

1

Introduction

*Kathleen Kuehnast, Chantal de Jonge Oudraat,
and Helga Hernes*

For most of the twentieth century the study and practice of war and international relations were dominated by men and focused on the security of states. The end of the Cold War and the changing nature of violent conflict—in particular, the unique and formidable challenges posed by intrastate conflicts—have changed the way in which policymakers and experts think about war and its impacts. At the conceptual level we have witnessed a shift from a perspective that sees security solely through a military lens and thus emphasized the security of states to a perspective that takes into account nonmilitary aspects of security, drawing on the notion of human security to focus on the individual and relations between individuals and groups within societies. This changed perspective has also led to greater awareness of the role of gender in international relations. At the operational level, we have witnessed a call for a more active role for the United Nations and greater sensitivity to the specific challenges faced by women in conflict situations.

The Fourth World Conference on Women, held in Beijing in 1995, brought the impact of war on women's lives and the issue of women's agency in international and national security issues to the attention of world leaders.¹ Five years later, they adopted UN Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1325. By recognizing the importance of the role of

1. Until 1995 the global conferences on women had focused on economic development issues.

women in preventing and resolving violent conflict, the members of the Security Council handed civil society organizations and women peace activists from around the world a major victory and an authoritative instrument for further mobilization. At the heart of the resolution are two main ideas. First, women must have the power to participate equally in all efforts to maintain and promote peace and security. The resolution recognized that women were largely absent from decision-making processes related to conflict prevention and resolution and that their role must be increased. Only the full and equal participation of both men and women could provide a sustainable and lasting peace. Second, world leaders recognized that women are more exposed to physical violence than men, especially in intrastate conflicts, and that they bear inordinate burdens during conflict. Hence, special efforts need to be made to protect them from physical violence—sexual violence, in particular—and to help them overcome the burdens imposed by war.

Since the adoption of UNSCR 1325, many states, international organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and academic institutions have undertaken many activities, including the elaboration of action plans, policies, and guidelines to ensure that women have equal and fair representation at operational and decision-making levels and be extended specific measures to guarantee their protection from physical harm—sexual violence, in particular. In sum, Resolution 1325 has become a powerful tool for those advocating for gender equality (gender balancing) and greater sensitivity to gender issues (gender mainstreaming). That said, stereotypical thinking about men and women in the international peace and security realm is persistent, and much remains to be done at both the conceptual and operational levels.

In this introductory chapter we do three things. First, we briefly review the state of the field—that is, we examine current thinking about the role of gender in the international security realm. The literature on this issue, while growing, remains on the margins of the international security studies field and suffers from the lack of good empirical data. Second, we briefly examine the situation of women in the field—that is, the way international actors have dealt with the particular role of women during and after violent conflict. We look in particular at how gender sensitivity has affected the situation of women in refugee camps, peace operations, and post-conflict reforms of the security sector. Again, much progress has been made, but more remains to be done. Lastly, we provide a road map to this volume and offer guidance for the road ahead.

Women and War: The State of the Field

In linking women's experiences of conflict to the international peace and security agenda, UNSCR 1325 recognizes gender to be a key issue for conflict analysis. That said, there is a lot of confusion and lack of understanding about the role of gender in conflict. Indeed, much of the literature on conflict and security depicts women as passive victims.

Recent research on women and conflict challenges this view and presents a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the varied roles of women in conflict. Caroline Moser and Fiona Clark (2001), for example, have highlighted the different roles that women play in conflict. The essays in their edited volume show that women often do not remain passive spectators during a war, or simply innocent victims, as once thought. Rather, they take on new roles and responsibilities, often participating in violent struggles as active combatants, or taking on the role of provider for their families by obtaining resources and building networks of support. The essays in Krishna Kumar's collection (2001) emphasize that though war places a heavy burden on women and may exact disproportionate costs from them, conflict may also help redefine traditional roles and reconfigure existing gender relations within society.

Conflict analysis that takes gender into account has also come to distinguish between women's roles before, during, and after conflict by focusing on societal inequalities that exist in access to and control over resources and participation in decision making at different points within the conflict cycle. For example, Tsjeard Bouta and Georg Frerks (2002) have proposed a framework identifying seven different roles that women may play in internal conflicts. They may be victims of (sexual) violence, combatants, peace activists in the non-governmental sector, actors in formal peace politics, coping and surviving actors, household heads, and/or employed in the formal or informal economic sectors. Combinations of these roles may also occur.

Others have stressed that more active roles of women are dependent on national, socioeconomic, and cultural contexts and often will fail without broader social transformations (Afshar and Eade 2003). For example, attention paid to women only during the post-conflict period may come too late to transform patriarchal gender relations (Meintjes, Turshen, and Pillay 2002). Projects focused on women in war, then, should take into account both the underlying gendered power relations that affected women's roles before the conflict broke out and the dynamics of social change that occur over the conflict cycle (Afshar and Eade 2003). Tsjeard Bouta, Georg Frerks, and Ian Bannon (2004) have suggested that policies and projects that introduce gender equality and notions of inclusion must, in order to

be effective, capitalize on gains made by women during wartime. Conflict presents an opportunity to encourage change and build more inclusive and gender-balanced social, economic, and political power relations in post-conflict societies. In addition, it has been argued that inclusive policies that engage women and youth and tackle underlying structural causes and power relations will result in more effective and long-term peaceful relations (Baksh-Sodeen 2005).

Efforts to end war and prevent its recurrence also need to provide the means for women to be active participants in building an inclusive, peaceful society. Indeed, those who assume power in the aftermath of war are the actors who create the social, political, and economic conditions within which such power is maintained (Mazurana, Raven-Roberts, and Parpart 2005). The marginalization of gender as a “soft” issue in conflict resolution and reconstruction can thus perpetuate or re-create societal inequalities that encourage conflict. In order to achieve sustainable peace, gender equality and gender discrimination issues should be regarded as essential components of post-conflict reconstruction projects (Greenberg and Zuckerman 2006). Elaine Zuckerman and Marcia Greenberg (2004) recommend a framework for post-conflict reconstruction work that addresses gender through a rights-based approach, identifying the kinds of rights that must be guaranteed to women in the post-conflict period. These include not only the right to participate in policymaking and resource allocation but also the right to benefit equally from those resources and services.

In spite of these advances in our understanding of the role of gender in conflict and post-conflict situations, gendered analyses of international relations and conflict situations remain marginal and outside the mainstream. This state of affairs has practical consequences, as Donald Steinberg explains in the concluding chapter of this volume. He recalls how the 1994 “gender-neutral” peace accords to end the civil war in Angola lacked provisions requiring the participation of women in the implementation bodies, and as a result “issues such as sexual violence, human trafficking, abuses by government and rebel security forces, reproductive health care, and girls’ education were given short shrift, if addressed at all.” Similarly, the amnesty provisions showed Angolan women that the peace process was intended for the ex-combatants and not for the women subject to sexual abuse during the war. He reminds us that gender-neutral peace accords not only neglect the voices of women, they also fail to recognize that such neglect ultimately undermines the peace. Similarly, many observers worry that talks about reconciliation with the Taliban in Afghanistan will ignore gender issues and shortchange women’s rights (Hassan 2010).

Disregard of women's basic human rights, such as protection from sexual abuse and access to education and work, will result in women's continued relegation to subordinate positions in the home and private sphere and the perpetuation of their being marginalized in the public sphere. Many feminist theorists argue that unless the unequal power relations between men and women are dealt with, insecurities and violent conflict will persist. A "sustainable peace requires a more permanent transformation of social norms around violence, gender and power" (Sarosi 2007, 1). As Susan Willett contends, "Gender hierarchies are socially constructed, and maintained, through power structures that work against women's participation in foreign and national security policymaking" (Willett 2010, 145; see also Tickner 2001). Ignoring these structures will only preserve relationships of oppression and subordination. Indeed, many women engaged in peace talks will frequently remind their Western interlocutors that ending the war often does not stop the violence.

The lack of attention in academic circles to the notion of gender and the role of women in international security, as well as the refusal to seriously examine gender as an analytical concept and a unit of analysis, is in the first instance a resistance to envisaging alternatives to traditional notions of security. For many academics and policymakers, security continues to be defined primarily in military terms and connected to the notion of the state. A worldview that remains prisoner of a Hobbesian and Westphalian conception of power has little to say about gender or the particular role of women in international peace and security. As long as these dominant frameworks stay in place, scant progress can be made in understanding what goes on in today's predominant form of violent conflict—namely, internal conflict. We believe that an effective conflict prevention and conflict management strategy must bring into focus the gendered reality of international relations and explore the complex web of power inequalities operating within and across the sexes.

The Lack of Data

The marginalization of gendered analyses in international peace and security studies has meant that the research agenda on these issues remains underdeveloped. International and national nongovernmental organizations have been more active in this realm and have provided a wealth of data on the experiences of women in war—but much of this material is anecdotal and lacks a systematic and analytical focus. The absence of systematically collected data is repeatedly lamented in the chapters in this volume.

The problem of accurate and reliable data is particularly acute when considering conflict casualty data—a key indicator for the severity of a conflict. There are many institutions that track deaths resulting from violent conflict. Each of these institutions has its own set of drivers and rationales for collecting data. Hence, they collect different types of data and use different methodologies. For example, the military focuses on military casualties and collects wartime casualty data—that is, they monitor the direct effects of combat and combat-related exposures.² NGOs and relief agencies, on the other hand, often focus on civilians and collect data about broader causes of death.³ Finally, academics might collect death-related data to uncover trends with regard to violent conflicts over time. They will generally adhere to strict definitions of violent conflict, using criteria of fatality thresholds and time frames, but those definitions themselves can vary widely, ranging from 1,000 deaths per year to 100 or 25 deaths per year (Eck 2005; World Bank forthcoming). As a result, we are often faced with conflicting findings. Moreover, in many civil wars it is often hard to make a real distinction between deaths directly related to combat and deaths occurring indirectly as a result of war—either because of health and sanitary issues or because of other forms of violence related to the conflict (Lacina and Gleditsch 2005; Roberts 2006).⁴

Conflict mortality data disaggregated by gender are virtually nonexistent. None of the major institutions that collect conflict data has made systematic efforts to gather such data. From the little data available, we know that men are more likely to die during conflicts—if only because combatants are predominantly male. In addition, while recent studies have pointed to an overall decline in battle deaths, the female:male ratio of people dying as a direct effect of violent conflict seems to have gone up considerably in the post-Cold War era—that is, relatively more women are dying as a direct consequence of war (Ormhaug, Meier, and Hernes

2. Civilian deaths are usually considered “collateral damage” by the military. The problems related to collateral damage in Afghanistan—that is, civilian deaths caused by failed military attacks—have led to a number of innovations in NATO’s data collection on civilian casualties. See Cameron, Spagat, and Hicks 2010.

3. The protocols for the collection of data often lack systematic definitions and hence are generally not consistent over time or across regions. While these data are important for quick impressions, it is hard to distill broader and more systematic lessons from them. Some observers have accused NGOs of grossly overreporting casualties, as the latest controversy on the Democratic Republic of the Congo illustrates.

4. War is often accompanied by other forms of violence, such as criminal and sexual violence. In addition, it must be pointed out that attendant fatalities related to disease, malnutrition, or exhaustion are often hard to quantify, in part because many countries lack reliable peacetime mortality data. See also Lacina and Gleditsch 2005; Roberts 2006.

2009; Lacina and Gleditsch 2005; Human Security Report Project 2005, 2010; Murray et al. 2002).

Some recent studies have also shown that the death rate of women is greater than that of men after the conflict is over (Ormhaug, Meier, and Hernes 2009). Thomas Plümper and Eric Neumayer (2006) have argued that the effect of war on women is particularly severe in ethnic conflicts. They also found that if in peacetime women are likely to outlive men, that difference in life expectancy becomes much smaller in conflict and post-conflict situations.⁵

Recent studies have also shown that women suffer more and die in proportionally greater numbers than do men from human rights abuses, the breakdown of social order, the lack of medical care, and the consequences of economic devastation. Some studies have argued that for women, the lawlessness of many post-conflict situations with their widespread violence is as dangerous and devastating as armed conflict itself (Ghobarah, Huth, and Russett 2003; for a different view, see Li and Wen 2005). It is obvious that the threat and fear of abuse in a post-conflict situation will keep women from leaving their homes, working, or otherwise participating in society. The reluctance to send children to school is usually an early indicator warning of widespread problems and lack of security. In Afghanistan, this is a grave problem with regard to girls' schools.

The destruction of infrastructures such as hospitals and schools causes great harm to family welfare and has a devastating effect on women and children. The desolation of the countryside and the presence of undetected mines make planting and harvesting very hazardous—and in many societies it is mainly the women who carry out these tasks. The lack of employment opportunities often has a greater direct effect on men, perhaps leading them into criminal activities, which in turn affect their families and communities.

The importance of collecting and analyzing conflict data was recognized by the members of the UN Security Council when adopting UNSCR 1325. Indeed, data on casualties and the causes of death would provide policymakers with great insights into the origins of violent conflict and when, where, and how to prioritize interventions. Unfortunately, much remains to be done in this area. For example, a report published by the United Nations in the fall of 2009 never mentions age and gender when discussing civilian protection policies (Holt, Taylor, and Kelly 2009). The absence of such data greatly impedes putting into place effective protection policies.

5. Plümper and Neumayer found that gender differences in life expectancy seem unaffected by interstate wars.

Women and War: In the Field

UNSCR 1325 describes women and children as “the vast majority of those adversely affected by armed conflict, including as refugees and internally displaced persons, and increasingly . . . targeted by combatants and armed elements[.]” Undersecretary-General John Holmes for the UN Office of the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) stated in a 2009 briefing to the UN Security Council: “However familiar the challenges to the protection of civilians are[,] . . . ensuring that we respond to them in a comprehensive and consistent way continues to elude us” (Holmes 2009, 6).

The lawlessness and lack of protection are especially striking in refugee camps. Peacekeeping forces have also at times been the cause of much insecurity and have subjected local populations to sexual abuse. Finally, ensuring protection and equal participation requires that gender issues be taken into account when dealing with reforms of the security sector in the post-conflict phase.

Refugee and IDP Camps

Around the world, 42 million people have been forced from their homes. Of these, 15.2 million are refugees and 26 million are internally displaced persons (IDPs). Women and children make up 68 percent of refugees and 70 percent of IDPs, yet refugee camps are quite often run by male refugees and male humanitarian workers (UNHCR 2009). The camps, despite all efforts by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees and despite the organization’s greatly improved gender strategies, are often very violent places. They are fortresses that still serve to protect warring groups, and the UNHCR rarely has at its disposal the security forces necessary to remove the combatants. There is a great shortage of nonmilitary security personnel in general, and in the camps in particular. Consequently, rapes occur at an alarming rate inside the camps. According to the UNHCR, there is a strong link between falling levels of assistance to refugees and their increasing vulnerability and exposure to forced sex work and sexual exploitation (UNHCR 2008). Refugee women rarely have any control over the distribution of food, blankets, health services, and other resources, and they must pay dearly for this dependence as they struggle for life’s necessities for themselves and their children.

The security conditions in refugee camps would improve if both staff and policymakers would take a greater number of women into their ranks, and if the existing codes of conduct for all international staff were more strictly enforced. Refugee women need to be included in making decisions that affect them and their children’s lives, the gender awareness of

international personnel must be improved, and refugees must be given legal and political status. Many refugees, especially girls and women, have no identity cards and few are registered. Their redress is minimal and their legal status at times uncertain, even though the UNHCR has increasingly addressed these problems (UNHCR 2008).

Peacekeeping Operations

Allegations and revelations of sexual abuse by UN peacekeepers go back to the early 1990s and the peace operations in Cambodia and the Balkans. However, it is only in 2005, after the publication of a report on sexual abuse by UN peacekeepers in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), that the United Nations started to address this problem more seriously. In addressing abuses, particularly sexual abuses by peacekeeping forces, the most important instruments have been so-called mainstreaming processes—namely efforts to increase gender sensitivity and consciousness on the part of male peacekeeping and security personnel through gender training and efforts to integrate and recruit women into peacekeeping operations and security forces. The thinking underlying these efforts mirrors standard democratic thought about the positive effects of representation and participation in decision making by those whose interests are affected, in this case women. This underlying assumption is also expressed in the opening paragraphs of UNSCR 1325.

Countries differ widely in the representation of women in their legislatures and in their commitment to gender equality. Many of those that have adopted gender equality policies also as a matter of policy recruit women into the security forces (Schjølset 2010). These policies make a case for acknowledging women's legitimate claim to participate and be represented in any type of peace operation, peacebuilding, and peace negotiation, as well as their right to security and to protection on par with men.

The active recruitment of women into the security forces is usually justified by appeals to gender equality and women's right of access to all types of positions in society, often supplemented by arguments of efficiency, utility, and complementary gender roles. The presence of women and creating a gender balance are viewed by many officers as salutary for their organization and for the success of the mission as a whole. Such justifications have increased with the greater number of humanitarian interventions and the increased contact of intervention forces with civilian populations. In the opinion of many officers, the presence of female colleagues in their teams has become mandatory if they are to effectively communicate with the civilian population—that is, with women as well as men. The U.S. Marines have deployed “female engagement teams” in Afghanistan in order to reach local women when units are out on patrol (Bumiller 2010). Norwegian

officers and those from other International Security Assistance Force units deploy their female troops with the same aim in mind. Many observers claim that the participation of women among personnel deployed in the security sector has proven to be crucial in bringing about successful operations and in preventing criminal behavior. This is especially true of all-female formed police units, such as the Indian one in Liberia, or the Ghanaian and Nigerian women deployed in Sierra Leone (Carvajal 2010). The Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) Gender Unit plans to carry out an evaluation of the impact of women's participation in peacekeeping operations during the past decade.⁶

Some experts have suggested that the presence of women in these organizations enhances civilian women's access to services, that women are more likely to enter into a dialogue rather than a confrontation with the civilian population, that they help reduce sexual misconduct by male international personnel, and that they enhance the confidence and trust of civilians in general. Thus, according to most military leaders and political decision makers, the implications of integrating women into both international and national security forces are wide-ranging and positive (Conaway and Shoemaker 2008).

That said, more research is needed to evaluate the precise effects of women's presence in the field. The anecdotal experience of those who have deployed women in peacekeeping forces, in police forces, and among civilian personnel in peace operations is worth noting. Indeed, the actual number of women involved in peace operations is still very small: in 2008, women comprised 2 percent (1,700) of all troops, 3 percent (89) of military observers, and 7 percent of all police (Center on International Cooperation 2009). The numbers change radically when civilians are taken into account. Thirty percent of all international civilian staff are women; 38 percent among the staff of the UN Department of Field Support are women; and 30 percent of the professional staff at DPKO headquarters are women. The uniformed personnel among the international and national staff in the United Nations include 7,700 women (7 percent of the total). However, only a small number fall into what might be considered the security sector. An exception is Liberia, where women made up 6 percent of the military observers, 2 percent of the troops, and 18 percent of the police, as well as 34 percent of the international civilian staff. These relatively high numbers result from a conscious decision by the Liberian government and the United Nations to recruit women. Even more impressive,

6. Clare Hutchinson, gender adviser at UN DPKO, personal communication to Helga Hernes, New York, April 2010.

the successful deployment of the female security personnel led to a 30 percent increase in the number of women in the national Liberian police force. A similar increase in the number of female police officers had earlier been observed in Kosovo, similarly as a result of the international deployment of women. The United Nations has made recruitment of police, including women, one of its top priorities, and aims to increase the proportion of female police officers to 20 percent by 2015. This initiative in part reflects the recognition that many contemporary security challenges, especially in countries recovering from conflict, are handled better by police than by military forces. In addition, in many post-conflict situations women's trust in all uniformed men is low, and they are reluctant to turn to male uniformed personnel for assistance.

The four countries contributing the most women soldiers to UN forces are Nigeria, India, Nepal, and Bangladesh. In most countries the number of available women professionals in the security sector is still very low, and for that reason the Norwegian and the Swedish governments have put great stress on recruiting women to their civilian crisis response units, which draw on individuals from all professions relevant to the security sector. This Scandinavian emphasis recognizes the ever-increasing need for personnel serving abroad who can communicate with both men and women, especially those women who are victims of sexual and gender-based violence, as well as the positive effects of female personnel in the field in peace operations. UNSCR 1325 aims to ensure women's right to representation and participation in all processes that affect their lives, including all types of peace operations, which—whether military, police, or civilian—are crucial for the effectiveness of the establishment of peace, stability, and security. The UN Police Division recognizes that there are still many obstacles to women's participation in the police service. Difficulties in recruitment, promotion, and retention are due in part to discrimination, and in part to the lack of any kind of satisfactory family policies, which not surprisingly affects women more than men (Police Division, OROLSI, DPKO 2010).

The major obstacle, however, is that countries contributing troops and police have few women in the ranks of their security personnel; they are not very successful at retaining or promoting the women whom they do recruit. Therefore, the prospects of recruiting significant numbers of women for future peacekeeping operations and meeting the demands of the United Nations are not optimistic. The recruitment and retention of female personnel in the security sector will for a period require affirmative action and antidiscrimination policies, as well as respect for women's need for health policies different from those of men and an end to sexual harassment, which still is a feature of all armies and police forces. What is needed, in

other words, are policies and programs aimed at ensuring gender equality for all security forces, regardless of country of origin (Conaway and Shoemaker 2008).

As important as the presence and integration of women professionals is the training of men in what has come to be called “gender sensitivity.” We know from experience that “gender blindness” is pervasive in male-dominated organizations, especially those that make up the security sector. Their organizational ethos is very masculine, and it is easier, for example, to speak about “zero-tolerance policies” or gender balance and percentages than to explain what equity or gender mainstreaming actually entails. Gender sensitivity is first of all an awareness of the basic human rights of women, which requires treating those who commit sexual transgressions as criminals and putting an end to their impunity. It is also the realization that in many situations women and men have different needs as well as different perceptions. It is a sad fact of life that many men tend to downplay other men’s sexual transgressions and harassment of women, not realizing how such actions are experienced by women. Security forces need to be trained to respect women’s equal worth as human beings, which among other things entails preventing and responding to violence against women. Only then can trust in the system, so often sorely lacking in post-conflict societies, begin to develop.

Security Sector Reform

The 1998 study commissioned by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development’s Development Assistance Committee, titled *DAC Guidelines on Conflict, Peace and Development Cooperation*, marked the development community’s willingness to address internal security issues after several decades of refusing to do so (Bryden 2007) and was an important step forward, since it changed the rules on the use of DAC’s financial resources. Security sector reform became the natural extension of disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration programs.

The security sector encompasses military and paramilitary forces, police forces, border guards, customs services, and the judicial and penal system, and its reform is a decisive step toward closing the security gap. Reform of the security sector is not limited to security in the narrow sense of the term but instead, and more importantly, is concerned with the legitimacy of the state, as well as accountability, democracy, good governance, and the social contract between the citizen and the state. The core elements of security sector reform are strengthening the rule of law, the judicial system, and democratic institutions; combating organized crime; and putting an end to trafficking in small arms, light weapons, and persons.

The need to integrate gender concerns into these security reform efforts has now been recognized and accepted by most international actors. That said, despite efforts by organizations such as the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF), which developed gender and security sector reform “tool kits” that are aimed at training security personnel (DCAF 2010), the resources at hand remain limited and the will to act is often lacking. Threats against men’s security are generally taken more seriously by national and international authorities than threats to which women are exposed. Louise Olsson (2009) has coined the term “security equality” to describe women’s equal right to protection from physical violence, a right often overlooked in peace settlements because women are absent from the negotiations. Personal safety and security and a firmly established rule of law are preconditions for women’s participation in the labor market and in public life, and their participation in both arenas is essential if they are to become equal partners in the social and economic life of their societies. Security sector reform increases stability and trust in the rule of law, which are necessary for peacebuilding. Women’s trust will depend on the system’s ability to remove threats to their personal security.

UNSCR 1325 has provided important impetuses to introduce gender concerns into policies and practices that deal with the causes and consequences of violent conflict—some progress has been made, but too often gender concerns remain “ad-hoc, dependent of a few committed individuals or small-scale units. Women are still an afterthought in many instances— . . . the feel-good project to make donors and diplomats look good. A box to be ticked, a meeting to be had, a paragraph to be written” (Anderlini 2007, 230).

The Road Ahead

This volume examines some of the concerns that led to the adoption of UNSCR 1325 and takes stock of current thinking and understanding of the resolution’s two pillars—power and protection. We examine what has been done thus far to ensure greater participation of women at the negotiating table as well as their participation in national prevention and post-conflict reconstruction strategies. We also examine the issue of sexual violence and discuss efforts to guarantee the protection of vulnerable groups, women in particular.

In chapter 2, Sanam Anderlini explores the impact of UNSCR 1325 in the legal sphere of power and protection, focusing on instances in which the resolution has contributed to the development of laws and practices

at the international, national, and local levels. The chapter also discusses the resolution's implications for future programming related to the rule of law. Chapters 3 and 4 focus on the problem of protecting women in the context of war. Elisabeth Jean Wood examines the variations of sexual violence that occur in different conflicts. She argues that the internal dynamics of armed groups explain this variation and develops policy recommendations. Inger Skjelsbæk further addresses the complexity of wartime sexual violence by drawing on studies from wars in the former Yugoslavia to map what we know about sexual violence in war and how we should expand research strategies to help us understand and hence address this issue more effectively in the future.

In chapter 5, Tilman Brück and Marc Vothknecht shed light on the economic situation of women in post-conflict settings by analyzing recent evidence from both qualitative and quantitative research. The authors find the cessation of violence, as well as equal access to resources, education, training, and employment, to be key to women's economic empowerment in post-conflict societies. In the volume's conclusion, chapter 6, Donald Steinberg issues a call to action in order to realize the promise of UNSCR 1325. Steinberg suggests that the success of these efforts will be measured not by the number of resolutions passed or the amount of money spent, but by the progress made in protecting the lives of women on the ground and the opportunities to play their rightful and vital role in peace processes and post-conflict governments and economies.

UNSCR 1325 has been a major instrument for advancing the power of women or, put differently, the rights of women—rights to speak, rights to move freely, and rights to own. It also was a major impetus for paying greater attention to the protection of women, particularly their protection from sexual abuse. But at the operational level, the implementation of UNSCR 1325 remains limited to a few countries. Only 19 out of 192 countries have adopted national action plans, and their scope varies widely.⁷ Similarly, at the United Nations, implementation of UNSCR 1325, be it in terms of gender balancing or of gender mainstreaming, remains a distant goal. The number of women appointed in high-level positions in peace and security operations remains extremely low—in 2008, out of sixty-six top management positions in peacebuilding only six were occupied by women (Puechguirbal 2010; WIIS 2006). Gender mainstreaming likewise remains far from complete. UN insiders as well as outside observers have pointed to a lack of understanding of what gender mainstreaming actually means, and they have noted the institution's lack of interest in pursuing it

7. In October 2010, the United States announced it would develop a National Action Plan.

seriously. At best, gender mainstreaming is viewed as a nonpolitical task. A recent analysis of UN documents concludes that most of them use stereotypical language that denies active roles for women and instead represents women mainly as victims (Puechguirbal 2010). In addition, women are persistently associated with children and cast as caretakers—portrayals that restrict them to the private sphere. Gender hierarchies are almost always taken as a given and women are most frequently “depicted as harmless victims in need of protection by male protectors” (Puechguirbal 2010, 177), leaving little room for women as independent agents. UN documents also tend to perpetuate the myth that women are somehow more peaceful than men.

In sum, despite the increased awareness at the policy level of how gender concerns affect international peace and security, implementation of gender sensitive policies is still flawed. Recent peacebuilding operations and interventions suggest that gender reforms do not necessarily strengthen the rights of women in a sustainable way (Bernard et al. 2008; Porter 2007). If women’s particular human rights and concerns are not explicitly integrated into peacebuilding mandates, strategies, and plans, then women’s concerns will continue to be marginalized and treated as matters that can be attended to later. Given the disproportionate exposure of women to violence in the wake of conflict, significant steps need to be taken to protect women, and to give them a stronger voice and greater visibility so that they are able to represent their own interests and participate in the reconstruction of their societies.

In 2000, members of the Security Council professed their belief that women play an important role in preventing and resolving conflicts and in peacebuilding and expressed the need to therefore provide women with the power to fully participate in making decisions about conflict prevention and resolution. World leaders also recognized that the continual assaults on women, particularly sexual assaults, have greatly hampered efforts at achieving durable peace and reconciliation—hence the importance of putting protective measures into place. The first decade of UNSCR 1325 has seen some progress, but women still lack power and are not given sufficient protection in contemporary wars.

Finally, we believe that it is important to engage the international relations field not only at an epistemological and ontological level but also on a well-grounded empirical level. By highlighting the relationship between micro-level local practices and macro-level global policies, we can lay bare the local impacts of global norms, practices, and regulations and discover how they affect local and global gender inequalities (True 2002; Youngs 2004; Tickner 2001; Enloe 2000; Goldstein 2003). In so doing we make

possible a better understanding of the forces leading to war and peace. The lack of accurate data about how gender affects issues of power and inequality helps sustain many of the myths surrounding men and women and reinforces stereotypes.

References

- Afshar, H., and D. Eade, eds. 2003. *Development, Women, and War: Feminist Perspectives*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Anderlini, S. N. 2007. *Women Building Peace: What They Do, Why It Matters*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Baksh-Sodeen, R., ed. 2005. *Gender Mainstreaming in Conflict Transformation*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Bernard, C., S. Jones, O. Oliker, C. Quantic Thurston, B. K. Stearns, and K. Cordell. 2008. *Women and Nation-Building*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Bouta, T., and G. Frerks. 2002. "Women's Roles in Conflict Prevention, Conflict Resolution, and Post-Conflict Reconstruction: Literature Review and Institutional Analysis." Netherlands Institute of International Relation.
- Bouta, T., G. Frerks, and I. Bannon. 2004. *Gender, Conflict, and Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Bryden, A. 2007. "From Policy to Practice: The OECD's Evolving Role in Security System Reform." Policy Paper No. 22. Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DECAF), Geneva.
- Bumiller, E. 2010. "Letting Women Reach Women in Afghan War." *New York Times*, 6 March.
- Cameron, E., M. Spagat, and M. Hicks. 2010. "Tracking Civilian Casualties under COMISAF's Tactical Directive." *British Army Review*, March, 32–38.
- Carvajal, D. 2010. "A Female Approach to Peacekeeping." *New York Times*, 6 March.
- Center on International Cooperation. 2009. *Annual Review of Global Peace Operations*. Boulder, CO: Lynn Rienner Publishers.
- Conaway, C. P., and J. Shoemaker. 2008. "Women in United Nations Peace Operations: Increasing the Leadership Opportunity." Paper presented at Women in International Security, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, July.
- DCAF. 2010. "Gender and Security Sector Reform Training Resource Website." Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF). Available at www.gssrtraining.ch (accessed 3 May 2010).
- Eck, K. 2005. *A Beginner's Guide to Conflict Data: Finding and Using the Right Dataset*. UCDP Papers 1. Uppsala: Uppsala Conflict Data Program.
- Enloe, C. 2000. *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ghobarah, H., P. Huth, and B. Russett. 2003. "Civil Wars Kill and Maim People—Long After the Shooting Stops." *American Political Science Review* 97: 189–202.
- Goldstein, J. S. 2003. *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenberg, M. E., and E. Zuckerman. 2006. "The Gender Dimensions of Post-Conflict Reconstruction: The Challenges in Development Aid." UNU-WIDER Research Paper 2006/62. Available at www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/files/rp2006-62.pdf (accessed 28 June 2010).

- Hassan, P. 2010. "The Afghan Peace Jirga: Ensuring That Women Are at the Peace Table." *USIP Peacebrief* 29, May.
- Holmes, J. 2009. "Statement to Security Council on the Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict." 14 January. Available at <http://ochaonline.un.org/OCHAHome/AboutUs/TheUSGERC/2010StatementsandSpeeches/2009StatementsandSpeeches/tabid/5959/language/en-US/Default.aspx> (accessed 3 May 2010).
- Holt, V., G. Taylor, and M. Kelly. 2009. *Protecting Civilians in the Context of UN Peacekeeping Operations: Successes, Setbacks and Remaining Challenges*. Independent Study Jointly Commissioned by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. New York: United Nations.
- Human Security Report Project. 2010. *The Shrinking Costs of War*. Part 2 of the *Human Security Report 2009*. Vancouver: HSRP.
- Kumar, K., ed. 2001. *Women and Civil War: Impact, Organizations, and Action*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Lacina, B., and N. P. Gleditsch. 2005. "Monitoring Trends in Global Combat." *European Journal of Population* 21:145–66.
- Li, Q., and M. Wen. 2005. "The Immediate and Lingering Effects of Armed Conflict on Adult Mortality: A Time Series, Cross-National Analysis." *Journal of Peace Research* 42:471–92.
- Mazurana, D., A. Raven-Roberts, and J. Parpart, eds. 2005. *Gender, Conflict, and Peacekeeping*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Meintjes, S., M. Turshen, and A. Pillay, eds. 2002. *The Aftermath: Women in Post-Conflict Transformation*. London: Zed Books.
- Moser, C. O. N., and F. Clark, eds. 2001. *Victims, Perpetrators, or Actors? Gender, Armed Conflict, and Political Violence*. London: Zed Books.
- Murray, C., G. King, A. Lopez, N. Tomijima, and E. G. Krug. 2002. "Armed Conflict as a Public Health Problem." *British Medical Journal* 239:346–49.
- Olsson, L. 2009. *Gender Equality and United Nations Peace Operations in Timor Leste*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Ormhaug, C. M., P. Meier, and H. Hernes. 2009. *Armed Conflict Deaths Disaggregated by Gender*. PRIO Paper, 23 November. A Report for the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Oslo: International Peace Research Institute.
- Plümper, T., and E. Neumayer. 2006. "The Unequal Burden of War: The Effect of Armed Conflict on the Gender Gap in Life Expectancy." *International Organization* 60:723–54.
- Police Division, OROLSI, DPKO. 2010. "Gender and Police: Factsheet." April, United Nations, New York.
- Porter, E. 2007. *Peacebuilding: Women in International Perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Puechguirbal, N. 2010. "Discourses on Gender, Patriarchy and Resolution 1325: A Textual Analysis of UN Documents." *International Peacekeeping* 17:172–87.
- Roberts, D. 2006. "Human Security or Human Insecurity? Moving the Debate Forward." *Security Dialogue* 37:249–61.
- Sarosi, D. 2007. "Human Security: Does Gender Matter?" Paper presented at conference "Mainstreaming Human Security: The Asian Contribution," Bangkok, 4–5 October. Available at <http://humansecurityconf.polsi.chula.ac.th/Documents/Presentations/Diana.pdf> (accessed 28 June 2010).
- Schjølset, A. 2010. "Closing the Gender Gap in the Armed Forces: The Varying Success of Recruitment and Retention Strategies in NATO." PRIO Policy Brief 4. Peace Research Institute Oslo, Oslo.

- Tickner, J. A. 2001. *Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post-Cold War Era*. International Relations Series. New York: Columbia University Press.
- True, J. 2002. "Engendering International Relations: What Difference Does Second-Generation Feminism Make?" Working Paper 2002/1, May. Department of International Relations, Australian National University, Canberra.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). 2008. *UNHCR Handbook for the Protection of Women and Girls*. Geneva: UNHCR.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). 2009. "Demographic Characteristics and Location." Chapter 5 in *UNHCR Statistical Yearbook 2008*, 51–56. Geneva: UNHCR. Available at www.unhcr.org/4bcc5aec9.html (accessed 3 May 2010).
- WIIS. 2006. "United Nations Reform: Improving Peace Operations by Advancing the Role of Women." Washington, DC: Women in International Security.
- Willett, S. 2010. "Introduction: Security Council Resolution 1325: Assessing the Impact on Women, Peace and Security." *International Peacekeeping* 17:142–58.
- World Bank. Forthcoming. "Review of Databases on Violence and Conflict."
- Youngs, G. 2004. "Feminist International Relations: A Contradiction in Terms? Or: Why Women and Gender Are Essential to Understanding the World 'We' Live In." *International Affairs* 80:75–87.
- Zuckerman, E., and M. Greenberg. 2004. "The Gender Dimensions of Post-Conflict Reconstruction: An Analytical Framework for Policymakers." *Gender and Development* 12:70–82.