

The Discursive Politics of Gendering Human Security: Beyond the Binaries

Myra Marx Ferree

This book has shown the concept of human security to be a catch-all term. Sometimes it stresses freedom from fear of violence, both interpersonal and militarized, and sometimes freedom from want in the sense of combatting the starvation and disease that kill more people worldwide than guns do. Sometimes it is used to legitimate and encourage police actions, both within local communities and by powerful states across national borders, as in US interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan. But at other times it is used to hold states accountable for their militarized drug and sex politics, ethnic repressions, and clashes over resources, arguing that violence in the name of ending violence is also a source of pervasive insecurity for those caught in the crosshairs.

So why try to “gender” such an amorphous and polysemic concept? By means of gendering human security, this book has offered a frame for all types of violence that reveals how they are embedded in gender relations, and used this frame as a means of advancing a more clearly feminist discourse of human security. Thinking of gender, violence and human security together is sometimes done in essentialist and stereotyped ways, but the feminist approach offered in this volume instead presents these relationships as complex, contested and intersectional. This approach is fundamentally a political one, in that it keeps the issue of power in the foreground. Feminist thinking about gender differs in this critical regard from using gender to mean thinking just about women or just about sex differences. A feminist gendering of human security discourse is a means of reconfiguring the idea of what human security should

be and imagining new approaches to applying it for the good of both women and men, not the old “add women and stir” type of inclusion.

The chapters of this volume offer a variety of ways for feminist scholars to engage constructively with the concept of human security, but perhaps just as importantly, the chapters offer significant practical reasons why it is essential not to ignore the development and impact of this human security discourse on national and international policy making. Whether by pointing to a problem in how the concept is applied, or finding promising uses for it in specific cases, each chapter provides an example of the practical importance of a critically informed, feminist understanding for ongoing political work, not only in peace-building but in advancing social inclusion and economic justice.

In this chapter, I first review some key theoretical claims about the notions of human security and of gender that animate this volume. I particularly emphasize the ways that gendering human security is a way of doing politics with discourse. The study of discursive politics is an outgrowth of analyses of the work that social movements, political parties and transnational advocacy networks do to name problems, set agendas and motivate normative change across multiple potential issues (Keck and Sikkink 1998, Stone 2001, Lombardo, Meier and Verloo 2009). I specifically highlight the ways that feminists have choices in how to gender human security discourse, define the approach called intersectionality and argue for the importance of an intersectional feminist perspective. I emphasize that even with gender included, human security can be defined in terms that hide power and injustice, that emphasize only violent conflicts, and that become as top-down and authoritarian as the state security models the discourse was supposed to correct. The implication for feminist discursive

politics is that the concrete implications of gender for human security and human security for gender should be reciprocally intersectional; both together can add breadth to the scope of what needs are considered political and particularity to the complexity of voices heard in particular struggles, but especially so when each concept is allowed to de-universalize the other.

After developing this argument, this chapter reprises the practical implications of gendering human security that these various chapters suggest and concludes by pointing out policy directions sensitive to these concerns. Although the authors stress different aspects of the application of gender to human security struggles, they are complementary in how they bring a wider understanding of politics to bear, join the micro and macro aspects of human insecurity and challenge the intersectional processes of constructing and subordinating others. Taken as a whole, their analyses reveal that mainstreaming gender into human security discussions will demand more than just bringing in attention to women but that, nonetheless, justice can only be done if particular attention is given to women. Making human security a more feminist framework is thus a discursive challenge, one that demands incorporating all women's voices in a framework which values both inclusion and diversity.

Gendering Human Security as Intersectional Feminist Politics

Human security has been defined as safeguarding “the vital core of all human lives from critical pervasive threats, in a way that is consistent with long-term human fulfillment” (Alkire 2003). In addition to being an unrealized goal of actual global politics, human security is a discourse with claims to configuring power, a way of thinking about the world and its material

social relations that both reflects existing power relations and is used to reinforce and to challenge them. In the discursive work around human security, we suggest that separating the concept of security from justice is particularly problematic, and not only for women. The very idea of peace without justice implies a politics of silencing and disempowering groups whose needs are being systematically ignored and excluded. Such exclusions connect as well as divide the interests of particular women and men in cross-cutting ways; this is what has come to be called intersectionality, a concept that this chapter will unpack in several dimensions.

As Tripp's first chapter amply documented, the current discourse of human security has contradictory elements; it has not been stabilized into any one hegemonic form, and although there are efforts by various actors (from the UN to defense intellectuals) to do so, it has not gained the invisibility, naturalness, and "taken-for-granted" status that characterizes hegemonic ideas. The ambiguity of what human security will be thought to mean in specific situations also leaves the way that human security can be "gendered" still open for debate. Gender itself is a discourse with configuring power on social relations but one that is also subject to various political interpretations, including some claims that are determinist (fixity ordained by God or nature), essentialist (in binary opposition), or social constructionist (separating sexed bodies from gender performance). Since invoking gender relations as relevant can suggest a number of quite different political projects, even feminists vary in their understanding of gender.

For the feminist view of gender advanced in this book, the crucial intervention into the framing of gender has been the development of intersectionality as a specific approach, one that is particularly critical of binary views of men and women and committed to a broadly

inclusive understanding of social justice. Intersectional theories of gender stress its macro-social grounding in relationships of power. Among other theorists, initially mostly women of color in the United States, Patricia Hill Collins (1986) is notable for highlighting the crisscrossing relations of injustice formed by gender, race and class oppressions and emphasizing that the downtrodden in one relationship can still be oppressors in another relationship. Kimberlé Crenshaw (1991) devised the specific and now widely used term intersectionality to describe the multidimensionality and non-additivity of such social relations of injustice. Both Hancock (2007) and McCall (2005) point out that intersectionality has since become a broad term, covering a variety of specific analytic strategies, but that such an approach also offers some generally important considerations for gender politics. These apply strongly in the case of human security discourses.

First, from an intersectional feminist perspective, gender is not the only relationship that matters, but it does matter. Seeking justice implies acknowledging gender as a process relevant to the individual and collective security of both women and men, but it also demands responding to women's particular interests in resisting patriarchal power and ending gendered inequalities, recognizing how these are also embedded within and shaped by other power relations (Choo and Ferree 2010, Lutz, Vivar and Supik 2011). Second, the intersectional perspective also connects the macro level and micro level by highlighting the ways that structure and agency are both involved in oppression. Last, but certainly not least, intersectional approaches problematize any essentialist view of women and men as binary groups in eternal opposition. By relying on the intersectional version of gendering human

security, this book set out to bring the positions and perspectives of both women and men into view and to prioritize the value of social justice for all.

This is not always what is meant by gendering human security: some non-intersectional versions of feminist human security discourse bring attention to only to women, as the chapter by Ní Aoláin has pointed out; some may ignore the other power relationships in which women are embedded, presenting the women of more nationally powerful groups as rescuers and women in the global south as victims, as Ewing's chapter suggests; some assume all women are innocent of the oppression of others and fail to recognize their own involvement in systems that perpetuate injustice, as Peterson notes. Internationally, feminists struggle among themselves and with other social justice movements to bring particular understandings of gendered security politics to bear, some of which are more intersectional than others (Lakkimsetti 2013, Liu 2006, Lombardo, Meier and Verloo, 2009, Thayer 2010).

It is important to emphasize that patriarchal versions of gendering human security are also commonplace. Such discourses frame women as vulnerable victims, safety as home and hearth, peace as weakness, and all people as served by reaffirming relations of natural subordination. For example, Buss and Herman (2003) outline how an international coalition of religious fundamentalists draws on patriarchal versions of gender expressed within specific Christian, Jewish and Islamic traditions to frame conventional gender arrangements as "family values" and fight feminist initiatives for gender equality as endangering women and their families. As the chapter by Brush points out, other conservative and some feminist discourses in the US converge in defining women themselves as responsible for their own human security

by means of the market. In the context of human security discourses, the hegemonic framing of gender as permanent and immutable can be a symbolic anchor to essentialize men and women into two diametrically opposed groups and to channel desires for peace and stability into a reactionary politics of restoring “traditions” of gender and family relations, a discourse that was common in Eastern Europe after the dissolution of communist state control (Gal and Kligman 2000). Talking about gender as a way of mobilizing the association of women with family and reproduction can be a way of using women’s need for physical or economic security to drum up support for religious or state interests in population growth or limitation (Yuval-Davis, 1997); naming women as vulnerable may be a way of creating or directing anger against other socially marginalized groups (Korteweg and Yurdakul, 2009).

Because diverse feminist and anti-feminist discourses struggle to represent the most “correct” form of advocacy for human security that names gender as a significant relationship, this chapter tries to clarify just what a feminist intersectional framing of gendered human security offers as well as to critique ways of bringing gender into human security discourse that fail to be either intersectional or feminist. For feminists, naming patriarchal power relations is critical to the analysis of gender, but believing that more justice is possible and being committed to making such change is no less important (Scott 1986, Connell 2009). Gendering human security in intersectional feminist terms, as this book presents it, is importantly a discursive political project that also resists the imposition of gendered binaries: whether of men and women, masculinity and femininity, agents and victims, weakness and strength, or peace and war.

Beyond binaries to realizing intersectionality

Human security as a political discourse offers a range of opportunities and resources to both feminists and non-feminists because it is still such a complex and amorphous term. In the present struggle to give meaning to the concept of human security, intersectional feminists have a stake in ensuring that this frame is able to recognize and respond to injustice in more than binary terms. The human security framework, as its feminist critics have pointed out, initially only saw “people” rather than acknowledging the gendered distributions of risks that women and men face. But for it to shift to see gender only as “women,” a single special interest or especially vulnerable category, is to leave men to be the “people” who remain central to any general view of the human. Such a binary approach to gendering human security also understates the intersectionality of the material insecurities violence imposes and ignores the way gender meanings are actively mobilized to empower, humiliate, incite and deter, legitimate and exacerbate individual and institutional violence.

Human security discourse, although a relatively new framing of the problems of violence and inequality, has demonstrated in various settings that it has real configuring power on gender relations. The feedback effect of human security framing is manifested in shifting political relationships at the global level, such as the UN’s articulation of the policy of “Right to Protect” (R2P) as a justification for actual international interventions to prevent states from engaging in or permitting widespread abuse. Moreover, in 2002, the UN Convention on the Status of Refugees was revised to grant women who were facing gender-based violence (rape, battering, trafficking, etc.) carried out by civil actors with political impunity in their home countries the right to claim asylum as refugees facing group-based persecution on the grounds

of gender. Women refugees were themselves central actors in the Canadian feminist network that led this successful struggle to gender international asylum law; they were by no means passive victims (Alfredson 2009).

This volume has also drawn out a number of positive elements in the discourse of human security that particularly overlap with intersectional feminist approaches. Most centrally, human security discourse is more collective and less legalistic than human rights claims, offering a proactive strategy for making group claims on power-holders. As Rubio-Marín and Estrada-Tanck argue, human security discourse is not a good alternative to making human rights claims, but can be a way to enrich the interpretation of what rights include beyond those exercised in existing power relations. This encourages women's collective agency, offering a discourse that appeals to those who are socially located in positions of vulnerability and in ongoing conflicts by adding moral force to their demands for change in the status quo. It is also a tool that women can deploy in post-conflict situations to resist returning to the *status quo ante* as if "traditional families" offered a state of safety rather than being a situation of real and abiding insecurity for many women and for all nonconformists to its gender binary values. By empowering resistance to gender "traditional" versions, feminist framings of human security encourage human agency (by both men and women) in defining their needs in the future-oriented, aspirational terms of gender justice.

The concept of human security also widens the scope of security politics to encompass more pervasive, slow, and not obviously violent threats to human survival such as disease and hunger. This also is a move toward an understanding of politics that fits well with intersectional feminist understandings of gender relations. Just as feminists of the 1970s had to draw

attention to the issues of violence and redistribution within households by mobilizing around battering and housework, feminists today need discursive tools for drawing attention to the linkages between macro and micro levels of intersectional insecurities for women and men. Using the discourse of gender relations helps analyze human insecurities such as those that Stites identifies in her chapter on Uganda's Karimojong communities wracked by increasing male violence. By connecting the gender-specific interactions among economic insecurity and the local physical environment, generational power relations and community reproduction, interpersonal conflict and the international trade in small arms, she situates the politics of masculinity simultaneously at macro and micro levels. While such problems in family formation and generational succession are not likely to be resolved just by addressing the gender assumptions embedded in them, understanding how they operate for men and women might also empower women in these communities to begin to articulate their own interests in human and social reproduction and resolve them in ways that do not naturalize gender domination.

As Tripp argues in the introduction, "human security is, in principle, an attractive normative frame for feminists because it looks at the impact of insecurities on people, not just consequences of conflict for the state. It focuses on societal activities, not just the state action. It highlights the agency of those affected by insecurity; and focuses on positive action to expand human capabilities, not just defenses of rights." But as she also notes, to advance a gendered view of human security without awareness of the cross-cutting power relations of national interests that situate some women as well as men in positions of global privilege risks depicting less privileged women primarily in terms of victimization and in need of being saved. Moreover, if analysts look only to those groups that explicitly call themselves feminist

movements, many of the diverse forms of women's organizing and collective agency in the struggle to expand human security may be overlooked (Ewig and Ferree 2013). Indeed, even as human security enters into the discourse of international organizations and governments dealing with the violence and misery resulting from famine, migration, economic crisis, environmental degradation, and religious or ethnic animosities, thinking about gender in terms other than a binary recognition of women as victims in need of special protection or rescue remains rare, as Ní Aoláin has shown. Rather than looking to alliances with the state for top-down change, movements that offer analyses of human security from positions of cross-cutting oppression are more likely to bring in an intersectional feminism from below, as women's voices in many different justice movements introduce greater gender awareness along with other demands for justice into the human security agenda (Alfredson, 2009, Thayer 2010).

Intersectional feminist versions of gendering human security expand the idea of human security to draw connections between political voice and protection from victimization, emphasizing political inclusion in decision-making not only for women but for all endangered people. This approach means not only breaking down the binary between freedom from fear and freedom from want, but also undermining the conventional binary understanding of negative (freedom from) and positive (freedom to) liberty. Freedom to develop human capabilities is also freedom to acquire future aspirations and articulate present interests; it demands such freedom from the oppressions of the past that unraveling the matrix of domination becomes imaginable and safe to attempt. Political agency and positive inclusion, from all levels from family decision-making through local community councils to national parliaments and international tribunals is essential to formulating a vision of security for all. A

stunted, defensive image of human security is inconsistent both with the intersectional analysis of social justice and the feminist struggle to allow all women's interests and aspirations to be voiced.

Human security understood as necessarily inclusive of democratic participation is therefore a politics inconsistent with the militarized discourse employed in such state-led politics as the war on poverty, war on drugs, or war on trafficking. Although some feminists may be drawn to such discourses as presenting opportunities for engaging states in addressing the situation of vulnerable and exploited groups, the chapters of this book have repeatedly shown how militarized discourses criminalize neediness and convert these same groups into potential enemies of the state. Too often, feminist alliances with lawmakers in specific contexts have increased penalties for rape, trafficking and other forms of gender-based violence in ways that have failed to be aware of the intersectional injustices that ensue: the chapter by Bumiller points to racially biased incarceration in the US, and Kinney to the ethnicized definition of trafficking in Thailand as processes that feminist anti-violence campaigners need to address more adequately than they have to date. States themselves articulate concern about human security in ways that justify the combined mobilization of their military power and criminal laws, enhancing their uses of coercive force in the name of protecting "domestic" populations. Such securitization of national and international politics to fight human trafficking or carry out a war on drugs may heighten collective and individual insecurities, depending on where the boundaries of state concern are drawn, as Peterson has shown. Human security discourse justifies building walls when it is framed in binary rather than intersectional terms, even by

feminists; it becomes a matter of defending “us” from them, whether the walls are at the edges of nation states, gated communities or prisons.

Human security as a feminist discourse also has to be intersectional to reach beyond the familiar gendered binaries of peace and war, to critique rather than reproduce the historical association of peace-making with women (and thus as weak and “wimpy”) and war with men (and thus with power and protection of the “homefront”). As modern technologies of conflict and rules of war have changed, any distinction between soldiers and civilians has become difficult to draw, and binary gender norms about fighting are increasingly counterproductive. As Hoganson (2000) shows, the gendered discourse of peace as weak can be used by some men to bully others toward war. The gendered discourse of war as “men’s business” also gives women little say when civic discourse is directed toward decisions about going to war (Christensen and Ferree, 2008). The practical impacts of wars on women and men can empower women to lead efforts to redirect popular mobilizations toward peacebuilding; but rather than stirring some binary and intrinsic female inclination to peace, violent conflicts may just disrupt men’s usual political alliances enough that previously marginalized women can find space to emerge as political leaders (Tripp 2009).

Since human security is not only a discourse about overtly violent conflicts, its multidimensionality also offers non-binary ways of thinking about what “ending” a conflict means. Unlike talking peace, one cannot proclaim human security to be achieved simply because treaties are signed or militaries are withdrawn to their homeland barracks. Seeking to create human security does not imply that violence ever will vanish, even if there are clear instances where insecurity greatly increases or declines. For both better and worse, human

security offers the conceptual space to think in terms of a continuum of possibilities for human development, including the development of capabilities for resilience and resistance, rather than a binary state of presence or absence of violence, harm and danger.

Moving away from imagining “womenandchildren” (Enloe, 1993) as innocent, powerless and only victimized in relation to violence is therefore a critical first step toward gendering human security as a feminist concept that does not lead to what Kinney decries in her chapter as the “strategic securitization” of social problems. Challenging the binary of gender, no less than undoing the binary of war and peace, is thus essential to creating a usable concept of human security. Human security is not something women desire more than men do, nor are either women or men a monolithic group, all members of which have common interests that are served by violence or its suppression. Women may be complicit in violence (including drawing benefits from racial-ethnic intolerance and the insecurity it generates), and women may be perpetrators of violence aimed at upsetting the status quo of power. An essentialized view of women as nurturing and loving, peaceful and passive denies the reality of some women’s participation in combat and some women’s fierce encouragement of men to fight on their behalf. For example, women were recruited to be nearly half of the horrifically brutal Shining Path guerilla movement in Peru, as Henríquez and Ewig note in their chapter. Men, too, have diverse reasons for embracing violence, and stereotypes of warriors as essentially violent are just as misleading as images of women as peaceful (Dudink, Hagemann and Tosh 2004).

If gender is misunderstood as a polarity of such opposites, insisting upon its importance will lead back to the classic “protection racket” that Judith Stiehm (1981) exposed, where women are most victimized by these same “men of their group” who claim to protect them,

and men's violence terrorizes the women to whom they are closest. Fearful women then accept such unreliable male guards against other men portrayed as even more dangerous. There is considerable evidence, including Ewing's chapter in this book, of such dynamics. As Ewing's analysis of stigmatizing discourses about Muslim men and boys in Germany shows, some feminists fall victim to the assumption that ending violence against women means mobilizing against men of other nations, religions, or racial-ethnic groups rather than dealing with the complex dynamics of gender inequality with "their own" men.

Even the importance of gender in specific human security discourses can be better understood if not approached in binary terms. Not only has the discourse of individual gender oppositeness rendered the concept of peace thin and passive, it has devalued the women who remain active in this uphill struggle by making their struggle seem a "natural" outgrowth of their femininity rather than a political commitment. Reaching to binary concepts of gender, even to explain women's agency rather than their victimization, oversimplifies the contextual significance gender has in relation to many other forms of injustice, endangerment and activism. When gender is allowed to recede into the background, it leaves just "people" to be seen. Such low salience can be a good thing, as when attention to gender would be otherwise used to draw invidious distinctions and attribute differential value, but it can also be a form of ignorance, as when the material situations of women and men are already differentiated but not recognized and responded to as such. Gendering human security discourses intersectionally demands attention to the variability of both the discursive salience and material significance of gender in particular relationships, and even more to the mismatch between discourses and the relationships they claim to represent.

Willed ignorance of gender relations often serves gendered interests, but it may also reflect a failure of imagination that information – especially when personalized and situationally relevant – can address (Ridgeway and Correll, 2006). The political work of gendering human security often takes such a consciousness-raising tack, drawing attention of transnational elites to the gendered dimensions of social relations. Yet even awareness of gender as a process can be distorted, particularly when it involves binary rather than intersectional notions of progress. Because gender is neither an individual trait nor a single social role, there is no “traditional” meaning it carries across context that can or should be “defended,” “restored” or “overcome.” There are cultural similarities in how female gender and subordinate status are linked, and there have long been struggles to contest and change this association, but there is no “modern” society that is free of gender inequality, nor any one style of “traditional” gender relations to be found in “the past.” Framing assaults on women’s self-determination from one side as a “war on women” and on the other side as a “war on the family” pits women’s desires for both autonomy and connection against each other, and allows a dehumanizing binary discourse of “enemies” and “traitors” to displace more inclusive concerns for reproductive justice and social care.

In sum, gendering human security will be most useful if it is consciously critical of binary views of gender that are popularly available and being mobilized politically to defend “traditional” values of men and women. Moreover, the gendered ascription of political agency to men and victimization to women overlooks and even undermines the actual efforts of women and men in particular groups to participate in democratic processes of articulating their concerns. Freedom to mobilize collectively and to act autonomously are political liberties

essential to achieving freedom from economic want and from fear of violence, just as health, safety and hope are vital to achieving inclusive democratic participation. Finally, human security as a political discourse has potential to move beyond conventional binaries of war and peace, but its ability to do so will be stunted if the gender connotations of these binaries are not challenged as well. Women are not in need of “special” protection that reifies difference in them and universalizes the masculine as a norm of human; women in general and feminists in particular should be cautious about politics that name women in order to instrumentalize their needs in service of something defined as “more general” and “bigger” than they are. Rather than some fixed set of “gender roles,” institutionally-specific roles are gendered and in complex, sometimes contradictory, ways that are more or less salient and significant in particular situations. Being a soldier and being a victim are culturally gendered roles, but these are roles that both women and men assume. War remains a familiar, polarizing and often dehumanizing metaphor for power struggles, and continues to privilege masculinized forms of authority and violent means of control. Our intersectional feminist approach to gendering human security has tried to bring this complex and continually contested view of gender to bear.

Reprising specific themes of this book

Although the chapters offer only small and selective glimpses of the full continuum of structural and institutional issues in the global struggle to increase human security, they provide a shared frame of reference for considering gender in an intersectional matrix of domination. Most especially, they show how “human” is always specific, not abstract: human relations are those of class, gender, race, nation, sexuality, generation and can only be seen

from the specific standpoints of those affected in particular ways. As Glenn (2000) argued, the strength of such intersectional analysis is especially clear when it shows how positions of privilege are also sites of oppression and when it highlights the power relations at the periphery, that is, among groups that are themselves marginalized.

The cases we have chosen stress particular ways that intersectionality becomes more visible in human security discourse. The chapters by Brush, Bumiller and Ewing bring a human security framework to the rich countries of the global North and make connections, theoretically and empirically, among social exclusion, physical violence and economic need in the United States and Europe, challenging the conventional us-them binary of empowered rescuers and needy victims. Not only do they bring the analysis of human insecurities “home,” they also point to feminist participation in framing the recurrent dynamic of threat and rescue in us-them terms that erect rather than undermine social barriers. They highlight the problems in the framing of human security from the standpoint of those (be they feminists, social scientists or journalists) in these richer countries who have the ear of authorities and are complicit with the state defining the needs of others in terms that stress the dangers to themselves. Although US feminists’ responses to sexual assault, German media accounts of Muslim threats to gender equality, and US social science arguments about using paid employment as a way out of domestic violence for poor women are certainly discourses that are quite different in many regards, they share a common theme of misrecognition of the human security needs in the populations they purport to describe.

Another theme that runs through many chapters but is especially evident in chapters by Ní Aoláin, Henríquez and Ewig, and Heideman is the emphasis on bottom-up participation by

marginalized women and men in the active processes of articulating issues, making political claims, and resolving conflicts. Although the duration and focus of ethnicized political violence in Ireland, Peru and Croatia is very different, the way that peace-building works in each country highlights the need for a grassroots mobilization of the people affected in creating the new structures of accountability that emerge after the conflict. When the discourse of political conflict identifies the parties involved as if they were homogenous and clearly bounded entities, the lines of violence that run into and across families and local communities are harder to address. Transnational one-size-fits-all formulas need to be remade to change local conditions of post-conflict insecurity, including endemic relations of gender and ethnic subordination. Insecure people need to identify sources of insecurity in their own voices in order to help create fit between the problem definition and solutions that they can recognize as helpful.

Recognition of women's gender-specific insecurities (collective as well as individual) provide a mandate for insuring that women are included in the arduous work of building more just and lasting peace, whether in Croatia or Peru. The global spread of peace and reconciliation processes highlight the need for the post-conflict process to be democratic, deliberative, participatory, but as Ní Aoláin points out, this proactive, long term and explicitly political work must include critical analysis of local patriarchal relations, which will not happen unless the complementary patriarchal relations built into powerful transnational organizations are also equally subject to critique and change. Gender mainstreaming into peacebuilding work – not as a cover for backing off from concern with women but approaching women's insecurities without essentializing, instrumentalizing or infantilizing women – demands active

attention to empowerment at a global level, too, including whatever training, accountability and budgeting the organization needs.

A third theme that has come to the fore through our intersectional feminist gendering of human security is how gender works as a macro process with micro implications. The social organization of gender plays a crucial role in the macro-level human insecurities to which Stites, Brush, Peterson and Kinney all draw attention. Yet while they emphasize the significance of gender they do so by showing how making a living is a deeply gendered process for individuals, too. As Stites and Brush emphasize, the day-to-day experiences of violence emerge from and affect work relationships, both in Karamoja and in Pittsburgh, and both men and women need economic security in order to have a stable and emotionally supportive family life, even sometimes to have a family at all. As Kinney and Peterson stress, conflict economies draw women and men into different kinds of work, and channel profits in different ways up and out of the local situation men (and a few women) with greater power. All four authors offer unmistakable evidence that gender security and economic survival are inseparable needs. While women's particular relationships to biological and social reproduction situate them differently than men to the work involved in caring for, participating in and protecting their families, their day-to-day reproductive labors are intertwined with the macro structure of the economy in ways that produce different vulnerabilities. Women survive, cope creatively, and as Brush shows, dream of a different future as more than mere victims, but their gender specific insecurities in the global economy demand more than gender neutral concern with economic growth and (re)distribution.

One common pitfall in trying to bring gender analysis into any political framework that was initially understood without gender is to define gender as meaning “bringing *women* in” to a still conventionally gendered framework, as Ní Aoláin argues in her chapter. Not only does this equation of gender with women ignore how gendered processes affect men (itself a major problem), but it also sweeps away the actual relationality, even among women, in gender relations. In addition to her chapter, those by Ewing, Stites and Kinney make clear that gendering human security only goes halfway at best if it fails to notice how women are situated in a variety of institutional roles with human security interests that vary depending on these particular situations. Even as mothers and wives (for example), they may have different positions and perspectives: mothers who are not wives and wives who are not mothers face different sorts of economic insecurities and risks from societal violence. Kinney shows how those sex workers in Thailand who are immigrants or native-born face different insecurities and levels of awareness. But Ní Aoláin also argues that bringing all women in still would not go far enough, since it would fail also to recognize men’s gendered human security needs, which both Ewing and Stites highlight.

Another important theme highlighted across chapters by our intersectional feminist approach is the joint significance of the material and cultural aspects of gender relations. These connections take quite different forms. Peterson’s chapter stresses the material side, showing how the global restructuring called neoliberalism has had effects on both women and men. But she also notes the cultural significance of understanding these trends as “feminizing” or bringing more men into the lower valued, unstable and economically precarious work relations associated with women and more often found to be acceptable for women workers. She notes

how gender operates as a thread that connecting the political and the economic dimensions of restructuring and produces different kinds of informalization for women and for men, as well as situating them differently in combat economies. Ewing's chapter conversely stresses the cultural aspects of insecurity through looking at the media construction of a Muslim menace in Germany, but ties this to the very material circumstances of migration and marginalization that Turkish families face in Berlin. She also stresses the agency involved, showing how some Turkish-German women's rights activists and some macho Turkish-German young men play starring roles in constructing the story. Not just this one Berlin story, many atrocity stories around the globe share the process by which very material violence against women – rapes in the former Yugoslavia or post-World War II Berlin, ripping fetuses out of pregnant women in El Salvador, female genital cutting in Somalia, honor killing in Nigeria –is converted into tropes about the monstrosity of men of the "other" group (e.g., Bos 2006, Viterna 2012).

These types of moral panics are intersectional, placing women and men of different religions or ethnic groups into very different relationships with gendered violence. Bumiller's chapter shows the implications of such gendered moral panics in the development of US policies on battering and rape, connecting a materialist argument about neoliberal restructuring that is also Peterson's concern with a cultural account of how media and activist mobilization against violence against women turns into stereotyped attacks on minority communities similar to that in Ewing's chapter. By telling a complex story of how US feminist mobilizations against battering and rape allied with the state to protect women and were coopted into becoming advocates or at least apologists for punitive policy, Bumiller uses the US experience to warn feminists about the potential harm done to minority women and men by

allowing experts and media to define “violence against women” as a social problem that intensified state control can solve.

The people-centered view of human security that Tripp praises as its distinctive improvement over classic state-centered security studies and security politics brings in a micro-dimension that might otherwise be overlooked. Analyses of agency and awareness of the work of grassroots groups are most visible in studies that examine individual woman and men and their framing work, such as Ewing offers. But even in relation to the macro-level material structures of global political economy that Peterson identifies as critical, attention to the daily struggles of women and men to survive informs the analysis. The connections of gender relations and human security concerns across levels are especially evident in the chapter by Henríquez and Ewig. They highlight the “ordinary” insecurities that individual men and women face “at home” before, during and after a conflict. Their richly intersectional account of the Shining Path in Peru and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) established after its war with the Peruvian state offers insight into how material (gendered insecurities) and cultural (gendered discourses) aspects of this struggle relate. Working across levels, Henríquez and Ewig connect the provider-protector tropes of masculinity locally attributed to the prewar *patrón* and to Shining Path guerrillas, the special targeting of indigenous women for abuse, the types of sexual assault practiced by both sides in the rural Andean communities where the war raged, the gendered challenges to economic survival that also accompanied torture and exile. Like Brush, they find hope in the end in the way that the voices of the most marginalized – in this case, the largely illiterate poor women of the rural Andes – can sometimes be heard, even if the

odds of the state actually providing adequate reparations to the victims and justice to the perpetrators still seem low.

In sum, the intersectional feminist approach taken across the chapters we selected offers both critical and constructive insights into gendering human security as a discursive process in particular situations. It brings in countries of the global north, transnational organizations and men in ways that show not only their complicity in creating insecurities but also the ways that they are vulnerable to them. It highlights the political value of empowering actors at the grassroots to name the insecurities that shape their lives and imagine alternatives to them, but also the risks of such communities focusing on the surveillance, control or exclusion of those who they define as “others.” It emphasizes the variability in the material significance and cultural salience gender has across situations, but also connects the material and cultural aspects of gender relations with each other, across levels and among apparently dissimilar countries and particular issues.

Conclusion

What then can a feminist intersectional gendering of human security offer as specific pragmatic suggestions for using this perspective more effectively and appropriately in the future? Three particular policy directions stand out. First, the many applications of rights discourse to gender relations have been very successful in reframing women’s rights as human rights, but that success has limited use as an analogy for gendering human security. Human rights discourse is, as has been noted earlier, individualizing, legalistic and retroactive. In all these respects, it can be applied to “women” as legally identifiable units with specific claims about something that has already happened. Human security discourses seem more appealing

to some precisely because they are not the same in these regards. But this also means that human security as a discourse has to be proactively concerned with the complexity of relationships in which human beings are embedded, which are permeated by inequalities of gender, race/ethnicity, class, generation and nation. Across all the articles, the specific workings of (trans)national law (and legal change), civil society (and the organizations that instantiate it), the global/local economy (in both formal and informal sectors) and kinship institutions (with and without state recognition) are recognized as sites for the working out of a gendered politics of human security.

Arguing that gender relations are thus always and everywhere intersectional and that all other social relations are gendered, an intersectional feminist gendering of human security discourse in policy work demands attention to how relationships of power operate in specific cases. “Women” can be framed as subjects and agents of human rights struggles, but human security is about power relationships as such, and demands attention to power in both cultural and material forms. To try to create “women’s human security” is a problematic effort regardless of what groups try to advance such a goal, including feminist organizations and activists, since as we have seen such feminist politics can lead too often to racist, nationalist and imperialist collaborations. Feminists who would like to see a gendered human security discourse replace a non-gendered one should be particularly attentive to such risks in their advocacy, and work affirmatively to construct more intersectional, non-binary security goals.

Second, the intersectional feminist perspective advanced on human security offers a case for seeing the need for making security policy more open, transparent, and inclusive of multiple voices. Creating space for individual testimonies and even, as in Brush’s chapter, the

ability to articulate a vision of the future, should not be so rare or apparently difficult in the various venues where human insecurities are addressed, be they truth and reconciliation commissions or welfare offices. The specific policy consequences of this inclusivity are various, but especially important to making the process more able to capture the needs of the socially marginalized. Abused women who have the extraordinary courage to raise their voices to testify to what has been done to them are agents of social change who should not be ignored, and their visions of what a society that could offer real human security to both men and women should not be ignored. As Henríquez and Ewig's chapter argues, the desire to pursue justice in horrific cases, such as systematic rape or genocide, should also not silence voices telling less hair-raising stories about displacement, destruction of livelihood, sexual and domestic servitude in guerilla camps, and militarization of social relations. They praise the Peruvian truth and reconciliation process for at least trying to achieve this goal.

As Rubio-Marín and Estrada-Tanck show in their discussion of supranational court decisions by the European Court of Human Rights and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, even highly placed authorities can adopt human security concerns that include the "ordinary" violence of daily life. Even when such a "perspective from above" is more intersectional, the failure to bring in participation from below can lead to perverse results. Heideman's chapter makes clear the unintended consequences of the well-meaning way that reparations were done, since the Croats not participating in the decisions and allocation process constructed a notion of the Serbian minority being the special favorites of the international community and became more rather than less antagonistic to them. The chapters point to policy processes working toward human security are improved by local involvement

and openness to imagining a future that is truly different, but warn of the desires by some participants at every level to turn the process to their own advantage. Adding transparency and accountability across levels to the process is a policy direction that these chapters suggest will increase access to the voices and visions of women, among others.

Finally, the chapters also suggest a cautious attitude to the feminist alliances with the state and its various agendas. Instrumental use of security discourses, even a feminist gendered human security discourse, can be turned in problematically militarized directions by more powerful global actors, as Kinney shows in her account of the strategic use of “security” as discourse in confronting problems of trafficking in Thailand. For some activists, adopting security language was viewed as opening opportunities to mobilize the state, gain resources and direct global attention to sexual victimization of women and young girls, while others pointed to the perverse effects of “protecting women” rather than protecting women’s rights. Bumiller critiques US feminists for uncritically taking state support to combat violence against women, and as Brush further notes, even feminists who are trying to help women escape violent partners may accept a framing of employment as escape that serves to undercut the critique of state cuts in welfare for women in need of support. Peterson shows how criminal and coping economies intersect, so that economically vulnerable women are pressured into illegal activities by armies or gangs or even intimate partners, and are being prosecuted by the state for succumbing to these threats rather than being offered safer alternatives. As the welfare states of the global north decrease social and economic support for poor people in their own populations, they channel more of their investments into surveillance technologies and militarized control, whether of their own citizens or those in other countries. Responsibility

to protect seems often to slide into prying into what should be the private decisions of mothers, pregnant women and poor people in general as well as protecting the state from protestors. A gendered human security discourse that is intersectional and feminist will be suspicious of policy directions that privilege control over caring.

Rubio-Marín and Estrada-Tanck argue for combining the best features of both human rights and human security approaches rather than choosing between them. This strategy may mitigate the risks to individual rights that over-reliance on collective versions of human security poses, whether coming from the state or from transnational NGOs with their own agendas. The specific cases collected in this volume support this conclusion. Gendering human security should not be attempted as a sequel to and replacement of the feminist discursive struggle that redefined women's rights as human rights, nor as an excuse to ignore calls to develop all people's human capabilities more fully and fairly as a matter of justice. But as an intersectional addition to the repertoire of concerns that human rights discourse has raised, a feminist human security discourse can widen policy attention to more issues, bring in more marginalized voices, and add accountability to the way states and other actors deploy claims to protect and aid women. While the path to achieving such goals remains rocky, the chapters of this volume do much to illuminate the way forward.

References

Alfredson, Lisa. 2009. *Creating Human Rights: How Noncitizens Made Sex Persecution Matter to the World*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Alkire, Sabina. 2003. A Conceptual Framework for Human Security. In *CRISE Working Paper*.
Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford: Centre for Research on Inequality, Human
Security and Ethnicity.
- Bos, Pasquale R. 2006. "Feminists interpreting the politics of wartime rape: Berlin, 1945;
Yugoslavia, 1992-1993" *Signs* 31 (4): 995-1025.
- Buss, Doris and Didi Herman. 2003. *Globalizing Family Values: The Christian Right in
International Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Choo, Hae Yeon and Myra Marx Ferree. 2010. "Practicing intersectionality in sociological
research: a critical analysis of inclusions, interactions and institutions in the study of
inequalities." *Sociological Theory*, 28 (2): 29-49.
- Christensen, Wendy and Myra Marx Ferree. 2008. "Cowboy of the World? Gendered Discourse
in the Iraq War Debate" *Qualitative Sociology*, 31(3): 287-306.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1986. *Black Feminist Thought*. NY: Routledge.
- Connell, Raewyn 2009. *Gender: A Short Introduction*. (Second Edition). Malden MA: Polity Press.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and
Violence against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* 43:6, 1241-1299.
- Dudink, Stefan, Karen Hagemann, and John Tosh, eds., 2004. *Masculinities in Politics and War:
Gendering Modern History* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Enloe, Cynthia 1993. *The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War*. Berkeley CA: University of California Press.

Ewig, Christine and Myra Marx Ferree, 2013. "Feminist organizing: What's old, what's new? History, Trends and Issues." In Laurel Weldon et al. (ed.) *Oxford Handbook of Gender and Politics*. (forthcoming)

Ferree, Myra Marx 2012. *Varieties of Feminism: German Gender Politics in Global Perspective*. Palo Alto CA: Stanford University Press.

Ferree, Myra Marx 2009. "Inequality, intersectionality and the politics of discourse: Framing feminist alliances." Chapter 6 in *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality: Stretching, Bending and Policy-making*. Emanuela Lombardo, Petra Meier and Mieke Verloo (editors), New York: Routledge.

Gal, Susan and Gail Kligman 2000. *The Politics of Gender after Socialism*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hancock, Ange-Marie 2007. "When Multiplication Doesn't Equal Quick Addition: Examining Intersectionality as a Research Paradigm." *Perspectives on Politics*, 5(1): 63-79.

Hoganson, Kristen L. 2000. *Fighting for American Manhood: How Gender Politics Provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars*. New Haven CT: Yale University Press.

Keck, Margaret E. and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Korteweg, Anna and Gökçe Yurdakul 2009. "Gender, Islam and Immigrant Integration: Boundary Drawing on Honour Killing in the Netherlands and Germany" *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 32(2): pp. 218-238
- Lakkimsetti, Chaitanya. 2013. "'HIV is Our Friend': Prostitution, Power and State in Postcolonial India". *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* (forthcoming).
- Liu, Dongxiao. 2006. "When Do National Movements Adopt or Reject International Agendas? A Comparative Analysis of the Chinese and Indian Women's Movements." *American Sociological Review*. 71(6): 921-942.
- Lombardo, Emanuela, Petra Meier and Mieke Verloo (eds). 2009. *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality: Stretching, Bending and Policy-making*. New York: Routledge.
- Lutz, Helma, Maria Theresa Vivar and Linda Supik (eds). 2011. Framing Intersectionality. Debates on a Multi-Faceted Concept in Gender Studies. Abingdon: Ashgate 2011
- Ridgeway, Cecilia and Shelley J. Correll, 2006. "Unpacking the gender system - A theoretical perspective on gender beliefs and social relations." *Gender & Society*, 18 (4): 510-531.
- Scott, Joan Wallach 1999. *Gender and the Politics of History* (second edition). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Stiehm, Judith. 1981. *Bring Me Men and Women: Mandated Change at the US Air Force Academy*. Berkeley CA: University of California Press.

Stone, Deborah. 2001. *Policy Paradox: the Art of Political Decision-Making*. Third edition. New York: Norton.

Thayer, Millie. 2010. *Making Transnational Feminism: Rural Women, NGO Activists, and Northern Donors in Brazil*. New York: Routledge.

Tripp, Aili Mari. 2009. *African Women's Movements: Transforming Political Landscapes*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Viterna, Jocelyn 2012. "Radical or Righteous? Using Gender to Shape Public Perceptions of Political Violence." Presentation at Sawyer Seminar, Gender and Women's Studies. March 30.

Yuval Davis, Nira 1997. *Gender and Nation*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.