial thinking" and argues for the need and duty to adopt policies of responsibility and commitment based on European self-reflection. She argues that this perspective will permit an understanding of Europe's current complicity in the cause and perpetuation of violent conflicts around the world and will facilitate the identification of possible solutions.

Finally, in the last article, Shamim Meer and the WoMin African Alliance illustrate the relationship between colonial land exploitation and communal insecurity. From an ecofeminist point of view, they show how women and nature bear the greatest costs of the economic system, characterized by extractivism. For this reason, they believe that only peaceful and sustainable economic policies can guarantee security.

As a complement to the main articles, the journal includes an interview with renowned feminist philosopher Judith Butler. Critical of power structures, in this interview she reflects on the limits and opportunities of the concepts of security, freedom and nonviolence, and on the growing vulnerability that is apparent during the current global pandemic.

Lastly, this monograph includes a series of recommendations of books, papers, projects and references to online seminars that aim to increase knowledge and contribute to the debate on feminist security.

“ We must believe in the potential of shared security models: less antagonistic, more cooperative and intercommunal, where support and accompaniment networks and mutual care relationships make interdependence a virtue ”

From all these issues that we set forth, we can deduce that rethinking security from a feminist perspective presents an important theoretical and practical challenge. From the outset, feminism today has many connotations in the collective imagination, many of which are a distortion of its most basic achievements. While there has been much progress in recent years in terms of equality between women and men and the promotion of sexual and reproductive rights, socially, the contributions that feminism can make to transform social problems and injustices remain quite unknown. Stereotypes of women’s demands often result in narratives of victimhood and paternalism. Many of the spaces in which they participate are eminently consultative or parallel and have no guarantee of influence in decision-making. There has been no substantial change in focus, since symbolic structures of integration, and not of inclusion, have been added. It is necessary to overcome a transcendence of the essentialism of certain categories, such as that of woman, and to support new methods of reflection and advocacy, in the pattern of an inverted pyramid. This monograph also aims to be a tool for reflection in this respect.

For all the reasons mentioned above, we now present a theoretical-practical document that leads to numerous road maps. They all point to security as a value. We defend not only its objective dimension –physical and psychological– conditioned by various dynamics of violence, but also its perceptive dimension. We understand that from a feminist perspective, the ideal of security should recognize the existence of an innate vulnerability and a constructed vulnerability. On the one hand, we are inevitably vulnerable because we are interdependent. This implies that, as individuals, we must believe in the potential of shared security models: less antagonistic, more cooperative

and intercommunal, where support and accompaniment networks and mutual care relationships make interdependence a virtue. But on the other hand, we must distinguish between those vulnerabilities that, due to relationships or situations of unequal power, create privileges and cause helplessness. This is where people and groups have a degree of vulnerability that changes with the context. From this we can infer that people are vulnerablized (or are in a situation of vulnerability) rather than vulnerable, and therefore it is the responsibility and duty of the state to assume a goal of social justice that transforms them through a redistribution of socioeconomic resources. We advocate for security policies and budgets that serve the wellbeing of people, and not the other way around.

1. SIPRI military expenditure database.

Photography: ICIP

INTERVIEW

Interview with Judith Butler, philosopher and activitst

Sandra Martínez and Eugènia Riera
ICIP

Judith Butler (Cleveland, USA 1956) is considered one of the world's most influential intellectuals with her contributions to feminist theory, gender studies, politics and ethics. Critiquing and challenging power structures, in this interview Butler focuses on security, freedom and nonviolence, and on the increasing vulnerability in the pandemic world.

Feminism advocates for an alternative to the traditional view of security, a people-centered and community-based approach that takes into account the differential impact of violence on women and other minoritized groups. Do you share this vision?

I do share this vision, but I also have some questions about it. Why, for instance, is the state increasingly concerned with security rather than with providing health care, shelter, and education for citizens and non-citizens. I am in favour of community-based or grass-roots approaches to ending violence against all women and minorities, including trans people and the genderqueer, but I think that local, state, and international authorities can support these efforts. So I am not always in line with the idea that true change happens only through communities, but not governments, states, or international authorities. We may well need the latter to help protect human rights and the environment.

Which are the main obstacles to achieving security policies different to the predominant ones?

Perhaps the first question we have to ask is whether “security” is invoked for the right reasons. I note, for instance, that the suppression of protests and demonstrations in several countries, including Romania and Poland recently against LGBTQ people, is justified through recourse to security. In the US, the Black Lives Matter movement has also been surveilled and suppressed in the name of “security.” So we can see quite clearly that “security” sometimes means “the secure continuation of the regime in power” at which point the only thing that is endangered is the power of those in power. That is not a security concern, but a partisan political one, and a misuse of state powers. I also think that figuring migrants as a threat to “security” is a false claim which actually relays a fear of the loss of ethnic or racial homogeneity. So “security” needs to be disarticulated from these specious deployments for us to see what we may still value about the term.

“ “Security” sometimes means “the secure continuation of the regime in power” at which point the only thing that is endangered is the power of those in power ”

The concept of “security” has many interpretations, such as the concept of “violence”. For example, the Movement Black Lives Matter has pointed out a wide range of social issues, from public health policies to mass incarceration, as State violence. Their critics, meanwhile, have accused them of promoting or inciting violence, especially against police and security officers. How should we deal with the flexibility of these terms , which can be deceiving, as you also pointed out?

Yes, well, terms like “democracy” and “freedom” can also be deployed by those with strong interests in their destruction. The main point for me is not to give up on the terms. We have to fight to stabilize the meaning and direction of the key terms of democracy as well as a political practice of non-violence focused on its systemic forms. Extensive reports on BLM protests establish that very few incidents of violence were initiated by BLM activists, and that the size and strength of the movement consisted in

its radically non-violent character. Indeed, the movement has anti-violence at its core, which includes police brutality and murder, but all the dimensions of the carceral state, including detention and imprisonment.

Do you think that the ideal of security is a life "free of fear"? Or, on the contrary, this idea is not realistic because fear is a central element of human experience?

We only know human experience through the social and historical experiences available to us. So if we get used to living with fear as a way of life, or fear as part of any way of life, we tend to generalize, even universalize fear as a necessary component of life. Of course, I do believe we have reasons to fear fire and floods and accidents, but even those natural disasters are experienced differently depending on whether or not we live in a world that is providing refuge, medical care, and shelter, a world that openly grieves the losses we suffer or reduces them to a statistic of demography.

We find ourselves in the midst of a global vulnerability. In your book *Frames of War*, you state that vulnerability is a feature of our shared and interdependent lives. The problem is how this condition of inevitable fragility is unequally distributed and exploited. Which are your thoughts regarding vulnerability at this moment, in a context of global pandemic?

I am struck by the fact that in the US long entrenched forms of social inequality have produced minority populations, mainly black and brown people (including the indigenous), who are suffering greater losses from Covid-19 than the rest of the country. The figures show a disproportionate number of people from those communities who are suffering worse forms of the illness and dying more rapidly and in greater numbers. How do we think about their vulnerability to the illness? On the one hand, we are all vulnerable, and the virus does not know anything about class and race. On the other hand, there is a socially constituted vulnerability that reflects long-standing social inequality, including lack of equal access to health care. So we can see that vulnerability has this dual dimension: it universalizes, but it also lays bare the radical inequalities among us. It may be, as some public health officials have argued, that only by first addressing social inequality will we be able to effectively address the pandemic. After all, we are starting to see how the vaccine distribution will take place. Will the poor

and the unhoused be identified as those most in need? Or will they be abandoned again?

“ If we can identity states, institutions, and policies as reproducing violence, then we need to oppose those larger structures as part of our non-violent practice ”

The debate on how to prioritize public safety without conflicting with human rights has emerged worldwide with the response to the pandemic. In order to stop COVID-19, we have witnessed the limitation of the right to freedom of expression and the right of free movement, war-rhetoric and the leading role of security and military forces. What is your opinion on the balance between freedom and security? Is there a risk that these exceptional measures will set a precedent for future crises?

The problem is not a tension between “public safety” and human rights, but the threat that “public safety” will expand to exclude many basic rights and even criminalize human rights themselves. At the same time, perhaps we can include “public health” as a category that is also sometimes spuriously invoked to justify the suppression of feminist and LGBTQ movements as well as anti-racist and migrant rights movements. The eugenics model has dominated the reactionary politics against migration. Recently, the British monarchy sought recourse to the same category when it asked that the Netflix series, *The Crown*, include a “public health” notice that the series is fiction, not fact. To answer your question, though, we all should worry that the augmentation of state powers under the pandemic will not be relinquished in a post-pandemic world. When reproductive rights and sexual freedom become “public health” issues, they are subject to regulation and criminalization. Indeed, the sphere of humanitarian aid, arguably part of the human rights framework, has already been criminalized in the Mediterranean, and that sets a terrible precedent.

You discuss not only about equality, but also about what you call "the radical equality of grievability". What might such an ideal entail in practice?

I suppose it is a way of asking what the world would be like if we really thought of all lives as equally valuable. If we object to the ease and shamelessness with which minorities are killed by the police, or left to die by health care and migration policies, then we will struggle to change those institutions so that each life is treated equally. To be grievable is to be, in this life, a life that would be grieved if it were lost. Too often we live in a world in which some lives are considered ungrievable, not really living, not really human, easy to lose, if not already lost.

" The threat is that "public safety" will expand to exclude many basic rights and even criminalize human rights themselves "

Instead of insisting on the dimension of care, like other feminist theorists, you direct the attention to the individual and collective capacity for resistance and action to achieve a fairer distribution of social conditions. Which are the means to channel this capacity towards transforming power structure transformation? Should they imply nonviolence?

I am in favour of care, and I especially like the new *The Care Manifesto* that has been published by Verso (and which, I hope, will appear in Catalan). But care is too often regarded as an ethical disposition, even a maternal prerogative, and I believe it must operate in ways that do not restrict it to women or the domestic sphere. Too often we think of non-violence as a personal moral stand, but if we can identity states, institutions, and policies as reproducing violence, then we need to oppose those larger structures as part of our non-violent practice. It takes a strong and transformative resistance movement to do so.

Authoritarian regimes are gaining ground. How do you perceive the future? Do you feel hopeful about any important change for global politics?

Right now I am encouraged by the radical democratic ideals embodied in social movements, the continuing student struggles against the Apartheid legacy in South Africa, *Ni una menos* in Argentina and throughout Latin America as it fights inequality and violence both, Black Lives Matter in the US and its alliance with the Palestinian struggle for freedom and dignity, Extinction Rebellion and other climate justice movements. Such movements keep ideals alive when states often compromise them in practice. My wager is that the authoritarians will keep falling: Netanyahu, Bolsonaro, Orban. The question is whether social movements and electoral systems can come to terms with one another. That is where the negotiations can be difficult. But I have hope.

Photography: © Agence Opale / Alamy Stock Photo, courtesy of Angle Editorial.

From fear to acceptance of human vulnerability: perspectives on security

Nora Miralles
Journalist specializing in international analysis and researcher in gender, militarism, security and human rights

Following the attacks of 11 September 2001 on the Twin Towers in New York, the need to prioritize security, even when in conflict with human rights, co-opted the framework of the debate. This need involved a whole series of policies based on mass surveillance and people's movement control and initiated a gradual curtailment of freedoms. The hegemonic concept of security returned to the traditional view of the Cold War, associated with the military power of the State to preserve its existence and territorial integrity against external or internal enemies. A close and interested association that was brought into question by other proposals that were emerging –such as human security or critical views on security– and that displaced the State from the heart of security to put life, people and communities in its place. Ever since the beginning of what has been called the "Global War on Terror", national security has once again monopolized debates and policies, but it is facing ongoing questions from human rights defenders.

As a starting point, and from a holistic perspective, security can be defined as being or feeling free from any harm to life and integrity.[1] Security, understood as a common good, is a recent ideal, which takes on importance as human life acquires value, until it becomes a fundamental dimension of the pact with which the modern State was born. To free us from the fear that –according to some state theorists, such as Thomas Hobbes– is caused by living in a "state of nature" of all against all, where property and assets are coveted by others, we put our protection in the hands of the authority in exchange for our obedience. Thus, security becomes an "exoneration from the care of public life",[2] delegating to the State, through what we know as the "social contract", the

protection of life, liberty and possessions.

“ Who decides what is a threat to our existence? Based on what? And, above all, a threat against whom? ”

Since then, freedom and security are sold as opposite ideals by more traditional narratives. A zero-sum game where more than one equals less than the other and vice versa. In the last two decades, this perspective not only has come back strongly, but it has immersed us in a process known as securitization, understood as the ability of States to deploy emergency measures and special powers, especially military, in response to existential threats.[3] But who decides what is a threat to our existence? Based on what? And, above all, a threat against whom?

Communities and individuals at the heart of security: human security

Some of the first critical voices to undermine the State-centered and traditional view of security suggested that the concept is deeply politicized and subject to interests and priorities. Therefore, they pointed out that security not only does not have a purely technical and objective nature, but everything about it is deeply political and subjective.

Exposing this subjectivity is key to questioning that, if existential threats are not objective, what the State considers threats to its security does not necessarily correspond with the dangers and risks faced by its inhabitants.[4] Therefore, if threats to human life and dignity are to be addressed, the focus of security policies must be moved away from the State and placed on communities and individuals.

“ If threats to human life and dignity are to be addressed, the focus of security policies must be moved away from the State and placed on communities and individuals ”

In the 1990s, with the end of the Cold War and the liberal revaluation of the individual and its individual rights, the architecture of Human Rights evolved, with the introduction of “development” as its key concept. This concept placed on the shoulders of the richest countries the obligation to “help” other countries to grow economically. At the same time, however, a wave of privatization of public services and lands was spreading in the countries of the South, led by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, in exchange for economic support.

In 1994, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) included the concept of “human security” in its Human Development Report. This concept proposed the pursuit of security through development, and not through weapons. With the aim of “addressing the root causes of human insecurity and not just its tragic consequences”, the report promoted human-centered development to achieve peace, human rights and environmental protection, in the face of new threats that were being introduced into the global political and security agenda: poverty, the destruction of ecosystems, the uncontrolled growth of the world’s population, crime and transnational delinquency –such as drug trafficking.

“ Critical views on security denounce the impossibility of achieving human security without touching the power structures ”

UNDP advocated that peace "had to be delivered on two fronts": the security front, or "freedom from fear" and the economic and social front, or "freedom from want", inseparable one from the other. Its operational deployment, however, favored one front or the other depending on the State or organization, its ideological positions, and its interests and strategies. Because the fact is, human security is not a univocal or static concept.

First of all, the deployment of human security presents two main approaches, depending on the political proposals to achieve it, the degree of challenge it represents to the traditional view of security and the degree of criticism of existing structures and power relations:

– The broad approach, more faithful to the original formulation of the concept contained in the UNDP report –closely linked to the concept of human development, first, and sustainable development, later. Human security is conceived here in a comprehensive way, as a situation in which people are free from all kinds of threats to their integrity, but also with their basic needs covered. The broad approach breaks human security down into seven dimensions to facilitate its practical materialization: economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community and political.

– The restricted approach, more adaptable to the majority of governments that have opted for it –led by Canada–, has adopted the concept assimilating it only to freedom from fear, neutralizing its most transformative content under the justification of making it easier to apply in practice. This vision, which has become hegemonic in the field of international politics, has borne important fruits, such as the ban on antipersonnel landmines, the nuclear weapons use prohibition[5] or the formulation of the concept of "responsibility to protect", an instrument of the United Nations that authorizes States to intervene in countries where governments are responsible for serious violations of International Law, such as genocide or crimes against humanity.

“ The customary violence that occurs in the family, at home, and in the community is interconnected with the dynamics of violence in more macro terms ”

Nonetheless, critical views on security consider that the adoption by some governments of the restricted approach to human security has stripped the concept of its most transformative content to make it more digestible and functional for liberal peace, and further away from any critique of the socioeconomic structures that, among other things, maintain North-South colonial domination. These voices denounce the impossibility of achieving human security without touching the power structures,[6] while asking: What happens when it is the State that generates, with its policies, insecurity among the citizenry?

Human security and feminism: accords and discords

Questioning the role of the State as protector, because it is an actor that can contribute to generate and to perpetuate inequalities, is precisely one of the greatest contributions of feminist perspectives on security. Feminists believe that many of the policies pursued by States –especially those that have a punitive basis and that are based on the logic of punishment– have had a negative impact on the lives and experiences of insecurity of people in general, and women in particular. This is believed to be the case especially among those who are part of the social, ethnic and religious groups considered to be potentially “threatening”. Feminism also critically confronts the so-called universality of human security, which, under the term “human”, has often tended to generalize male experiences and voices under a false universal character,[7] making invisible the differential experiences of women and a gender analysis of security.

“ Transformative proposals regarding security face an intense process of securitization that has endangered freedoms that were believed to be solid ”

Security as a field of study and political practice has historically been impervious to gender analysis, i.e., to power and subordination between men and women and in relation to other socially marginalized identities. These unequal relationships, though, totally condition our understanding and experience of insecurity and vulnerability. However, this historical exclusion does not imply that security in its traditional conception is gender neutral. On the contrary, the militarization of social life that drives this vision requires a strict sexual division of roles, in which men are saviors of the homeland, while the bulk of the sustenance of life is left under the responsibility of women in a normalized manner and free of charge. At the same time, when it has been functional at the strategic level, the traditional view of security has used the discourse on women’s rights to justify measures such as the invasion of countries like Afghanistan, which in turn have had serious impacts on the security and human rights of women.

But what exactly does a feminist perspective bring to the field of security? Gender analysis suggests that the customary violences that occurs in the family, at home, and in the community are interconnected with the dynamics of violence in more macro terms. Thus, the classic feminist slogan “the personal is political” applies to the international arena and the field of security. In addition, and this coincides with human security, the feminist perspective focuses on individuals and communities from a broad understanding of the threats to life and integrity and to whom security must be applied. It does so by addressing power relations and gender inequality, and their intersection with race and class, as key facts for understanding the experiences of insecurity[8] experienced by women and other gender and sexual identities escaping the norm, such as trans or LGBTIQ+ people.

“ Life care management will allow human communities to evolve from being frightened individualities to accompanied vulnerabilities ”

Alternative and transformative proposals regarding security today face an intense process of securitization that has endangered freedoms that were believed to be solid, while weakening the international system for the protection of human rights. In this new world order, what used to be social conflicts or issues of public order –migratory flows, cultural and religious minorities, drug trafficking, new social movements– are now addressed via exceptional solutions, many of them of dubious legitimacy and legality.

Thus, for example, in the era of the fight against terrorism, the interconnection between security and development is put at the service, not of poverty reduction, but of alleviating the fears of the richest countries through the reorientation of cooperation funds to those regions and countries that are considered a threat to the West.[9] The development world is under pressure to redefine its criteria and a blackmail relationship is generated in which the Global South is committed to stopping the migration and recruitment of new violent extremists, by whatever means necessary, in exchange for development aid. This situation is replicated in the case of the so-called Prevention of Violent Extremisms, which, in some cases, as reported by researchers like Arun Kundnani[10] and activists like Ainhoa Nadia Douhaibi,[11] has been used to justify mass surveillance of ethnic or religious communities. This deployment often results in the violation of fundamental rights and does not lead to a solution to the phenomenon of terrorism. Human security thus becomes an alibi at the service of securitization.

It is not an easy context for the deployment of security alternatives that put people, communities and their needs at the center. But at the same time, visions –such as feminism– have emerged with strength to draw attention to the structures of power and domination with the goal of transforming them. What feminism proposes is a community and everyday security that places the notion of vulnerability at the center of

the debate and of political practices.[12] Security is an insatiable ideal and only an approach based on the restoration of community ties and the accountability in life care management will allow human communities to evolve from being frightened individualities to accompanied vulnerabilities.

1. Fierke, K.M. (2015) Critical approaches to international security, Cambridge: Polity Press.

2. Barberis, M. (2020) No hay seguridad sin libertad. La quiebra de las políticas antiterroristas, Madrid: Editorial Trotta.

3. Buzan, B., Waever, O., De Wilde, J. (1998) Security: A New Framework for Analysis, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

4. Hoogensen, G. i Rottem, S. (2004) "Gender identity and the subject of security", Security Dialogue, Volume 35, Issue 2, p 152-171.

5. The Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons entered into force on January 22, 2021. Even so, and despite its ratification by 50 nations, the main atomic powers of the world, such as the US, the United Kingdom, France, China and Russia, are not signatories to the text.

6. Pérez de Armiño, K. and Mendia, I. (eds.) (2013) Seguridad Humana. Aportes críticos al debate teórico y político, Madrid: Tecnos.

7. Hudson, H. (2005) "'Doing' Security As Though Humans Matter: A Feminist Perspective on Gender and the Politics of Human Security", Security Dialogue, Volume 36, Issue 2, June.

8. Mendia, I. (2013) "Feminismo y Seguridad Humana: Encuentros y desencuentros" in K. Pérez de Armiño and I. Mendia (eds.) Seguridad Humana. Aportes críticos al debate teórico y político, Madrid: Tecnos.

9. Duffield, M. (2020) "Seguridad Humana: vincular desarrollo y seguridad en la era del terror", Relaciones Internacionales, UAM, Issue 43, February-May.

10. Kundnani, A. (2015) A Decade Lost: Rethinking Radicalisation and Extremism, Claystone.

11. Douhaibi, A. N. (2019) La radicalización del racismo. Islamofobia de Estado y prevención antiterrorista, Madrid: Cambalache.

12. Urrutia, P., Villellas, A., Villellas, M. (2020) “Seguridad Feminista. Aportaciones conceptuales y desarrollo actual”. International Catalan Institute for Peace, Informes 16/2020.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Journalist specializing in international analysis and researcher in gender, militarism, security and human rights at the Centre Delàs d’Estudis per la Pau, at the Observatory of Human Rights and Business (ODHE) and Shock Monitor. Holder of a master’s degree in Gender, Conflict and Human Rights from Ulster University (Northern Irland). Member of the feminist research and intervention cooperative Sudergintza Cooperativa, of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) and an activist in the Catalan feminist movement and the popular movement in Manresa.

This is a translated version of the article originally published in Catalan.

Photography: © Grzegorz Żukowski

National security and care work: two sides of the same coin

Marissa Conway
Co-Founder of the Centre for Feminist Foreign Policy

Concepts of care and the actions associated with caring are reflected in every corner of our world. The state too, provides degrees of care work. Some government-sponsored opportunities, like free education for children, ensure everyone has access to such support structures. Other mechanisms, like healthcare and welfare, are specifically built to catch those who are vulnerable and in need of help. Care makes the world go round, in local and global ways, and generally functions to keep people safe. Naturally, then, concepts of care manifest in how we understand the general concept of national security.

As an American now living in the UK, my understanding of state-endorsed care has been filtered through my experience in these two societies. The US, one of the richest nations and global superpowers, drags its feet when it comes to such programmes. The UK too is quickly hanging out its care policies on austerity lines to dry. In an increasingly capitalist world, one that is oriented around patriarchal values, care is commodified and manipulated to exploit certain people. However, "in households, communities, and nation-states where the giving and receiving of care are adequate and nonexploitative, the risks associated with other kinds of security threats are reduced".[1] In other words, care has a ripple effect that impacts every corner of our world.

" In an increasingly capitalist world, one that is oriented around patriarchal values, care is

commodified and manipulated to exploit certain people ”

While state interest in care decreases, interest in feminist approaches to policymaking is increasing. A growing number of states, including the US and the UK, are engaging with Feminist Foreign Policy (FFP) frameworks, largely a result of decades of feminist activism. But efforts to cull social support mechanisms stand at odds with the goals of an FFP, which expressly prioritise the needs of the marginalised and vulnerable and are heavily influenced by human security. How, then, can this be reconciled?

Utilising the ethics of care as a theoretical framework,[2] I outline how expanding our understanding of national security beyond militarism and deterrence is necessary to implementing a genuine FFP. This article will first take a critical eye to the gulf between ideas about care and ideas about security and highlight some of the useful features of the ethics of care. Secondly, it will explore how an updated association between care and security can be best reflected through FFP.

“ The ever looming threat of force and violence becomes commonplace when establishing mechanisms to keep people “safe” ”

Care ethics in relation to security

Feminists have long pointed out the linkages between local and global, personal and political. It makes sense, then, that looking to the ethics of care as a means of understanding identity, subjectivity, and morality through relationship has its roots in feminist thought. Specifically, how we live in relationship and fulfil our responsibilities to one another is the key lens through which care ethics asks us to filter information. The line between private and public is explicitly blurred, as matters of “intimacy are of great political significance in that their form and nature are determined by relations of

power that play out in a variety of different contexts –from the household to the global political economy".[3]

The world we exist in and its corresponding power hierarchies have a formative hand in how we respond and relate to one another, be it between people or between states. Currently, these hierarchies are based around patriarchal values, which view power as a limited resource to be hoarded and not shared. This informs mainstream understandings of security and are thus reflected by heavily militarised approaches to keeping a state and its people "safe". But feminism is actively disinterested in reinforcing hierarchies, and instead seeks to normalise a different kind of relationality which includes compassion, power-sharing and care.

" Feminism seeks to normalise a different kind of relationality which includes compassion, power-sharing and care "

Fiona Robinson[4] points out that on the surface, security and care seem polar opposites. The word "care" originates from the Latin root 'securus' which in a rather ironic twist means 'without care'. The origin of the word has a baked in resistance to the idea of caring for or caring about. And this theme has carried through to today, where any semblance of care or caring is often intentionally eliminated from security discourse. In particular, Western national security relies on deeply gendered and realist ideas based on power optimisation. Many states attempt to do this with the development of a military and weapons arsenal. The ability to achieve security, then, becomes based on a state's potential to cause damage and death in other states. For example, the dramatic nuclear hierarchy between nuclear haves and have-nots means that ideas about deterrence often influence international relationships and processes. The ever looming threat of force and violence becomes commonplace when establishing mechanisms to keep people "safe". Dominance and aggression, traits typically coded as masculine, become justified as forms of self-defence. Protection, another masculine coded trait, becomes the role of the state, and "good" leadership is equated with a willingness to

inflict violence to keep peace.[5] [6]

With such an approach to security, there is a distinct absence of any semblance of care. However, the label "security" has also been lent to food security, housing security, and social security, which operate to sustain the wellbeing of individuals.[7] The contradiction between how security is understood and applied in international versus domestic spaces reflects a stubborn patriarchal and rather imperialist insistence that there is little overlap between the local and the global. This is not to say that there should be one, universal application of care in the context of security, nor that care should be blindly held on a pedestal.[8] This would be counter to the philosophical underpinnings of care ethics, as will be discussed. But rather, by incorporating such principles into security discourse, we can question what has been accepted as objective and begin to wedge the door ever so slightly wider to new and 'alternative' ways of understanding security –for instance, that of Feminist Foreign Policy.

" FFP represents decades of feminist activism aimed at normalise a new way of doing foreign policy which has the goal of sustainable peace "

Feminist Foreign Policy, care ethics, and security

Feminist Foreign Policy (FFP) refers to a policy framework that has recently been championed by a growing handful of states. Some, like Sweden and Mexico, have an elaborated commitment to this agenda. Others, like Canada and France, are engaging with it in part. And others, including Spain, Luxembourg, the US, and the UK, are dipping their toe in the water, with either commitments to or calls for adoption.[9]

FFP represents decades of feminist activism aimed at normalise a new way of doing foreign policy which has the goal of sustainable peace. It draws attention to existing patriarchal structures that shape our societies, which reproduce very narrow and often harmful ideas of security. In practice, this looks like including people who have been traditionally excluded from policy decision making spaces or redistributing funds from

defence budgets into education and healthcare, for example. In short, incorporating a feminist lens into foreign policy allows for the scrutiny of power dynamics that manifest between people, communities, and states. Moving away from patriarchal systems like capitalism, imperialism, and colonialism, for example, become of central focus in understanding policy issues.[10]

“ Incorporating a feminist lens into foreign policy allows for the scrutiny of power dynamics that manifest between people, communities, and states ”

There are many parallels in ideology behind the ethics of care and FFP. Both are interested in unveiling and then challenging “the way that patriarchy serves to institutionalise hierarchical relations in global politics while dismissing or ridiculing the capacity for attentive listening and empathy”.[11] Both FFP and care ethics reject binaries in favour of deeper context, understanding how relationships constitute any given situation or moral dilemma. These ideas move us quickly away from the realist realm of thinking and incorporate principles of human security. We better able to then interrogate how ideas about gender, race, class, sexuality, ability and ethnicity influence how we perceive care as useful or not useful in formulating security policies. In one of Robinson’s more recent works, she offers the theory behind the ethics of care as a guiding frame for developing a more robust FFP. There are three distinct principles that Robinson[12] offers up as useful for FFP: relationality, context, and revisability.

Firstly, relationality speaks to the process of an actor, be it a person or a state, gaining selfhood through relationships with others. Morality becomes about responding to the needs of others with listening, patience, and understanding. When considered within the context of security, the principles of human security are fore fronted, moving us away from an overt focus on protecting territory and reifying borders and instead reorienting us toward what basic needs must be met to ensure the health and wellbeing of the average person.[13] Likewise, the habit of coding behaviour as masculine or

feminine, and then using this information to inform what and who makes “good” policy, can be rejected. As Robinson[14] suggests, the human bound up in gendered constructs can be found more easily when we are able to build relationships outside of the confines of hierarchies.

“ For FFP to present itself as an absolute moral authority based on Western ideas of human rights would be a mistake that would lead us down a rigid, inflexible, and therefore unfeminist road ”

Secondly, under an ethics of care lens, identity is not framed as a way to make distinctions between people but rather speaks to the relationships between them. And to understand relationships, we must also understand context. FFP will not be transformative if it adopts and enacts a rigid set of morals. Instead, it must be a slow process, one in which its framework is intentionally and thoughtfully developed, in order to properly contextualise historical and modern-day relationships between actors. [15] In other words, without being grounded in context, policy decisions will continue to fail people and reinforce abstract morals for the sake of reinforcing abstract morals.

Lastly, revisability indicates that noting is fixed or set in stone. Navigating complex moral dilemmas and doing so in a way to buck the status quo, invites a constant process of reflexive and introspective thinking. In the case of foreign policy, this means questioning the patriarchy as the main framing of morality. Revisability is oriented around the idea that decisions do not lead to static outcomes, but only better or worse ones. This final step is inherently linked to the first two, as to move away from a universal and rigid moral framework comes from a concern for context to better understand relationships within the bigger picture. For FFP to present itself as an absolute moral authority based on Western ideas of human rights would be a mistake, one which would lead us down a rigid, inflexible, and therefore unfeminist road.

“ The achievability of a truly feminist foreign policy is still up for debate, but we can set down the path toward a security that is people-oriented, not territory oriented ”

Conclusion

The idea of a state reforming its patriarchal motivations and reorienting itself toward justice and equality is thrilling. But many feminists, while celebrating state efforts to adopt and implement FFP, remain sceptical about the ability of a patriarchal body to become a truly feminist actor. Audre Lorde aptly captures this problem in her commentary that “the master’ s tools will never dismantle the master ’s house”.[16] Can the state refashion its own institutions in such a way that equality becomes reality, or will we watch as feminist ideas become twisted and manipulated to serve patriarchal agendas? I would venture that it’s too early to tell.

Ultimately, invoking an ethical framework like the ethics of care to guide FFP “is about seeing global actors as constituted and sustained through relationships in specific times and places, and tracing how power, in its various forms, makes those relationships –in various, ever-changing contexts– oppressive or enabling”.[17] If social values and norms set the scene for how we understand any moral argument, as the ethics of care suggests, then utilising these ideas to develop a more robust FFP must include a fierce loyalty to relationality, contextualisation, and revisability. While the achievability of a truly *feminist* foreign policy is still up for debate, we can at least set down the path toward a security that is people-oriented, not territory oriented.

1. Robinson, F. (2011) The Ethics of Care: A Feminist Approach to Human Security, Temple University Press.

2. I rely on Fiona Robinson’s excellent work in this area to inform my writing.

3. Ibid, Robinson, F. (2011).

4. Ibid, Robinson, F. (2011).

5. Cohn, C. (1993) “Wars, Wimps and Woman: Talking Gender and Thinking War”. Cooke , M. and Woollacott, A. (eds.), Gendering War Talk, Princeton: Princeton University Press, p 232.

6. Conway, M. (2016) A Feminist Analysis Of Nuclear Weapons: Part 1 – Hegemonic Masculinity. Centre for Feminist Foreign Policy. Available at: https://centreforfeministforeignpolicy.org/journal/2016/12/30/a-feminist-analysis-of-nuclear-weapons-part-1-hegemonic-masculinity

7. Ibid, Robinson, F. (2011).

8. Ibid, Robinson, F. (2011).

9. Vogelstein, R., Bigio, J. and Turkington, R. (2020) “The Best Foreign Policy Puts Women At The Center”, Foreign Affairs. Available at: https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2020-03-09/best-foreign-policy-puts-women-center

10. Centre for Feminist Foreign Policy (2020) Feminist Foreign Policy. [Web] Available at: https://centreforfeministforeignpolicy.org/feminist-foreign-policy

11. Robinson, F. (2019) “Feminist foreign policy as ethical foreign policy? A care ethics perspective”, Journal of International Political Theory, pp 1-18.

12. Ibid, Robinson, F. (2019).

13. Gomez, O. and Gasper, D. (2020) Human Security Guidance Note | Human Development Reports. Hdr.undp.org. Available at: http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-security-guidance-note

14. Ibid, Robinson, F. (2019).

15. Ibid, Robinson, F. (2019).

15. Ibid, Robinson, F. (2019).

17. Ibid, Robinson, F. (2019).

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Marissa Conway is the Co-Founder of the Centre for Feminist Foreign Policy, a current doctoral candidate earning her PhD in Politics at the University of Bristol (UK) and is on the Forbes 30 Under 30 list. Conway is also a Research Associate at SOAS, University of London, and is a Gender Champion in Nuclear Policy. She holds a BA in Political Science and a BA in Music from Chapman University (USA).

Photography Women, Peace and Security: Security Council Open Debate 2019, by Ryan Brown/UN Women

1325 and the notion of security: dilemmas and significance

Ana Velasco
Feminist security analist and member of Women in International Security (WIIS)

Are women safer today than two decades ago? I ask this question on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the adoption of a historic resolution by the United Nations Security Council. On 31 October 2000, for the first time in the history of the organization, the debate addressed the role of women in international peace and security. In Resolution 1325, the Security Council urges governments and other actors to take measures to implement a series of actions on the participation and protection of women in conflict and post-conflict settings around the world. It is also the first in a series of ten resolutions in what is now known as the Women, Peace and Security Agenda. But the real merit of 1325 lies in the long and hard work of the feminist activists who pushed for the resolution's passage.

Resolution 1325 began as a project that follows two paths. One lies within the scope and limitations that it has as a legal product of the Security Council, an organization that has "primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security".[1] It is binding, but it lacks mechanisms to ensure its compliance. The other path is due to the conception and expectations that its promoters had about its achievements and applications. However, this double affiliation is not exempt from conflict. At the heart of Resolution 1325 is what Cynthia Cockburn describes as the "delicate language of security."[2] What does Resolution 1325 say about this concept? What vision and context does it respond to? Where does "security" stand twenty years after the Resolution was adopted? In the following paragraphs, I intend to answer these questions, while putting the validity of the document in perspective.

“ At the heart of Resolution 1325 is the “delicate language of security.”(2) What does Resolution 1325 say about this concept? ”

Apart from references to the Security Council as the author of the Resolution, the word “security” is mentioned only three times in the text of the 1325. These references go hand in hand with the concept of “peace” and with the connotation “international” for both of them. From this perspective, the interpretation of the concept is clearly framed by the objectives of the Council: “To determine the existence of a threat to peace or an act of aggression” and to act, through diplomatic channels or by authorizing the use of force, to “maintain or restore international peace and security”. This means that security is understood as control, military if deemed necessary, over threats or those acts identified as acts of aggression by member States towards the international system, i.e., towards the status quo and, in essence, towards the exercise of their sovereignty. Along these lines, the contribution made by the Resolution is to link the protection of that system to the acknowledgement of the differentiated impact of armed conflict on women and girls, and the importance of their participation “in peace processes for the maintenance and promotion of international peace”.[3]

The prelude to the Security Council finally admitting what feminism, especially pacifist, had been denouncing for decades was the overwhelming evidence of the armed conflicts of the 1990s. First of all, the “peace” that the end of the so-called Cold War should have brought, according to some interpretations, was called into question by the wars in the former Yugoslavia, the genocide in Rwanda and the wars in the Democratic Republic of Congo. In these places, women suffered in particular ways. Cases of mass rape as a tool of genocide and, more generally, sexual violence as a weapon of war had already occurred in other conflicts, but this was the first time they gained relevance in the international media. This visibility was in turn driven by activists who denounced them in multilateral forums and demanded the implementation of mechanisms to stop them and, especially, to prevent them from happening again.

The activists who undertook the hard and complex advocacy work of the Resolution were the NGO Working Group on Women, Peace and Security. However, in this group there were diverse views. For example, one of the participating organizations, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), has been working from a pacifist perspective since 1915. But there were also other organizations of a less specialized nature that did not share pacifist and anti-militarist values. They advocated for a pragmatic document that would be limited to protecting women in conflict situations without questioning the system that causes them. In other words, making war safer for women rather than preventing it.[4] Despite these differences, that a group of women-led civil society organizations influenced the work of the Security Council is no small feat. The Council is the most powerful body in the UN system, the most statist, militaristic –and therefore patriarchal– and the least democratic.

“ Feminists adopted the human security paradigm shift and they also gave gender specificity to the concept ”

So what is the common understanding of the Group's concept of security? The starting point for answering this question is the concept of human security. In 1994, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) proposed this concept as an alternative approach to State-centered security. Among its characteristics is that it refers to human security as a universal issue, and places people at the center. In essence, it is a critique of military conceptions of security. Feminists adopted this paradigm shift and also gave the concept gender specificity.[5] This was, for them, the meaning of the Group title and the Agenda: Women, Peace and Security. Other documents relevant for the 1325 are the 1995 Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, specifically its chapter on women and armed conflicts, and the Namibia Action Plan.

However, the differences in interpretation that the Council's member States gave to the values of the Resolution were palpable just a year after its approval. In the autumn of 2001, the United States, one of the five permanent members, launched the “War on

Terror". For the purposes of the Agenda, one of the most pernicious consequences of that imperialist initiative was the securitization of women. To begin with, the US government used the situation of women in Afghanistan as an excuse for the invasion of that country. Muslim women had to be "saved", in the words of the then First Lady.[6] The other angle was the propagandistic use of the deployment of women in the military as a test of the "moral superiority of the West" as opposed to "the enemy," as illustrated by the rescue of Jessica Lynch in Iraq.[7]

" The differences on the interpretation that the Council's member States gave to the values of the Resolution were already palpable a year after its approval "

It is precisely the relationship with martial institutions where 1325 finds the most unstable ground. The Resolution does not literally mention the inclusion of more women in the military. In fact, as discussed above, some of the proponents have explicitly anti-militaristic views. However, it does emphasize the presence of women in decision-making roles aimed at promoting peace and security. Under the current functioning of most States, this includes high officials of the armed forces. For this reason, Cockburn believes that the wording and provisions of the Resolution leave it in a position to be coopted by militarism. But its proponents were already aware of this possibility. On the contrary, it has been said that, if the Resolution had adopted an emphatic tone against militarism, it would probably have not been passed. The fact is that, while some States and military alliances have approached this dilemma from a presumably feminist agenda, others have limited themselves to opening some spaces to women without thoroughly questioning the androcentric premises of the institutions.

The Resolution's militaristic orientation also presents another complicated aspect. If security is understood as an external threat, something "out there", the concept of security perpetuates North-South power dynamics.[8] In an analysis of the operation of

global racial hierarchies in the Agenda's main instruments of implementation, the National Action Plans, Toni Haastrup and Jamie J. Hagen found that only "certain type of women" are considered to require the intervention of Peace Operation Missions and that, invariably, these women reside in the "Global South" (2020). This implies that women in situations of insecurity, according to these countries, are not to be found within their borders. However, it is enough to listen to local activists to question this premise. A n exemplary case is the report of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls in Canada, published in 2019, which concludes that these women are victims of genocide. This country is, by the way, a leader in the implementation of 1325.

" Resolution 1325 was a turning point in the discussion of women in conflict situations, but it has significant conceptual limitations "

Another limitation is that (in)security does not mean the same thing in the "Global South" and "Global North". The case of Latin America is frequently mentioned in this regard.[9] The region has had relatively few war conflicts between States since the 19th century compared to other regions, but it has the highest rates of violence in the world. Moreover, this violence is structural; it has a gender and women suffer from it in particular ways. For example, eleven women are violently murdered every day in Mexico. Such threats to the security of Mexican women do not escape the contextualization of gendered human security, but they do escape the dominant view of the Security Council: their deaths are not a threat to "international peace and security". But can anyone speak of "peace" in a country with such high murder rates and rampant impunity? As Claudia Card argues, a State that allows its citizens to kill others (whatever their character) without authorization, cannot provide basic security for any of them.[10]

With regard to the last sentence, this dilemma between what constitutes security for women versus that of States becomes clear if one reviews the concept of the *continuum*

of violence. Although the phases of war or conflict are often distinguished for methodological convenience, the reality is that this is extremely difficult to determine in practice. In other words, conflicts, from the point of view of States, can be events with a clearly defined beginning and end, but this is not the case for individuals. Moreover, gender is manifested in the violence that flows through all these phases and even in the process of pacification. An example of this is the assassination attempt this summer in Kabul on the Afghan politician Fawzia Koofi, one of the few women involved in the peace negotiations. The participation of women in these processes was precisely one of the cornerstones of 1325. However, the fragile concept of security is broken when women peacemakers themselves risk their lives to stop what in theory was resolved by "protecting international security" in 2001.

" Despite the obstacles, Resolution 1325 and the Agenda open up spaces for the concept of (in)security to be (re)defined from a non-State perspective "

Finally, it is worth reviewing the contrasts of the concept in the face of COVID-19. First of all, it is clear that States were not ready to deal with a pandemic of these dimensions, that no effective prevention scenarios or containment actions were foreseen, or that they were given sufficient priority. What is the point of having trained and armed soldiers to intervene in the event of an "international security threat" if medical personnel lack the resources to save lives? And not only that: medical personnel also have a female face in most parts of the world. Due to prevailing stereotypes and precarious employment, women are overrepresented in the care sector. And, of course, it is impossible to ignore the rising rates of domestic violence. Women are not safe in their homes. The stories that have been reported in the press in recent months in Argentina, Turkey, the United Kingdom, South Africa, and in many other countries are far from being considered issues of "international peace and security".

In short, Resolution 1325 was a turning point in the discussion of women in conflict situations, but it has significant conceptual limitations. In this essay, I have simply pointed out some of the most important underlying tensions with respect to the concept of security. One important point is that the 1325 is a resolution that has been fairly well diagnosed. Various authors in multiple contexts have dedicated themselves to identifying its problems and challenges, and providing solutions. Some of the most prominent, such as Laura J. Shepherd and Paul Kirby, have even pointed out that, due to the document's inherent tensions, it is almost impossible for the Agenda to push for a radical turn; in other words, that it could act as a trigger for a profound paradigm shift in how security is understood and pursued.[11]

In my opinion, despite the obstacles, Resolution 1325 and the Agenda are pivots that allow us to continue naming the persistence and adaptations of patriarchy, and there is evidence that they open up spaces for the concept of (in)security to be (re)defined from a non-State perspective. Otherwise, as has been repeatedly criticized, leaving some women in decision-making positions will continue to be a small price to pay in exchange for the system remaining essentially unchanged. Evidence from the last twenty years proves that not all women are more secure. But more importantly, this task precedes the Agenda itself. The seeds of 1325 were planted prior to the dawn of the League of Nations, the predecessor organization to the UN. It is not a matter of waiting for tipping points, such as a crisis of violence against women, or the anniversary of the Resolution itself; it is that we cannot stop.

1. Security Council of the United Nations.

2. Cockburn, C. (2012) "Snagged on the Contradiction: NATO, Resolution 1325, and Feminist Responses." Women in Action, pp. 48–57.

3. UN Security Council (2000), Resolution 1325.

4. Weiss, C. (2011) "We Must Not Make War Safe for Women," Open Democracy, Mayo 24. Available at: https://www.opendemocracy.net/5050/cora-weiss/we-must-not-make-war-safe-for-women

5. Cockburn, op. cit.

6. Abu-Lughod, L. (2002) “Do Muslim women really need saving? Anthropological reflections on cultural relativism and its others,” American anthropologist, 104 (3), pp. 783-790.

7. Khalid, M. (2011) “Gender, orientalism and representations of the ‘Other’ in the War on Terror”, Global Change, Peace & Security, 23:1, pp.15-29. DOI:10.1080/14781158.2011.540092

8. Parashar, S. (2019) “The WPS Agenda: A Postcolonial Critique”, in Sarah E. Davies and Jaqui True, eds., The Oxford Handbook of Women, Peace and Security, ed., (Oxford University Press: 2019).

9. Drumond, P. and Rebelo, T. (2020) “Global pathways or local spins? National Action Plans in South America”, International Feminist Journal of Politics. DOI: 10.1080/14616742.2020.1783339

10. Card, C. (2010) “Genocide is social death”, in Confronting Evils: Terrorism, Torture, Genocide, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (pp. 237-266).

11. Kirby, P. and Shepherd, L. J. (2016) “The Futures Past of the Women, Peace and Security Agenda”, International Affairs 92 (2), pp. 373–392.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Ana Velasco is a feminist security analyst. She has a degree in International Relations from the Mexico Autonomous Institute of Technology. She also has a master’s degree in Gender, Violence and Conflict from the University of Sussex (UK), and another in International Law and International Relations from the University of Granada (Spain). About to start her PhD studies, she is currently a researcher and member of the US NGO Women in International Security. She recently won the international essay contest “1325 and Beyond”.

This is a translated version of the article originally published in Spanish.

Photography: © UN Women Asia and the Pacific.

Gendering war and war bodies

Swati Parashar
Associate Professor in Peace and Development Research at the School of Global Studies, Gothenburg University

We continue to live in a world where war is the larger reality. It remains the single most studied activity in almost every scholarly discipline, in literary works and in popular culture. We are inundated with media reporting and journalistic analysis about wars, often at the cost of other kinds of violence and suffering. Very often we debate whether art reimagines and mimics actual wars or wars eerily enact what films and other creative mediums have already depicted about human hostilities and armed exchanges. The peace that was promised to humankind since the end of the Second World War and other anti-colonial wars, is aspirational but elusive. Some of us 'experience' war through distance and discourses as we study its various aspects. For many, it offers opportunities of various kinds. Also brings untold suffering as 'living inside wars' becomes a reality.[1] [2] At the time of writing this paper, wars rage in several parts of the world including Yemen, Syria, Mali, Central African Republic, Israel, Somalia, Burkina Faso etc. Some are more reported than others are, but war stories continue to dominate public debates.

Christine Sylvester suggests that "war is a politics of injury: everything about war aims to injure people and/or their social surroundings as a way of resolving disagreement or, in some cases, encouraging disagreement if it is possible to do so".[3] War as 'politics of injury' is a deeply gendered activity in how it is imagined, strategized, performed and also in its impact, representation, language and storytelling. Femininity and masculinity are invoked in specific ways, and men and women perform a variety of roles in wars, which entrench gender hierarchy and uphold gender subordination, as well as transform gender relations significantly. Gendering war shifts the focus from war strategies and actor motivations to exploring how war privileges gender roles and hierarchies. Feminine values are frowned upon or projected as those that need to be

protected and cherished, while the bulk of the war labour is supposed to be undertaken by men. A gendered reading of war disrupts these narratives, busts war myths and prevents the perpetuation of the idea of war as the natural outcome of conflicts in society.

“ Gendering war shifts the focus from war strategies and actor motivations to exploring how war privileges gender roles and hierarchies ”

In the last three decades or so, feminists have written extensively about the need to democratise war studies and centre people in its analyses.[4] These feminist accounts draw attention to how war impacts women, their experiences as victims, survivors, anti-war activists and as cultural/national symbols on whose bodies wars are waged. Consider the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan –what was projected as a war between enemies (the US against Taliban/Al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein)–, soon reflected the violent contestations over different gendered orders. Both sides claimed to be waging the war to liberate women from either the constraints of decadent western modernity or fundamentalist, authoritarian Islamist regimes. Moreover, both sides also projected a certain masculinity to their preferred audiences. For example, the gun wielding Taliban militants ensured that women were erased out of public life and were reinstated in the perfect ‘Islamic’ household in full *purdah* and performing chores suitable to their religiously sanctioned gender identity. They not only wielded full control and right over women’s lives and bodies, but also governed public morality and private spaces. Their masculinity was defined through a very narrow interpretation of Islam that gave them privileges and power through militarism. On the other hand, American masculinity was severely threatened by the 9/11 attacks; a sense of emasculation resulted. The recovery of masculinity became a political project in which the Bush administration played a key role. Only a spectacular military response to the 9/11 attacks, witnessed through the invasion of Afghanistan, would suffice and rid the world of the evil Taliban terrorists. The good American soldiers would not only serve their country and people, but also the

women of Afghanistan, liberating them from Taliban control. That is what civilized white men do anyways, 'save the brown women from brown men'! In this dominant narrative, there was no space to listen to women or their aspirations, until feminists began to write about issues that affected them.

" A gendered reading of war busts war myths and prevents the perpetuation of the idea of war as the natural outcome of conflicts in society "

Thanks to feminist research, we have known about the magnitude of sexual violence in wars.[5] Emasculating 'the enemy' and impregnating 'enemy women' is now an established war strategy. In the 1971 Liberation War of Bangladesh, it is estimated that 300,000 women were subjected to sexual violence by the Pakistan army, as documented war strategy developed at the highest levels of decision-making. Bina D'Costa argues that women "were raped by members of the Pakistan Army in a strategic attempt to target Bengali ethnic identity".[6] Feminists' works in different disciplines have made the stories of the raped Bengali women accessible by documenting the experiences of these women and pointing out the challenges they faced after the war, including during the hearings of the International Crimes Tribunal.[7]

From cases during the World Wars to former Yugoslavia, from Sudan to the Democratic Republic of Congo, from the Rohingya Genocide to the Civil Wars in Nepal and Sri Lanka, from the Islamic State wars in Syria and Iraq to localised conflicts in Kashmir and Chechnya, sexual violence has been deployed by all sides. Comparatively less written about, but equally important, are cases of sexual violence against men and boys that feminists have started to highlight. These experiences are underreported, precisely because of the gendered order that thrives on preserving militarised masculinity, and not on narratives of emasculation.[8] [9] Another area of neglected research that has been undertaken by feminists studying wars, is the involvement of and impact on children. The reality of thousands of children being inducted into armed militias and as sex slaves got some public attention with the release of the documentary on the *Lord's*

Resistance Army, led by warlord Joseph Kony in Northern Uganda in 2012. However, this is a much wider phenomenon, that highlights not just the abuse of vulnerable children, but ways in which children navigate violent wars and their aftermath.[10]

“ Although deeply invested in uncovering the stories that bring untold suffering to women and children, feminist analyses move beyond the narratives of victimhood ”

Although deeply invested in uncovering the stories of before, within and beyond war that bring untold suffering to women and children, feminist analyses move beyond the narratives of victimhood. Those narratives have been questioned and nuanced in several feminist works, which have highlighted the role of women in wars as planners and perpetrators. There have always been women fighters at the frontline, senior women military strategists and women Heads of State who have taken decisions about going to war. The inclusion of women in armed combat in different roles is either scripted through an appeal to women’s empowerment or to a call for traditional feminine notions of sacrifice, nation and motherhood.[11] Women’s participation in and support for combat roles, in states and non-state militaries, is a growing phenomenon and yet is dependent on gender norms that vary from culture to culture. The reasons why Tamil women fought in the war in Sri Lanka were very different from women who contributed to the anti-colonial war in Algeria, to the militant resistance in Kashmir, or to the Maoist resistance in Nepal. A number of women continue to participate in war mongering and violent activities of right wing vigilante groups, even advocating the use of extreme violence and rape against women perceived as the ‘enemy’.

Rather than dismiss these as cases of women performing militarised masculinity, feminist works highlight the prevalence of militarised femininities, which may perform tasks that are seemingly patriarchal, but with different motivations and objectives. In many such cases of women demonstrating militarised femininity, the gendered order is subverted, sometimes causing uneasy ruptures and paradigm shifts: the culture of the

military changes, traditional gender norms are set aside and women find themselves in decision making positions, not just as victims. This does not mean that militarised masculinity disappears, but militarised femininity challenges gender stereotypes (men are violent, women are peaceful) and reclaims some ground for nuance and for the complex and multi layered identities of women.

“ A focus on masculinity enables an emphasis on the fact that most wars are man-made, and militarisation and masculinity are co-constitutive ”

A number of liberal state militaries today are making the case for women to serve in the armed forces. This may or may not change the culture of war, but will definitely mean that militaries reliant on patriarchal cohesion and male bonding will be subjected to new gender norms and greater representation of women.[12] It is impossible to not think about the consequences of these changes on issues of sexual violence and LGBTQ rights in the military, and on societies that restrict the participation of women in some arenas.

While mainstream analysis continues to focus on actors, decision-making, methods and outcomes of wars, feminists have consistently focussed on the category of gender and its relationship to the ‘everyday’ of wars. The most important contribution in the gendered rereading of war by feminists has been the focus on militarism and masculinity.[13] While this link is obvious and perhaps most overstated, recent feminist and postcolonial works have unpacked the relationship between the state, citizens and militarism. Discourses about security and development in postcolonial contexts have led to ‘excessive militarism’ that thrives on the shared consensus between the state and citizens that security is a collective enterprise in which the material and affective labour of militarism must be performed by both sides.[14] Masculinity plays a critical role in such expressions of excessive militarism, and both states and citizens adopt masculinist vocabularies, waging wars against those they see as the ‘enemy’ or the

'other'. States filled with 'postcolonial anxiety', at the slightest questioning of their sovereignty and territorial integrity, demonstrate excessive militarism in order to police non-conforming citizens, who are yet to be mainstreamed. Citizens, on the other hand, embrace military logics and military ethos, both to contest the state's violence and to confer legitimacy on the state and secure development benefits. The case of the Maoist/Naxal conflict in India is a suitable example, where the state treats Maoist insurgents as wayward citizens, who need to be –militarily– brought to the 'mainstream'. The state's masculinity is in direct contestation with the militarised masculinity of a section of the people who feel marginalised. Women have participated in the guerrilla warfare, not perhaps in the hope of complete emancipation from patriarchal constraints, but to alleviate their material and living conditions that make them vulnerable to state violence.

" Certain kinds of war deaths and suffering, such as those afflicted by hunger and famines are yet to find a place in our debates and writings "

A focus on masculinity (embodied by the state and its institutions, by vigilante/guerrilla groups, by resistance fighters and by ordinary citizens) enables an emphasis on the fact that most wars are man-made, and militarisation and masculinity are co-constitutive. Recent works in the field have challenged the idea of hegemonic masculinity, arguing for more alternative masculinities that can challenge the efficacy of wars and the violence that they necessitate. However, militarised masculinity does not fully capture the discourses around wars that deal with complex colonial histories and inequalities. In some sense as we focus on the gendered narrative of wars, we must not lose sight of the fact that in our studies are hidden erasures and marginalizations.

It is important to take into account that feminists have over emphasised certain kinds of war violence (rape, direct combat, disappearances) at the cost of those others that are perhaps not 'masculine', 'exceptional' or 'mainstream' enough. I am thinking of

famines and hunger deaths associated with wars and conflicts, a slow kind of violence that is hardly ever reported, except as a humanitarian crisis, not as war inflicted on certain populations. A careful study will suggest that more people globally are threatened by food insecurity and famines, than by death in direct combat or civilian attacks. Feminists, first appropriately suggested that wars are understudied compared to peace, then they themselves overstudied certain wars and war bodies, at the cost of others. This selective focus in critical war studies, contributes to the hierarchical gendered world, where certain deaths hold more political purchase than others. In this context, the most recent Nobel Peace Prize to the World Food Programme[15], is a timely and astute reminder to all of us, who study war and peace from a gender lens, that certain kinds of war deaths and suffering, such as those afflicted by hunger and famines are yet to find a place in our debates and writings.

“ Feminists have ably demonstrated through their research and activism that wars are ‘normalised’ through gendered discourses and practices ”

In conclusion, the gendered stories of wars point to varying roles that men and women perform, the embeddedness and subversion of gender hierarchies and the preservation of the gendered social order where wars appear to be inevitable, and perhaps even natural. As discussed in the preceding paragraphs, feminist knowledges have been critical in highlighting the various forms of violence and injuries that war inflicts, those that are hidden, erased, ‘slow’ and less spectacular. Can we then reimagine a world without the relevance and spectacle of wars? Yes. Feminists have ably demonstrated through their research and activism that wars are ‘normalised’ through gendered discourses and practices. However, this reimagination would also require us to acknowledge differences in feminist approaches, epistemologies and methods, enabling us to bust every possible myth that normalises war in human history or privileges one kind of suffering over another.

1. Parashar, Swati (2014). Women and Militant Wars: The Politics of Injury, London: Routledge.

2. Yadav, Punam. (2020). “Can women benefit from war? Women’s agency in conflict and post-conflict societies”, Journal of Peace Research.

3. Sylvester, Christine (2013). War as Experience: Contributions from International Relations and Feminist Analysis, London: Routledge.

4. Parashar, Swati (2013). “What wars and ‘war bodies’ know about international relations”, Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 26 (4): 615-630.

5. Eriksson Baaz, Maria, Stern, Maria (2013). Sexual Violence as a Weapon of War? Perceptions, Prescriptions, Problems in the Congo and Beyond. London and New York, NY: Zed Books.

6. D’Costa, Bina (2011). Nationbuilding, Gender and War Crimes in South Asia, New York: Routledge.

7. Ibid.

8. Zawleski, Marysia, Drumond, Paula, Prügl, Elisabeth and Stern, Maria eds. (2018), Sexual violence against men in Global Politics. New York: Routledge.

9. Feron, Elise (2018) Wartime Sexual Violence against Men: Masculinities and Power in Conflict Zones. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

10. D’Costa, Bina, ed. (2016) Children and Violence: Politics of Conflict in South Asia, New Delhi: Cambridge University Press India.

11. Parashar, Swati (2014) Women and Militant Wars: The Politics of Injury. London: Routledge.

12. Megan MacKenzie (2015) Beyond the Band of Brothers: The US Military and the Myth that Women Can’t Fight. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

13. Duriesmith, D. (2017). Masculinity and New War. London: Routledge.

14. Parashar, Swati (2018). "Discursive (in)securities and postcolonial anxiety: Enabling excessive militarism in India", Security Dialogue. 49 (1-2): 123-135.

15. Parashar, S., Orjuela, C. "Nobel Peace prize to World Food Programme recognises hunger as violation of human rights" , The Indian Express, October 13th 2020.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Director of Gothenburg Centre for Globalisation and Development (GCGD) and Associate Professor in Peace and Development Research at the School of Global Studies, University of Gothenburg (Sweden). Her research engages with the intersections between feminism and postcolonialism, focused on war, peace and development. Most recently, she has coedited the *Routledge Handbook of Feminist Peace Research*, which is in production. She is the author and editor of several books and journal articles and regularly contributes to media debates as an op-ed writer. She is the Associate Editor of the journal, *Critical Studies on Security* and serves on the advisory boards of *International Feminist Journal of Politics, Millennium: Journal of International Studies, Critical Terrorism Studies and Security Dialogue*. She has been an active member of the International Studies Association for over a decade, serving within its Governing Council as Chair of the Peace Studies Section, Member at Large of the Feminist Theory and Gender Studies Section and Member of the Academic Freedom Committee.

This is a translated version of the article originally published in Spanish.

Photography WPS Working Group, by Fardin Waezi/UNAMA

Beyond the policies of fear

Carme Colomina
Journalist and senior researcher specializing in the European Union, disinformation and global politics at CIDOB

Europe has militarized its crises. The more vulnerable it feels, the more it clings to symbolic policies and belligerent language. We have seen soldiers on the streets of large French or Belgian cities after they had suffered attacks as an attempt to infuse a supposed perception of security; or the president, Emmanuel Macron, declaring a health "war" on the coronavirus. The pandemic has fuelled exceptionalism and siren calls that, in the midst of the spread of contagion in Europe, praised the coercive capacity of States that managed to temporarily confine a frightened world.

Government responses to the coronavirus have, in many cases, resulted in a concentration of power and authoritarian temptations emerging with states of emergency, attempts to control public opinion, unwarranted militarization and police violence. Populist rhetoric identified the virus as an external threat, an "imported" evil, which led to the stigmatization of certain communities and the closure of borders. In Hungary, rule by decree was imposed for several months. The Bulgarian government took advantage of the pandemic to impose abusive restrictions on the Roma population, forming a perimeter around neighbourhoods where there was no evidence of Covid-19 positive test results. Media outlets were shut down in Romania. Journalists have been persecuted and access to press conferences and official information has been limited. The International Press Institute denounced "an alarming number of European governments, especially in central and eastern Europe, which have used the ongoing health crisis as a pretext to restrict the free flow of information and clamp down on independent media." In Greece, security forces used violence against asylum seekers, human rights activists and journalists. More than half a year later, exceptionalism continues. Faced with a second wave of mass infections, the logic of confinement, curfews, social restrictions and extensions of the states of emergency are

increasingly met with movements of protest and discontent in the streets of some European cities. The lack of a clear horizon and the weight of physical distance, while forced to try to comply with the logic of productivity, take their toll on mental health. The health emergency has been used as an alibi for a technocratic moment that needs to be undone.

“ Europe has developed a false security narrative. It has used fears, real or perceived, to impose political agendas and stigmatize otherness ”

The securitization of Europe is based on the violations of rights and the inhibition of responsibility. One need only to look at the humiliation, overcrowding, unhealthy conditions and despair in which the thousands of refugees trapped in camps in Greece live. They are the perfect reflection of the migration policy of a European Union (EU) that abdicated its commitment to international law and human rights long ago. An EU that has made these inhumane and dangerous living conditions the perfect manifestation of its policy of deterrence.

Europe has developed a false security narrative. It has used fears –real or perceived– to impose political agendas and stigmatize otherness. A concept of security based on the sealing of borders that is an attack on the rights and lives of those trying to reach EU territory.

Spending on security technology at Europe’s borders is around €15 billion a year and, according to some forecasts, in 2022 it could be as high as €29 billion a year. These are calculations by sociologist Jean Ziegler, a member of the advisory committee of the UN Human Rights Council and author of the book *Lesbos, la honte de l’Europe* (“Lesbos, the Shame of Europe”). Private companies have become the major providers of border services in a bunkered European Union. States have decided to relinquish their responsibility to protect –they sell it at market price– and security generates a lucrative business. Large transnational corporations export military services on lands that, until

very recently, was exclusive and inherent to States. In this Europe, so concerned about sovereignty, the business of security privatization is beginning to find loopholes.

“ States have decided to relinquish their responsibility to protect, and security generates a lucrative business ”

There are securities that are built against people, and State powers that act, in the name of security, against the individuals who question them. It is a repressive securitization, which locks people in camps that are really outdoor prisons; centres for asylum seekers, internment or administrative detention; makeshift settlements; identification centres; temporary encampments in front of the many fences that have been erected at the borders; ghettoes, jungles or *hotspots* (depending on the prevailing terminology at any given moment) that have spread throughout EU territory. Without fundamental rights or freedoms. Legal limbos and truncated times in which to build a life. Realities where women and children are the most vulnerable links.

European governments need to recognize the connections between these structures of violence and those that survive in patriarchal societies in the form of precariousness, violence, economic insecurity, invisibility or exploitation.

Democratic erosion

The regression of rights at the borders of the European Union is not unrelated to ongoing democratic involution. The Polish women in black who, for more than three years, have been protesting against the curtailment of sexual and reproductive rights systematically enforced by the PiS (*Prawo i Sprawiedliwość*, Law and Justice), or the protest movements against the far right in Italy know this. Gender has become a battleground for ideological confrontation in the European Union. Confinement due to the pandemic has multiplied intra-family aggressions and gender-based violence, which some political forces deny. Last March alone, the number of phone calls to the helpline for victims of domestic violence of the Polish NGO Women’s Rights Center

increased by 50 percent. But there are still administrations that opt for invisibility and masculinized public and political spaces that sustain structural discrimination. “Mutilated democracies”, as Daniel Innerarity calls them, ruled by the logic of sovereignty, when human interdependence should be at the heart of their political agenda.

“ The opposition to women’s rights has become a new cross-cutting argument among much of the European extreme right ”

The opposition to women’s rights –and the polarization that questions shared values and concepts– has become a new cross-cutting argument among much of the European extreme right. It is erosion in slow motion. A gradual change. A series of renunciations that are gradually making their way into political agendas. While women multiply as a mobilizing force, the populist right has turned feminism, as a concept, into one of the obsessions of their conservative counterrevolution. At the legislative level, there is also a deadlock that reflects this involution. The EU Council of Ministers has for years blocked the approval of a new directive on non-discrimination on grounds of gender, religion, disability, age or sexual orientation, which would extend equality in areas such as social protection, access to housing, education or health care. Governments are also blocking another directive –already approved by the European Parliament– for the establishment of quotas to ensure a greater presence of women on boards of directors, with Germany leading the opposition because it considers it an interference with its area of jurisdiction.

Many democracies die of “erosion”, according to Steven Levitsky and Daniel Ziblat, authors of *How democracies* Die. They die due to the renunciations of their governments and political parties in the face of setbacks in rights and violations of the separation of powers; in alliances of moderate forces with populist xenophobic parties, as has happened in Finland or Austria; in the polarization of debates and the radicalization of political agendas to win the far right vote; due to the elimination or systematic co-

optation of the arbitrators who are supposed to ensure political and institutional fair play. The idea of security in Europe has been perverted in the same way that the idea of Europe is being perverted, along with the concept of solidarity, which was considered a fundamental value of the Union.

“ While states cling to old concepts of sovereignty and borders, a hyperconnected world has made it possible to incorporate a certain cross-cutting nature to the revolt ”

Inequalities erode democracies and our perception of security. A liberal-conservative American analyst such as Arthur Brooks, director of the American Enterprise Institute, denounced long ago in Barcelona the “deficit of dignity” with which millions of people who have felt unprotected by hyperglobalization have been treated. He explained how in Donald Trump’s United States “the top and bottom of American society are completely separate today, developing completely different cultural, food and lifestyle habits”. Unequal societies in spaces undergoing transformation; and cities are today the centers where these redefinitions converge. As Eva Garcia Chueca and Raquel Roknik explain in the monograph on international municipalism and the right to the city published by CIDOB, globalization is strongly expressed in cities: the outsourcing of productive industry, the transnationalization of the financial economy and the dynamics of mobility and transit of migrants are at the heart of some of the vulnerabilities and insecurities that affect today’s cities. These cities, having become global urban phenomena, must also fight against environmental degradation, uncontrolled growth or precarious access to housing.

“Human security does not depend on the quantity or size of our weapons”, said John Paul Lederach, when he inaugurated the University of Peace in Sant Cugat del Vallès in 2018, “but on the quality of our relations, the creativity of our imagination and the courage to act from our convictions”. Security is also –and above all– based on care and protection. Beyond military power, there is a formidable relational power that is wielded

everywhere, which is changing leadership models and opening up new spaces of influence.

“ In the age of Covid, the idea of security has been transformed, more than ever, into the idea of care and the need for public services and social protection ”

The power of a global actor must also be measured by its ability to promote its own ideas. To leave dichotomies behind. Hegemonic views of the concept of security must be overcome. While states cling to old concepts of sovereignty, borders and areas of influence, this hyperconnected world has also made it possible to incorporate a certain cross-cutting nature to the revolt; in the awareness of a need for change. The challenge to abuses of power is still alive globally. Each protest is unique, yet there are obvious points of connection. From the viral nature of denunciation chants (such as *El violador eres tú* [The rapist is you]) to uprisings against corruption (from Bulgaria to Lebanon), these protests break down the barriers of fear. Traditional frameworks are slowly being overcome. Hence the regressive reactions.

We are experiencing a certain disconnect between the world’s institutional and political structures. This is due to the irruption of populism or because institutions have been surpassed, not only by the questioning of multilateralism, which is gaining adepts, but also by new geopolitical realities and the technological revolution, which has transformed and reconfigured traditional balances of power. According to Nikolas Gvosdev, an American security expert and researcher at the Carnegie Center, the pandemic has placed us at a key moment in international relations where ethics and strategy converge. And both will be indispensable to redefine the post-coronavirus world and the idea of security which, in the age of Covid, has been transformed, more than ever, into the idea of care and the need for public services and social protection.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Carme Colomina Saló is a journalist and senior researcher specializing in the European Union, disinformation and global politics at CIDOB (Barcelona Center for International Affairs). She is also an Associate Professor at the College of Europe in Bruges (Belgium) and a member of the ICIP Governing Board. As a journalist, she has covered international summits and political conflicts in some twenty countries. She has worked for the newspaper ARA, where she writes weekly, and for Catalunya Ràdio.

This is a translated version of the article originally published in Catalan.

Photography Women's March on Washington, by Ted Eytan.

What does it mean to think postcolonially about security?

Pinar Bilgin
Professor of International Relations at Bilkent University

While the definition of 'postcolonial' is contested, 'thinking postcolonially' need not be. For, it entails taking into consideration the imprint that colonialism has left on the colonisers, the colonised and everyone else. Granted, depending on the power one wields, that imprint is experienced and understood very differently. Those who are better off in terms of the distribution of power in world politics (understood in military, economic or ideational terms) have had, over the years, more opportunities in evading the colonial imprint. The awareness that we need to take that imprint into consideration when thinking about world politics is what I mean by thinking postcolonially.

What do I understand by the imprint that colonialism has left? I will break it down into three dimensions: material exploitation, define and rule, and claim to know. I will conclude by highlighting one way in which thinking postcolonially matters for policy practice.

The *material* dimension is perhaps easier to discern as rendered memorable in Frantz Fanon's words: "Europe is literally the creation of the Third World"[1]. When read together with the preceding sentences, Fanon's emphasis is on the material:

In concrete terms, Europe has been bloated out of all proportions by the gold and raw materials from such colonial countries such as Latin America, China and Africa. Today Europe's tower of opulence faced these continents, for centuries the point of departure of their shipments of diamonds, oil, silk and cotton, timber, and exotic produce to this very same Europe. Europe is literally the creation of the Third World.[2]

“ The colonial imprint can be broken down into three dimensions: material exploitation, define and rule, and claim to know ”

Yet, the material dimension is both more straightforward and trickier to discern. This is because some tend to reduce the imprint that colonialism has left to its material dimension alone. Reducing the imprint of colonialism to material usurpation alone, in turn, allows simplistic portrayals that mistake thinking postcolonially for making excuses for contemporary failings of some with reference to their colonial background. This is not to underestimate the significance of paying attention to the material dimension but to highlight that focusing only on that dimension runs the risk of undermining the effort to think postcolonially. Not only is there more than one dimension to the imprint colonialism has left on world politics, it is also not something that merely belongs to history.

It is therefore imperative to underscore that thinking postcolonially is not only about highlighting past relations of material exploitation between the coloniser and the colonised, however important such a task is. It is also about the “colonial present”, which refers to “the constellations of power, knowledge and geography that…continue to colonize lives all over the world”.[3] To give an example, thinking postcolonially allows us to see the linkages between the global coffee economy and the 1994 Rwanda genocide so that we move away from assumptions of cultural determinism, or explanations that focus on the consequences of colonial ‘divide and rule’ strategies in making sense of the violence. Thinking postcolonially about the 1994 genocide in Rwanda encourages us to study the “structured economic-material relations [that] make the conditions for genocide possible”, in that:

Pre- and post-independence colonial practices institutionalised in foreign aid donors, commodity markets, and international lending institutions formed the economic-material base on which a deadly mixture of ethnic ideology, arms exports, foreign military support, forced democratisation, an invading army, impotent international

institutions, hate radio, elite manipulation, individual complicity and regional instability created a nexus of precarious, perverse and ultimately genocidal social relationships.[4]

“ Reducing the imprint of colonialism to material usurpation alone allows simplistic portrayals ”

But then, colonial divide and rule strategies are better comprehended as define and rule policies, as Mahmood Mamdani submitted.[5] Put differently, those identity groups that are portrayed as having fought for centuries or as having been played off against each other (divide and rule) are in fact products of “define and rule” policies insofar as community identities were (re)defined and (re)shaped as part of colonial rule: “the native was classified and reclassified, each time in response to political necessity, but always in the language of cultural difference and cosmopolitan tolerance”.[6] To stay with the Rwanda case, for instance, “political and economic signifiers” were turned by 19th century colonisers into “‘ethnic’ identities in order to ease the extraction of wealth from the [Rwandan] kingdom”.[7] Thinking postcolonially, then, allows us to discern how the colonisers were able to (re)define peoples, (re)shape their community identities and decide who deserves what kind of treatment, and to study the ways in which define and rule policies continue to have implications for contemporary dynamics. Thinking postcolonially about the 1994 genocide in Rwanda allows us to see the linkages between the way coffee trade is structured (which is another colonial leftover) and the colonial (re)shaping of community identities.

That some have been able to define others (tell them who they are and what kind of treatment they deserve) brings us to the third dimension of the imprint that colonialism has left: *claim to know*. Of the three, this dimension is the most difficult to discern. Yet it is the most important one insofar as it warrants the other two, often precluding the question heading this essay. Let me elaborate.

“ Thinking postcolonially is about rejecting Eurocentrism and calling for broadening existing perspectives ”

What does it mean to think postcolonially about anything? ‘Not much’, some say without much hesitation. That self-assured claim that there is no need to think postcolonially takes at least two forms: ‘we know because we produce universal knowledge’, and ‘we know because we aspire to produce non-parochial knowledge’. The difference between the two is not unimportant.

The former answer (‘We know because we produce universal knowledge’) is unreflective of Eurocentric limitations to knowledge production. Eurocentric limitations here refer to the situatedness of knowledge –that knowledge is not independent of where it is produced and by whom. In the 19th and early 20th centuries knowledge was produced in and by individuals and institutions in Western Europe, which was in a colonial relationship with much of the rest of the world. What some view as ‘universal knowledge’ is implicated in such relationships of power and their contemporary echoes.

The latter answer (‘we know because we aspire to produce non-parochial knowledge’) is aware of and reflects upon of its own Eurocentrism. Parochialism of knowledge refers to the limitations imposed by one’s own local concerns in its production. Eurocentrism is not just another form of parochialism but goes beyond it by virtue of the power that Eurocentric body of knowledge has yielded since the 19th century. Those who insist on the need for not only non-Eurocentric but also non-parochial knowledge fear that thinking postcolonially would amount to cultural relativism, i.e. the presumption that only members of individual cultures are authorised to speak about their culture and such claims cannot be evaluated one against the other. Yet, as Uma Narayan[8] has maintained, “commitment to the contextual nature of knowledge does not require us to claim that those who do not inhabit these contexts can never have any knowledge of them” or that communication is impossible. Rather it amounts to an attempt to make knowledge less exclusionary. As Siba Grovogui[9] has argued, “belief in the possibility of

life beyond the polis has existed elsewhere across history, along with the ambition to develop corresponding moral implements".

" It is not only the content of narratives about other parts of the world but also the concepts and categories through which they are told that need rethinking "

To recap, thinking postcolonially about the third dimension of the imprint that colonialism has left, the *claim to know*, is about rejecting Eurocentrism and calling for broadening existing perspectives to "account for the multiplicity of political languages and ethical idioms from which differently situated individuals and communities derive their notions of common humanity and social justice".[10] Viewing the call for thinking postcolonially as warranting cultural relativism underestimates the contributions that this body of thought has made. That said, those who claim to know often do not know about such contributions "because of the lack of methods for indexing and cataloguing them alongside comparable and concurrent thought forms".[11]

But then, how to address this third dimension which warrants the other two? Writing alternative narratives on 'non-Europe' does not suffice. For, what is missing is not narratives about other parts of the world, but relationships in between, explored postcolonially. This is because it is not only the content of narratives about other parts of the world but also the concepts and categories through which they are told that need rethinking. Over the years, apparent absence of non-European experiences from mainstream narratives has been constitutive both of the discipline and of subjects and objects of security in different parts of the world. As with gendering the production of knowledge, it is not only about increasing the number of women contributors, but also about changing "the very nature of those activities and their self-understanding".[12] Thinking postcolonially offers a remedy insofar as students of world politics would learn to challenge Eurocentrism not only by reflecting upon the empirical focus of their narratives, or their situatedness, but also challenge the claim to know on the part of

some by virtue of having already defined "the idea of what counts as an explanation".[13]

" When insecurities are understood as 'the aftermath of Europe', self-reflection and other policies of engagement become not only possible but also needed "

Having identified three dimensions of the imprint colonialism has left on all students of world politics, let me highlight one way in which thinking postcolonially matters for security policy. Failing to think postcolonially blinds policy-making in important ways. Oftentimes problems occurring 'beyond Europe' are portrayed as "before Europe".[14] Needless to say, 'Europe' here does not denote mere geography but a particular claim to know about world politics. That is to say, thinking about "beyond Europe" as "before Europe" could be observed in other parts of the world, including but not limited to North America.

Other parts of the world are often portrayed as "before Europe" not only economically (as per usual in such debates) but also normatively, insofar as they were viewed as carrying values that belong to a past world that 'Europe' is understood to have left behind. Thinking postcolonially, in turn, allows us to understand the ways in which developments that are portrayed as "before Europe" are at the same time *the aftermath of 'Europe'* as regards their colonial past and/or present. A case at hand is differentiated experiences with 'the international system of sovereignty' in Western Europe and Africa throughout the 20th century. Whereas "one regime contributed to the 'resilience' of European 'quasi-states', another helped to undermine the sovereignty of African entities and, later, to assist in the 'failure' of a number of African states", underscores Grovogui:[15]

Specifically, the regime of sovereignty applied by European powers to Belgium, from its inception in 1830 to the present, contrasted greatly with that applied to the Congo, from the Berlin Conference in 1884 to the end of Belgian colonial rule in Congo in 1960. The

same is true of Switzerland and Zaire in the post-World War II era.

“ Debates about responsibility beyond borders could move towards our complicity in sustaining our ‘colonial present’ ”

Thinking postcolonially about these cases is important for policy practice. For, how the problem at hand is understood shapes thinking about the solutions. When insecurities in another part of the world are understood as “before Europe”, the solution proposed is fit for those who live in such a past world, i.e. involving violent response (as with the 2003 war on Iraq or the Libya intervention in 2011). [16]

However, when those insecurities are understood as ‘the aftermath of Europe’, then self-reflection and other policies of engagement become not only possible but also needed. As seen in the discussion on thinking postcolonially about the 1994 genocide in Rwanda, the purpose would be to uncover “how what is commonly understood as a local ‘ethnic conflict’ can simultaneously be described as an over-determined symptom of a particularly violent neoliberal restructuring of the global capitalist economy”.[17] Accordingly, debates about responsibility beyond borders could move away from being merely about the colonial past or the possibility of humanitarian intervention, and towards our complicity in sustaining our ‘colonial present’.

1. Fanon, Frantz (1963) The Wretched of the Earth, Translated by Constance Farrington. New York: Groove Weidenfeld.

2. Ibid, p 58.

3. Gregory, Derek (2004) The colonial present, New York: Wiley.

4. Kamola, Isaac A. (2007) “The global coffee economy and the production of genocide in Rwanda”, Third World Quarterly 28 (3): 571-92.

5. Mamdani, Mahmood (2012) Define and Rule: Native as Political Identity. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

6. Ibid, p 29.

7. İbid, Kamola, p 577.

8. Narayan, Uma (2004) “The Project of Feminist Epistemology: Perspective from.” In The feminist standpoint theory reader: Intellectual and political controversies, edited by Sandra Harding, 213-24. New York: Routledge.

9. Grovogui, Siba N. (2005) “The New Cosmopolitanisms: Subtexts, Pretexts and Context of Ethics”, International Relations 19 (1): 103-113.

10. Ibid, p 113, 105.

11. Ibid, p 106.

12. Ibid Narayan, 312.

13. Seth, Sanjay (2014) “The Politics of knowledge: Or, how to stop being eurocentric”, History Compass 12 (4): 311-20.

14. McGrane, Bernard (1989) Beyond Anthropology: Society and the Other, New York: Columbia University Press.

15. Grovogui, Siba N. (2002) “Regimes of sovereignty: International morality and the African condition”, European Journal of International Relations 8 (3): 315-38.

16. Jabri, Vivienne (2013) The Postcolonial Subject: Claiming Politics/governing Others in Late Modernity, London: Routledge.

17. Ibid, Kamola p 573.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Pınar Bilgin is professor of International Relations at Bilkent University (Turkey). She specialized in Critical Security Studies and is the author of Regional *Security in the Middle East: A Critical Perspective* (2005; 2nd ed. 2019), *The International in Security, Security*

in the International (2016) and co-editor of *Routledge Handbook of International Political Sociology (with Xavier Guillaume, 2017), Asia in International Relations: Unthinking Imperial Power Relations* (with L.H.M. Ling, 2017).

Photography: Wind rose on the pavement in front of the monument to the discoveries, Lisbon, Portugal.

IN DEPTH

Extractivism's intrinsic violence: the domination of women and the domination of nature

Shamim Meer
Feminist activist, researcher and writer. Collectively written with WoMin

Over the past years women across the world brought attention to men's violence against women with increased vigour and anger. In capital cities across the world, women held marches, slutwalks,[1] *flashmobs* and *hashtag* campaigns. In Lebanon women hung wedding dresses from nooses, in Beijing women walked the streets in wedding dresses splattered with red paint, in Brazil women scattered hundreds of items of underwear across a beach, and in Argentina women stripped and lay in a heap in front of a banner saying "Femicide is Genocide". These demonstrations screamed out that women want an end to violence and rape and an end to men's impunity for such violence in private and public spaces.

Relatively more absent in mainstream media is the violence experienced by women in remote rural areas. A long way from capital cities, extractive industries such as mining, agricultural plantations and mega dam projects wreak the violence of impoverishment on women's lives. Women and their communities encounter land, forest and water grabbing at times at gunpoint, disruptions in ways of living, and the destruction of ways of sustaining life.

“ In remote rural areas, extractive industries, agricultural plantations and mega dam projects wreak the violence of impoverishment on women’s lives ”

When women and their communities exercise their right to say no[2] to the natural resource grabbing by extractive industries, when they protest removals, or the failure of companies to fulfil promises of relocation and development they face the might of the army and the police. They also face the might of private security, which defend company wealth by policing the movement of community members, searching bodies and homes, and sexually violating women. Often women are reluctant to speak of the sexual violence they encounter, fearing not only reprisals from security forces but also the patriarchal victim blaming from their own families and communities that often accompanies sexualised violence.

Guns, power and politics

In recent research with partners, WoMin brings ecofeminist understandings to the exploration of the political economy of extractivism in three countries –Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Sierra Leone.[3] The research reveals how corporations and the political elite manipulate and undermine law and policy and use violence to gain control over mineral wealth. It makes clear that the violence unleashed upon poor women and their communities and upon the earth’s resources is intrinsic to the current economic system.

This predatory system of capitalism places profit and the wealth of an elite ahead of the security of the majority of the earth’s people, the ecosystems upon which all life defends, and the sustainability of the planet. It is women, in particular, who bear the cost of this violent and destructive economic system.

“ The violence unleashed upon poor women and their communities and upon the earth’s resources is intrinsic to the current economic system ”

Women’s specific experiences result from their reproductive roles –the expectation that women should perform household duties, bear and rear children, care for the sick, and from deeply rooted sexist ideas about the services, including sex, that men believe they can extract from women. The work of reproduction also includes putting food on the table, mobilising energy, and ensuring that the family and the community have access to safe water resources. Women are designated responsibility for all of these.

In all three contexts, mining under colonial rule led to the displacement and dispossession of people, turning men into cheap labourers, and abusing women’s reproductive labour in order to keep men at work and guarantee the next generation of workers in the mines and factories. The research by WoMin and its partners highlights how colonial land grabs, dispossession and exploitation continue in the neoliberal and neocolonial present, as national elites aid, abet and enable multinational corporations to continue natural resource grabbing.

Laws in all three countries privilege multinational companies and fail to protect the rights of communities whose lives are destroyed to make way for mining. In addition, in all three contexts the state and company security unleashed violence on communities in order to establish and maintain control over minerals.

“ Colonial land grabs, dispossession and exploitation continue in the neoliberal and neocolonial present, with the permission of

national elites ”

A case study: Marange[4]

The Marange diamond mining area of Zimbabwe has been a battlefield with military and company security waging war on artisanal miners and the local community for the past 14 years in order to secure control over the diamond wealth[5]

Diamonds were discovered in Marange in 2005. Between November 2006 and October 2008, police killed, tortured, beat, harassed, and set dogs on artisanal miners in raids intended to drive them from the fields. Police assaulted and arrested local community members and subjected women to sexualized violence.

A woman from Marange recounted[6] how a truck of soldiers stopped her and another woman as they were coming from the fields. The women were forced to strip, armed with sticks, and then instructed to fight one another. The soldiers indicated that the loser would be raped by the soldiers in the truck.

“ The state and company security unleashed violence on communities in order to establish and maintain control over minerals ”

On October 27th, 2008 the Army, Air Force and Central Intelligence Organisation (CIO) launched Operation *Hakudzokwi*[7] in Marange. Soldiers fired live ammunition and teargas from the ground and from helicopters at artisanal miners and villagers. More than 200 artisanal miners and diamond dealers were gunned down. Thousands more were tortured, and hundreds of women were raped.

In 2009 armed forces forcibly removed 1,300 families from Marange to clear land for diamond mining. There was no consultation and families were forced onto trucks at gunpoint, their homes destroyed by bulldozers. They were moved to Arda Transau, a

government farm about 60 km north of Marange, where they experience considerable hardship and continued violence.

The Marange area has been declared a restricted zone under the Protected Places and Areas Act (PPAA) and this turns villagers into effective prisoners, with outsiders including family members able to visit the area only if they have police clearance. Villagers are regularly searched for diamonds at 11 checkpoints on the more than 100 kilometre road between Mutare and Marange, and women often experience sexual violence at these checkpoints. Three women told *Human Rights Watch* that a male police constable forced them to strip naked at a checkpoint, and inserted his gloved finger in their private parts, claiming to be looking for hidden diamonds.[8]

“ Not a single arrest has been made for these human rights violations of miners and women. ”

The harassment, murder, assault and sexual abuse perpetrated by security operatives has continued over the years, as highlighted by reports on the torture and killings of artisanal miners in August 2019.[9] Yet, not a single arrest has been made for these human rights violations of miners and women.

Linking domination of women to the domination of nature

Women in all three-country studies conducted by WoMin and allies, experienced sexualised violence including rape at the hands of state and company security forces. However, while there was much documentation on violence on the communities, there was little documentation on women’s experiences of such violence.

Ecofeminist understandings that such violence is intrinsic to a violent extractivist model of development, enables the development of transformative organising approaches and alternative visions. This is in contrast to mainstream responses to violence against women, which often individualise the problem and the solution, offering women individual treatment or casting justice in legal terms.

“ Both land and women are deemed inferior, are treated as property and as commodities that are expendable and are abused ”

Challenging mainstream responses, WoMin with other ecofeminists point out that violence against women is linked to systems of class and patriarchal oppression; and that change is needed in structures of oppression while at the same time addressing the immediate effects through counselling, breaking the silence, and enabling women to work through self-blame, fear, and stigma.

For ecofeminists, the domination of women and the domination of nature are linked. Claudia von Werlhof[10] sees the patriarchal urge to dominate and control as embedded within capitalism which places money, economic growth and profit ahead of people and the environment. Nature and women are dominated as a result of this urge and are a means to increasing profits. Both land and women are deemed inferior, are treated as property and as commodities that are expendable and are abused. The environment is destroyed and women’s reproductive labour is abused and used as a subsidy to capital. Women are exploited by men in power for the profit, success, and pleasure of these men.[11]

The domination of women therefore stems from the same ideologies that lead to the domination of the environment. Increased profits and growth are touted as progress or development, and take place through processes which entail the domination over and the exploitation of both nature and women.

“ Ecofeminist understandings contrast to mainstream responses to violence against women, which often individualise the problem

and the solution ”

Vandana Shiva[12] points out that capitalist patriarchy abuses both nature and the sustenance economy stretching both to their limits. The earth and its resources, which sustain life, are destroyed; women are displaced from their livelihoods and removed from access to the land, forests, water and seeds on which they and their families and communities depend for survival. The powerful grab resources from the vulnerable, and this intensifies violence. Women’s deepening vulnerability as a result of extractivist land grabs and ecological exploitation makes them more vulnerable to violence.

WoMin’s ecofeminist analysis highlights that both women and nature carry the externalised costs of an extractivist economic system. The costs to nature include pollution, the destruction of large swathes of land, forest and water bodies, the growing loss of biodiversity, and ultimately, hand in hand with all forms of extractivism, is the growing climate crisis. Because of women’s role in social reproduction they are the ones who clean up polluted ecosystems, walk longer and further to meet basic needs of their families, and fall ill as they encounter, in the greatest proximity, the toxicities and poisons of this model of development. This gives rise to the idea that extractivist capitalism is an economy of unpaid costs, for it is nature and people, especially women, which absorb the social, environmental and economic costs, whilst capital carries few or none. The system is structured so that corporations pay little if any of the costs of clean ups, fair compensation for the loss of resources and livelihoods, increases in women’s unpaid labour, and the costs of destroyed health in affected communities.

“ Extractivist capitalism is an economy of unpaid costs, for it is nature and people who absorb the social, environmental and economic costs ”

In line with ecofeminist thinking, the Yaoska Guardians Movement of Rancho Grande in northern Nicaragua see body and land as territories to defend.[13] The movement rejects

mining because mining impacts the sustainable local economy; mining changes ecosystems and water sources burdening women, who are responsible for ensuring the food and health of their families; mining promotes sexual division of labor and deepens relationships of domination of men over women; mining leads to increased sexual violence and abuse by men who come from outside the area, and feel entitled to invade the territory and the bodies of women.

In defending land from mining, the Guardians Movement is defending a way of life deeply rooted in the land and in the community, in which mutual care still exists. The territory they are defending cannot be filled with relationships of inequality, as these weaken the community and causes divisions. They are defending a good and happy life for all, with free bodies living in harmony with each other and with nature.

Building power and alternatives from below

WoMin draws on ecofeminist understandings that ending violence against women means moving beyond a violent economy shaped by capitalist patriarchy to a nonviolent, sustainable peaceful economy that respects women and the earth. This transition can only be achieved through movements of conscientized people, with clear political analysis and strategy, unified across countries and sectors.

“ Moving beyond a violent economy to a peaceful economy can only be achieved through movements of conscientized people, unified across countries and sectors ”

It is from this understanding that WoMin and its allies support women’s organizing and movement-building and works with women in communities impacted by violent repression to address trauma, organize, explore the roots of violence and advance ecofeminist alternatives to development. Our interventions include some of the following:

Firstly, we have been supporting women who experienced extreme violence and torture perpetrated by the military and police, to work through trauma and define what justice means to them, in context, and taking into account the risks women and their communities confront. This work, piloted in partnership with the *Counselling Services Unit* in Zimbabwe, entailed developing a collective model of trauma support which enables women to organize, support one another, rebuild livelihoods, build consciousness, and break down the victim-blaming narrative.[14]

Secondly, WoMin and its partners have been working, alongside women, to undertake research which illustrates the connection between patriarchal extractivist capitalism and violence, including violence against women. This work includes research on the political economy of extractives in Mozambique, Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe; the documentation of women's experiences in Zimbabwe, and an African webinar on extractives to build a common analysis.[15]

" WoMin works with women in communities impacted by violent repression to address trauma, organize and advance ecofeminist alternatives to development "

Thirdly, we support women and their communities in sites across the continent, to deepen their resistance to destructive extractivism under the banner of the Right to Say NO. As women and their communities say NO to mega projects, assert their collective rights to the commons, and their control over the territory of their bodies, they are also defending and asserting their YES to 'development' as the good life, defined on their own terms.

Finally, the work above is located in a wider alliance effort to collectively imagine Pan African alternatives to the dominant extractivist capitalist model. Led by women from below, and supported through a wide alliance of organisations,[16] this work on building an alternative vision of the Just Transition[17] is ongoing and involves creative

engagement of women in dialogues, learning exchanges, research and documentation on women's coping strategies and living alternatives and will culminate in an expression of women's dreams and hopes for a different community, society and Africa. The final expression of these dreams may emerge as a charter, a tapestry or a series of stories.

1. The SlutWalk movement began in 2011 and wants to challenge rape culture and myths about the nature of sexual violence –including who is likely to commit it and who is likely to be a victim.

2. Right to Say NO is a call by communities for development sovereignty so that they can shape their development without external intervention.

3. WoMin and its partners –Centre for Natural Resource Governance (CNRG) in Zimbabwe, Justiçia Ambiental (JA) in Mozambique, and Network Movement for Justice and Development (NMJD) in Sierra Leone– undertook research published in 2020 under the title "Guns, Power and Politics Extractives and Violence Against Women".

4. Guns, Power and Politics Extractives and Violence Against Women in Zimbabwe Research Report", WoMin CNRG and WoMin Alliance, 2020.

5. Human Rights Watch (2009) "Diamonds in the Rough Human Rights Abuses in the Marange Diamond Fields of Zimbabwe", reports on the brutality and human rights abuses wreaked on artisanal miners and villagers.

6. Recounted to WoMin and Counselling Services Unit (Zimbabwe), who are working in partnership with women in communities affected by mining.

7. Shona word meaning "you do not come back".

8. Ibid.

9. CNRG, "Extreme Human Rights violations continue in Marange", August 2019.

10. Von Werlhof, Claudia (2007) "No critique of capitalism without a critique of patriarchy! Why the Left is no alternative", Capitalism Nature Socialism, 18(1), 13-27.

11. WoMin has long made this argument in inter alia the following publications: "Collection 1: Synthesis of the available literature addressing key themes and questions related to women, gender and extractives","Women Building Power Towards Climate, Energy And Justice","Covid-19 – Crisis upon crisis in Africa: an ecofeminist perspective", and "Addressing crisis and building counter power through new African ecofeminist movement".

12. Mies, Maria and Shiva, Vandana (1993). Ecofeminism. London: Zed Books.

13. World Rainforest Movement, "Defending the body-earth territory: An alternative for social movements in resistance 1" , Bulletin 226, September/October 2016, Uruguay.

14. This experience is being written up for launch in 2021.

15. A conceptual paper on violence against women in extractive sectors from a social, ecological and political economy vantage point is underway.

16. WoMin, the southern African Rural Women's Assembly, the World March of Women, Friends of the Earth Africa, local women's organisations, and academics.

17. A Just Transition, for WoMin and other social movements, involves rethinking our relationship with nature, building peoples and women's power from below, and the radical transformation to an economic system of support and care that sustains livelihoods.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Shamim Meer is a researcher, writer, writing coach and educator working with activists in communities and trade unions. She has written on feminist struggles, women's land rights, violence against women among other issues. She co-founded feminist publications *SPEAK Magazine* and *Agenda* –a journal about women and gender. She is currently working with WoMin on a conceptual paper on violence against women in extractive sectors from a social, ecological and political economy perspective.

Photography: Waiting for rain in Burkina Faso, by John Isaac/Un Photo

RECOMANEM

Materials and resources recommended by the ICIP

Book
***The Ethics of Care: A Feminist Approach to Human Security*, by Fiona Robinson**

Robinson's book is one of the most important contributions to the literature on human security, on the one hand, and to the feminist ethics of care, on the other.

She takes a unique approach, using a feminist lens to advocate for the need to include gender and care as backbones in addressing security. Her analysis, both in ethical and practical terms, provides a baseline for understanding and addressing the material, emotional and psychological conditions that create insecurity for people. Her book also explores the practical implications of care relations in a variety of contexts: women's labor in the global economy, humanitarian intervention and peacebuilding, healthcare, and childcare.

Theoretically innovative and relevant to public policymaking, this critical analysis demonstrates the need to change the existing security paradigm, which reinforces obstacles and inequalities that hinder the equitable and adequate delivery of care around the world.

Book
***Routledge Handbook of Gender and Security*, by Caron Gentry, Laura Shepherd and Laura Sjoberg**

This handbook, edited by Caron Gentry, Laura Shepherd and Laura Sjoberg, three renowned academics and theorists on feminist security, provides a comprehensive look at the study of gender and security in global politics. The volume is based on the core

argument that gender is conceptually necessary to think about key security issues and is also important for considering new policies with more open and inclusive approaches. Contributions to this volume look at various aspects of studying gender and security through lenses that intertwine diverse feminisms, the political implications they entail and the most recent theoretical contributions to security.

Beyond the theorizing contributions of the articles, the book also shows how political practice and theory work together (when they do). The last section is dedicated to institutions that work on the concepts of gender and security around the world.

Like all the Routledge handbooks, both in terms of subject matter and list of contributions, this volume is a valuable reference tool for students of security studies and international relations.

Report

***A Feminist Foreign Policy for the European Union*, Centre for Feminist Foreign Policy**

The aim of this study is to put forward and initiate the discussion on a feminist foreign policy in the European Union. In its various sections, authors Nina Bernading and Kristina Lunz outline the opportunities that can be derived from adopting such a policy and offer the state of the art of foreign policies from around the world. They also analyze the various dominant narratives regarding gender, gender equality and existing initiatives aimed at promoting a feminist foreign policy within the EU's external action.

Finally, the report suggests specific priorities and steps aimed at advancing a feminist approach, with a strong desire to contribute to a change in the implementation of foreign policy. Among other things, it calls for the mandatory representation of women in foreign policy and recommends increasing financial and human resources to make this possible. It highlights the need to address and understand the experiences of ethnic and sexual minorities and to dismantle the male-dominated hierarchy in foreign policy.

Report

***Feminist security: Conceptual contributions and current development*, ICIP**

This report, published by ICIP and prepared by Ana Villelas, Maria Villelas and Pamela Urrutia, researchers at the School for a Culture of Peace, offers a perspective on the developments and main contributions of feminist security studies, with a particular focus on Latin America.

Numerous conceptual contributions and recent publications that are especially relevant to the gender, peace and security agenda are referenced based on a literature review. The paper highlights the predominance of Anglo-Saxon references in the academic literature on feminist security and notes the need to diversify the theoretical and practical approach to security. Thus, the authors defend the necessary documentation and dissemination of the multiple practical experiences that take place in various contexts of chronic violence. They also emphasize the importance of articulating allegations of human rights violations, peacebuilding strategies and alternative approaches to hegemonic security.

Project

Red Latinoamericana de Seguridad Incluyente y Sostenible (Latin American Inclusive and Sustainable Security Network)

The *Red Latinoamericana de Seguridad Incluyente y Sostenible*, made up of international experts from the fields of politics, academia, diplomacy, the security sector and civil society organizations, was created for the purpose of debating and seeking common answers.

In Latin America, the tendency to militarize public safety policies and use strong-arm tactics may result in relative short-term success and generate electoral gains, but these measures fail to address the underlying causes of insecurity, instability and challenges of democracy. The network strives to change paradigms, concepts and policies, and move towards a concept of security that is more democratic, inclusive and linked to development.

The Latin American Network of Inclusive and Sustainable Security was established under the umbrella of the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung Foundation in Colombia (FESCOL), which seeks to promote public policy analysis and debate, support learning processes and international exchange experiences, and give visibility and recognition to

peacebuilding efforts.

Dialogues series
Rethinking security

In 2020, ICIP, in collaboration with other organizations, organized two series of online seminars dedicated to reflecting on the notion of security and feminist security in particular.

On the one hand, in May, ICIP proposed the webinar series "Rethinking security in times of Covid-19" with the aim of reflecting on the prevailing notion of state security to address the pandemic and defining short- and long-term strategies that focus on security policies designed to defend people. The series consists of three sessions, in Spanish, available on the ICIP YouTube channel.

On the other hand, in November, ICIP organized the series "20 years of the Women, Peace and Security Agenda" in order to take stock of compliance with the United Nations resolution on Women, Peace and Security, adopted in 2000, and reflect on the challenges that remain to advance in this area. The series consists of three sessions, in Spanish and English, available on the ICIP YouTube channel.

This webinars series was jointly-organized by WILPF Spain, CEIPAZ and Alianza por la Solidaridad, with support from the School for a Culture of Peace, the Delàs Center for Peace Studies, the SIP Foundation and the University of Málaga.

SOBRE L'ICIP

News, activities and publications about the ICIP

ICIP
International Catalan Institute for Peace

Congolese activist Julienne Lusenge, ICIP Peace in Progress Award 2020

The ICIP Board of Governors has decided to grant the ICIP Peace in Progress Award 2020 to the activist for human rights, peace and security in the Democratic Republic of Congo Julienne Lusenge, for her work on the “prevention and reduction of sexual and gender-based violence, and the strengthening women’s participation in peacebuilding” in the African country.

Lusenge is founder and currently president of the organization SOFEPADI (Female Solidarity for Integrated Peace and Development), which provides integral attention to victims of sexual and gender-based violence, and she is executive director of Fund for Congolese Women, which offers financial and technical support for the empowerment of Congolese women and girls to become agents of change within their families and their communities. She is also founder of hospital Karibuni Wa Mama, in Bunia, which provides holistic services to sexual violence survivors and their children, having served over 7,000 survivors to date.

Originally from eastern Congo –a region devastated by war started in 1998 and by atrocities committed by armed groups against local communities and, in particular, against women and girls– Lusenge has experienced this violence herself and has emerged as a voice to denounce injustices and support the victims. From the organizations where she works, Lusenge has pushed the Congolese government and the international community to act against sexual violence and to put women at the centre

of peace and security processes and foster the political rights of women and girls. She has advocated for the adoption of Resolutions 1820 and 1325 on women rights at the UN Security Council and for the creation of the Special Relator to the Democratic Republic of Congo.

ICIP presents the "Coexistence and polarization in Catalonia" survey

The ICIP has published the "Coexistence and polarization in Catalonia" ICIP 2020 Survey. The poll, coordinated by political scientist Berta Barbet, was based on 2,010 online interviews, with the aim of assessing the perception of coexistence in Catalonia and the dynamics of polarization, accentuated by the current territorial conflict. This is the first survey conducted in Catalonia that analyses the emotional polarization of its citizens.

The results of the survey show that the majority of the population values the level of coexistence in Catalonia positively. Specifically, 67 % consider coexistence in Catalonia to be good or very good. The levels of social trust are also positive, since the degree of trust of the Catalan population in the rest of the population is higher than the levels in Spain as a whole and the European average.

The survey also analyses the situation of ideological polarization in Catalonia based on various issues. The results indicate that the territorial conflict is currently the issue that generates the most polarization, and this polarization has opened wounds: a quarter of the population doesn't feel empathy or trust for those who think differently, and almost half have felt attacked by an institution as a result of the territorial conflict.

Read the full Report ICIP: Survey on polarization and coexistence in Catalonia by Berta Barbet.

Open call for the Documentation of Experiences of Spaces for Critical Analysis and Awareness in Peacebuilding

The ICIP call for proposals to produce the following documents:
1. Museums of Peace. An annotated bibliography in this topic, with a synthesis of the conceptual developments of the pedagogical criteria. A description of the most emblematic cases (physical and virtual) at an international level, incorporating data on

their impact, quantitative data (number of visits, budget, funding, etc.) and qualitative data.

2. Centers for Civil Society Organizations (NGO hub). A description of the main international centers for civil society organizations dedicated to peace, with an international outlook. Description of similar spaces with a vocation for global justice: budget, characteristics of the organizations, coordination among the organizations and with the administration, financing, typology of users, etc.

3. Centers and spaces for critical thinking on peace, violence and global justice, with a commitment to raising public awareness beyond publications and conferences. A description of the main initiatives (highlight those that have had the most impact with quantitative and qualitative data).

Last publications

- *Survey on polarization and coexistence in Catalonia 2020*, by Berta Barbet. Reports 17/2020. Available the summary of the survey.

– *Feminist security. Conceptual contributions and current development,* by Pamela Urrutia, Ana Vilellas and María Vilellas. Reports 16/2020.

– *Polarización. Una mirada a la dinámica del pensamiento nosotros versus ellos*, by Bart Brandsma. Published by the ICIP and Líniazero (in Spanish and Catalan).

– *Thoreau. Biografia essencial*, by Antonio Casado da Rocha. Published by the ICIP and Angle Editorial (in Catalan).

– *Desarme, desmovilización y reinserción. Teoría y práctica*, by Desmond Molloy. Published by the ICIP and Edicions Bellaterra (in Spanish).