Gendering World Politics

Gendering World Politics

Issues and Approaches in the Post–Cold War Era

J. Ann Tickner

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS NEW YORK

Columbia University Press
Publishers Since 1893
New York, Chichester, West Sussex

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Tickner, J. Ann.
Gendering world politics : issues and approaches in the post-Cold War era / J. Ann Tickner
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0–231-11366-8 (cloth : alk. paper) —
ISBN 0–231-11367-6 (pbk. : alk. paper)
1. Feminism. 2. World politics—1945– 3. Sex role—Political aspects. 4. Nationalism and feminism. 5. Globalization. 6. Security, International. I. Title.
HQ1154.T53 2001
305.42—dc21
00–047503

Casebound editions of Columbia University Press books are printed on permanent and durable acid-free paper.
Printed in the United States of America

c 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
p 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

For Emma, Maxwell and Rose

Contents

Preface

It is almost ten years since, in the preface to *Gender in International Relations*, I asked the following questions: Why are there so few women in my discipline of international relations? If I teach the field as conventionally defined, why are there so few readings by women to assign to my students? Why is the subject matter of my discipline so distant from women's lived experiences? Why have women been conspicuous only by their absence in the worlds of diplomacy and military and foreign policy-making?

When *Gender in International Relations* was published in 1992, there were few texts in international relations that could help answer these questions. Today, thanks to the hard work of a growing community of feminist scholars in IR, there are many. This book is a celebration of all the work that has begun to provide answers to these questions and to challenge our students to take gender and women seriously. These feminist scholars have found women (and men) in places not normally considered part of the discipline of international relations; in so doing, they have enlarged our horizons and stimulated us to ask new and important questions about global politics. It is still true, however, that outside this emergent feminist literature, there are few "great books" in IR by women. While women students now feel more comfortable in IR courses, there are still too few men who are willing to take gender courses or courses that focus on women. In many political science and IR departments, the IR curriculum still lacks serious attention to gender issues. During the 1990s, women were admitted to most

combat positions in the U.S. military, and the U.S. president appointed the first female secretary of state, but occupations in foreign and military policymaking in most states remain overwhelmingly male, and usually elite male. We may have provided some answers to my questions as to why IR and foreign policymaking remain male-dominated; but breaking down the unequal gender hierarchies that perpetuate these androcentric biases remains a challenge.

While this book is a celebration of the feminist work of the last ten years, it also attempts to situate this work within the quite profound transformation that the discipline of IR has undergone during this period, when constructivist and postpositivist approaches have challenged the "scientific" foundations of the field. The deep questioning of the epistemological foundations of a U.S.-dominated post–World War II IR that took place in the 1980s helped to make space for feminist approaches. I hope that the audience for this book will include scholars and students of IR who are seeking to broaden their understanding of a field that has been profoundly altered by the realities of the post–Cold War world.

This book also marks my own journeys through IR in the 1990s. I have spent much of this time trying to understand why the intellectual gulf between different IR approaches is so wide and why conversations between proponents of these various approaches can be so difficult. The luxury of a semester at the Australian National University in Canberra in 1996 allowed me time to talk and think deeply about these issues; chapter 1 of this volume, which attempts to answer some of these questions, was the result. I want to thank Andrew Mack and members of the Department of International Relations at the Research School for Pacific and Asian Studies for providing a supportive environment, and James Richardson, Gavan Mount, and Cindy O'Hagen for their thoughtful comments on an earlier version of chapter 1. Others in Australia to whom I owe a continuing special debt of gratitude are Hilary Charlesworth and Jan Jindy Pettman. Besides her untiring support for me and other feminist scholars, Jindy has worked hard to launch the first feminist journal of international relations, the *International Feminist Journal of Politics*.

Gender in International Relations adopted a framework built on the concept of *comprehensive security*, a concept that reflects the influence of Scandinavian peace research in my writings. Continuing to write and teach in the area of peace research and peace studies challenges me to think about how to foster better communication and understanding not only across lines

of conflict but also across disciplinary boundaries that can sometimes be as divisive as "real-world" issues. For this reason, the recognition of my work by the Department of Peace and Conflict Research at Uppsala University is particularly cherished. A special word of thanks to Peter Wallensteen.

My travels have included a move from Boston to Los Angeles. The College of the Holy Cross was a particularly supportive environment in which to begin my unconventional intellectual journeys. While we may never agree on our epistemological differences, I have always benefited from the support and thoughtful comments on my work by Robert Keohane. I have also appreciated the comments of Craig Murphy. In Los Angeles, I continue to be supported by a vibrant feminist community; thanks to Jane Jaquette, Carole Pateman, and especially Sandra Harding for her always insightful comments, the influence of which appear throughout this book.

A quiet and beautiful fall on Block Island in 1999 allowed me some focused time to finish this book. I thank Jonathan Aronson and the School of International Relations at the University of Southern California (USC) for granting me this "extra" time off after a sabbatical year that, for reasons of health, was less productive than I had hoped. I also owe a very special debt of gratitude to Kate Wittenberg at Columbia University Press for staying with the project and encouraging me during what turned out to be a slower than expected process. I truly appreciate Kate's continued support not only for my own work but also for supporting so many younger IR feminist scholars.

While they are too numerous to name, I could never have completed this particular journey without the friendship and advice of all the wonderful scholars in the Feminist Theory and Gender Studies Section of the International Studies Association. This section has become a very special place for those of us working in this field. Before writing chapter 5, I asked some of the scholars whose works I cited to offer their reflections on where they think we have come in the last ten years. Thanks especially to L. H. M. Ling, Jan Jindy Pettman, Elisabeth Prügl, and Jaqui True for their thoughtful replies.

At USC I owe special thanks for the editorial and research assistance of two of my graduate students: Leslie Wirpsa, who stepped in at the last moment under a tight deadline and helped me complete a first draft on time, and Catia Confortini, who has worked with this project for several years. Catia has provided invaluable assistance and encouragement throughout; her careful and thorough research skills have allowed me to write away from

Los Angeles with the knowledge that there is always someone back there on whom I can rely for prompt and professional assistance.

Finally, the support and encouragement of Hayward Alker, as well as that of Joan, Heather, and Wendy, during the good as well as the not so good times will always be remembered. As always, Hayward's careful reading and thoughtful comments on the manuscript are gratefully appreciated.

Gendering World Politics

Introduction: Gendering World Politics

The dramatic changes in world politics in the last ten years have fueled a disciplinary ferment in the field of international relations (IR), and new issues have stimulated new ways of understanding them. The end of the Cold War and the consequent decline in the predominance of military-security issues, defined in terms of the nuclear arms race between the United States and the former Soviet Union, have contributed to the decline of national-security studies, the heart of the discipline, at least in the United States, since 1945. With war between the great powers being unlikely in the near future, many IR scholars are focused on states' economic, rather than strategic, relationships. Previously obscured by the East/West rivalry, a variety of new issues are now preoccupying the international relations security agenda. Ethnic conflicts and the clash of civilizations defy traditional statist categories and balance-of-power or interest-based explanations; they demand additional understandings of changing collective identities and the role of culture in defining both identities and interests. Issues related to economic globalization and democratization are also taking center stage. While none of these issues is new, the IR discipline is taking increasing notice of them, and ways to understand and explain them are proliferating.

Many of these new disciplinary areas of focus are ones where women scholars and students of world politics seem to feel more at home than in strategic studies; they are also areas where gender issues, such as the differential rewards of the current manifestations of economic globalization and democratization, seem more obviously relevant.[1] It may not be coincidental,

therefore, that feminist perspectives on world politics entered the discipline at about the same time as the end of the Cold War; over the last ten years, they have been given increasing recognition. Certain introductory IR texts are now including feminist approaches in their overview of the discipline, and edited volumes and some anthologies have begun to include a chapter on feminist approaches.[2]

The title of this introduction, "Gendering World Politics," both reflects some of these changes and conceptualizes a worldview into which feminist approaches fit more comfortably. While international relations has never been just about relations between states, an IR statist focus seems even less justified today than in the past. International politics cannot be restricted to politics between states; politics is involved in relationships between international organizations, social movements and other nonstate actors, transnational corporations and international finance, and human-rights organizations, to name a few. Decrying the narrowness of Cold War IR, Ken Booth has suggested that the subject should be informed by what he calls a "global moral science" that entails systematic enquiry into how humans might live together locally and globally in ways that promote individual and collective emancipation in harmony with nature. He goes on to suggest that the state, the traditional frame for IR, "might be seen as the problem of world politics, not the solution."[3]

Since women have been on the peripheries of power in most states, this broad conception of world politics seems the most fitting disciplinary definition in which to frame feminist approaches. Their investigations of politics from the micro to the global level and from the personal to the international, as well as their analyses as to how macro structures affect local groups and individuals, draw on a broad definition of the political. Using explicitly normative analysis, certain feminists have drawn attention to the injustices of hierarchical social relations and the effects they have on human beings' life chances. Feminists have never been satisfied with the boundary constraints of conventional IR.[4] While women have always been players in international politics, often their voices have not been heard either in policy arenas or in the discipline that analyzes them.

If the agenda of concerns for IR scholars has expanded, so too have the theoretical approaches. The "scientific" rationalistic tradition,[5] associated with both neorealism and neoliberalism, is being challenged by scholars in critical and postpositivist approaches that grow out of humanistic and philosophical traditions of knowledge rather than those based on the natural

sciences. While certain scholars applaud this flowering of a multiplicity of approaches and epistemologies,[6] others see a discipline in disarray with fragmentation and pluralism as its essential characteristics. Kalevi Holsti's claim, in the early 1990s, that there is no longer agreement on what constitutes reliable or useful knowledge and how to create it still holds true today.[7] It is in the context of this intellectual pluralism and disciplinary ferment that feminist approaches have entered the discipline.

In spite of the substantial growth and recognition of feminist scholarship in the last ten years, it still remains quite marginal to the discipline, particularly in the United States, where neorealism and neoliberalism, approaches that share rationalistic methodologies and assumptions about the state and the international system, predominate.[8] Apart from occasional citations, there has been little engagement with feminist writings, particularly by conventional IR scholars.[9] There is genuine puzzlement as to the usefulness of feminist approaches for understanding international relations and global politics. Questions frequently asked of feminist scholars are indications of this puzzlement: What does gender have to do with international politics and the workings of the global economy? How can feminism help us solve real world problems such as Bosnia? Where is your research program?[10] While the new feminist literatures in IR are concerned with understanding war and peace and the dynamics of the global economy, issues at the center of the IR agenda, their methodological and substantive approaches to these questions are sufficiently different for scholars of IR to wonder whether they are part of the same discipline.

It is this lack of connection that motivates many of the issues raised in this book. While I have attempted to site feminist perspectives within the discipline, it will become clear from the topics addressed that IR feminists frequently make different assumptions about the world, ask different questions, and use different methodologies to answer them. Having reflected on reasons for these disconnections, as well as the misunderstandings over the potential usefulness of feminist approaches raised by some of the questions above, I believe that they lie in the fact that feminist IR scholars see different realities and draw on different epistemologies from conventional IR theorists. For example, whereas IR has traditionally analyzed security issues either from a structural perspective or at the level of the state and its decision makers, feminists focus on how world politics can contribute to the insecurity of individuals, particularly marginalized and disempowered populations. They examine whether the valorization of characteristics associated

with a dominant form of masculinity influences the foreign policies of states. They also examine whether the privileging of these same attributes by the realist school in IR may contribute to the reproduction of conflict-prone, power-maximizing behaviors.[11] Whereas IR theorists focus on the causes and termination of wars, feminists are as concerned with what happens during wars as well as with their causes and endings. Rather than seeing military capability as an assurance against outside threats to the state, militaries are seen as frequently antithetical to individual security, particularly to the security of women and other vulnerable groups. Moreover, feminists are concerned that continual stress on the need for defense helps to legitimate a kind of militarized social order that overvalorizes the use of state violence for domestic and international purposes.

Conventional IPE has typically focused on issues such as the economic behavior of the most powerful states, hegemony, and the potential for building international institutions in an anarchic system populated by self-interested actors; within a shared state-centric framework, neorealists and neoliberals debate the possibilities and limitations of cooperation using the notion of absolute versus relative gains.[12] Feminists more often focus on economic inequality, marginalized populations, the growing feminization of poverty and economic justice, particularly in the context of North/South relations. Whereas IR has generally taken a "top-down" approach focused on the great powers, feminist IR often begins its analysis at the local level, with individuals embedded in social structures. While IR has been concerned with explaining the behavior and interaction of states and markets in an anarchic international environment, feminist IR, with its intellectual roots in feminist theory more generally, is seeking to understand the various ways in which unequal gender structures constrain women's, as well as some men's, life chances and to prescribe ways in which these hierarchical social relations might be eliminated.

These different realities and normative agendas lead to different methodological approaches. While IR has relied heavily on rationalistic theories based on the natural sciences and economics, feminist IR is grounded in humanistic accounts of social relations, particularly gender relations. Noting that much of our knowledge about the world has been based on knowledge about men, feminists have been skeptical of methodologies that claim the neutrality of their facts and the universality of their conclusions. This skepticism about empiricist methodologies extends to the possibility of developing causal laws to explain the behavior of states. While feminists do see

structural regularities, such as gender and patriarchy, they define them as socially constructed and variable across time, place, and culture; understanding is preferred over explanation.[13] These differences over epistemologies may well be harder to reconcile than the differences in perceived realities discussed above.

Subsequent chapters of this book serve two purposes. First, they elaborate upon and forge a better understanding of the ontological and epistemological differences between feminists and IR scholars. These differences will become evident as subsequent chapters move further away from traditional IR concerns. Although security (the subject of chapter 2) is central to both conventional IR and feminist perspectives, even though each approaches it from quite different perspectives, democratization (one of the topics in chapter 4) has not been central to IR as conventionally defined.

The second goal is to demonstrate what feminist approaches to IR are contributing and can contribute to our understanding of global politics. While not suggesting that they can tell us everything we need to know about world politics, feminists are challenging us to see the inequality and domination aspects of "common sense" gender differences. For example, uncovering previously hidden gender hierarchies in policy priorities or workplace participation can show how they contribute to conflict and injustice in ways that have detrimental effects on the security of both men and women. Much of feminist analysis draws upon and intersects with that of scholars who would not consider themselves part of the discipline of IR; this suggests that feminists are charting their own voyages of discovery rather than staying within the confines of the discipline. Debates as to how connected feminism should be to the discipline are central to feminist discussions.

Acknowledging these concerns, chapter 1 attempts to situate feminist scholarship within an increasingly fragmented discipline of IR. Subsequent chapters do the same in a variety of issue areas. A sharp division between realism and liberalism, and their neorealist and neoliberal versions, and critical and postpositivist approaches is now evident in IR.[14] While there is no necessary connection between postpositivism and feminism, many IR feminists would identify themselves as postpositivists. Additionally, many would be uncomfortable describing themselves as either liberals or realists. For these reasons, they are closer to other critical approaches than to conventional theory; they are distinctive, however, in that their work is also grounded in contemporary feminist theoretical debates and by the fact that all of them use gender as a central category of analysis.

Chapter 2 deals with war, peace, and security—issues that continue to be central to the discipline. While realists see the contemporary system as only a temporary lull in great-power conflict, others see a change in the character of war, with the predominance of conflicts of state building and state disintegration driven by ethnic and national identities as well as by material interests. Since feminists use gender as a category of analysis, issues of identity are central to their approach; chapter 2 explores the ways in which the gendering of nationalist and ethnic identities can exacerbate conflict. Feminists are also drawing our attention to the increasing impact of these types of military conflicts on civilian populations. Civilians now account for about 90 percent of war casualties, the majority of whom are women and children. Questioning traditional IR boundaries between anarchy and danger on the outside and order and security on the inside, as well as the realist focus on states and their interactions, feminists have pointed to insecurities at all levels of analysis; for example, Katharine Moon has demonstrated how the "unofficial" support of military prostitution served U.S. alliance goals in Korea, thus demonstrating links between interpersonal relations and state policies at the highest level.[15] Feminist analysis of wartime rape has shown how militaries can be a threat even to their own populations;[16] again, feminist scholarship cuts across the conventional focus on interstate politics or the domestic determinants of foreign policy.

Feminists have claimed that the likelihood of conflict will not diminish until unequal gender hierarchies are reduced or eliminated; the privileging of characteristics associated with a stereotypical masculinity in states' foreign policies contributes to the legitimization not only of war but of militarization more generally. Wary of what they see as gendered dichotomies that have pitted realists against idealists and led to overly simplistic assumptions about warlike men and peaceful women,[17] certain feminists are cautioning against the association of women with peace, a position that, they believe, disempowers both women and peace. The growing numbers of women in the military also challenges and complicates these essentialist stereotypes. To this end, and as part of their effort to rethink concepts central to the field, feminists define peace and security, not in idealized ways often associated with women, but in broad, multidimensional terms that include the elimination of social hierarchies such as gender that lead to political and economic injustice.

Chapter 3 focuses on economic globalization. Given an increase in inequality on a global scale, which has accompanied the latest round of eco-

nomic globalization, feminists are questioning the optimistic prognoses of liberal supporters of a Western-led globalizing economy. Focusing on populations at the margins of the world economy, feminists call our attention to the fact that while women's positions vary according to race, class, and geographical location, women are disproportionately situated at the bottom of the socioeconomic scale in all societies; drawing on gender analysis, they point to the devaluation of women's work and the dichotomy between productive and reproductive labor as explanations of the relatively disadvantaged position of women and the growing feminization of poverty.

In an era characterized by the hegemony of neoliberal ideology, structural-adjustment policies have placed further burdens on women as government programs have been scaled back and women have taken on unremunerated welfare and caregiving functions previously assumed by the state. Gender analysis highlights that structural-adjustment programs, along with other economic policies and consequences of economic globalization, are not gender neutral. Local resistances to these adverse effects, which often go unnoticed, are acting as generators of new knowledge upon which feminists are drawing to counter the growing neoliberal consensus.

Globalization involves more than economic forces; it has also led to the spread of Western-centered definitions of human rights and democracy. Feminist scholars are questioning whether these definitions are gender biased: for example, until very recently violence against women was not considered part of the international community's human-rights agenda. Additionally, postcolonial feminists are drawing attention to the ways in which Western feminism may itself be complicit in imposing a Western view of democracy and rights that ignores issues of race and cultural differences. Conversely, it is important to recognize that cultural reassertions against Westernization are often framed in terms that result in the regulation and control of women.

Feminists also claim that, while democratization is being celebrated by Western liberals, new democracies are not always friendly toward women. Feminists have traditionally been suspicious of what they see as the legacy of the Western liberal-democratic tradition that they claim is patriarchal and that, historically, has favored men's over women's interests. Additionally, since women have traditionally had less access to formal political institutions, the focus on state institutions by scholars of democratization may miss ways in which women are participating in politics—outside formal political channels at the grassroots level.

Chapter 4 investigates how different women impact and are impacted by political institutions at all levels and what effect this may have on global politics. It has been suggested that international organizations and global institutions, which are further removed from democratic accountability than are states, may be even less receptive to women's interests and gender issues. If this is the case, it may be time for feminists to reassess their generally critical view of the role of the state. In certain cases, democratization has brought increased participation by women in the formal political process; in others, it has not. Women's participation in nongovernmental activities has had similarly mixed effects. Their involvement in social movements provides points of leverage on state policies that, because of democratic accountability, offer the potential at least for more responsiveness than do international organizations.

In these substantive chapters, I have chosen to focus on security, economic globalization, and democratization because they are the topics that concern much of the recent feminist IR literature; they are also the focus of much of the critical scholarship in IR, scholarship with which feminist IR has more affinity. Most of the feminist scholarship to be discussed in this book has moved outside the traditional confines of the discipline; recent studies demonstrate that feminist IR has moved beyond critique into "second-stage" empirical research. Nevertheless, claims that feminist IR lacks a research program will persist, due in part to the misunderstandings over epistemology and methodology discussed earlier.

Abstracting and generalizing from the literatures discussed in earlier chapters, chapter 5 outlines some feminist methodologies that are being used for understanding world politics. Since, as I have already suggested, feminist IR draws on local knowledge and examines issues not normally considered part of the discipline, its research and methodologies will often seem strange to conventional IR scholars. Practical reasoning, grounded in everyday experience and conversational, interpretive frameworks are not seen as "scientific" by a discipline committed to theories based on the natural sciences and economics. It is hoped that by contributing to a better, more informed understanding of feminist IR, this book can facilitate more fruitful conversations among advocates and students of different persuasions in international relations. Nevertheless, as this introduction demonstrates, these conversations will remain troubled as long as there are such wide divides between IR and feminist ontologies and epistemologies.

1 Troubled Encounters: Feminism Meets IR

Since its inception, at the beginning of the century, the discipline of international relations has gone through a series of debates over both its subject matter and the methodologies appropriate for its investigations.[1] None of these debates have been as fundamental as those of the last two decades. The end of the Cold War and the plurality of new issues on the global agenda, to which I referred in my introductory chapter, have been accompanied by increasing calls for rethinking the foundations of a discipline that appears to some to be out of touch with the revolutionary changes in world politics, as well as deficient in how to explain them. Justin Rosenberg has suggested that it is strange that momentous events, such as the collapse of Soviet Communism, the strains of European integration, and the economic growth of China (which presently contains one-fifth of the world's population), events that are part of a gigantic world revolution of modernization, industrialization, nationalism, and globalization in which the West has been caught up for the last two hundred years, tend to be excluded from most IR theory.[2] Instead of what he claims are arid debates about hegemonic stability or order versus justice, which abstract from real-world issues, Rosenberg calls for theory grounded in historical and social analyses. He suggests that global issues can be better explained through narrative forms of explanation rather than social-scientific methodologies of conventional IR.

Such calls for rethinking the way in which we explain or understand world politics began in the 1980s, with the so-called third debate in IR;[3] the 1980s marked the appearance of a substantial body of scholarship, associated

with critical theory and postmodernism, that challenged both the epistemological and ontological foundations of the field. Asserting that we had moved from a world of states to a global community, R. B. J. Walker claimed that the third debate represented a fundamental divide that went well beyond methodological issues because it arose more from what scholars thought they were studying than from disagreements as to how to study it.[4] While these concerns are obviously interrelated, scholars on the critical side of the third debate challenged the foundations of the field as well as the appropriate methods by which it should be studied.

It is no coincidence that feminist theory came to IR, in the late 1980s, at about the same time as this fundamental questioning of the foundations of the discipline. Although there had been earlier literatures on women in the military and on women and development, IR feminists pointed to the gendered foundations of the field and began to develop feminist critiques of the major assumptions of the discipline.[5] Although their definition of real-world issues might be different from IR theorists' abstractions, they, too, were concerned with concrete issues embedded in what they claimed were gendered social relations. Raising issues that had rarely been seen as belonging in the discipline as conventionally defined, they also preferred theory grounded in historical and social analysis.

Like the third debate in IR, feminist theory has also been engaged in a critical discussion and reevaluation of epistemological issues. These debates began earlier, however, in the 1960s, when radical feminists challenged the empiricist foundations of liberal feminism; in many ways, they were more genuine debates than those in IR, with scholars from a variety of epistemological and disciplinary perspectives, ranging from the natural and social sciences to the humanities and philosophy, engaging openly with one another. Questioning liberal assumptions that women's subordination can be diminished by incorporating women into existing institutional structures on an equal basis with men, postliberal feminists pointed to hierarchical structures that would have to be radically challenged to address these issues. They also claimed that knowledge about both the social and natural world is not objective but based on the experiences of men.

Feminist IR scholars were drawn to this earlier interdisciplinary discussion. As had other feminists in sociology, literature, and the natural sciences, they perceived IR as a field, largely within political science, committed to universalist, positivist methodologies that, they claimed, did not recognize its gendered foundations; nor did it speak to the concerns that feminist schol-

ars brought to their investigations. Identifying with the postpositivist side of the third debate, but critical of its silence on gender issues, feminist scholars went outside the discipline to feminist theory to seek answers to their questions.

In this chapter, I first outline some of the approaches to feminist theory and some of the debates between them—the debates dating back to the 1960s. This survey is intended to demonstrate how far the ontological and epistemological concerns of feminist theory are from those of conventional international relations and also why IR feminists have been drawn to them. I then briefly review some of the earlier debates in IR, thereby demonstrating their difference from feminist concerns. Finally, I introduce some feminist IR perspectives, integrating them into the third debate. Although much feminist IR scholarship demonstrates affinities with critical or postpositivist IR, its roots in feminist theory, and its commitment to the importance of gender as a category of analysis, make this body of literature distinctive and different. In this chapter, I focus on the epistemological and methodological issues raised by these feminist and IR debates, rather than on substantive issues in world politics. These issues will be explored in subsequent chapters.

Feminist Theories

Feminist theories are multidisciplinary; they draw from both the social and natural sciences as well as the humanities and philosophy. They include a wide variety of epistemological and methodological approaches. Although I shall outline some feminist theoretical approaches by presenting them sequentially, it should be emphasized that many of these approaches still coexist: the debates to which I refer are far from resolved. The key concern for feminist theory is to explain women's subordination, or the unjustified asymmetry between women's and men's social and economic positions, and to seek prescriptions for ending it.[6] Susan Okin defines feminists as those who believe that women should not be disadvantaged by their sex; women should be recognized as having human dignity equal with men and the opportunity to live as freely chosen lives as men.[7] However, feminists disagree on what they believe constitutes women's subordination, as well as how to explain and overcome it. Feminist theories have been variously described as liberal, radical, socialist, psychoanalytic, postcolonial, and postmodern.[8] Besides seeking better understanding of women's subordination,

most of these approaches see themselves as politically engaged in the practical tasks of improving women's lives. While liberal feminists have generally relied on empiricist methodologies, other approaches have questioned these positivist methodologies. Arguing from standpoint or postmodern epistemological positions,[9] they claim that "scientific" theories, which claim the possibility of neutrality of facts and a universalist objectivity, hide an epistemological tradition that is gendered. Below, I outline some of the major features of these approaches as well as their epistemological orientations, emphasizing issues that have been important for feminist IR. Acknowledging that much of contemporary feminism has moved beyond these labels, they are, nevertheless, helpful in understanding feminist thought in its historical context.[10] It is important to emphasize that not all feminists think alike; the diversity in feminist scholarship is often not recognized by IR scholars.

Liberal Feminism

Contemporary feminist theories have emerged out of a long historical tradition of feminism that goes back to the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries and is associated with names such Christine de Pizan, Mary Astell, Mary Wollstonecraft, and Harriet Taylor.[11] Each of these theorists argued that women should have the same chance to develop their rational capacities as men. Liberal feminism is a continuing intellectual tradition; in the United States, it is also associated with women activists and organizations such as the National Organization for Women (NOW). While many contemporary academic feminists have moved beyond liberal feminism, it should not be underestimated; most reforms in Western liberal democracies that have benefitted women can be attributed to liberal feminism.

Resting on a conception of human nature that is radically individualistic, whereby human beings are conceived as isolated individuals with no necessary connection with each other, the liberal tradition sees humans as separate rational agents.[12] Liberal feminists claim that discrimination deprives women of equal rights to pursue their rational self-interest; whereas men have been judged on their merits as individuals, women have tended to be judged as female or as a group. Liberal feminists believe that these impediments to women's exercise of their full rational capacities can be eliminated by the removal of legal and other obstacles that have denied them the same rights and opportunities as men. When these legal barriers are removed,

they claim, women can begin to move toward full equality. Unlike the classical liberal tradition, which argues for a minimal state, most liberal feminists believe that the state is the proper authority for enforcing women's rights; although it may engage in discrimination in practice, the state is capable of becoming the neutral arbiter necessary to ensure women's equality.

Liberal feminism has generally relied on positivist epistemologies typical of the analytic and empiricist traditions of knowledge that began in seventeenth-century Europe. These knowledge traditions are based on claims that there is an objective reality independent of our understanding of it, and that it is scientifically knowable by detached observers whose values can remain outside their theoretical investigations. Liberal feminists claim, however, that existing knowledge, since it has generally not included knowledge about women, has been biased and not objective; nevertheless, they believe that this problem can be corrected by adding women to existing knowledge frameworks. Therefore, liberal empiricists claim, the problem of developing better knowledge lies not with the scientific method itself but with the biases in the ways in which our theories have been focused and developed.

Challenges to Liberal Feminism

In the 1960s and 1970s, feminists began to question this liberal belief in the possibility of women's equality; they also began to question feminist empiricist methodologies for studying these inequalities and the liberal feminists' prescriptions for ending them. Critics of liberal feminism claimed that the removal of legal barriers did not end the discrimination against women in either public or private life. Moreover, critics suggested that the liberal emphasis on individualism and rationality promoted masculine values, which privileged mind over body and individualism over relationships.

Radical feminism, which emerged out of the political movements of the 1960s and 1970s, claimed that what it referred to as women's "oppression" was too deep to be eliminated by the removal of legal barriers; radicals believed that women's oppression is the first, the deepest, and most widespread form of human oppression.[13] Radicals claimed that women were oppressed because of patriarchy or a pervasive system of male dominance, rooted in the biological inequality between the sexes and in women's reproductive roles, that assigns them to the household to take care of men and children. Unlike liberals, radical feminists did not endorse the idea that

women should aspire to being equal to men; rather, they should celebrate women's unique virtues that, in patriarchal societies, have been devalued. Valuing characteristics typically associated with females, such as caring and the fostering of relationships, radicals believed that these female virtues could be the basis for better societies.

Rejecting liberal empiricism, radical feminism questioned the possibility of objective knowledge and the separation of the knower from the known; claiming that dominant groups (certain men) will impose their own distorted view of reality, they argued for "women's ways of knowing" that are arrived at through consciousness raising, a technique begun in the 1960s, that allowed women to understand the hitherto invisible depths of their own oppression.[14] Whereas patriarchal thought is characterized by divisions and oppositions, women's ways of knowing have tried to construct a worldview based on relationships and connections.

Psychoanalytic theories also claimed difference between women and men and suggested "women's ways of knowing." Object-relations theory suggested that gender differences are formed in early childhood socialization, when boys are encouraged to separate from their mothers while girls remain identified with them, a relationship that fosters attachment. Sara Ruddick's work on maternal care claims that skills that are necessary for mothering, which girls learn through socialization, are different from those employed in public life. She suggests that maternal practice or responsibility for child care requires nonviolence, trust, and tolerance of ambiguity, skills that are consistent with peacemaking. While she is careful not to make the claim that women and mothers are always peaceful, she does suggest that ways of knowing that arise out of maternal practice could serve us well in areas such as conflict resolution.[15]

Challenging the work of Piagetian psychologist Laurence Kohlberg, who outlined six stages of moral development, Carole Gilligan has suggested that women and men have different conceptions of morality and a different way of moral reasoning from men. On Kohlberg's scale, women rarely reach the sixth or highest stage's association with universal abstract principles of justice, but, rather, exemplify the third stage—morality conceived in interpersonal terms of pleasing others. Contrary to Kohlberg, Gilligan claimed that women do not have a less-developed sense of justice than men; rather, because women have different views of self from men, they do not engage in formal reasoning, suited to universalistic conceptions of justice, but instead in relational, consequentialist reasoning. Moral choices

are not made from universal ethical orientations but from choices situated in particular contexts.[16]

Both radical and psychoanalytic feminism have generated criticism particularly for their essentialism, or seeing "woman" as an undifferentiated category across time, class, race, and culture. Critics have also claimed that valorizing and celebrating female characteristics can perpetuate rather than overcome women's marginalization. Radical feminism's attribution of all women's oppression to an undifferentiated concept of patriarchy, and psychoanalytic feminism's explanations for women's subordination as being fixed in early childhood, appear overly determined. Nevertheless, these approaches began to offer versions of women's standpoint, which have since been refined and incorporated into other approaches. The use of gender as a conceptual category of analysis is also rooted in early radical feminism. Before moving to other postliberal approaches and to some of the contemporary debates generated by these approaches, I will first offer a definition of gender, on which a variety of postliberal feminist approaches have depended for their theoretical investigations.

As Sandra Harding has suggested, gendered social life is produced through three distinct processes: assigning dualistic gender metaphors to various perceived dichotomies; appealing to these gender dualisms to organize social activity; and dividing necessary social activities between different groups of humans. She refers to these three aspects of gender as gender symbolism, gender structure, and individual gender.[17] Feminists define gender as a set of variable but socially and culturally constructed characteristics: those such as power, autonomy, rationality, activity, and public are stereotypically associated with masculinity; their opposites—weakness, dependence/connection, emotionality, passivity, and private—are associated with femininity. There is evidence to suggest that both women and men assign a more positive value to these masculine characteristics that denote a kind of "hegemonic masculinity"—an ideal type of masculinity, embedded in the characteristics defined as masculine but to which few men actually conform.[18] They do, however, define what men ought to be. Characteristics associated with hegemonic masculinity vary across time and culture and are subject to change according to the requirements of power. They serve to support male power and female subordination and they also reinforce the power of dominant groups, since minorities have frequently been characterized as lacking in these characteristics. Indeed, there is a hierarchy of masculinities in which gender interacts with class and race. Importantly,

definitions of masculinity and femininity are relational and depend on each other for their meaning; masculinities do not exist except in contrast with femininities. It is also important to note that there can be no such thing as hegemonic femininity, because masculinity defines the norm.[19]

As Joan Scott claims, while the definition of masculinity and femininity and the forms gender relations take across different cultures may vary, they are almost always unequal; therefore, gender in the structural sense is a primary way of signifying relationships of power. Although gender is frequently seen as belonging in the household, Scott argues that it is constructed in the economy and the polity through various institutional structures that have the effect of "naturalizing," and even legalizing, women's inferior status.[20] Recent feminist writings that deal with issues of race and class problematize these power relationships still further.

Individual gender relations enter into and are constituent elements in every aspect of human experience. Jane Flax reminds us that, while feminism is about recovering women's activities, it must also be aware of how these activities are constituted through the social relations in which they are situated.[21] Therefore, gender is not just about women: it is also about men and masculinity.[22] Gender is a notion that offers a set of frameworks within which feminist theory has explained the social construction and representation of differences between the sexes.[23] Consequently, working for gender equality is deemed impossible by many feminists because, definitionally, gender signifies relationships of inequality.[24] Rather, feminists should work toward making gender visible in order to move beyond its oppressive dynamics.[25]

Reacting against the essentialism of radical feminism and its notion of an undifferentiated patriarchy, socialist feminism, coming out of Marxist roots, has looked to differences in men's and women's material existence as a reason for women's oppression. Socialist feminists have claimed that patriarchy has a material base that is expressed in men's control over women's labor power. In the modern West, women's role as reproducers and household workers have reduced them to a state of economic dependence; even when women work in the labor force, they receive on average less pay than men and are still responsible for a disproportionate share of household duties. Whereas Marx claimed that capitalist modes of production were responsible for workers' oppression, these feminists have looked at modes of reproduction as primary sources of women's oppression. Claiming that classical Marxism dismissed women's oppression as less important than that of

workers in capitalist systems, socialist feminists have pointed out that often women do not fare better under socialism. Women's oppression, therefore, is linked to these various modes of production and reproduction, as well as to class and economic position.

Although all of these postliberal/postempiricist approaches have introduced the idea of women's ways of knowing, feminist standpoint as an epistemology was most highly developed in socialist feminism. Based on its Marxist roots, socialist feminists define standpoint as a position in society from which certain features of reality come into prominence and from which others are obscured.[26] Standpoint feminism presupposes that all knowledge reflects the interests and values of specific social groups; its construction is affected by social, political, ideological, and historical settings. Women's subordinate status means that women, unlike men (or unlike some men), do not have an interest in mystifying reality in order to reinforce the status quo; therefore, they are likely to develop a clearer, less biased understanding of the world. Nancy Hartsock, one of the founders of standpoint feminism, has argued that material life structures set limits on an understanding of social relations so that reality will be perceived differently as material situations differ. Since women's lives differ systematically and structurally from men's, women can develop a particular vantage point on male supremacy. However, this understanding can be achieved only through struggle, since the oppressed are not always aware of their own oppression; when achieved, it carries a potential for liberation. Hartsock argued that women's liberation lies in a search for the common threads that connect diverse experiences of women as well as the structural determinants of these experiences.[27]

Similarly, Sandra Harding has argued that while women's experiences alone are not a reliable guide for deciding which knowledge claims are preferable because women tend to speak in socially acceptable ways, women's lives are the place from which feminist research should begin.[28] Harding explores the question as to whether objectivity and socially situated knowledge is an impossible combination. She concludes that adopting a feminist standpoint actually strengthens standards of objectivity. While it requires acknowledging that all human beliefs are socially situated, it also requires critical evaluation to determine which social situations tend to generate the most objective claims.[29] Susan Heckman avers that feminist standpoint is rooted in a concrete "reality" that is the opposite of the abstract, conceptual world inhabited by men, particularly elite men, and that in this reality lies the truth of the human condition.[30]

In important ways, all of these approaches challenge the assumptions and worldviews of liberal feminism as well as its positivist/empiricist epistemological foundations. Today, however, feminist theory is engaged in a fundamental reassessment of these approaches and their epistemologies. While, in the 1970s, it was assumed that the various structural causes of women's oppression could be specified and broken down, this consensus has now eroded. For example, Nira Yuval-Davis has argued that the notion of patriarchy, so important to radical and socialist feminisms, is highly problematic. While it may be appropriate for specific historical periods and geographical regions, Yuval-Davis claims that it is much too crude an analytical instrument. In most societies, certain women have power over some men as well as over other women.[31]

This debate, which began in the late 1980s, has been strongly influenced by postcolonial, Third World, and postmodern feminisms. This is due both to the impact of black feminist critiques, which have introduced considerations of race and class, and to the influence of postmodernism that has called into question the possibility of systematic knowledge cumulation.[32] These and other critics have argued that standpoint theories failed to recognize differences amongst women based on race, class, sexual preference, and geographical location. Standpoint has been faulted for basing its generalized knowledge claims on the experiences of white Western women. As Patricia Hill Collins tells us, African American women experience the world differently from those who are not black and female.[33] Questioning liberal feminism's focus on equality, black feminists remind us that black women would be unlikely to subscribe to the goal of equality with black men, who are themselves victims of oppression.

Third World women have begun to question the term *feminist* because of its association with Western cultural imperialism. Stressing the importance of producing their own knowledge and recovering their own identities, these women, speaking out of the historical experiences of colonial oppression, offer further evidence of a multiplicity of oppressions. Chandra Mohanty, while she acknowledges the impossibility of representing all their diverse histories, suggests the need to explore, analytically, the links among the struggles of Third World women against racism, sexism, colonialism, and capitalism. She and other postcolonial feminists use the term *Third World* to include North American women of color; their writings have insisted on the need to analyze the interrelationships between feminist, antiracist, and nationalist struggles. Postcolonial feminists interpret Western im-

perialism as the historical imposition of an imperial order, based on white, masculine values, on subjugated and feminized colonial peoples.[34] Avtar Brah claims that, in today's world, feminist questions about women's locations in the global economic system cannot be answered without reference to class, ethnicity, and geographical location.[35]

Dissatisfaction with the essentialism of early standpoint theory has moved feminist theory toward the consideration of multiple standpoints and multiple subjectivities.[36] Whereas, in the 1960s and 1970s, the emphasis was on a political agenda designed to work toward the equality of women, this new concern with the identity of the subject has shifted theoretical considerations toward philosophical and epistemological issues and has brought feminist theory closer to postmodern perspectives. According to Michele Barrett, the social sciences are losing their purchase; the new turn to culture has moved feminism toward the humanities and philosophy.[37]

Feminist postmodernism has criticized feminist standpoint for being overly committed to an essentialized view of women.[38] Rather than grounding feminism in women's experiences, postmodern feminism examines gender as a source of power and hierarchy in order to better understand how these hierarchies are socially constructed and maintained. Disputing liberals' claim that there is a world out there waiting to be discovered, postmodernists reject the foundationalism of Enlightenment knowledge. For them reality is multiple and historically contingent; what has counted as knowledge has done so through its association with prevailing power structures. Under the influence of postmodernism, universalistic theoretical discourses have been subject to a profound critique.[39] Postmodernism has produced the tendency to shift central theoretical concepts from structure to discourse, or from "things" to "words."[40] Feminist postmodernism deconstructs and critiques rather than prescribes; it attempts to problematize entities such as women, truth, and knowledge.[41]

Attempts to incorporate race and class into theoretical analysis have moved feminism closer to postmodernism. Indeed, one of postmodernism's strongest appeals to many feminists has been its focus on difference; its rejection of male-centric thought has allowed space within which to legitimize voices of the marginalized, whose experiences have not been part of conventional knowledge construction.[42] But, in spite of the positive value of these moves, feminism has an uneasy and complex relationship with postmodernism. A developing post-postmodern critique warns of the perils of tolerating cultural relativism; it also warns of the dangers of skepticism about

all knowledge claims, for such skepticism could lead to an abandonment of the political project of reducing women's subordination that has motivated feminism since its early beginnings. For example, Maria Nzomo claims that removing the possibility of appealing to universal ideals, such as human rights, would serve to diminish the strategies available to women.[43] If feminism loses sight of its political goals, certain feminists fear that power will remain where it is. Moving attention from women's subordination to gender constructions, or from agents to structures, makes it more difficult to determine ways of emancipating women.[44]

In a critique of trends in women's studies in the 1990s, Renate Klein claims that the new focus on gender studies threatens to make women invisible again; a lack of connection to the real lives of women endangers the political project of women's emancipation. Klein suggests that while we need to listen to women from other cultures, we must focus not only on difference, but on commonalities.[45] Agreeing with early critics of liberal feminism that the removal of legal barriers will not end women's subordination, many contemporary feminists are urging a sensitivity to difference and a respect for contextual knowledge that does not lose sight of the emancipatory goals to which various feminist approaches have been committed.

This overview suggests a multiplicity of feminist approaches. Rosi Braidotti describes feminism not as a canonized body of theories but a widely divergent, sometimes contradictory, amalgam of positions.[46] For IR, a discipline that has been concerned with cumulation and working toward a unified body of theory defined in terms of propositions that can be tested, this array of positions appears unsettling. Indeed, the concerns and debates in feminist theory that I have outlined seem far from the agenda of conventional IR. These positions have, however, been central to providing important insights and guidance for IR feminists as these scholars have constructed feminist critiques of the discipline and begun to develop feminist research programs.

Feminist Theories and IR

Although IR feminists, seeking to develop feminist critiques of the core of the discipline, have drawn on the work of liberal feminists (for example, those writing about women in foreign policy and the military),[47] many of them have rejected a liberal-empiricist orientation. Noting the dispropor-

tionately low numbers of women in elite foreign-policymaking positions in most societies, as well as their historical absence from the academic discourse of IR, feminists in IR would be unlikely to subscribe to liberal feminism's claim that these absences are the result of legal barriers alone. Moreover, incorporation into liberal analysis arouses fears of co-optation into the mainstream discipline.[48] Feminist IR theorists generally agree with postliberal claims that gender hierarchies are socially constructed and maintained through power structures that work against women's participation in foreign- and national-security policymaking. Rather than seeing the state as a neutral arbiter, feminist IR scholars have pointed to "gendered states" that promote and support policy practices primarily in the interests of men. They have examined concepts such as security and sovereignty for gender biases, and they have suggested that boundaries between inside and outside, order and anarchy, evoke gendered constructions of self and other that privilege hegemonic constructions of masculinity. International relations and international politics are arenas dominated by men; therefore, any analysis of gendered concepts and practices in IR demand that attention be paid to the construction and reproduction of masculine identities and the effects that these have on the theory and practice of IR.[49]

Calls for studying men and masculinities have been accompanied by a suspicion, voiced by some feminists, of radical feminism's celebration of female characteristics. Besides the obviously problematic slide into distinctions such as good women/bad men, the association of women with maternal qualities and peacemaking has the effect of disempowering both women and peace and further delegitimating women's voices in matters of international politics. However, socialist feminists' claims about the material bases of women's subordination have been important for explanations of the feminization of poverty, a trend that appears to be accompanying forces of economic globalization. Given that feminist IR is attempting to better understand a variety of subordinations confronted by women worldwide, the introduction of race and class as well as postcolonial perspectives, which attend to issues of culture and identity, has been another welcome development. Conventional IR has been very Western, great-power oriented; listening to and respecting women's voices worldwide and recovering the activities of those on the margins—people not usually considered significant actors in world politics—is an important contribution to the discipline.

These investigations into the gendered practices of IR owe a great deal to feminist epistemologies, which are sensitive to differences in women's

position and experience while remaining committed to producing the kind of knowledge that can contribute to the lessening of women's subordination. Understanding subordination and uncovering the gendered foundations of the theories and practices of international politics that have contributed to them have been central to feminist IR. I return to these epistemological contributions later in this chapter, and in subsequent chapters I will elaborate on the contributions of feminist theories to understanding these issues and global issues more generally. But first, to provide background for these contemporary epistemological debates and feminist perspectives on them, I will briefly survey earlier IR debates out of which they arise.

Debates in IR

Epistemological debates of the magnitude of those in feminist theory did not begin in IR until the late 1980s. Even then, the challenge to conventional social-scientific methodologies to which IR, particularly in the United States, had been committed since the 1950s has not had the same significant impact on the discipline. While IR has had debates between a variety of paradigms or worldviews, in the United States (where it has largely been a subdiscipline of political science) it has remained for the most part committed to social-scientific methodologies and a search for more rigorous explanatory theories.[50] IR began as a discipline seeking a better understanding of war, conflict, and the problems of anarchy; it was hoped that such an understanding could diminish the frequency and severity of future conflicts. The first debate in IR took place in the 1930s and 1940s, when realists criticized so-called idealists for their optimistic assessment of the possibility of cooperation in international politics through legal agreements and the building of international institutions.[51] As Brian Schmidt has suggested, debate was a misnomer; it was more an evolution, from scholars in the tradition of international law and institutions to those who focused on international politics. Schmidt argues that intellectual histories of the field have served justificatory and legitimizing purposes—in this case, the legitimation of realism.[52]

Most of the founding fathers of U.S. realism in the post–World War II era were European intellectuals fleeing from Nazi persecution. Flagrant violations of international law and abuses of human rights in the name of German nationalism motivated realist scholars to dissociate the realm of

morality from the realpolitik of international politics. Painting a gloomy picture of "political man" and the dangers of an anarchic international system, realist Hans Morgenthau claimed that war was always a possibility. However, he believed that the search for deeper explanations of the laws that govern human action could contribute to lessening the chances that such disasters would reoccur in the future.[53] Morgenthau believed that only by a more "scientific" understanding of its causes could the likelihood of war be diminished.

Yet many subsequent international theorists did not consider Morgenthau and other mid-century realists scientific enough. The second debate, which took place during the 1950s and 1960s, was between these early realists and more scientifically oriented scholars. While initially it was largely a methodological debate conducted between and among scholars who shared realist assumptions, this scientific turn in U.S. postwar realism was also adopted by behavioralists, liberal institutionalists, and some peace researchers, all of whom drew on models from the natural sciences and from economics to build their theories. Seeking scientific respectability, international theorists turned to the natural sciences for their methodologies; many of them were also defending the autonomy of rational inquiry against totalitarian ideologies, this time of postwar Communism. Theories were defined as sets of logically related, ideally causal propositions, to be empirically tested or falsified in the Popperian sense. Scientific research programs were developed from realist assumptions about the international system serving as the "hard core."[54] Although international theorists in this scientific tradition never sought the precision of Newton's grand schemes of deterministic laws and inescapable forces, they did claim that the international system is more than the constant and regular behavior of its parts.[55] Structural theories, which are still popular today in the discipline, account for behavior by searching for causes. Structural theorists believe that events are governed by structures external to the actors themselves.[56] In all these endeavors, theorists in the scientific tradition have generally assumed the possibility, as well as the desirability, of conducting systematic and cumulative scientific research.

Borrowing from economics, game theory and rational-choice theory became popular for explaining the choices and optimizing behavior of self-interested states in an anarchical international system, as well as the means for interpreting the actions of foreign-policy decision makers. Given the dangers and unpredictability of such a system, theory building was motivated by the desire to control and predict.[57] The search for systematic inquiry

could, it was hoped, contribute to the effort of diminishing the likelihood of future conflict. Broadly defined as positivist, this turn to science represents a view of the creation of knowledge based on four assumptions: (1) a belief in the unity of science—that is, the same methodologies can apply in the natural and social worlds; (2) that there is a distinction between facts and values, with facts being neutral between theories; (3) that the social world has regularities like the natural world's; and (4) that the way to determine the truth of statements is by appeal to neutral facts or an empiricist epistemology.[58]

During the 1970s the realist predominance in IR began to be challenged by scholars committed to different worldviews rather than to different epistemologies. Known as the interparadigm debate, these competing worldviews continue to define the major approaches to IR, at least for those who reject the newer critical orientations. In the 1970s the realist view of the world began to be challenged by two competing paradigms; first that of liberals, who questioned realism's state-centrism and focus on power and conflict. Liberal scholars pointed to the growth of transnational forces, economic interdependence, regional integration, and cooperation in areas where war appeared unlikely—trends and issues not amenable to realist analysis.[59] The second challenge came from scholars concerned with the global capitalist economy and its tendencies toward uneven growth and development. Many of these scholars employed Marxist or other sociological theories to try to understand the growing disparities between North and South.[60]

While scholars in these three competing traditions—realism, liberalism, and Marxism—have continued to work within a social-scientific framework, they see a different reality, make different assumptions, and tell different stories about the world. Although each of these approaches is still evident in IR today, Marxism has suffered considerable decline, particularly since the end of the Cold War. Each paradigm has its own supporters, and there is little debate between them; the little that has taken place tends to be between realists and liberals.[61]

With the decline of Marxist approaches, which began in the 1980s and is attributable, in part, to the triumph of liberal capitalism and the demise of the socialist alternative, debate within these scientific traditions, particularly in the United States, became focused on that between its two most visible proponents, neorealism and neoliberalism, approaches that evolved from earlier realist and liberal paradigms, with the intention of making them

more "scientific." Distinguishing neorealism from the classical realism of Morgenthau and others, Ole Waever claims that what divides them is neorealism's concept of science expressed in the form of theory. In contrast to classical realism, which generalized about the nature of human life and philosophies of history, neorealism, in becoming more scientific, can say (to quote Waltz) only a small number of big and important things.[62]

Likewise, neoliberalism underwent the same type of methodological transformation from its earlier form associated with liberal theories of integration and interdependence. Describing this as a "neo-neo synthesis" that has brought realists and liberals closer together in terms of their worldviews as well as their methodologies, Waever claims that both are searching for more limited and precise assertions that can be reduced to simple analytical statements amenable to tests and theory building.[63] Robert Keohane, a major proponent of neoliberalism, describes neoliberal research on international institutions as being rooted in exchange theory, which assumes scarcity and competition as well as rationality on the part of actors. Operating under similar assumptions about international anarchy as realists, neoliberals see greater possibilities for cooperation with institutions mitigating the conflictual effects of anarchy.[64]

According to Charles Kegley, theoretical debate in IR since its advent as a discipline has ranged primarily within the boundaries of the competing worldviews of realism and liberalism. He goes on to argue that the most important topic (although, as he admits, not the only one) in international-relations theory in the 1990s was the challenge to the dominant realist paradigm that was mounted from diverse perspectives grounded in liberal or "idealist" theoretical orientations. Kegley's "key cleavage" is reminiscent of the conventional reading of the first debate. While to many scholars, particularly U.S. scholars, this assessment of the field may seem accurate, for others, including feminists, this description appears excessively narrow.[65]

In a review article that includes the Kegley volume, Richard Mansbach claims that if the debate between realists and liberals accurately reflected the state of the field in the 1990s, we should be wondering "whether our theories are relevant to an era of failed states, warring tribal and ethnic identities, hot money, environmental catastrophe, massive popular mobilization and participation, and the immobilisme of governments everywhere."[66] Similarly, Fred Halliday refers to what he terms the North American branch of IR as a search for scientific analysis that cannot provide a general or comprehensive methodology for any area of human behavior,

that of international relations included. He goes on to suggest that this search, which grew out of the behaviorist revolution, has been an unmiti gated disaster for the discipline of international relations, as well as for its ability to influence and attract interested attention from outside the field.[67] These critics raise a fundamental challenge to conventional IR. By questioning the ontological and epistemological foundations of the field, they raise issues that are at the heart of the third debate.

The term *third debate* was articulated by Yosef Lapid, who in 1989 proclaimed a "post-positivist era" in international relations. Postpositivism, to use Lapid's term, includes a variety of approaches—critical theory, historical sociology, and postmodernism, as well as most feminist approaches; all of them lie outside the approaches defined by the interparadigm debate, although critical theory's intellectual roots lie in Marxism. All of them challenge the social-scientific methodologies of conventional IR. But their critiques of the discipline go well beyond methodological issues to debates over ontology and epistemology. While, as Lapid noted, many scholars have celebrated this multiplicity of approaches; others have disagreed, seeing "a discipline in disarray."[68]

Steve Smith claims that these newer approaches are more united by what they oppose than by what they agree on.[69] Their agreement centers on a skepticism about the value of social-scientific theories for understanding world politics. The third debate is, therefore, a dispute over the relative validity of what have been variously termed explanatory and constitutive theories or rationalist and reflectivist epistemologies.[70] According to Robert Keohane, who used the terms *rationalist* and *reflectivist* in his 1988 presidential address to the International Studies Association, rationalists postulate a "natural world," outside theory, whose regularities can be observed by the theorist; rationalists accept a substantive conception of rationality—behavior that can be adjudged objectively to be optimally adapted to a situation. Keohane claims that rationalist theories have been used in fruitful ways in international relations to explain behavior, including the behavior of institutions.[71]

Reflectivists, on the other hand, see theory as constitutive of reality. They are concerned with understanding how we think about the world, and how ideas, including those of the theorist, help shape the world. Coming out of sociological rather than natural scientific approaches, they stress the role of social forces as well as the impact of cultural practices, norms and values that are not derived from calculations of interests as in rationalistic theories.

The word *debate* is probably a misnomer for the divide between these two positions. Because they disagree sharply about how to build knowledge, there is very little contact between explanatory and constitutive theorists.[72] Not only do proponents of each position rarely talk to each other, the disparity of power between them makes the potential for genuine dialogue very difficult, particularly in the United States, where postpositivist approaches, including feminism, are rarely given much attention, and where there is little critical self-reflection by the mainstream on these epistemological issues.[73] Scholars in the scientific tradition tend to judge critical theorists according to positivist criteria for good scientific research, which makes other approaches, when judged in these terms, look less than adequate.

Feminist Intersections with IR

Feminist IR scholars, many of whom are skeptical of IR's scientific turn for the same reasons that postliberal feminists are skeptical of empiricism (discussed earlier), have tended to identify with the reflectivist side of the third debate. Even though scholars in the third debate have been slow to introduce gender into their analysis, this debate has opened up space for feminist perspectives in a way that previous debates did not. Most IR feminists firmly reject identification with either side of the first debate; even though IR scholars have frequently associated feminists with the idealist position, feminists see this association, like that between women and peace, as disempowering and likely to further reduce their being taken seriously.[74] Just as Schmidt noted that defining the realist/idealist divide as a debate that delegitimized the idealist position, current attempts to associate feminists with idealism has a similar effect on delegitimizing feminist perspectives. Moreover, as feminists have pointed out, the construction of the realist/idealist dichotomy is in itself implicitly gendered.[75]

In her assessment of the potential for finding a space in IR for feminist theory in the realist and liberal approaches of the interparadigm debate, Sandra Whitworth has suggested that, to incorporate gender, theories must satisfy three criteria: (1) they must allow for the possibility of talking about the social construction of meaning; (2) they must discuss historical variability; and (3) they must permit theorizing about power in ways that uncover hidden power relations. Whitworth claims that, in terms of these three cri-

teria, there is little in realism that seems conducive to theorizing about gender.[76] The liberal paradigm that has sought to enlarge concerns beyond the state-centric, national-security focus of realism might seem more promising; however, according to Whitworth, it is ahistorical and denies the material bases of conflict, inequality, and power. Introducing women and gender to the liberal paradigm would also encounter the same problems noted by critics of liberal feminism. Attempts to "bring women into IR" feed into the mistaken assumption that they are not there in the first place. As Cynthia Enloe tells us, women (as well as marginalized people more generally) are highly involved in world politics, but existing power structures, institutionalized in the split between the public and private spheres and what counts as "important," keep them from being heard.[77]

Whitworth concludes by suggesting that critical theory is the most promising approach for feminist IR. Writing in 1989, Whitworth noted that the critical approach was, at that time, still quite underdeveloped; she also suggested that creating a space within critical theory would not launch gender analysis into the mainstream of IR, since critical theory is as much on the periphery as feminist analysis. While critical theory has become more developed and recognized in IR since 1989, in the United States at least, it remains on the margins.

Although not all IR feminists would identify themselves as critical theorists, most would define themselves as postpositivists in terms of the characterization of positivism outlined above. With a preference for hermeneutic, historically based, humanistic, and philosophical traditions of knowledge cumulation, rather than those based on the natural sciences, IR feminists are often skeptical of empiricist methodologies, for reasons mentioned above. While they are generally committed to the emancipatory potential of theory, which can help to understand structures of domination, particularly gender structures of inequality, they are suspicious of Enlightenment knowledge, which they claim has been based on knowledge about, and produced by, men—a claim that seems particularly true of the discipline of international relations.

In an introductory text, Steve Smith identifies five types of what he calls reflectivist or postpositivist theories: normative theory, feminist theory, historical sociology, critical theory, and postmodernism. He stresses that they are too different from each other to be added together and presented as one theory to rival the neo-neo synthesis.[78] However, all of them place IR in a broader interdisciplinary context; drawing on different intellectual traditions

such as philosophy, history, sociology, and political theory, many of these scholars come from outside international relations; many of them are also situated outside the United States.

While many authors in these various traditions remain silent on gender issues, these postpositivist, historical, and normative orientations are compatible with many of the orientations of postliberal feminists. Yet as Marysia Zalewski emphasizes, it is not easy to apply one disparate and large body of theory to another. It entails taking into account a whole area conventionally defined as invisible or as part of the private realm and, therefore, out of the scope of conventional political analysis. A key task of feminist analysis is to extend the scope of the agenda rather than to answer questions about what is already on the agenda.[79] Feminists also emphasize that, rather than introducing gender into IR, they are revealing how gender is already embedded in the theory and practice of international relations. I shall now suggest ways in which feminist perspectives have found space within these various postpositivist traditions to expand the agenda and bring to light existing gender hierarchies. Here I emphasize epistemological concerns; in later chapters I will discuss how this knowledge is used to expand the agenda of world politics and deepen our understanding of global issues.

Normative Theory Normative theory began to gain attention in the 1980s. Although it had been an important influence on the early discipline, it was subsequently submerged under realism's portrayal of amoral states and positivism's quest for the separation of facts and values. Addressing itself to the morality, or immorality, of war, as well as some of the issues that emerged on the international relations agenda in the 1970s, such as economic development, inequality, and distributive justice, normative theory evaluates the moral dimensions of world politics. Many of its leading theorists come out of traditions of political philosophy and international law rather than international relations.[80] World-order theorists postulate a better world and then investigate how progress toward its realization might be achieved.[81] A major debate in normative theory is whether we can postulate the existence of a world society and talk about justice and democracy in a universal sense, or whether society is contained within states that then form boundaries of moral obligation.[82] Communitarians argue that state boundaries define the political community within which discussions about justice and obligation can take place, whereas cosmopolitans argue for the need to think about justice in universal terms.[83]

Since women own a very small share of the world's wealth and are frequently discriminated against in the articulation of human rights and through cultural practices, theories of justice are an important issue in feminist theory, although one usually addressed by feminist political philosophers, rather than IR feminists. Western theories of universal justice, built on an abstract concept of rationalism, have generally been constructed out of a definition of human nature that excludes or diminishes women. Feminists assert that the universalism they defend is defined by identifying the experience of a special group (elite men) as paradigmatic of human beings as a whole.[84]

Feminist attempts to articulate a theory of justice that steers between the pitfalls of a false universalism (which in reality is based on a masculine concept of justice and the experiences of certain men) and cultural relativism (which denies any possibility of articulating generalizable standards for moral behavior) has been difficult. The debate over difference in recent feminist theory has made this an especially crucial issue. That women have been excluded from definitions of human rights is undeniable. Yet basing appeals for justice for women on false universals is also problematic. A sensitivity to difference, but an awareness of the need for a "community of conversation across cultures," in which conversational partners are given equal rights of participation, is one constructive approach to a feminist conception of justice.[85] I return to this issue when I discuss human rights in chapter 4.

Historical Sociology Historical sociology examines the ways in which societies develop through history. Rather than taking the state as given and unproblematic, as neorealists and neoliberals do, this tradition tries to understand how certain states have developed, looking at both internal and external factors.[86] IR feminists would agree that state formation and the development of states must be examined for evidence of patriarchal structures and the effects that they may have had on foreign-policy and security-seeking behaviors.[87] Like historical sociologists, IR feminists challenge liberals' assertions that the state is a neutral arbiter; Spike Peterson and Anne Runyan, for example, claim that while historical sociologists have articulated the coercive dynamics of states, their continued omission of women produces inaccurate and inadequate accounts. Peterson and Runyan argue that it is not possible to understand power relations without understanding the absence of women from elite decision-making positions in states, as well as the gen-

dered constructions of public and private that support these exclusions.[88] These patriarchal customs were enshrined in early state formations and have been reproduced through history through a reconfiguration of legitimating ideologies.[89] These issues, too, will be pursued further in chapter 4.

Critical Theory Critical theory played a central role in motivating the third debate. Critical theory comes out of Marxism as well as Hegelian and Kantian Enlightenment traditions.[90] Like historical sociologists, critical theorists examine the historical development of society with the intent of understanding various forms of domination in order to overcome them. Critical theory views the prevailing order of social and political relations as a historical production that must be explained. In order to explain injustice, it is necessary to understand the world as it is. In this sense, critical theory accepts the realist description of world politics, but it seeks to change it. Critical theorist Robert Cox uses a hermeneutic approach that conceives of social structures as having an intersubjective existence; however, making the claim that structures are socially constructed does not deny that they have real concrete effects: humans *act* as if the structures are real.[91]

This is quite a different concept of theory from positivism, and it is one that many IR feminists find compatible with their orientations. Feminists claim that gender structures are socially constructed, historically variable, and upheld through power relations that legitimize them. Like critical theorists, most feminists would claim an emancipatory interest in seeking to overcome these structures of domination. Most feminists would also agree with critical theorists that knowledge reflects certain interests of the society from which it is produced; in IR, knowledge has generally been produced by and for men, particularly elite men. Feminists are particularly concerned to examine and explain why certain kinds of knowledge have been left out of the discipline. Like many critical theorists, they, too, question the subject matter of conventional IR. Often focused on the lives of people at the margins of global politics, they raise issues not normally considered part of the discipline and ask questions about them in new ways. As Sandra Harding tells us, an important task of feminist theory is to make strange what has previously appeared familiar, or to challenge us to question what has hitherto appeared as "natural."[92] A reexamination of the meaning of security in chapter 2 is an example of how feminists are expanding the subject matter of IR.

Many IR feminists would also agree with Robert Cox's famous definition of critical theory, which he contrasts with what he calls problem-solving

theory, a type of theory that takes the world as it finds it and implicitly accepts the prevailing order as its framework. The purpose of problem solving is to make prevailing social and power relationships and the institutions into which they are organized work smoothly, by dealing effectively with particular sources of trouble.[93] Since feminist theorists believe that the world is characterized by socially constructed gender hierarchies that are detrimental to women, and since they are committed to finding ways to eliminate these hierarchies, they are unlikely to take such an epistemological stance.

In contrast, Cox claims that critical theory does not take institutions and social/power relations for granted but calls them into question by concerning itself with their origins and how and whether they might be in the process of changing. In other words, critical theory stands apart from the prevailing order of the world and asks how that order came about; it can, therefore, be a guide to strategic action for bringing about an alternative order.[94] Agreeing with Cox's assertion that theory is always for someone and for some purpose, the goal of feminist approaches is similar to that of critical theory as defined by Cox. Like critical theorists, feminists are concerned with context and historical process and with "how we construct, rather than dis-cover, our world(s)."[95]

Postmodernism According to Chris Brown, *critical theory* and *postmodernism* are ambiguous terms. He suggests that postmodern theorists are also critical theorists, in the broad sense of the term, since they, too, challenge the existing order.[96] Like critical theorists, they, too, see a crisis in Western thought, and they share a suspicion of rationality and science. Postmodernists, however, are more willing to abandon the Enlightenment project; therefore, they criticize the foundationalism of critical theory.

It is particularly hard to categorize postmodern theory; indeed, postmodernists reject any notion of a unified approach, and attempts to define it are contentious issues even among its adherents. Although feminist theory has had an uneasy relationship with postmodernism (discussed earlier), IR feminists and postmodern IR share many assumptions. Indeed, many IR feminists can be placed at the intersection of critical and postmodern approaches; their unwillingness to give up the emancipatory project of critical theory—an unwillingness shared by certain IR theorists who might define themselves as postmodern—places them at this intersection. Christine Sylvester's text *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era* takes much from postmodernism, but notes the dangers of sacrificing women as the

primary concern; for this reason, she advocates a "postmodern feminism." According to Sylvester, "postmodern feminism is emerging as a position of negotiation between standpoint feminism, with its conviction that real women exist and lean toward practical-moral imperatives, and feminist postmodernist skepticisms."[97] Sylvester advocates a position that recognizes many local standpoints and identities and suggests an empathetic conversational politics.

Like critical theory, postmodernism claims that knowledge is produced in certain people's interests. Postmodernism believes that the positivist separation between knowledge and values, knowledge and reality, and knowledge and power must be questioned.[98] In international relations, this requires an investigation of the way some issues are framed as "serious" or "real," such as national security, while others are seen as unimportant or subjects for another discipline—an issue of great importance for IR feminists, as discussed above. Postmodernists, like critical theorists and feminists, aver that knowledge is shaped by and constructed in the service of existing power relations. Thus they are skeptical of positivist claims about the neutrality of facts and objectivity.

Many feminists would agree. In her critique of the natural sciences, Evelyn Fox Keller asserts that modern Enlightenment science has incorporated a belief system that equates objectivity with masculinity and a set of cultural values that simultaneously elevates what is defined as scientific and what is defined as masculine.[99] Throughout most of the history of the modern West, men have been seen as the knowers; what has counted as legitimate knowledge, in both the natural and social sciences, has generally been knowledge based on the lives of men in the public sphere. The separation of the public and private spheres, reinforced by the scientific revolution of the seventeenth century, has resulted in the legitimization of what are perceived as the "rational" activities in the former, while devaluing the "natural" activities of the latter.[100]

To uncover this relationship between knowledge and power, postmodernism has drawn on the notion of genealogy—a style of historical thought that exposes and registers the significance of these power/knowledge relations. The goal of genealogy is to write counterhistories that can bring to light processes of exclusion. Claiming that there can be no one true story or historical narrative, genealogy situates knowledge in a particular time and place and demonstrates how it is constructed from particular perspectives. In international relations, postmodernists have demonstrated how particular

representations of international relations take hold and produce political effect. For example, R. B. J. Walker claims that standard interpretations of Machiavelli, as the initiator of the realist tradition, legitimize certain political practices that gain a sense of permanency, practices that Machiavelli's own insistence on impermanence and contingency would have denied. Walker and certain IR feminists have also noted Machiavelli's gendered construction of *fortuna* and *virtu* that place the feminine *fortuna* as a representation of wild and untamed spaces of anarchy against which masculine *virtu* must prevail.[101] As Runyan and Peterson suggest, the association of "woman" with unruly nature has a long history in Western political theory.[102] In this sense, "woman," like Machiavelli's *fortuna*, is representative of the problem of anarchy in realist international relations.

Walker and other postmodernists have also questioned realism's reading of Hobbes's state of nature, asking why, when Hobbes himself refused to make such distinctions, the phrase has become associated with distinctions between community on the inside and anarchy on the outside. IR feminists have questioned realism's reliance on state-of-nature myths on the grounds that it introduces gender bias that extends into IR theory.[103]

Importantly, postmodernism engages in the deconstruction of conceptual oppositions. It questions binary hierarchical oppositions in which one of two terms is privileged over the other. This kind of deconstruction has been used to question prevailing interpretations of international relations. For example, Richard Ashley questions the conventional reading of the anarchy problematic, which depends on an opposition between sovereignty and anarchy, where sovereignty is seen as stable and a legitimizer of state practices and anarchy is viewed as dangerous and problematic.[104] IR feminists also problematize the defining dichotomies of the field that are reinforced through an association with the masculine/feminine gender dichotomy.[105] They question how they serve to naturalize other forms of superordination in world politics. For example, boundaries between self and other, realism and idealism, order and anarchy, all of which evoke gendered connotations, serve as legitimators of national-security practices.

I have shown, through this chapter's discussion of debates in both the disciplines of IR and feminism, that there are many kinds of feminist IR that have affinities with a variety of critical IR approaches. I have suggested why they tend to be situated on the critical side of the third debate. Importantly, however, they are rooted in a long tradition of feminist theory—for as Re-

becca Grant has claimed, while the newest theories in IR are radical, they come with no guarantee of being feminist.[106] I have also suggested that, just as postliberal feminists have developed standpoint and postmodern epistemologies, which they see as better able to understand women's subordination than liberal empiricism, IR feminists have similarly identified with postpositivist epistemologies in IR, which they feel can provide better ways to understand the gendered structures and practices of world politics. Yet, as Spike Peterson suggests, a rejection of positivist empiricism does not mean repudiating empirical study.[107] Rather than rejecting systematic inquiry or empirical research, a postpositivist critique involves examining boundaries, frameworks, and research questions; it involves asking how and why these forms came to be and how they reproduce the status quo. Moving beyond these critiques, IR feminists are beginning to develop their own research programs—extending the boundaries of the discipline, asking different questions in new ways, and listening to unfamiliar voices from the margins. While these new frameworks and questions appear strange to the conventional discipline of IR, they are ones that feminists are using as they begin to build their own research programs—programs that they hope will lead to new understandings of world politics. As subsequent chapters will demonstrate, these investigations are shedding new light on traditional topics as well as taking IR feminists on journeys that are far from the conventional discipline.

2 Gendered Dimensions of War, Peace, and Security

War and conflict have been fundamental to a discipline whose founding texts include Thucydides' *History of the Pelopponesian War* and Machiavelli's *Prince*. Motivated by the devastation of two world wars in the first half of the twentieth century, the contemporary discipline of international relations was founded by scholars searching for explanations for the causes of war and prescriptions for its avoidance. During the Cold War, the predominance of the realist paradigm was due to its focus on U.S./Soviet rivalry; national-security studies, which was based on a realist worldview and studied the strategic implications of this rivalry, became an important subfield in the discipline. With the end of the Cold War, however, the centrality of national-security studies and the predominance of realism began to be questioned. Scholars skeptical of realism's claim that the future would soon look like the past began to introduce new security issues, new definitions of security, and new ways to analyze them. At a more fundamental level, critical-security studies, a new approach situated on the critical side of the third debate, began to question the "scientific" foundations of the field that had been first applied in security studies. It was within the context of these debates about ontology and epistemology that feminist perspectives on security began to be articulated.[1]

Security specialists in universities and research institutions played an important role in designing U.S. security policy during the Cold War. For this reason their work was aimed at policymakers and military experts, an audience that traditionally included very few women and one that has not been

particularly concerned with the kind of security issues important to many women. While national security has been a privileged category both in the discipline of international relations and in international "high" politics, the term *woman* is antithetical to our stereotypical image of a national-security specialist. Women have rarely been security providers in the conventional sense of the term, as soldiers or policymakers; in the U.S. Department of Defense in August 1999, women occupied only 14.6 percent of all officer ranks and only 5 percent of the top four positions in these ranks.[2] It is only recently that women have begun to enter the IR security field in significant numbers.[3] Yet women have been writing about security from a variety of perspectives for a long time; their voices, however, have rarely been heard. For these reasons, feminist perspectives on security are quite different from those of conventional security studies. To the mainstream, they often appear to be outside traditional disciplinary boundaries.

I begin this chapter by overviewing traditional thinking on security, most of which is situated in the realist paradigm. Then I review some of the recent attempts to broaden the security agenda as well as some of the critical-security literature that, besides raising new issues, is challenging realism's epistemological and ontological foundations. After examining some feminist literature that is documenting women's activities in war as well as the ways in which war is impacting on women, I elaborate on some feminist critiques of realist understandings of security as well as some feminist contributions to understanding issues of state and national identities and their similarities with, and differences from, critical-security studies. War and peace are frequently portrayed as gendered concepts; while women's voices have rarely been granted legitimacy in matters of war and national security, they have been stereotypically associated with idealized versions of peace. Having analyzed these relationships (war and masculinity; peace and femininity—relationships that are, as I will suggest, quite problematic) I conclude by offering some feminist redefinitions of security that attempt to get beyond these unhelpful dichotomies and contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of security issues.

Realist Perspectives on Security

Following World War II, an emergent, self-named "realist" school of international relations claimed that the lack of military preparedness on the

part of the Allied powers, as well as what it saw as a naive faith in the possibility of international law and institutions on the part of those it termed "idealists," contributed to the war's outbreak. Realists believe that, in an anarchical world of sovereign, self-interested states, war is always a possibility; therefore, states must rely on their own power and capabilities rather than international agreements to enhance their national security. Although their portrayal of IR in the interwar period, which they claimed was captured by "idealist" thinking, was probably more of a move to legitimate realism than an accurate portrayal of so-called idealist thinking, realists questioned idealists' belief in human progress and the possibility of an international society; realists see only an anarchy, characterized by repetitive competition and conflict.[4]

The realist/idealist debate in IR comes out of these conflicting worldviews that differ over their belief in the possibility for peace and cooperation. Since 1945, the realist side of the debate has predominated, particularly with respect to analyses of issues related to conflict and security. Peace research, which has attempted to specify conditions necessary for a less conflictual world, has proceeded as a separate field on the edges of the discipline. While neorealism and neoliberalism, more recent iterations of these contending positions, are closer together than earlier realist and idealist positions, neorealism has been the predominant approach in security studies, while neoliberals have been primarily, but not exclusively, concerned with matters related to economic relations between states.[5] Neorealists and neoliberals agree that both national security and economic welfare are important, but they differ in the relative emphasis they place on these goals. These tendencies have had the effect of further reinforcing realism's predominance in security studies.

Realists define security in political/military terms as the protection of the boundaries and integrity of the state and its values against the dangers of a hostile international environment. Neorealists emphasize the anarchical structure of the system, which they liken to the Hobbesian state of nature, rather than domestic determinants as being the primary contributor to states' insecurities. Skeptical of the neoliberal claim that international institutions can mitigate the dangerous consequences of anarchy where there are no restraints on the self-interested behavior of sovereign states, realists claim that wars occur because there is nothing to prevent them.[6] States, therefore, must rely on their own capabilities to ensure their security. As realists have acknowledged, this self-help system often results in what they describe as a

"security dilemma"; measures that are justified by one state as part of a legitimate, security-enhancing policy are likely to be perceived by others as a threatening military buildup.[7] Seeking more scientific rigor, neorealists have used game-theoretic models to explain the security dilemma, which is often characterized as a prisoners-dilemma game.[8] States are postulated as unitary actors whose internal characteristics, beyond an assessment of their relative capabilities, are not seen as necessary for understanding their vulnerabilities or security-enhancing behavior—a behavior in which states have been engaged for centuries.[9]

In an often-cited 1991 review of the literature in the security field—a field that he suggested had recently undergone a welcome resurgence—realist Stephen Walt claimed that the main focus of security studies is the phenomenon of war: it may be defined as the study of threat, the use and control of military force, and the conditions that make the use of force more likely.[10] During what Walt termed the "golden age" of security studies (which he suggested ended in the mid 1960s), the central question was how states could use weapons of mass destruction as instruments of policy given the risks of nuclear exchange. Heavily dominated by U.S. strategic thinking about nuclear weapons and the security problems of the United States and its NATO allies, the field of national security was based on the assumption that, since nuclear wars were too dangerous to fight, security was synonymous with nuclear deterrence and power balancing. Power balancing is seen by realists as the primary mechanism for enhancing stability. During the Cold War, the balance of power was bipolar, rather than multipolar; certain realists saw this balance as one that afforded increased stability.[11]

The turn toward science in IR, which ushered in the second debate between those who believed in the possibilities of methods drawn from the natural sciences and those who preferred more historical interpretive methods, was strongly associated with security studies. Waltz's, *Theory of International Politics*, which offered a structural explanation of the security-seeking behavior of states, was an important articulation of the scientific method. In his review, Walt was enthusiastic about this move to what he termed a more "scientific," less "political," security studies based on systematic social-scientific research. Defending rationalist methods, Walt applauded realism's scientific turn; he claimed that the resurgence of security studies was facilitated by its adoption of the norms and objectives of social science. Advocating a positivist research agenda, Walt argued that security studies should engage in three main theoretical activities: theory creation,

or the development of logically related causal propositions; theory testing according to standards of verification and falsification; and theory application, or the use of existing knowledge to illuminate specific policy problems.[12] He noted approvingly that peace researchers were also beginning to address issues of military strategy and defense policy in a more sophisticated way, thus leading to a convergence of the two perspectives.

Walt went on to warn of "counterproductive tangents," such as the postmodern approach that, he claimed, has seduced other areas of international studies, a development that he clearly viewed as dangerous. Walt asserted that security studies had profited from its connection to real-world issues; if it were to succumb to the tendency to pursue the "trivial" or the "politically irrelevant," its practical value would decline.

In spite of Walt's positive words about conventional security studies, the end of the Cold War eroded the realist consensus and threw its agenda into disarray. The demise of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact ushered in a system in which major war among the great powers appeared unlikely. Some have gone as far as predicting the end of cross-border conflict as a tool of state policy.[13] Power balancing seemed like an unlikely explanation for wars of state formation and state disintegration, which have been the predominant types of conflict in the late twentieth century. Beginning in the 1980s, but further stimulated by these changes, the field of security studies started to broaden its agenda; while certain realists continue to hold the belief that conflict between the great powers is likely to reemerge, others see a new security agenda based on ethnic conflict, failed states, and emerging North/South boundaries demarcated by stability and conflict. Other scholars, many of whom are outside the realist tradition, have begun to debate whether the definition of security should be broadened beyond its exclusive military and statist focus; in a highly interdependent world that faces multiple security threats, certain scholars are claiming that military definitions of national security, as opposed to a more comprehensive global security, may be fundamentally flawed.

Beyond the Realist Agenda

As the conflict between the great powers deescalated rapidly at the end of the 1980s and the world seemed poised on the verge of a "new international order," space opened up for broadening the security agenda to include

conflict on the periphery as well as economic and environmental issues, a move that had actually begun well before the end of the Cold War. Yet, for many security specialists in the realist tradition, this broadening was viewed negatively; claims that great-power rivalry had ended were strongly disputed. Asserting that the age-old threat of great-power conflict should remain the focus of security studies, some looked back to the Cold War with nostalgia, seeing it as an era in which nuclear, bipolar power balancing made stability more likely. John Mearsheimer saw the potential for more, rather than less, conflict in Europe; he predicted an evolution to a multipolar system in which deterrence and alliance structures are less stable.[14] Likewise, Kenneth Waltz pointed to the competitive behavior of states that has existed for centuries and is likely to continue into the future. While he conceded that there are political problems associated with Germany and Japan becoming nuclear powers, he does expect these states to increase their military capabilities and begin to act like "normal" powers.[15]

The realist preoccupation with cross-border conflict and military power, defined in terms of the interests and security of the great powers, has come under a great deal of criticism from those who argue that its worldview is a poor fit with contemporary reality. Edward Kolodziej has faulted Walt's survey for its ethnocentric definition of the field—a definition that focuses almost exclusively on U.S. national security.[16] Certain scholars have drawn attention to the fact that more than one hundred significant wars have occurred since 1945, almost all of them in the South,[17] One irony of the relative stability of the Cold War world, applauded by realists, was that military conflict was removed to the peripheries of the system; in other words, the quest for systemic security may actually have increased Southern insecurity.[18]

These types of conflicts are less amenable to traditional realist analysis. Military conflicts in the South have rarely been cross-border; rather, they are the result of domestic challenges to the legitimacy of political regimes frequently supported by outside intervention. Security threats more often arise, not from outside aggression, but from the failure to integrate diverse social groups into the political process. Deterrence against external attack is not an adequate representation of security goals when it is internal insecurity that is the greatest threat: moreover, as Nicole Ball has pointed out, even the term *internal security* is a misnomer since its purpose is rarely to make all citizens equally secure but rather to enable ruling elites to remain in power, often at the expense of the majority of the population.[19] Ethnic wars,

which often overlap international borders, are frequently the result of artificial boundaries imposed by former colonial powers—boundaries seen as illegitimate by local populations. Some scholars have even suggested that the term *state*, as it is used in the Western context, is not appropriate in certain areas of the South, where "quasi states" derive their legitimacy from the international system rather than from the support of their own people.[20] The arming of the South with advanced weapons, usually provided by the great powers and used primarily for internal security purposes, reinforces the claim that, in some parts of the world, it is militarization itself that is becoming the greatest threat to security.

Although most realists remain committed to a traditional security agenda, some are joining the move to consider new security issues. The most extensive reexamination of security from a realist perspective that takes into account some of these new issues is Barry Buzan's *People, States, and Fear*. True to his realist orientation, Buzan sees progress toward greater security, not in the diminution of state power, but as a result of a systemic move toward a "mature anarchy" that, he believes, is becoming evident in relations between Western democracies. Answering the claim raised by scholars concerned with security in the South—that states can be a threat to security, rather than a source of it—Buzan argues that the evolution toward "strong states," more typical of the West, will result in a greater degree of security for individuals. Likewise, Stephen Van Evera distinguishes between a benign nationalism, typical of West European states, and an East European nationalism that is delinked from the state and is thus more dangerous.[21] While certain liberal scholars in the Kantian tradition are claiming that war among democratic states in the North is highly unlikely, the South is being described as a zone of turmoil that can expect to experience conflict for some time to come.[22] These are a few of the many examples of a trend in the security literature that has begun to see the security environment in terms of a North/South, or West versus the rest of the world, divide. Brian Schmidt has claimed that this is not a new phenomenon, however. Drawing on some of the international-relations literature in political science at the beginning of the century, Schmidt notes a substantial body of work on colonial administration in which colonial territories were viewed as falling outside the society of nations and characterized as places plagued by internal anarchy.[23] Whether intentional or not, this North/South framework feeds into a tendency to view the world in ethnocentric and adversarial terms in which the West is seen as the locus of stability and democracy.

Redefining Security

In *People, States, and Fear*, Buzan also broadened the meaning of security to include freedom from societal, economic, and environmental threats; a similar redefinition of security, beyond its association with military issues, has been articulated by other scholars, most of them outside the realist tradition. Even before the end of the Cold War, scholars such as Richard Ullman and Jessica Mathews were calling for an expanded definition of security to include economic and environmental issues.[24] Also in the 1980s, proponents of the term *common security*, many of whom were policymakers and academics outside the United States, began to argue that military-centered definitions of national security were fundamentally flawed in a highly interdependent world facing multiple security threats, many of which were not amenable to statist solutions.[25] Johan Galtung's earlier use of the term *structural violence* was introduced into the security literature to describe the violence done to individuals through decreased life expectancy due to economic deprivation.[26] Economic dimensions of security were defined not only in terms of the security of the state, but also in terms of secure systems of food, health, money, and trade.[27]

As with the introduction of new issues, this redefinition of security has also fueled a lively debate in the security literature. Stephen Walt has decried the move to redefine security—a move that, he claimed, threatens to destroy the intellectual coherence of the field.[28] This is an opinion shared by many realists, but it is not only realists who disapprove of this broadening. In a 1995 volume, the stated goal of which was to bring together a broad spectrum of security specialists, ranging from realists to postmodernists, the emphasis of many of the contributors remained on the state and issues of military security.[29] While defining security in constructivist terms, Ole Waever criticized the attempt to broaden the security agenda beyond a focus on the state to one on the security of individuals; as security becomes synonymous with everything good or desirable, it is emptied of content, Waever claimed—a concern shared by certain other scholars outside the realist tradition.[30] Simon Dalby has suggested the possibility of disposing with the term *security* altogether and replacing it with a different political language of ecology, justice, and sustainability.[31] Yet rejecting the term *security* does nothing to end its privileged status. As Ken Booth has claimed, the word has "enormous political significance; and that to get an issue onto a state's security agenda

is to give it priority."[32] The same might be said about the agenda of the discipline of international relations, where national-security studies have also enjoyed a privileged position.

Epistemological Debates

New issues and new definitions of security have been accompanied by calls for new ways of understanding security. Controversy about the meaning of security has been part of a more fundamental debate over broader epistemological issues that, on the critical side, has included questioning the state-centric foundations and assumptions of realism as well as challenging its positivist-rationalist methodologies. Many scholars on the critical side of these epistemological debates claim that these ontological and epistemological issues are highly interrelated. The beginning of the debate over the meaning of security and its expanding agenda, as well as over how to explain conflict and prescribe for its amelioration, was coincidental with the third debate in IR. Scholars on the critical side began to question realism's explanations for states' security behavior based on economistic, rational-choice models or natural-science equilibrium models associated with the balance of power. Many claimed that issues of culture and identity must be included in order to gain a fuller understanding of states' security interests and policies. Poststructuralist scholars began to question the foundational myths of realist worldviews upon which realist explanations of conflict depend. Claiming that theory cannot be divorced from political practice, critics pointed to realism's complicity in shaping policymakers' understandings of and prescriptions for U.S. security behavior in the Cold War world.

Walt's defense of the social-scientific foundations of security studies (mentioned earlier) and his dismissal of other approaches have drawn sharp criticism from critical-security scholars. The ethnocentricism of his review and his description of a field that appears closely allied with U.S. security interests call into question his claim about the field's ability to "rise above the political" and raises the issue of whose interest security is serving. Edward Kolodziej has claimed that Walt's philosophically restrictive notion of the social sciences confines the security scholar to testing propositions largely specified by policymakers; it is they who decide what is real and relevant.[33] Kolodziej goes on to say that Walt's definition of science bars

any possibility of an ethical or moral discourse; even the normative concerns of classical realists are deemphasized in order to put the realist perspective on scientific foundations. Challenging Walt's view of the history of the field as a gradual evolution toward an objective, scientific discipline that ultimately yields a form of knowledge beyond time and history, Keith Krause and Michael Williams have claimed that Walt has created an epistemic hierarchy that allows conventional security studies to set itself up as the authoritative judge of alternative claims;[34] this leads to a dismissal of alternative epistemologies in terms of their not being "scientific."

Critics claim that issues they consider important for understanding security cannot be raised within a positivist-rationalist epistemology or an ontology based on instrumentally rational actors in a state-centric world. In addition to constraining what can be said about security, a realist-rationalist approach precludes consideration of an ethical or emancipatory politics. For example, Krause and Williams contest realism's claim that states and anarchy are essential and unproblematic facts of world politics. They suggest that this worldview is grounded in an understanding of human subjects as self-contained—as instrumentally rational actors confronting an objective external reality. This methodologically individualist premise renders questions about identity and interest formation as unimportant.[35] These and other critics claim that issues of identity and interest demand more interpretive modes of analysis. For this reason, critical scholars see the necessity of shifting from a focus on abstract individualism to a stress on culture and identity and the roles of norms and ideas. Such criticisms are being voiced by scholars variously identified as constructivists, critical theorists, and postmodernists. While not all of them reject realism's state-centric framework, all challenge its assumptions about states as unitary actors whose identities are unimportant for understanding their security behavior.

Although certain of these scholars see an incommensurability between rationalist and interpretive epistemologies, others are attempting to bridge this gap by staying within realism's state-centric worldview while questioning its rationalist epistemology. Ronald Jepperson, Alexander Wendt, and Peter Katzenstein have argued for what they call "sociological institutionalism"—a view that advocates an identity-based approach, but one that stays within the traditional security agenda, a focus on states, and explanatory social science. Where this approach differs from rationalism is in its investigation of how norms, institutions, and other cultural features of domestic and international environments affect states' security interests and policies. Con-

versely, when states enact a particular identity, they have a profound effect on the international system to which they belong.[36]

Alexander Wendt's constructivist approach also attempts to bridge the constructivist/rationalist divide. His strategy for building this bridge is to argue against the neorealist claim that self-help is given by anarchic structures. If we live in a self-help world, it is due to process rather than structure; in other words, "anarchy is what states make of it."[37] Constructivist social theory believes that "people act toward objects, including other actors, on the basis of the meanings that the objects have for them."[38] People and states act differently toward those they perceive as friends and those they see as enemies. Therefore, we cannot understand states' security interests and behavior without considering issues of identity placed within their social context.

Claiming that realist ontology and its rationalist epistemology are interdependent, more radical versions of critical-security studies reject these bridging attempts. Their calls for broadening the security agenda are made within the context of both a rejection of rationalism and a search for emancipatory theories that can get beyond realism's skepticism about progressive change and the possibility of an ethical international politics. Poststructuralists claim that when knowledge about security is constructed in terms of the binary metaphysics of Western culture, such as inside/outside, us/them, and community/anarchy, security can be understood only within the confines of domestic community whose identity is constructed in antithesis to external threat.[39] This denies the possibility of talking about an international community or an amelioration of the security dilemma since it is only within the space of political community that questions about ethics can be raised. In other words, the binary distinctions of national-security discourse limit what can be said and how it can be discussed.

Thus, critical-security studies is not only about broadening the agenda—because, as mentioned earlier, this is possible with a realist framework. According to Ken Booth, critical-security is fundamentally different from realism because its agenda derives from a radically different political theory and methodology that question both realism's constrained view of the political and its commitment to positivism. Critical-security studies rejects conventional security theory's definition of politics based on the centrality of the state and its sovereignty. Arguing that the state is often part of the problem of insecurity rather than the solution, Booth claims that we should examine security from a bottom-up perspective that begins with individuals; however, critical-security studies should not ignore the state or the military dimensions

of world politics: "What is being challenged is not the material manifestations of the world of traditional realism, but its moral and practical status, including its naturalization of historically created theories, its ideology of necessity and limited possibility, and its propagandist common sense about this being the best of all worlds."[40]

When we treat individuals as the objects of security, we open up the possibility of talking about a transcendent human community with common global concerns and allow engagement with the broadest global threats.[41] The theme of emancipation is one that runs through much of the critical-security studies literature. Emancipatory critical security can be defined as freeing people as individuals and groups from the social, physical, economic, and political constraints that prevent them from carrying out what they would freely choose to do.[42] A postrealist, postpositivist emancipatory notion of security offers the promise of maximizing the security and improving the lives of the whole of humankind: it is a security studies of inclusion rather than exclusion.[43]

Yet imagining security divested of its statist connotations is problematic; the institutions of state power are not withering away. As R. B. J. Walker has claimed, the state is a political category in a way that the world or humanity is not.[44] The security of states dominates our understanding of what security can be because other forms of political community have been rendered unthinkable. Yet, as Walker goes on to say, given the dangers of nuclear weapons, we are no longer able to survive in a world predicated on an extreme logic of state sovereignty, nor one where war is an option for system change. Therefore, we must revise our understanding of the relationship between universality and particularity upon which a statist concept of security has been constructed. Security must be analyzed in terms of how contemporary insecurities are being created and by a sensitivity to the way in which people are responding to insecurities by reworking their understanding of how their own predicament fits into broader structures of violence and oppression.[45] Feminists—with their "bottom-up" approach to security, an ontology of social relations, and an emancipatory agenda—are beginning to undertake such reanalyses.

Feminist Perspectives on Security

Critical-security studies challenges realism on both ontological and epistemological grounds. Many of its adherents argue for a broader definition

of security, linked to justice and emancipation; a concept of security that starts with the individual allows for a global definition of security that moves beyond hierarchical binary distinctions between order and anarchy and inside and outside. Although not all critical-security scholars are willing to dispense with state-centric analysis, all agree that an examination of states' identities is crucial for understanding their security-seeking behavior.

Most feminist scholarship on security also employs a different ontology and epistemology from conventional security studies. Reluctant to be associated with either side of the realist/idealist debate, for reasons outlined in chapter 1, and generally skeptical of rationalist, scientific claims to universality and objectivity, most feminist scholarship on security is compatible with the critical side of the third debate. Questioning the role of states as adequate security providers, many feminists have adopted a multidimensional, multilevel approach, similar to some of the efforts to broaden the definition of security described above. Feminists' commitment to the emancipatory goal of ending women's subordination is consistent with a broad definition of security that takes the individual, situated in broader social structures, as its starting point. Feminists seek to understand how the security of individuals and groups is compromised by violence, both physical and structural, at all levels.

Feminists generally share the view of other critical scholars that culture and identity and interpretive "bottom up" modes of analysis are crucial for understanding security issues and that emancipatory visions of security must get beyond statist frameworks. They differ, however, in that they adopt gender as a central category of analysis for understanding how unequal social structures, particularly gender hierarchies, negatively impact the security of individuals and groups.

Challenging the myth that wars are fought to protect women, children, and others stereotypically viewed as "vulnerable," feminists point to the high level of civilian casualties in contemporary wars. Feminist scholarship has been particularly concerned with what goes on during wars, especially the impact of war on women and civilians more generally. Whereas conventional security studies has tended to look at causes and consequences of wars from a top-down, or structural, perspective, feminists have generally taken a bottom-up approach, analyzing the impact of war at the microlevel. By so doing, as well as adopting gender as a category of analysis, feminists believe they can tell us something new about the causes of war that is missing from both conventional and critical perspectives. By crossing what many feminists

believe to be mutually constitutive levels of analysis, we get a better understanding of the interrelationship between all forms of violence and the extent to which unjust social relations, including gender hierarchies, contribute to insecurity, broadly defined.

Claiming that the security-seeking behavior of states is described in gendered terms, feminists have pointed to the masculinity of strategic discourse and how this may impact on understanding of and prescriptions for security; it may also help to explain why women's voices have so often been seen as inauthentic in matters of national security. Feminists have examined how states legitimate their security-seeking behavior through appeals to types of "hegemonic" masculinity. They are also investigating the extent to which state and national identities, which can lead to conflict, are based on gendered constructions. The valorization of war through its identification with a heroic kind of masculinity depends on a feminized, devalued notion of peace seen as unattainable and unrealistic. Since feminists believe that gender is a variable social construction, they claim that there is nothing inevitable about these gendered distinctions; thus, their analyses often include the emancipatory goal of postulating a different definition of security less dependent on binary and unequal gender hierarchies.

Casualties of War: Challenging the Myth of Protection

Despite a widespread myth that wars are fought, mostly by men, to protect "vulnerable" people—a category to which women and children are generally assigned—women and children constitute a significant proportion of casualties in recent wars. According to the United Nations' *Human Development Report*, there has been a sharp increase in the proportion of civilian casualties of war—from about 10 percent at the beginning of the twentieth century to 90 percent at its close. Although the report does not break down these casualties by sex, it claims that this increase makes women among the worst sufferers, even though they constitute only 2 percent of the world's regular army personnel.[46] The 1994 report of the Save the Children Fund reported that 1.5 million children were killed in wars and 4 million seriously injured by bombs and land mines between 1984 and 1994.[47] But there is another side to the changing pattern of war, and women should not be seen only as victims; as civilian casualties increase, women's responsibilities rise. However, war makes it harder for women to fulfill their reproductive and care-

giving tasks. For example, as mothers, family providers, and caregivers, women are particularly penalized by economic sanctions associated with military conflict, such as the boycott put in place by the United Nations against Iraq after the Gulf War of 1991. In working to overcome these difficulties, women often acquire new roles and a greater degree of independence—independence that, frequently, they must relinquish when the conflict is terminated.

Women and children constitute about 75 percent of the number of persons of concern to the United Nations Commission on Refugees (about 21.5 million at the beginning of 1999). This population has increased dramatically since 1970 (when it was 3 million), mainly due to military conflict, particularly ethnic conflicts.[48] In these types of conflicts, men often disappear, victims of state oppression or "ethnic cleansing," or go into hiding, leaving women as the sole family providers. Sometimes these women may find themselves on both sides of the conflict, due to marriage and conflicting family ties. When women are forced into refugee camps, their vulnerability increases. Distribution of resources in camps is conducted in consultation with male leaders, and women are often left out of the distribution process. These gender-biased processes are based on liberal assumptions that refugee men are both the sole wage earners in families and actors in the public sphere.[49]

Feminists have also drawn attention to issues of wartime rape. In the Rwandan civil war, for example, more than 250,000 women were raped; as a result they were stigmatized and cast out of their communities, their children being labeled "devil's children." Not being classed as refugees, they have also been ignored by international efforts.[50] In northern Uganda, rebels abducted women to supply sexual services to fighters, resulting in a spread of AIDS; frequently, after being raped, these women have no other source of livelihood.[51] As illustrated by the war in the former Yugoslavia, where it is estimated that twenty thousand to thirty-five thousand women were raped in Bosnia and Herzgovina,[52] rape is not just an accident of war but often a systematic military strategy. In ethnic wars, rape is used as a weapon to undermine the identity of entire communities.

Cynthia Enloe has described social structures in place around most U.S. Army overseas bases where women are often kidnapped and sold into prostitution; the system of militarized sexual relations has required explicit U.S. policymaking.[53] More than one million women have served as sex providers for U.S. military personnel since the Korean War. These women, and others

like them, are stigmatized by their own societies. In her study of prostitution around U.S. military bases in South Korea in the 1970s, Katharine Moon shows how these person-to-person relations were actually matters of security concern at the international level. Cleanup of prostitution camps by the South Korean government, through policing of the sexual health and work conduct of prostitutes, was part of its attempt to prevent withdrawal of U.S. troops that had begun under the Nixon Doctrine of 1969. Thus, prostitution as it involved the military became a matter of top-level U.S.-Korean security politics. Crossing levels of analysis, Moon demonstrates how the weakness of the Korean state in terms of its wish to influence the U.S. government resulted in a domestic policy of authoritarian, sexist control. In other words, national security translated into social insecurity for these women.[54]

By looking at the effects of war on women, we can gain a better understanding of the unequal gender relations that sustain military activities. When we reveal social practices that support war and that are variable across societies, we find that war is a cultural construction that depends on myths of protection; it is not inevitable, as realists suggest. The evidence we now have about women in conflict situations severely strains the protection myth; yet, such myths have been important in upholding the legitimacy of war and the impossibility of peace. A deeper look into these gendered constructions can help us to understand not only some of the causes of war but how certain ways of thinking about security have been legitimized at the expense of others, both in the discipline of IR and in political practice.

National Security: A Gendered Discourse

Donna Haraway claims that all scientific theories are embedded in particular kinds of stories, or what she terms "fictions of science."[55] IR feminists, like some other critical theorists, particularly those concerned with genealogy, have examined the stories on which realism and neorealism base their prescriptions for states' national-security behavior, looking for evidence of gender bias. Feminist reanalysis of the so-called "creation myths" of international relations, on which realist assumptions about states' behavior are built, reveals stories built on male representations of how individuals function in society. The parable of man's amoral, self-interested behavior in the state of nature, made necessary by the lack of restraint on the behavior of others, is taken by realists to be a universal model for explaining states'

behavior in the international system. But, as Rebecca Grant asserts, this is a male, rather than a universal, model: were life to go on in the state of nature for more than one generation, other activities such as childbirth and child rearing, typically associated with women, must also have taken place. Grant also claims that Rousseau's stag hunt, which realists have used to explain the security dilemma, ignores the deeper social relations in which the activities of the hunters are embedded. When women are absent from these foundational myths, a source of gender bias is created that extends into international-relations theory.[56]

Feminists are also questioning the use of more scientifically based rational-choice theory, based on the instrumentally rational behavior of individuals in the marketplace that neorealists have used to explain states' security-seeking behavior. According to this model, states are unproblematically assumed to be instrumental profit maximizers pursuing power and autonomy in an anarchic international system. Where international cooperation exists, it is explained not in terms of community but, rather, in terms of enlightened self-interest. Feminists suggest that rational-choice theory is based on a partial representation of human behavior that, since women in the West have historically been confined to reproductive activities, has been more typical of certain men.[57] Characteristics such as self-help, autonomy, and power maximizing that are prescribed by realists as security-enhancing behavior are very similar to the hegemonic, masculine-gendered characteristics described in chapter 1. The instrumentally competitive behavior of states, which results in power balancing, is similar to equilibrium theory, or the market behavior of rational-economic man. Therefore, it tends to privilege certain types of behaviors over others. While states do indeed behave in these ways, these models offer us only a partial understanding of their behavior. As other IR scholars, too, have pointed out, states engage in cooperative as well as conflictual behavior; privileging these masculinist models tends to delegitimate other ways of behaving and make them appear less "realistic."

Does the fact that states' national-security policies are often legitimated by appealing to masculine characteristics, such as power and self-help, mean that certain types of foreign-policy behaviors—standing tall, rather than wimping out—are seen as more legitimate than others? Could it be that men who, in the role of defense experts, must employ tough "masculine" language and suppress any "feminized" thoughts when constructing strategic options, come to regard more cooperative choices as unthinkable and co-

operative behavior as unlikely?[58] Carol Cohn claims that the language we use shapes the way we view the world and thus how we act on it. Her analysis of the language of U.S. security experts, whose ideas have been important for mainstream security studies, suggests that this masculine-gendered discourse is the only permissible way of speaking about national security if one is to be taken seriously by the strategic community. This rational, disembodied language precludes discussion of the death and destruction of war, issues that can be spoken of only in emotional terms stereotypically associated with women. In other words, the limits on what can be said with the language of strategic discourse constrains our ability to think fully and well about national security.

In their analysis of U.S. policy on bombing Indochina during the Vietnam War, Jennifer Milliken and David Sylvan examine the discourse of U.S. policymakers. They claim it was gendered.[59] When policymakers spoke or wrote about South Vietnam, it was portrayed as weak and feminized, its population as hysterical and childlike; the North Vietnamese, on the other hand, were characterized as brutal fanatics—as manifesting a perverted form of masculinity. The authors claim that bombing policy, responding to these gendered portrayals, was different in each case. While not denying the reality of what policymakers do, Milliken and Sylvan, like Cohn, claim that words have power and, therefore, consequences; the way in which policymakers and scholars construct reality has an effect on how they act upon and explain that reality. Gender-differentiated images are often used in foreign policy to legitimate certain options and discredit others. Therefore, Walt's aspiration for separating the "political" from the "scientific" is questionable. In other words, theories cannot be separated from political practice.

Gendering State and Nation

Most feminists would agree with constructivists that state behavior cannot be understood without analyzing issues of identity and the social relations in which identities and behaviors are embedded. The gendered identities of states and the construction of national ideologies should be examined in order to better understand their security-seeking behavior. Attention to issues of identity is particularly important for understanding the types of ethnonationalist wars that dominate the contemporary security agenda.

While critical-security studies has emphasized the importance of identity for understanding state behavior, feminist theorizing is distinctive insofar as it reveals how these identities often depend on the manipulations of gender. An examination of the historical development of state sovereignty and state identities as they have evolved over time does indeed suggest deeply gendered constructions that have not included women on the same terms as men. Early states in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe were identified with the person of the sovereign king. Hobbes's depiction of the Leviathan, a man in armor wearing a crown and carrying a sword, serves as a visual representation of this early-modern form of sovereign authority. With the advent of republican forms of government in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the identity of the "people" remained limited; women were incorporated slowly into the political process and it is still questionable whether they have achieved a legitimate voice in the construction of foreign policy.[60] We must conclude, therefore, that the historical construction of the state, upon which the unitary-actor model in international theory is based, represents a gendered, masculine model. In the West, the image of a foreign-policymaker has been strongly associated with elite, white males and representations of hegemonic masculinity.

From the time of their foundation, states have sought to control the right to define political identity. Since their legitimacy has constantly been threatened by the undermining power of subnational and transnational loyalties, states' survival and success have depended on the creation and maintenance of legitimating national identities; often these identities have depended on the manipulation of gendered representations that are constructed and reconstructed over time. While there is a close coincidence between states and types of hegemonic masculinity, nationalist identities are more ambiguously gendered. Drawing on metaphors that evoke matrimonial and familial relations, the nation has been portrayed as both male and female. The ideology of the family has been an important metaphor on which states rely for reinforcing their legitimacy; it also provides a powerful symbol for individuals' need for community. Images of motherlands, fatherlands, and homelands evoke a shared sense of transcendental purpose and community for states and their citizens alike. Nevertheless, the sense of community implicit in these family metaphors is deeply gendered in ways that not only legitimate foreign-policy practices but also reinforce inequalities between men and women.

For example, during the post–World War II era in the United States, these gendered images evolved over time and adapted to new understandings of

gender relations; however, they continually served as legitimators of U.S. foreign policy. In her examination of the culture of the early Cold War, Elaine Tyler May claims that the post–World War II reinstantiation of traditional gender roles served to uphold U.S. containment policy.[61] The containment doctrine was articulated through the U.S. white, middle-class family consisting of a male breadwinner and a female housewife. Female domesticity was lauded as serving the nation as women were encouraged to stay at home and stock pantries and fall-out shelters in the event of nuclear war. The U.S. family was portrayed as a safe, protected space in a dangerous nuclear world; consumerism highlighted U.S. superiority over the Soviet Union. In contrast to this feminized domesticity, "real men" stood up against the Communists. The witchhunts of the McCarthy era frequently associated U.S. Communism with homosexuality and other types of behavior that did not conform with middle-class respectability.

During the 1960s and 1970s, these traditional family roles were disrupted at home by the women's movement and abroad by the Vietnam War, which shattered Americans' faith in the righteousness of the anti-Communist crusade and its strong, masculinist images. Steve Niva analyzes what he terms the remasculinization of American society during the Reagan era of the 1980s. While the return to the nuclear family of the 1950s was impossible after the upheavals and changes in social mores of the 1960s, a new form of masculinity that combined toughness with compassion emerged. Niva claims that the Gulf War of 1991 was the showcase for this new form of compassionate masculinity; its slight feminization allowed for the presence of military women in the Gulf as well as portraying a more enlightened masculinity that could be contrasted with the less-benign form in societies in the Gulf region where women suffered under the overtly repressive gender relations of Muslim societies.[62]

Both the contrast between traditional gender roles in the United States and the Soviet Union, where working women were the norm in the early Cold War, and the distinction between an enlightened masculinity in the United States and the repressive policies against Muslim women of the Gulf serve to reinforce boundaries between self and other. Such distinctions evoke images of safe havens in a dangerous world. The construction of national identities around the notion of a safe, or civilized, space "inside" depends on the construction of an "outside" whose identity often appears strange or threatening.

Since its birth in early modern Europe, the Western state system has constructed its encounters with "uncivilized" or dangerous others in ways

that have justified expansion, conquest, and a state of military preparedness. Such rhetoric is being deployed today with respect to dangers in the South. While I would not deny the very real problem of conflict in the South, such conflicts take on particular identities that render them intractable and often incomprehensible. Newly articulated North/South boundaries between mature and immature anarchies reinforce these distinctions. Anarchy, or the state of nature, is not only a metaphor for the way in which people or states can be expected to behave in the absence of government; it also depicts an untamed natural environment in need of civilization whose wide and chaotic spaces are often described as female. Such language was frequently used during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to legitimate colonial rule over peoples who were deemed incapable of governing themselves.[63]

It is not only threats from outside against which nationalist ideologies are created. The threats that states pose to their own citizens, issues of importance on the new security agenda, are often exacerbated by the manipulation of nationalist ideologies that pits ruling groups against "outsiders" within their own territory. Frequently, the reassertion of cultural or religious identities, in the name of national unity, may take the form of repressive measures against women. Nira Yuval-Davis suggests that the defining of women as the bearers of culture—a practice that often accompanies these movements—reinforces women's inequality. When gender relations come to be seen as the "essence" of culture, women who stray outside the definition of "good women" can be punished for bringing shame to their families; besides solidifying ethnic identities, this can be used as a way of legitimizing the control and oppression of women.[64] Such behavior is illustrated in the way women have been regulated by the Taliban in Afghanistan.

National identities are often used by domestic elites to promote state or group interests and hide race and class divisions. Defining moments in collective historical memories are frequently wars of national liberation, great victories in battles against external enemies, or the glories of former imperialist expansion. Flags and national anthems are often associated with war. Scholars who study nationalism have emphasized the importance of warfare for the creation of a sense of national community. Not only does war mobilize the national consciousness, it also provides the myths and memories that create a sense of national identity, an identity for which people have been willing to die and kill.[65] As Jean Elshtain asserts, societies are, in some sense, the "sum total" of their war stories.[66] War stories are often used to gain a society's support for a war; frequently, these stories rely on the portrayal of

a certain kind of masculinity associated with heroism and strength. These portrayals can be racialized as well as gendered; as Susan Jeffords notes, all the heroes in Hollywood's 1980s Vietnam War and action-adventure films were white men.[67] Rarely do war stories include stories about women.

Gendering War

The association between masculinity and war has been central to feminist investigations. While the manliness of war is rarely denied, militaries must work hard to turn men into soldiers, using misogynist training that is thought necessary to teach men to fight. Importantly, such training depends on the denigration of anything that could be considered feminine; to act like a soldier is not to be "womanly." "Military manhood," or a type of heroic masculinity that goes back to the Greeks, attracts recruits and maintains self-esteem in institutions where subservience and obedience are the norm.[68]

Another image of a soldier is a just warrior, self-sacrificially protecting women, children, and other vulnerable people. The notion that (young) males fight wars to protect vulnerable groups, such as women and children, who cannot be expected to protect themselves, has been an important motivator for the recruitment of military forces. The concept of the "protected" is essential to the legitimation of violence; it has been an important myth that has sustained support for war and its legitimation for both women and men. In wartime, the heroic, just warrior is sometimes contrasted with a malignant, often racialized, masculinity attributed to the enemy that serves as further justification for protection.[69]

These images of the masculinities of war depend on rendering women invisible. Yet women have been part of armies—as cooks, laundresses, and nurses—throughout history. Since the late nineteenth century, military nursing has involved women serving close to the front lines; such women have been vital to war efforts, although stories about their activities are rarely told, perhaps because they speak of death, injury, and vulnerability, rather than heroism.[70] More recently, in certain states, women are beginning to be incorporated into the armed forces.

In the United States, the end of the draft made it imperative that women be recruited into the armed services in order to meet "manpower" needs. In 1997, women comprised 14 percent of the army, 17 percent of the air force, and 13 percent of the navy; they have been admitted to many combat po-

sitions.[71] Economic opportunity and upward mobility have been important motivators for women joining the armed forces; the rate of accession for black women in the 1970s and 1980s was greater than for other women and black men.[72] By the end of the 1980s, 430,000 women were serving as uniformed personnel in the world's regular military units, although this has not changed the masculinized culture of states' militaries. Problems of sexual harassment are unlikely to go away until this masculinized culture has diminished. In other words, the military remains largely a male institution in which the presence of women stirs deep currents, particularly with respect to combat. The image of female soldiers fighting and dying in wars, as was evidenced in the Gulf War of 1991, is deeply disturbing to public opinion. While placing women in combat is motivated by the liberal principle of equality, it is in strong tension with the culturally embedded view of what it means to be a warrior: it has been strongly resisted in some parts of the U.S. military with claims that it has negative effect on combat readiness. It has also been viewed negatively by radical feminists, who believe that women should reject fighting in men's wars. In fact, certain radical feminists have claimed that women have a special affinity with peace.

Gendering Peace

If women have been largely absent from the world's militaries, they have been well represented in a variety of peace movements. All-women peace groups have frequently drawn upon maternalist imagery to relay their message. Drawing on feminine characteristics such as caregiving and connectedness, many women in these movements see themselves as different from men. Such movements have ranged from protesting the nuclear confrontation between the great powers to organizing against the repressive activities of states on their own populations. The Women's Strike for Peace in the United States in the early 1960s (pre-dating radical feminism) drew attention to what its members believed was an alarming escalation of the Cold War. These women defended their right as mothers to influence the course of government in its support for nuclear containment, a course that they claimed threatened the American family, rather than protected it. Stressing that nuclear war was the greatest threat to families, they challenged the notion that war is waged by men to protect women.[73] Their use of a strategy based on maternalism contributed to their successful confrontation with the

U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities in 1962.

Similarly, the Women's Peace Camp at Greenham Common in the United Kingdom in the 1980s, a protest against the staging of U.S. cruise missiles in the United Kingdom, drew on the concept of "close friendships and woman-made culture of songs and rituals—reminiscent of preindustrial ways of living."[74] Founded on radical feminist principles of celebrating women's role as nurturers and caregivers, the women at Greenham Common lived simply in a nonhierarchical fashion and brought their principles of nonviolence to bear on their protest. In Argentina, also using maternalist imagery, Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo protested their government's brutal repression and the "disappearance" of their husbands and sons, and Russian mothers have protested the military's sending their sons to Chechnya.[75]

These are but a few examples of how women peace activists have drawn explicitly on maternal or womanist imagery to craft their strategies. Feminist peace researchers have also drawn on images of motherhood and the notion of a special standpoint of women to support their claims. Feminist peace researcher Betty Reardon has argued for the need for "feminine" values, which she sees as morally superior in a nuclear world.[76] Drawing on psychoanalytic object-relations theory and influenced by the work of Carole Gilligan, Sara Ruddick has argued for the affinity of a politics of peace with maternal thinking. Ruddick is careful not to say that women are more peaceful than men, but she does claim that there is a contradiction between mothering and war. Given military "rationality," maternal thinking that arises from maternal practice and that is centered on caring labor is an alternative ideal of reason.[77]

While these maternal images have often been quite successful in motivating women's peace movements, they have made many feminists uncomfortable. Lynne Segal—while seeing women's peace movements as among the strongest progressive forces of the 1980s—is troubled by the notion of an inherent pacifism in women and also by the tendency of women's peace politics to reduce analyses of militarism to a matter of individual psychology. An ideology of women's essential difference, typical of radical feminism, may encourage men to fight for fear of appearing unmanly; moreover, biological reductionism does not allow for change.[78]

In a context of a male-dominated society, the association of men with war and women with peace also reinforces gender hierarchies and false dichotomies that contribute to the devaluation of both women and peace. The

association of women and peace with idealism in IR, which I have argued is a deeply gendered concept, has rendered it less legitimate in the discourse of international relations. Although peace movements that have relied on maternal images may have had some success, they do nothing to change existing gender relations; this allows men to remain in control and continue to dominate the agenda of world politics, and it continues to render women's voices as inauthentic in matters of foreign policymaking.

An example of the negative consequences of associating women with peace is Francis Fukuyama's discussion of the biological roots of human aggression and its association with war. Fukuyama claims that women are more peaceful than men—a fact that, he believes, for the most part is biologically determined. Therefore, a world run by women would be a more peaceful world. However, Fukuyama claims that only in the West is the realization of what he calls a "feminized" world likely; since areas outside the West will continue to be run by younger aggressive men, Western men, who can stand up to threats posed by dangers from outside, must remain in charge, particularly in the area of international politics.[79]

Besides its implications for reinforcing a disturbing North/South split, this argument is deeply conservative; given the dangers of an aggressive world, women must be kept in their place and out of international politics.[80] The leap from aggressive men to aggressive states is also problematic. There is little evidence to suggest that men are "naturally" aggressive and women are "naturally" peaceful; as bell hooks reminds us, black women are very likely to feel strongly that white women have been quite violent and militaristic in their support of racism.[81] Traditional concepts of masculinity and femininity that sustain war require an exercise of power: they are not inevitable.[82]

While this essentializing association of women with peace is problematic, it is the case that women in the United States have consistently shown less support for forceful means of pursuing foreign-policy goals than men, and this gender gap continues to grow. It was widest at the time of the Gulf War of 1991—although it closed somewhat once the fighting had begun.[83] It has also been suggested that those who oppose military intervention are among those most likely to support feminist goals, a claim supported by an analysis of attitudes toward the peace process in the Middle East. A study of Israeli, Egyptian, Palestinian, and Kuwaiti attitudes toward the Arab/Israeli conflict, broken down by sex, found that men and women did not have different attitudes and there was no evidence of women being less militaristic. Using data collected between 1988 and 1994, the study did, however, find a strong

positive correlation between attitudes toward support for equality of women and support for diplomacy and compromise. The authors therefore saw a connection between feminism and positive attitudes about the resolution of international conflict.[84]

This example is instructive; reducing unequal gender hierarchies could make a positive contribution to peace and social justice. Likewise, by moving beyond dichotomous ways of thinking about war and peace, problematizing the social construction of gender hierarchies, and exposing myths about male protection that these ways of thinking promote, we would be able to construct less-gendered and more-inclusive definitions of security. Offering a counterposition that rejects both the masculinity of war and a feminine peace, Mary Burguieres has argued for building a feminist security framework on common, ungendered foundations. She has suggested a role for feminism in dismantling the imagery that underlies patriarchy and militarism and a joint effort in which both women and men would be responsible for changing existing structures.[85] Such efforts require a problematization of dichotomized constructions such as war and peace and realism and idealism in order to provide new ways of understanding these phenomena that can help us envisage a more robust notion of security.

Feminist Redefinitions of Security

At the International Congress of Women at The Hague during World War I, a meeting called to protest the war, Jane Addams spoke of the need for a new internationalism that could replace the kind of nationalism that was fostering such a devastating war. She claimed that, since civilians could no longer be protected during war, war was becoming an obsolete instrument of national policy; the congress passed a resolution to end warfare.[86] After the congress, Addams met with Woodrow Wilson; as is frequently the case when women write about security issues or offer policy advice, the president never cited Addams, but there was a remarkable similarity between Wilson's Fourteen Points and the congress's proposals.[87] Although Addams was branded at the time as a hysterical woman, her proposals were actually quite similar to the "common security" proposals of the 1980s that defined security as interdependent rather than zero-sum.

Feminists are suspicious of statist ontologies that define security in zero-sum terms associated with binary distinctions between anarchy and order; they are also aware of the dangers of identities that, in their quest for unifying

symbols that can themselves be a source of conflict, mask social relations of inequality and insecurity. Many feminists, therefore, like certain critical-security scholars, define security broadly in multidimensional and multilevel terms—as the diminution of all forms of violence, including physical, structural, and ecological.[88] Since women have been marginal to the power structures of most states, and since feminist perspectives on security take human security as their central concern, most of these definitions start at the bottom, with the individual or community rather than the state or the international system. According to Christine Sylvester, security is elusive and partial and involves struggle and contention; it is a process, rather than an ideal in which women must act as agents in the provision of their own security.[89] It is important to emphasize that women must be (and are) involved in providing for their own security; notions of security that rely on protection reinforce gender hierarchies that, in turn, diminish women's (and certain men's) real security. Speaking from the margins, feminists are sensitive to the various ways in which social hierarchies manifest themselves across societies and history. Striving for an emancipatory type of security involves exposing these different social hierarchies, understanding how they construct and are constructed by the international order, and working to denaturalize and dismantle them.

Questioning the role of states as adequate security providers, but being aware of their continuing importance as the political category within which security is defined by policymakers and scholars alike, leads feminists to analyze power and military capabilities differently from conventional security studies. Rather than seeing military capability as an assurance against outside threats to the state, militaries are seen as frequently antithetical to individuals' (particularly women's) security—as winners in the competition for resources, as definers of an ideal type of militarized citizenship, usually denied to women,[90] and as legitimators of a kind of social order that can sometimes even valorize state violence. Simona Sharoni has suggested that, in states torn by conflict, the more government is preoccupied with national security, the less its citizens, especially women, experience physical security.[91] State violence is a particular problem in certain states, but it must also be emphasized that many states, although formally at peace, sustain huge military budgets at the same time as social spending is being cut; this, too, can be a form of violence.

These feminist definitions of security grow out of the centrality of social relations, particularly gender relations, for feminist theorizing. Feminists

claim that structural inequalities, which are central contributors to the insecurity of individuals, are built into the historical legacy of the modern state and the international system of which it is a part. Calling into question realist boundaries between anarchy and danger on the outside and order and security on the inside, feminists point out that state-centric and structural analyses miss the interrelation of insecurity across levels of analysis. Since "women's space" inside households has also been beyond the reach of law in most states, feminists are often quite suspicious of boundaries that mark states as security providers. Although, in nationalist ideologies, family metaphors are used to evoke a safe space or sense of belonging, families are not always considered a safe space for women. In most societies, families, frequently beyond the reach of law, have too often been the site of unsanctioned violence against women and children.[92] Violence, therefore, runs across levels of analysis. While these types of issues have not normally been considered within the subject matter of security studies, feminists are beginning to show how all of these issues and levels are interrelated.

In this chapter, I have shown how feminist perspectives on security come out of different ontologies and epistemologies from those in conventional security studies. Believing that the culture and identity of states is important for understanding their security-seeking behavior, feminists are closer to some of the work in critical-security studies than to the mainstream; their goal of thinking about security as emancipation is also closer to certain critical perspectives. Questioning state-centric frameworks of conventional security analysis, feminists have tried to get beyond boundaries between inside and outside to construct a more comprehensive definition of security. Nevertheless, it is important to remember that states are fundamental to the way we think about security. Feminists have pointed out how often the security-seeking behavior of states is legitimated by its association with certain types of hegemonic masculinity. Besides narrowing the range of permissible or legitimate ways for states to act, this can also contribute to the subordination of women and the perceived inauthenticity of their voices in matters of policymaking. Claiming that the personal cannot be separated from the political and the international, feminists have suggested that issues of personal and international insecurity are not unrelated. This is a question that deserves further empirical investigation.

Feminists have generally rejected rationalist models when seeking to understand states' security-seeking behavior. They believe that the claim to

universality and objectivity made by these models is problematic since it is based on male models of human behavior. Such a search for universalistic laws may miss the ways in which gender hierarchies manifest themselves in a variety of ways across time and culture. Claiming that theory cannot be separate from practice, feminists have investigated strategic language and foreign-policy discourse to see how they shape, legitimate, and constrain certain policy options. Starting at the microlevel and listening to the experiences of women, feminists base their understanding of security on situated knowledge, rather than knowledge that is decontextualized and universalized. Speaking from the experiences of those on the margins of national security, feminists are sensitive to the various ways in which social hierarchies are variably constructed. Striving for security involves exposing these different social hierarchies, understanding how they construct and are constructed by the international order, and working to denaturalize and dismantle them. Gender and other social hierarchies have effects, not only on issues of national security but also on the workings of the global economy and the uneven distribution of economic rewards that, in turn, also affect human security. These issues are taken up in chapter 3.

3 Gender in the Global Economy

Whereas conflict and security issues motivated the founding of international relations at the beginning of the century, economic issues, now defined as the separate subdiscipline of international political economy (IPE), became visible in the discipline only in the 1970s, when liberal interdependence and Marxist approaches began to challenge the primacy of state-centric realism and its focus on national security. With the end of the Cold War and the emergence of an international system in which relations between the great powers are defined largely in terms of trade and investment, the importance of economic relations between states has been further reinforced. With the demise of the socialist alternative, as represented by the former Soviet Union and states of the Eastern bloc, the focus of conventional IPE in the United States, although not elsewhere, has narrowed to a debate between neorealists and neoliberals. The socialist decline has generated another literature, outside mainstream IR but also centered in the United States, which is celebrating the triumph of liberal capitalism and the spread of Western-style democracy. This celebratory response to the end of the Cold War has stimulated a debate over the pros and cons of "globalization"—a phenomenon that has not been central to neorealism or neoliberalism.

It is mostly within this debate about globalization, which has been joined on the critical side by a broad range of scholars both inside and outside the United States, that feminist perspectives on IPE are being articulated. Although, as Sandra Whitworth has claimed, it is within the subfield of IPE that feminist questions can most successfully be raised, it has proved difficult

to articulate them within the framework of conventional IPE.[1] The neorealist and neoliberal frameworks, with their common focus on state-centric issues of cooperation and conflict and their positivist and rationalistic methodologies, do not lend themselves to investigating gendered structures of inequality and issues of human economic security that are at the center of feminist concerns. Building on an earlier literature on women and development, which has also remained outside the field of IPE, and influenced by socialist, postcolonial, and postmodern approaches, feminist scholars are examining the effects on women's lives of structural adjustment, the globalization of markets and finance, and the new international division of labor, and they are seeing how women, in their various locations, are responding to these economic forces. These investigations, like those in the area of conflict and security, are taking feminist scholars well beyond the conventional boundaries of the IPE discipline.

In this chapter,[2] I first present a brief overview of the evolution of conventional IPE. I then introduce literature from both sides of the debate between those who are celebrating economic globalization and their critics. Outside conventional IPE, economic globalization has become the primary focus of IPE in the 1990s. Although scholars are divided as to whether globalization is a new phenomenon or part of the historical evolution of global capitalism, economic globalization is defined as a compression of the world through advances in technology and increased intensification of economic activities that are eroding the autonomy of states. Globalization also involves a changing conception of time and space: social interactions at the local level are becoming embedded in global networks, and political, economic, and social activities are becoming global in scope, blurring the lines between national and international.[3]

This definition of globalization parallels feminist perspectives on IPE that are also concerned with the reorganization of production, gendered divisions of labor, the problematization of boundaries, and the reconceptualization of space. Given an ontology of social relations and a preference for postpositivist methodologies, feminist perspectives generally fit more comfortably into a globalist rather than a statist framework. Below I elaborate on some feminist perspectives on economic globalization, focusing on feminists' concerns with the new international division of labor and its gendered implications; feminist perspectives are by no means in agreement on the effects of the spread of capitalism and global markets on women. Finally, since the literature has provided an important framework for the development of femi-

nist methodologies relevant for IPE, I outline the evolution of some of the writing on women and development. As feminists and others have pointed out, globalization is not just about economics. The spread of Western democracy, culture, and definitions of human rights, as well as local resistances to these forces, are also issues of globalization; all are highly interrelated. While acknowledging that any attempt to separate these issues is artificial and arbitrary, I will nevertheless leave consideration of these aspects of globalization until the next chapter.

From Three Paradigms to the Neo/Neo Synthesis

When IPE first became a recognized subfield of IR in the 1970s, its parameters were consistent with the approaches defined by the interparadigm debate—realism, liberalism, and Marxism—outlined in chapter 1.[4] Liberal interdependence theory challenged the realists' focus on the state and issues of national security and pointed to a multiplicity of nonstate actors and international organizations whose activities were deemed necessary for explaining relations between states where war was not expected.[5] With a focus on economic relations, conditions under which cooperation could be expected were investigated. The oil shocks of the early 1970s and the subsequent decline of the Bretton Woods system, which depended on the role of the United States as manager of the global economy, pointed to a need for the discipline to focus on a multiplicity of issue areas other than security, issues that were not likely to be solved by force or the threat of force. As the hegemonic position of the United States continued to decline, both liberals and realists turned their attention to the prospects for stability and instability in a posthegemonic world. Given the lack of international institutions with enforceable powers to manage the global economy, regime theory became the preferred framework within which cooperation, or the lack thereof, could be explained in a variety of issue areas. Less formal than institutions, regimes were defined as "principles, norms, rules and decision-making procedures around which actor expectations converge."[6]

Both liberal interdependence theorists and realists continued to focus on the activities of the major states.[7] With the introduction of redistributive demands for a new international economic order into the United Nations General Assembly in 1974 by states in the South—demands inspired by the success of the OPEC cartel—literatures from a variety of theoretical per-

spectives that focused on North/South issues began to get more attention in the discipline. Coming out of a Marxist perspective, dependency and world-systems theories pointed to a structural relationship of inequality between North and South, whereby the South was locked into a historically dependent and peripheral relationship with the North through a hierarchical global capitalist economy. Dependency theory claimed that the capitalist world economy systematically distorted the economies of less-developed countries through deteriorating terms of trade and investment flows from poor to rich that constrained their development. Solutions were thought to lie in autonomous, delinked development, rather than integration with the world economy.[8] Although dependency theory has been somewhat discredited by increased industrialization of the South and self-reliant development has not become a reality, it is interesting to note that net capital flows were indeed from South to North in the 1980s and 1990s.

With the declining popularity of socialist models of development and the adoption of structural adjustment and more open market policies, which began in the South even before the end of the Cold War, Marxist approaches to IPE suffered a decline.[9] Conventional IPE has narrowed its focus to a debate between neorealists, some of whom are turning their attention from security to economic issues, and neoliberals. Neoliberals, including some earlier liberal interdependence and regime theorists, have moved closer to a realist ontology, in that they generally accept realists' characterization of an anarchical international system of states, defined as unitary rational actors, which impedes cooperation. They also accept that states are the major actors in international relations, and they thus focus their investigations on them.

The central research agenda of both these approaches has been to investigate under what conditions cooperation between states is more or less likely. Whereas neorealists claim that states are highly competitive and thus focus on relative gains, neoliberals suggest that, under certain conditions, cooperation between states is possible, making absolute gains a more likely outcome. Neoliberals accept that self-interested behavior can result in suboptimal outcomes; they believe, however, that these collective goods' failures can be mitigated by international institutions. Both these approaches share a methodology grounded in microeconomics, which employs rational choice and game theories.[10]

In their review of the evolution of IPE, Robert Denemark and Robert O'Brien have explored the division between two approaches: to use their terms, one approach sees IPE as a subdiscipline of political science; the

other sees it as interdisciplinary. The former, which they label "traditional," covers a range of economic issue areas having important political effect and sees the state as the dominant actor. The latter, the inter- or transdisciplinary approach, is outgrowing statist boundaries of conventional IR and, in addition to economic issues, has focused on issues such as militarization, migration, development, gender, and ecology. Uncomfortable with disciplinary boundaries, it sees divisions along gender and class lines and is cautious about positivist methodologies for understanding these divisions.[11]

Whereas many conventional IPE scholars, particularly in the United States, are working within the parameters of the neorealist/neoliberal (neo/neo) approaches and traditional political science boundaries, some scholars—who tend to be closer to the transdisciplinary approach—have questioned the narrowness of focus of neorealism and neoliberalism in an era of heightened globalization of markets and finance, increasing inequality, decline in state power, and concerns over ecological limits to continued economic growth. David Long has questioned what he sees as a limited debate in which protagonists share both a positivist social science methodology and a substantive focus on the state precisely at a time when world politics appears to be breaking the bounds of sovereignty.[12] A possible explanation for this narrowness may be that understanding the causes and consequences of the decline of U.S. hegemony is the central goal of both approaches. Thus, they are both concerned primarily with the actions of the great powers in what many of them see as a posthegemonic system.

The Debate about Economic Globalization

Paradoxically, the end of the Cold War also witnessed the rise of a quite different literature—one that, rather than focusing on decline, is celebrating what it claims is the United States' resurgent position in a world where liberalism and capitalism are becoming dominant. Sounding a triumphal note, Francis Fukuyama has proclaimed, in the West at least, the "end of history," a victory for Western economic and political liberalism marked by the total exhaustion of viable systemic alternatives. With the demise of fascism and communism as the two major ideological challengers to liberalism in the twentieth century, Fukuyama sees an end of ideology, which will be replaced by the growing "common marketization" of international relations and the diminution of the likelihood of large-scale conflict between states.

Curiously, Fukuyama sees this as a sad time, with economic calculation replacing struggles that call for daring, courage, and imagination.[13]

Most of the scholars who have written in this celebratory mode have been outside or peripheral to the conventional discipline of IR and IPE. Nevertheless, this liberal optimism has spawned a widespread critical reaction from a broad range of scholars, including critical theorists, world-system theorists, and scholars from the South, most of whom fit within Denemark and O'Brien's definition of transdisciplinary IPE. For some, the "end of history" is seen as a "world without alternatives," a world that exhibits a growing insensitivity to the plight of the powerless, and an erosion of the legitimacy of strategies to counter an ascendant liberal ideology that threatens the richness and complexity of global civil society.[14] Others see ethnic and social movements and localized cultural reassertions as offering some welcome resistance to the homogenizing forces of Western-led liberalism. Critics have focused on growing inequalities that, they believe, are exacerbated by the spread of liberal market forces.

A Resurgent Liberalism

In his analysis of what he terms "contending liberalisms," James Richardson has identified two strands of liberal thought: one is a liberalism of privilege associated with individual freedom, universality, the defense of property rights, and the limiting of state power; the other is a liberalism of economic and social rights and state intervention in the economy to promote equality. Richardson claims that the global political economy provides a setting of maximum polarization between the liberalism of privilege and that of universal rights. The liberalism of privilege, or globalization from above, which he saw as being ascendant in the 1990s, is the liberalism of the international establishment—of governments, international financial institutions, and business: the liberalism of rights is represented in claims of peoples affected by the pressures of globalization to manage their own choices and not have them predetermined by global managers.[15]

With the collapse of the socialist economies of the Eastern bloc and the adoption of export-led growth models by many states in the South, liberals who are close to Richardson's definition of liberalism of privilege are heralding a new era in which, they believe, the expansion and near universalization of a capitalist global market will be accompanied by the spread of

liberal democratic norms and political liberties. According to these liberals, the globalization of markets has the potential to reduce inequalities within and between states and to increase cooperation through economic interdependence and an interlinked global civil society that will gain strength as the competitive system of states is undermined. International institutions will be strengthened as states perceive that their interests are better met through cooperation than they are through competition.[16] The core ideals of this version of liberalism were born in nineteenth-century Europe; its international version stems from the free-trade movement that began in Britain during its period of hegemony in the middle of the nineteenth century.

In its late-twentieth-century manifestation, the global restructuring of the economy heralded by the liberalism of privilege was characterized by the spread of financial markets and the reorganization of production evidenced by a shift from integrated corporations to networks of firms manufacturing components of the production process at different locations according to the availability of cheap labor and favorable tax rates. According to these liberals, this has resulted in increased efficiency of production and presumably in lower costs. The transnationalization of production has widened the availability of standardized consumer goods; markets have determined distribution on a global scale. In what has been termed a post-Fordist economy, the compact between labor and capital, forged in the earlier part of the twentieth century, has been superseded by an emphasis on efficiency and competitiveness gained through the "flexibilization" of labor markets.

Applauding these trends and echoing the aspirations of nineteenth-century internationalist liberals, Kenichi Ohmae, a financial consultant who is frequently cited by advocates of economic globalization, has written of a "borderless world" in which nothing is overseas any longer. He sees an interlinked economy of one billion people in which transnational companies are bringing the promise of a better life with increased security and prosperity. The core of this interlinked economy is located in what Ohmae has called the "strategic triad"—centered in the United States, Europe, and Japan; he claims that it is becoming so strong that it has made traditional national borders almost disappear.[17] According to Ohmae's liberal predisposition, these economic benefits have wider implications as both producers and consumers begin to think of themselves as "global citizens." This borderless economy creates a local/global dynamic whereby the importance of the state, both as an economic manager and a source of citizen identity, is eroding.

Ohmae's preferred minimalist role for the state—limited to providing the necessary infrastructure for competitive behavior in the global market—accords with the principles of liberalism of privilege. He has heralded a new age in which the military-based security associated with the Cold War is being replaced by global economic security supported by a new framework of global governance that, he believes, will replace outdated, conflict-prone mercantilist behavior. His advice to states in the South, which have not yet reaped the benefits of this growing global prosperity and that remain outside the strategic triad, is to open their borders and shed the outworn vestiges of economic nationalism. This, Ohmae claims, is the only way to create sustained and widespread economic growth and prosperity—because in an interlinked economy there will be no absolute winners and losers.

Certainly, there are some grounds for optimism regarding an increase in global prosperity. Global trade and finance have contributed to the more than trebling of world per-capita income since 1945; the United Nations human development report for 1994 reported that the proportion, if not the absolute numbers, of humanity living in abject poverty more than halved between 1960 and 1992.[18] Nevertheless, the divisions between the haves and have-nots are striking, and inequality has been increasing. The U.N. human development report for 1996 reported that, over the preceding three decades, the world had become more polarized and the gulf between the poor and the rich had actually widened: the poorest 20 percent of the world's population saw their share of global income decline from 2.3 percent to 1.4 percent, while the share of the richest 20 percent rose from 70 percent to 85 percent.[19] Most of the wealthiest 20 percent is located in Ohmae's "strategic triad" of North America, Europe, and East Asia, although problems in the global economy in the mid 1990s had adverse effects even in these areas. Instabilities in global financial markets incur heavy costs in terms of human security. For example, with the collapse of East Asian financial markets in 1997, an additional forty million people were estimated to have fallen into poverty. Between April 1997 and April 1998 (one year after the start of the financial crisis in Asia) average real wages in Korea fell by nearly 10 percent; public services also declined.[20] In times of financial crisis, reversals in human security spread from one region to another due to the integration of global financial and consumer markets and the consequent shrinking of world demand.

While many liberals of privilege conclude that gains from economic globalization will not be evenly spread and that economic growth will suffer

some setbacks, Ohmae and others have claimed that the benefits enjoyed by the core will trickle down to the rest of the global economy. Others are not so sure, however, and economic globalization has as many critics as it has supporters. For critics, this growth of inequality that is evident both within and between states, and the fact that, in terms of absolute numbers, poor populations have greatly increased over the last thirty years, call into question the liberal faith in the ability of trade and investment to improve the welfare of poorer countries and people. They suggest that recent trends in the global economy (discussed above) are responsible for these disturbing trends.

Critical Reactions

In a critical reflection on Fukuyama's "end of history" thesis, Gillian Youngs has claimed that its universalism is actually highly particularistic in that it argues for the globalization of values associated with liberal democracy and economic liberalism that are characteristic of the evolving Western state. Youngs asserts that Fukuyama's claim about the end of history avoids a critical discussion of persistent inequalities and of investigations into the location, exercise, and effects of economic and political power.[21] Issues of inequality and the dynamics of power have concerned a broad spectrum of scholars critical of the liberalism of privilege and its support for economic globalization. Even the term *globalization*—the word itself is as ambiguous as it is popular—is the subject of debate.[22] Marianne Marchand and Anne Runyan, finding that the term itself has become associated with a pro–free market ideology, prefer, therefore, to use the term *global restructuring*.[23] Nevertheless, the spread of a new vocabulary of globalism reflects an inchoate awareness that contemporary social relations have acquired an important new character.[24]

Robert Cox's historical-materialist approach that points to the contradictions and conflicts inherent in social structures as a way of understanding structural change seems particularly appropriate at times of uncertainty and change in power relationships.[25] Cox's specification of three categories of reciprocal interacting forces—material capabilities, ideas, and institutions—offers a framework that, he has claimed, can provide a deeper understanding of economic globalization than either state-centric or liberal economic models. Cox has argued that, with the internationalization of production, it be-

comes pertinent to think, not in terms of unitary states, but in terms of a global class superimposed on national class structures; at its apex stands a transnational managerial class that consists of not only business executives and officials of international agencies but also state managers of internationally oriented domestic sectors.[26] As transnational managers choose their locations in the "borderless world," they play off national governments against each other in order to get the best financial deals. Wages and environmental regulations are undermined as firms threaten to leave in search of cheaper labor and lower restrictions. As business perceives investment being inhibited by inflation, national governments see the necessity of curtailing wages and public spending in order to provide a good business climate.[27]

All of this means that, in order to attract international investment, governments across the political spectrum shifted to the right during the 1980s and 1990s. John Ruggie has argued that this trend, fueled by the logic of global capitalism, is a decline of the post–World War II embedded-liberalism compromise, whereby governments countered the harsh effects of the market with social spending.[28] The enormous increase in public debt has been financed in international financial markets; as a result, governments have become more accountable to external bond markets than to their own publics.[29] Unlike liberals of privilege, many of these critics lament the erosion of state autonomy; they claim that, in a globalized division of labor, the state no longer initiates action but reacts to worldwide economic forces, which results in a politics of disillusionment.[30] For many governments, these trends are not a matter of choice but of necessity. Indeed, the locus of power may be shifting from the public world of politics to the privatizing, and, thus, depoliticizing, world of economics.[31] This further problematizes issues of accountability.

Ethan Kapstein has claimed that, just when working people most need the state as a buffer against the world economy, it has abandoned them. Kapstein, like many other critical scholars, has compared this late-twentieth-century predicament to the social dislocation caused by the nineteenth century laissez-faire approach to labor markets documented by Karl Polanyi in *The Great Transformation*.[32] Polanyi outlined a change in family and social relations caused by an emerging factory system. The demand for workers generated by this system was satisfied through the lowering of social support systems that pushed people out of home production into factories where labor became a commodity. Whereas post–World War II economic leaders designed a world economy with an active role for the state in ensuring equity

and growth, this compact between the state and its workers, which came about due to the demand for amelioration of the social disruptions of the nineteenth century, has been breaking down.[33]

Cox, however, sees a cleavage between two classes of worker—between what he calls established and nonestablished labor. The former are skilled and unionized and have relative security; the latter suffer insecure employment and have no prospect for career advancement. This cleavage is exacerbated by the division between international and national capital, whereby established workers in international production are potential allies of international capital. Nonestablished labor is, nevertheless, of particular importance to international capital, which has been making increasing use of relatively cheap, semiskilled workers, decentralized across sites of production.[34]

Although both proponents and critics of globalization have pointed to the erosion of the state, some critics have claimed that, since certain states have more power than others to influence outcomes and decisions, economic globalization has affected different regions of the world in different ways.[35] In contrast to liberals of privilege as well as to certain critics, Saskia Sassen has argued that global capital needs the state to further deregulation, to strengthen markets, and to push for privatization, a role that has been led by the United States.[36] Indeed, certain critics have claimed that, far from witnessing a bypassing of the state by global capitalism, we have been seeing very active states working to enhance the global and domestic interests of capital.[37] This changing role of the state has been marked by a decrease in democratic accountability as well as its decreased ability to provide public goods. Working within a neo-Gramscian framework, Stephen Gill has claimed that we are witnessing the emergence of a politics of supremacy rather than a politics of justice. This is due to the emergence of a market civilization—one marked by patterns of social disintegration and exclusionary and hierarchical patterns of social relations, and a perspective on the world that is economistic, materialistic, and ecologically myopic.[38]

Although critics have been more inclined to emphasize the continued importance of political power in recent trends toward liberalization, they, too, see a lack of viable alternatives although they predict a more conflictual road ahead. Rajni Kothari sees the demise of the "third way"—a blending of capitalist and socialist models of development first proposed by Jawaharlal Nehru of India—as part of the failure of Southern elites to articulate an independent path of development and as their complicity in fostering a

partnership with transnational capital. Writing from a Southern perspective, where most states have less power than those in the North with which to counter the detrimental effects of global forces, Kothari has claimed that the state is being disabled and disempowered.[39] For Kothari, the consequences of the espousal of Western capitalist development in the South include a widening of poverty, serious environmental damage, an increase in ethnic conflict, and a declining sense of community.

Like scholars in critical-security studies, many critics of economic globalization take it as part of their project to postulate a world that could be otherwise. Neo-Gramscian theory, as articulated by Cox, Gill, and others, has highlighted dialectical forces and contradictions that embody seeds of change.[40] Gill has pointed to the contradictory logic of liberalism—promoting, on the one hand, global economic integration, but also generating the depletion of resources and the environment as well as the capacity to provide public goods. This sense of insecurity may give rise to resistances and countermobilization; in other words, history has not ended, as Fukuyama has claimed—because history is made and remade by collective human action.[41]

Challenging the pessimistic view of a world without alternatives, Richardson's more radical version of liberalism is concerned with justice and development from below. Rejecting the universalistic claims of liberalism of privilege, this form of liberalism endorses the need for greater attention to the specific local and historical conditions of each particular development case. Richardson claims that the United Nations Human Development Programme, with its preferred program of human development based on the satisfaction of basic needs, offers pointers toward an alternative to the established orthodoxy. Yet, noting the widespread legitimacy of current liberal orthodoxy and its near universal espousal by ruling global elites, Richardson has claimed that radical liberalism lacks a generalized strategy for achieving its preferred program of human development. He also notes that a narrowing of the political debate to issues of economic management has caused an erosion of democratic political culture and a reduction in citizen participation.[42]

Many of these critics of economic globalization have drawn attention to the disproportionate numbers of women at the bottom of the socioeconomic scale, and to the feminization of labor, the disproportionate burdens of structural adjustment on women and children, and the consequent growth of women's social movements protesting the detrimental effects of global capi-

talism.[43] Yet these scholars' recognition of gender as a structure of inequality or of the growing feminist literature on economic globalization has been slight.[44] Going beyond traditional disciplinary boundaries and including issues beyond the agenda of conventional IPE, feminist approaches generally fit within Denemark and O'Brien's definition of transdisciplinary IPE. I now turn to this literature to offer some feminist perspectives on economic globalization and on the debates just outlined.

Feminist Perspectives on Economic Globalization

Ohmae's top-down view of a borderless world, with its emphasis on the globalization of production and finance, hides the large inequalities, stressed by critics, that exist both within and between societies. While there are obviously enormous differences in the socioeconomic status of women depending on their race, class, nationality, and geographic location, women share a certain commonality since they are disproportionately located at the bottom of the socioeconomic scale in all societies. Figures vary from state to state, but on an average, women earn three-quarters of men's earnings, even though they work longer hours. Many of these hours are spent in unremunerated reproductive and caring tasks. Of the 1.3 billion people estimated to be in poverty in the mid 1990s, 70 percent were women: the number of rural women living in absolute poverty rose by nearly 50 percent from the mid 1970s to the mid 1990s.[45] Women have received a disproportionately small share of credit from formal banking institutions. For example, in Latin America, in the early 1990s women constituted only from 7 to 11 percent of the beneficiaries of credit programs; in Africa, where women contribute up to 80 percent of total food production, in the mid 1990s they received less than 10 percent of the credit to small farmers and 1 percent of total credit to agriculture.[46]

Feminist perspectives on economic globalization and on IPE more generally have investigated the extent to which these disturbing figures are attributable to gendered effects of trends in the global economy outlined above. Findings have suggested that the new international division of labor has had significant effects on women. Even in areas of the world where economic growth has been rapid, economic progress has not been matched by improvements in the position of women. Women who work in the wage sector are generally the most poorly paid, and women make up a dispropor-

tionate number of those working in the informal sector or in subsistence agriculture, areas of the economy that are often ignored by conventional economic analysis. Women have not been left outside global restructuring; they are participating while remaining invisible.[47]

Feminists are investigating the reasons for this invisibility that exists not only at the level of policy discourse but also in the field of IPE. However, making women visible within the statist frameworks of neorealism and neoliberalism does not lend itself (for reasons given below) to investigating hierarchical global economic structures detrimental to women; adding women to the liberal literature on economic globalization is equally problematic because it continues to hide the gendered power structures that feminists believe are the cause of women's disadvantaged position. Silence about gender occurs because it is invisible in the concepts used for analysis, the questions that are asked, and the preference for the state level of analysis typical of conventional IPE.[48] Certainly the questions asked by both neorealists and neoliberals about the reasons for state conflict and cooperation are quite different from those of feminists. Rather than trying to understand the conditions necessary for stability in the international system, feminists are seeking to understand the causes of women's various economic insecurities and investigating the conditions under which they might be alleviated. While neorealists and neoliberals both claim that states are furthering their own interests in the global economy, they have been less concerned with how these rewards are distributed internally. Rather than taking the state as given, feminists seek to understand how state policies and structures, in their interactions with the global economy, have differential effects on individuals; making visible gendered power relationships can help us to understand how women and men may be rewarded differentially as the state pursues gains from the global economy.

Much of feminist analysis of economic globalization comes out of a different ontology and different methodologies than those of neorealists and neoliberals. Concerned with questions such as the global division of labor, feminists have examined how hierarchical structures of class, race, and gender cross and intersect with national boundaries; they also have examined the interactive effects of these hierarchies on the workings of the global economy. In so doing, they draw on sociological analysis rather than rationalist methodologies based on microeconomics. Given their interest in understanding how culture, norms, and values shape and are shaped by material structures, they are unlikely to choose rational-choice methodologies that focus on calculation of interest.

While IPE feminists are seeking to uncover hidden power structures that reinforce unequal gender relations, making women visible should not lead to portraying them as victims. Postcolonial scholars are reminding us that, too often, Western feminists have been complicit in generating knowledge that objectifies certain women and treats them as "problems." They have also emphasized the importance of the local production of knowledge, rather than relying on Western knowledge with its false claims of universalism.[49]

Gender in the Debate on Economic Globalization

While IPE feminists have been centrally engaged with the debate about the pros and cons of economic globalization, most of them have been quite critical of the assumptions and prescriptions of liberalism. Feminist scholars more generally tend to be skeptical of celebrations of beginnings and endings and historical turning points: they find evidence to suggest that times of "progress" are often regressive for women. For example, the "triumph" of capitalism in the former Eastern bloc was accompanied by a sharp decline in both the economic status of women and their level of political participation. Skeptical of claims about a "new world order," feminist perspectives on economic globalization are unanimous in pointing to continuities in various forms of patriarchy that have had detrimental effects on women's economic security throughout much of history. Given the increase in global inequality, the feminization of poverty, and the discriminations that women often face when they participate in the global market, some feminist scholarship is questioning the triumphalist story of a borderless world that is being told by supporters of economic globalization. It is today's global financiers and corporate executives, those whom Cox has defined as the transnational managerial class—most of whom are men—who seem most comfortably to fit definitions of global citizenship.

Most feminists also reject theoretical projects that offer universal, essentialist, or reductionist explanations of multifaceted and complex social relations.[50] Many claim that liberalism's metanarratives about the triumph of rationality and the end of history have not moved us beyond ideology; rather, they are a disguise for a form of knowledge that tells only a partial story—a story that often does not include the experiences of many women (and marginalized people more generally) whose identification with a marketized version of global citizenship is minimal.

Certain feminists also claim that values espoused by liberalism of privilege—such as individual freedom, the importance of property rights, and universalism—emphasize values associated with a Western form of hegemonic masculinity. These values are then reproduced in economic models that tend to conflate this masculine viewpoint with a general "human" standpoint, thereby confining the feminine to the structural position of "other"; such thinking renders the masculine as norm and the feminine as difference.[51] For example, when proponents of economic globalization speak of economic actors and global citizens, they are using terms that come out of a historical tradition of Western political and economic thought and practice based on experiences more typical of men than women. Denied the right to vote, in all societies, until the twentieth century, women are still seeking full citizenship in many parts of the world. Terms such as these focus our attention on the public world of the market and the state, historically inhabited by men, while rendering the private world of women virtually invisible.

Fukuyama's prediction of a "common marketization" of international relations based on economic calculation comes out of this worldview that portrays individuals solely as economic actors and hides the complex social relations, including class and gender relations, within which individuals' lives are embedded. The market model, favored by liberals, is based on the instrumentally rational behavior of economic actors whose self-interested behavior in the marketplace leads to an aggregate increase in wealth. Households and women's labor more generally remain invisible in economic analyses that privilege productive labor over reproductive labor.[52] This representation of "homo economicus" is detached from the behavior of real people in the material world; it is gendered masculine because it extrapolates from roles and behaviors historically associated with Western (elite) men. However, it has been used by liberal economists to represent the behavior of humanity as a whole. It also tends to mask power relationships that structure differential rewards to different individuals, based on class and race as well as gender.

Top-down visions of universality hide the extent to which the globalization of capital and finance is built on divisions, often gendered and racialized, both within and between societies. Immanuel Wallerstein has claimed that racism and sexism are mechanisms of exclusion whereby universalist values in practice become applicable only to an in-group that receives a disproportionate share of the system's rewards.[53] Also challenging the uni-

versality of globalization, Kimberly Chang and L. H. M. Ling see two global processes taking place at once; the first, the liberal internationalism or globalization from above, described by liberals; the second, which is less visible, a globalization that is sexualized, racialized, and class-based.[54] This form of globalization from below refers to the movement of "nonestablished" labor—low-skilled and low-waged menial service provided by migrant workers, many of whom are female, particularly in the domestic-service and light-industry sectors. Women and girls are migrating as factory, domestic, and sex workers, often moving from poor states to richer ones. This migration of female workers is often the result of the need to augment family incomes that have been declining due to the effects of structural adjustment. Labor migration is increasingly female and racialized; often it is coerced, with children being bought from impoverished parents; when women, particularly minority women, move across boundaries, they find themselves beyond the protection of the state. Absent from conventional accounts of international relations, these issues challenge mainstream understanding of space and territory; the interaction of local and global becomes crucial for understanding the gendering effects of the global economy.[55]

Feminist discomforts with liberalism from above parallel those of other critical perspectives that also see deeper structures of inequality that cannot be solved by liberal faith in generating wealth through investment and trade and assuming it will "trickle-down" to the less well-off. Complementing critical theory's analysis, feminists look to deeper structures, such as the gendered division of labor, to understand women's economic insecurities. Since so many women's lives have been affected by changing labor markets, many feminists have focused their analysis of economic globalization on labor issues.

A Globalized Gendered Division of Labor

As they seek to explain women's disproportionate representation at the bottom of the socioeconomic scale in all societies, feminists have drawn attention to a gendered division of labor that had its origins in seventeenth-century Europe, when definitions of male and female were becoming polarized in ways that were suited to the growing division between work and home required by early capitalism. The notion "housewife" began to place women's work in the private domestic sphere, as opposed to the public world

of the market inhabited by rational-economic man; it was also coincidental with the growing separation of mind and body typical of Cartesian thinking. Gendered constructs such as "breadwinner" and "housewife"—central to modern Western definitions of masculinity, femininity, and capitalism—have been evoked at various times to support the interests of the state and the economy.[56] Even though many women work outside the home, the association of women with gendered roles, such as housewife, caregiver, and mother, has become institutionalized and even naturalized, thereby decreasing women's economic security and autonomy.[57]

When women enter the workforce, they are disproportionately represented in the caring professions or in "light" manufacturing industries, vocations, and occupations that are chosen, not on the basis of market rationality and profit maximization alone (as liberal economic theory assumes), but because of values and expectations that are often emphasized in female socialization. Studying expectations about appropriate roles for women can help us to understand why women are disproportionately represented in the caregiving professions such as education, nursing, and social work. Cynthia Enloe has claimed that a "modern" global economy requires traditional ideas about women—ideas that depend on certain social constructions of what is meant by *femininity* and *masculinity*.[58] However, in spite of these assumptions about appropriate gender roles, characterizing women as supplemental wage earners, estimates suggest that one-third of all households are headed by women, about one-half of which are in the South, a fact that is frequently obscured by role expectations based on the notion that breadwinners are male.[59]

Socialist feminists, in particular, have emphasized how gender ideologies and structures as well as market forces lead to low wages and double burdens. In the export-processing zones (EPZs) of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, between 70 and 90 percent of the workforce in the 1980s was female.[60] Certain feminists claim that women provide an optimal labor force for contemporary capitalism because, since they are defined as housewives rather than workers, they can be paid lower wages: the assumption is that their wages are supplemental to their family's income. Women's cheap labor dates back to the first industrial revolution, in Britain, and is particularly predominant in textiles and electronics and what are termed "light" industries. Companies favor hiring young, unmarried women who can achieve a high level of productivity at a low wage; these women are frequently fired if they get married or become pregnant. Because of expectations associated with tra-

ditional gender roles, there is a belief that women possess "nimble fingers," have patience for tedious jobs, and sew "naturally"; thus, this kind of work is not seen as skilled and is remunerated accordingly. Moreover, political activity does not go with female respectability; employers hire women on the assumption that they will provide a "docile" labor force unlikely to organize for better conditions.[61] When women in factories making sneakers in South Korea started to engage in unionizing activities, the companies moved to locations with more authoritarian governments, such as China and Indonesia.

Faye Harrison has questioned whether workers in the South should be so under-rewarded. Receiving, on average, no more than one-sixth of the wages of their counterparts in industrial countries, Southern women represent a cheaper-than-cheap labor force since they are usually rewarded at a lower rate than men, who are themselves paid low wages. This leads Harrison to conclude that the interplay of class and gender is integral to capitalist development at the national and international levels.[62]

Not all feminist scholars believe that the increase in employment of women in low-paying factory jobs is detrimental, however. Linda Lim argues that negative stereotyping of women in export manufacturing in the South has been based on outworn assumptions and generalizations drawn from data collected in the 1970s during the earliest stages of the establishment of export factories. Lim claims that wages, hours, and conditions in factories in EPZs are generally better than those in their domestic-market counterparts and are, therefore, much desired.[63] She also suggests that women workers in these industries tend to be better educated than the average worker in their countries and that there is considerable diversity in terms of age and marital status. Even if this type of work is underremunerated relative to men or to wages in the North, many argue that it may be the best option for women in these countries, and better than no work at all; the extra cash flow can significantly enhance the income of very poor families. It also gives women more financial independence and higher status.[64] In certain cases, the employment of women in EPZs is responsible for changing gender relations. On the U.S.-Mexican border, where in the *maquiladoras* factories women are the favored employees, men are the majority of the unemployed: women are being empowered at the expense of men.[65]

In her study of African women, April Gordon has claimed that paid work is an important source of power for women; like Lim, she sees no necessary connection between capitalism and the exploitation of women. Citing the

African case, she predicts that a transition to capitalism—which is already leading to the increased participation of women in the waged sector—will actually enhance women's position relative to men and break the hold of African patriarchy that pre-dates both capitalism and colonialism. For Gordon, therefore, patriarchy, not capitalism, is the real source of women's oppression.[66]

Ruth Pearson has suggested that the only way to assess the validity of these competing arguments is by empirical case studies; such studies are indeed demonstrating that women's experience of industrial employment varies between marginality, inclusion, and exploitation. In some places, women's share of the industrial workforce is declining because of upgrading of levels of technology, whereas in others women are emerging as multiskilled workers. Pearson claims that it is necessary to recognize that we are not talking about structurally determined processes but gender identities that are open to reconstruction by women workers themselves. Nevertheless, countless studies have demonstrated that women are almost always the preferred "cheap" labor force; in today's globalizing economy, industrialization depends on the conversion of *all* employment to the (inferior) conditions endured by female labor.[67]

Issues of class and gender enter into another global labor issue—that of home-based work. As companies have moved toward a more "flexible" labor force in all parts of the world, "cost containment" strategies have used home-based workers who are easily hired and fired. Exempt from any national labor standards that may exist, "domesticated" workers are outside the working class and its regulations; they are generally paid at lower wages than factory workers and are not paid when there is no work. Since women, often of necessity, prefer work that more easily accommodates to family responsibilities, home-based workers are predominantly women. Traditional notions of the division of labor that defines women as housewives—a category associated with the expectation that labor is free—legitimizes wages at below subsistence levels.[68]

The industrial-age separation of home and work has helped to maintain this unjust labor order. However, women's groups have begun to organize to improve conditions for home workers. In 1996, the International Labor Organization adopted a convention that set international standards for individuals who work at home for pay. The convention requires governments to promote equal treatment between workers who work at home and other wage earners. This was the result of organizing by the Self-Employed Women's

Association (SEWA—based in India; the association also includes homeworker advocacy groups from Asia, Europe, and Africa). The issue remains, however, whether women's groups should seek equality of women within existing categories or seek to challenge categories that are based on gendered constructions of the meaning of labor.[69]

Even in cases where women do benefit from entry into the workforce, they continue to suffer in all societies from the imposition of a double or even triple burden. In addition to their paid work, women continue to carry most of the responsibility for household labor and unpaid community work, which is seen as an extension of women's domestic role. Often men are reluctant to take on community work unless it is financially remunerated. Although there is a sense that women are not "working" when they are engaged in household or volunteer community labor, they are actually playing a crucial role in the reproduction of labor necessary for waged work; moreover, these reproductive tasks often constrain women's opportunities for paid work. The narrow definition of work as work in the waged economy tends to render invisible many of the contributions that women make to the global economy. Although some feminists find this split between productive and reproductive work problematic (because it obscures women's various roles throughout the economy), it does help to illuminate the often hidden and unrecognized income-earning work that women undertake due to gender-role expectations.[70]

Although considerable attention has been given to women's unpaid reproductive labor, feminists have been reluctant to take on the question of paid domestic service, an issue that is becoming increasingly internationalized due to economic globalization. Since it is women who usually employ, and often exploit, other women, paid domestic service is an arena where issues of colonialism, class, and race are particularly acute. Largely ignored in international relations also, domestic servants became an issue during the Gulf War of 1991 when the international media drew attention to the plight of Asian domestic workers in Kuwait.[71]

The international movement of domestic workers impacts states in two major ways: it relieves the pressure on the receptor states to take responsibility for childcare and social welfare; and when overseas workers remit their wages back to their home countries, it contributes to those states' foreign exchange. In a case study of the employment of Philippine and Indonesian domestic servants in Malaysia, Christine Chin dates the inflow of overseas domestic workers back to the 1970s, when the Malaysian government instituted the

New Economic Policy designed to promote growth through modernization of the economy. Chin claims that domestic service, a "pre-modern" labor form that has traditionally been thought of as a private issue beyond the reach of the state, is actually shaped by state policies. In the case of Malaysia since the late 1980s, the state has needed Malaysian women to fill labor shortages in the industrial sector; thus, in turn, foreign workers have been imported to work in the home for family-related tasks. It is an arena where the state has been reluctant to regulate. Thus modernization is being achieved at the expense of the working poor, many of whom are immigrants left unprotected and often working under extremely harsh conditions.[72]

Economic globalization has had varying effects on women's work in agriculture, a role that is significant, particularly in many parts of Africa. Women are incorporated into the world market through agriculture in a number of ways; they undertake cash-crop production or work on plantations, or, frequently, they work as unpaid family labor in small units that produce independently or on contract. Consequently, men are more likely to gain access to money, new skills, and technology, while women continue to be defined as dependents or subsistence producers.[73] In fact, as agriculture has moved into the monetarized economy, often producing for export—a phenomenon that has increased as states have come under constraints of adjustment policies that create pressures to open their economies and participate in international trade—women have tended to get left behind in the subsistence sector, producing for family needs; this has had the effect of subsidizing male workers who are directly linked to the global economy.

Another way in which women are subsidizing the global economy is through their work in the informal sector. In a study of Jamaica's informal economy in the 1980s (a time when Jamaica was undergoing IMF structural adjustment), Faye Harrison noted that the informal sector was complementing large-scale industry by taking on tasks that the latter saw as unprofitable. Jamaica's export-oriented economy could not satisfy all local market demands—the shortfall included staple foodstuffs. These items were thus produced and sold in the informal economy, at lower prices. Harrison claims that the presence of the informal sector with its large supply of cheap labor, disproportionately composed of women since women were unemployed at twice the rate of men, reduced labor costs for large corporations and provided cheap accessible goods for waged workers, thus allowing a depression of their wages.[74] In general, the informal labor market is easier for women to enter since it allows more flexible schedules that can be accommodated to repro-

ductive work; therefore, female heads of households tend to be overrepresented in the informal sector, partially accounting for their relative poverty.[75]

Feminists have generally agreed that the effects of structural-adjustment policies (SAPS) have been disproportionately borne by women due to the expectations of the gendered division of labor. In order to increase foreign exchange necessary for debt repayment, the goal of structural-adjustment policies has been to decrease domestic demand and increase production and supply, particularly of private-sector exports; many critics have claimed that SAPs fall most heavily on the poor when government welfare services and government bureaucracies shrink and subsidies decline, particularly those on food. It is often urban areas that suffer most from these effects; rural areas, with more potential for growing food and with cash crops producing export earnings, sometimes experience an increase in income, due to higher prices for market crops.

Feminists claim that SAPS are often gender-biased. Since cash crops are typically controlled by men, increases in rural incomes may not benefit women equally. Since the public sector has traditionally provided many jobs for urban women, a freeze on wages and employment disproportionately affects women, particularly middle-class women employed as teachers, social workers, and nurses. When welfare services are cut, women usually take up the burdens of caring in the home for children, the aged, and the sick, which means working longer hours with less pay.[76] Since the imposition of SAPs typically means a rise in food prices, when states decrease or eliminate food subsidies, the impact falls disproportionately on women, who must stretch family income by increasing their unpaid labor, earning a wage income, or reducing total family consumption—a cost that is typically borne by women and girl children.[77] While a World Bank report on Africa cast women and the informal sector as the "safety net" in the transition to modern capitalism in Africa, women's unpaid labor is not infinitely elastic if women's health and nutritional status begin to suffer.[78] As discussed earlier, when households experience a decline in income, there is an incentive for women to emigrate—either to export processing zones or abroad, often as domestic servants.

These gendered effects of SAPS are due to differential expectations about women's roles in production and reproduction. While the concept of a gendered division of labor, with its origins in the development of capitalism and the state system, has provided important insights into the detrimental effects of a globalizing economy, it is a story based on Western experiences. As

postcolonial feminists have reminded us, it is important that Western feminists not impose their own historical metanarratives when critiquing those of contemporary liberals, particularly when writing about the so-called Third World. It is also important that analyzing Third World women's experiences not reinforce the notion of a North/South split evident in so much IR literature that sees the South as poor and underdeveloped and the North as rich and prosperous; forms of gender oppression and gender hierarchy exist in almost all parts of the world although forms of patriarchy vary across cultural, racial, and class divides. Indeed, postcolonial feminists use the term *Third World* to problematize North/South boundaries: in the Third World, they include minority women in the North.[79]

Chandra Mohanty, while admitting that feminist writing is still marginalized in the United States, claims that Western feminist writing on women in the Third World must be placed in the context of the global hegemony of Western scholarship.[80] Postcolonial feminists point out that Third World women face multiple oppressions, based on racism and imperialism as well as the patriarchy that is emphasized in Western feminist analyses. Cautioning against a projection of Western feminist concerns, April Gordon has claimed that, despite the existence of patriarchy, women often feel a greater solidarity with their menfolk than with other women;[81] Third World women have claimed that Western feminism's emphasis on the division of labor by sex creates an artificial competition between women and men that underestimates their common interest in economic survival.

Nevertheless, it is also true that Western forms of patriarchy spread to much of the rest of the world through imperialism, where "civilized" behavior was often equated with the behavior of Western men and women, particularly behavior based on appropriate gender roles. Often, native inhabitants of colonies were described in gendered and racialized terms—as childlike, emotional, and dependent, vestiges of which still appear in today's political and academic discourse about the South; liberal modernization programs of the 1950s and 1960s held up an ideal of what it meant to be modern that conformed with an idealized Western masculinity. Modernity was portrayed in opposition to a feminized and traditional household; it required the emergence of rational and industrial man, an individual receptive to new ideas and to beliefs that rewards should be distributed on the basis of universalistic rules.[82] Even when devising schemes for the betterment of women's lives, development programs have often drawn on Western assumptions about the gendered division of labor. Although, as Gordon sug-

gests, African women do not identify with the Western public/private dichotomy, development planning is permeated with sexist assumptions, including the notion, often untrue, that households are nuclear, having a male breadwinner and a woman who is primarily a housewife.[83]

A flourishing and diverse literature on women and development supports these claims that Western attitudes about women are being transmitted to the South. This scholarship has much to say about the effects of contemporary economic globalization and earlier modernization programs on the lives of women. While generally ignored by IR and IPE, it is a literature from which much feminist IPE has drawn, and its evolution provides an important example of the development of feminist theory more generally.

Women in Development: Expanding the IR Agenda

During the 1950s and 1960s, development theory and practice was based on the idea that, with Western assistance accompanied by a Western definition about what it meant to be modern, newly-independent states in the South could "take-off" into self-sustained economic growth. This earlier incarnation of the globalization of Western liberalism, which, in its scholarly form, was generally situated in the field of comparative politics and outside the IPE literature, paid little attention to women in the development process and, for the most part, ignored the contributions that women were making to development.

The goal of the earlier Women in Development (WID) literature, which began in the 1970s, was to make women visible in the development process. In the 1980s, emphasis shifted to an understanding of gender relations and how they impacted on women's lives. Most recently, under the influence of postcolonial and postmodern feminism, this literature has focused on developing local and particularized knowledge with which to challenge the hegemony of Western orthodoxy. This literature, emanating from women in postcolonial societies, has contributed significantly to the contemporary feminist epistemological debates discussed in chapter 1; it has also been an important source for feminist attempts to expand the boundaries and subject matter of IR.

One of the earliest books that attempted to break the silence with respect to women was Ester Boserup's *Women's Role in Economic Development*, published in 1970. Boserup pointed out that early development models not

only overlooked women's contributions but devised projects that were frequently harmful to women. For example, based on Western notions of appropriate gender roles, development projects frequently overlooked women's role in agricultural production and, by reinforcing patterns of landholding based on Western legal practice, actually decreased women's access to land.

While Boserup's work has been criticized for ignoring women's reproductive roles as well as hierarchical gender relations that uphold women's subordination more generally,[84] her book succeeded in making women visible and stimulated calls for women to be integrated into the development process. The recognition of the need to make women visible was an important motivation for naming 1975 International Women's Year, the year that marked the beginning of the United Nations Decade for Women. International organizations, most notably the World Bank, began constructing projects to better integrate women into the development process. The WID literature classified these development projects under three approaches; the welfare approach, which was designed to assist women in their reproductive roles as mothers and housewives; the antipoverty approach, which aimed to reduce women's poverty by a focus on basic needs; and the efficiency approach, which began in the 1980s, coincidentally with the move to marketization and structural adjustment, and sought to integrate women more fully into the economy as workers.[85]

These efforts to integrate women into development projects generated an equally large critical literature.[86] Paralleling critiques of liberalism more generally, the WID approach was criticized for ignoring gender. Critics claimed that the UN Decade for Women was engaged in a misleading strategy of integrating women into a process in which they were already fully participating and of which their unremunerated labor was an essential part.[87] Moreover, the WID literature tended to see women as separate from men; it did not deal with the more radical issue as to how gender relations and triple burdens decrease women's economic security. An emergent critical literature began to focus on the gendered dimensions of global restructuring and how development processes are embedded in power structures related to ethnicity, race, and class as well as gender. This literature on Gender and Development (GAD) has focused on both women and men and how relations between them must be changed if women are to be empowered. This has led to a fundamental reexamination of social structures, a rethinking of hierarchical gender relations, and an acknowledgement of

the fact that the situation of women is not homogeneous but a function of multiple power relations; in other words, there is no single women's voice.[88]

The shift from women to gender has occurred not only in the feminist development literature but also in development policy circles; however, this move is not without its critics, who claim that it has refocused attention away from women, sometimes even back to vulnerable men, an issue that was raised about feminist theories more generally in chapter 1. The "mainstreaming" of gender has also created a disjuncture between the feminist intent behind the term, which was to focus on hierarchical and unequal social relations, and the way *gender* is being employed in certain policy circles to talk only about women's issues; this has the effect of minimizing the political and contested character of relations between women and men. When *gender* is used descriptively to refer to women rather than analytically to underscore unequal relations between women and men, questions of power can easily be removed; critics suggest that it is ironic that a term intended to carry a political message has been so depoliticized in many policy arenas.[89] This has the effect of removing from debate any radical restructuring of political, economic, and social relations, a goal to which many IR feminists have dedicated their work.

Recent feminist perspectives on development have also emphasized the importance of knowledge emanating from Southern voices, rather than from "experts" in the North. Drawing on postmodern critiques of modernization, certain scholars have questioned the representation of the South as backward and needing salvation from the developed North, a position that reinforces the authority of Northern development agencies.[90] An important feminist critique of Western development models, which has claimed as one of its goals the empowerment of women, has taken place within DAWN (Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era). DAWN is a network that links women researchers from the South to provide guidelines for action based on research and analysis growing out of Southern women's experiences. DAWN's research methodology, which comes out of feminist standpoint, differs from economistic and positivist approaches in that it is bottom-up; starting from analyses of microlevel experiences of poor women and linking these experiences to the macroeconomic level, it works from the assumption that knowledge at each level should inform the other. Recognizing the political nature of the development process and the imbalances of power within and between states, this type of analysis rejects the separation

of the public and private domains, and intuition from rationality. It claims to promote a new science of empathy that uses intuition and reason simultaneously.[91]

Southern feminists, such as those working in the DAWN group, recognize that Southern women face multiple subordinations based on sex, race, and class; to alleviate these subordinations, DAWN has promoted women's empowerment and self-reliance. While recent economic crises have reinforced the representation of Southern women as vulnerable or as victims in need of help from the North, they have also generated literatures, inspired by DAWN and voices from the South and influenced by postcolonialism and postmodernism, that are attempting to generate knowledge and development models based on the various experiences of local women. This literature suggests that a variety of development models may be needed depending on region and socioeconomic position. Increasingly, those marginalized by the development process and the forces of economic globalization are carving out their own problem-solving paths.[92] Paralleling feminist redefinitions of security (see chapter 2), this literature is engaged in redefining development.

One such model is a feminist version of sustainable development. Recent debates in the South on women, the environment, and sustainable development (WED) have generated critiques of Western models as contributing to increases in economic and gender inequality as well as degradation of the environment that reduce people's control over their lives and use of resources. Feminist models of sustainable development advocate a bottom-up form of development that emphasizes community control over resources, different lifestyles, and a rethinking of the relationship between humans and nature. They also make the link between the oppression of women and the degradation of nature. While Western models of sustainable development have prioritized the need to curb population growth, feminists in the South—while they advocate human-centered, user-controlled reproductive health care—emphasize that environmental degradation is as much the result of high levels of consumption in the North as it is of population growth in the South.[93]

Alternate models of development, such as those proposed by WED, depend on the transformation of science and knowledge. Rather than relying on scientific knowledge of Western "experts," the knowledge of local people, often subjugated, is believed to be vital for sustainable development. Braidotti et al. argue that postmodernism, with its stress on dif-

ference and locality, can make an important contribution to generating these new types of knowledge. Since it respects difference and thinks beyond dualism and hierarchy, postmodernism can contribute to dismantling the power relations implicit in the production of knowledge; it offers important new ways to critique scientific rationality and technological development.[94]

The development debate has been an important locus for the evolution of feminist theories. It is within the context of development issues that postcolonial and postmodern approaches have made important contributions. Postcolonial and postmodern approaches reject the universalism of Western theories that have informed so many development policies and international development institutions. They emphasize the need for local, specific, and historically informed analysis: a negative consequence of the Western approach is that development theory and practice is still directed from the North to the South, thus perpetuating Northern domination and the validity of Western knowledge. As postcolonial theorists remind us, although we cannot talk about a homogeneous South we must remember that the so-called Third World exists within the First.[95] Traditional boundaries between inside and outside, North and South, and developed and less-developed must be deconstructed and problematized if we are truly to understand the negative effects of globalization and provide effective prescriptions, coming out of local knowledge and circumstances.

The contributions of postmodernism to the development debate are highly contested, however. Supporting WID's role in giving voice to women and putting gender onto the agenda of international aid agencies, Mridula Udayagiri is less sure about the value of postmodernist and postcolonial writings. She asks whether postmodernism can lead the way to political activism through textual analysis that is decipherable for the most part only by erudite academic feminists.[96] Udayagiri argues that it is not only postmodernism that can lead to a study of difference; she claims that the political nature of feminist studies derives from the Enlightenment goal of universalizing experiences that bind us together in order to build effective coalitions.

While postcolonial and postmodern feminists are rightly concerned with countering the hegemonic voices of Western women and Western knowledge more generally, it is important that fragmentation not become an obstacle to collective action. Fearing further objectification and victimization of women in the South, Braidotti et al. propose an alliance between North-

ern and Southern women built on mutual respect and a recognition of multiple positionality. Based on an interchange of local knowledge arising out of specific situations, this type of model is very different from Western models that rely on elite knowledge emanating only from the North.[97] It is this type of knowledge, informed by political and social practice, that is often advocated by feminist theorists and practitioners.

While some liberals would celebrate a borderless world, feminists today see a world in which boundaries divide rich and poor. These are boundaries that cannot be eliminated by market forces alone; frequently they are racialized and gendered. Although feminists disagree over whether there is a necessary connection between patriarchy and capitalism, most of them believe that women continue to be disadvantaged relative to men by a global gendered division of labor that relegates them disproportionately to unremunerated subsistence or household tasks or to low-paying jobs and roles; these jobs/roles, in responding to new demands for flexible labor, are effectively subsidizing global capitalism. While these roles change in response to international competition and the needs of states trying to compete in the face of the forces of economic globalization, they are not always contributing to women's economic security or well-being (or, for that matter, to underpaid men's). Feminists are particularly interested in the local/global dynamic. Using analysis that starts at the local level, they have examined the extent to which global economic forces penetrate as far down as the household and how activities in the local arena sustain and support global capitalism, often at the expense of those on the margins.

Suspicious of universal arguments about economic rationalization, feminists claim that the negative effects on women of the gendered and racialized division of labor cannot be understood without an analysis of the complex social relations in which the lives of all individuals are embedded; many believe that women's subordination is caused, not by impersonal market forces alone, but by processes that result from conscious political, economic, and social choices. Feminists writing about contemporary economic globalization claim, therefore, that only when these processes are revealed and understood, through forms of knowledge that come, not from those at the center of the system, but from the lives and experiences of those on the margins of the global economy, can progress be made toward substantially reducing these gendered and racialized boundaries of inequality.

It is not only economic models that are being transmitted from North to South; that is to say, globalization involves more than the penetration of liberal capitalism: other Western ideas are becoming globalized through the discourse of human rights and the spread of Western democratic institutions. I turn to these developments in chapter 4.

4 Democratization, the State, and the Global Order: Gendered Perspectives

Approximately thirty countries shifted from authoritarian to democratic political systems during the 1970s and 1980s; this so-called "third wave" of democratization,[1] defined as a move toward competitive electoral politics, was most successful in countries where Western influences were strongest.[2] Although not at the center of the conventional IR agenda in the 1990s, democratization received considerable attention from liberals, normative theorists, critical theorists, and world-order scholars; it has also had important implications for peace and security scholarship, particularly the neo-Kantian literature on the democratic peace. Coming out of the world-order tradition, new literatures on transnational movements and human rights have also focused on democracy and the possibilities for its realization at nonstate levels.

While trends toward democratization, often accompanied by a shift to open-market economies (discussed in chapter 3), have been celebrated by certain liberals, others are more qualified in their assessment. Scholars from a variety of IR approaches have noted that the spread of domestic democratic institutions has been accompanied by a democratic deficit and great power domination at the international level, where important decisions about the global economy, weapons proliferation, and environmental issues must be made. Additionally, at a time when the increase in the numbers of democratic states is being celebrated, certain scholars see the state as dysfunctional and increasingly unable to cope with an ever-larger number of transnational forces and issues that demand regulation. Some also claim that liberal de-

mocracy as opposed to social democracy is unresponsive to the needs of its most vulnerable members;[3] consequently, certain scholars from world-order and other normative critical IR perspectives are investigating the potential for devolving democratic decision making, both up to the regional/international level and down to the grass roots. Indeed, as universal standards of human rights to which individuals can appeal outside the framework of the state are being articulated at the international level by transnational social movements and nongovernmental organizations, some see the beginnings of a nascent global society. Like other critical IR perspectives, feminists often work outside a statist ontology and assume mutually constituted levels of analysis; for these reasons, certain feminists are also seeking to explore models of democracy that are less focused on the state.

Issues of democratization and global governance, given their normative concern with the effects of the international system and state policies on the lives of individuals, have been central to feminist IR perspectives.[4] Feminist scholars have generally taken a critical stance toward liberal literature that celebrates democratization, a literature that has had little to say about gender issues. While evidence suggests that democratic transitions in Latin America and Africa are opening up space for women's political participation, women's presence and influence in formal democratic political institutions has not been great; in East Europe and Russia, it has actually declined since the transitions of the early 1990s.

While the relative absence of women from political institutions has led feminists, particularly Western feminists, to be suspicious of the state, they are also questioning visions of alternative models that advocate the devolution of power up to international governmental institutions, where often there are even fewer women in decision-making positions. Universal norms, such as standards of human rights, articulated at the international level are also being examined for gender bias. Typically, women's movements, which strive for what they claim is a more genuine form of democracy, have been situated at the local level or in nongovernmental transnational social movements. As discussed in chapter 3, feminists have stressed the importance of these movements, not only in terms of their attempts to place women's issues on the international agenda, but also in terms of their success in redefining political theory and practice and thinking more deeply about oppressive gender relations and how to reconstitute them. However, certain feminists have begun to question whether women's participation in these nongovernmental arenas can have sufficient power to effect change; while they remain

skeptical of the patriarchal underpinnings of many contemporary states, certain feminists are now beginning to reexamine the potential of the state as an emancipatory institution. Particularly for women and feminists from the South, democratization has opened up some space within which to leverage the state to deal with their concerns; many of them see the state as having the potential to provide a buffer against an international system dominated by its most powerful members. However, a genuinely democratic state, devoid of gender and other oppressive social hierarchies, would require a different definition of democracy, citizenship, and human rights, as well as a different relationship with the international system.

In this chapter, having suggested some reasons why democratization has not been central to conventional IR, I begin by elaborating on the debate about democratization and global governance as articulated by liberals, scholars in the democratic peace tradition and their critics, and some normative and world-order perspectives. I then discuss some of the feminist assessments and implications of these literatures. Focusing on feminist analyses of human rights, I elaborate on what they reveal about the gendered norms that underpin international institutions; I assess the potential of international social movements and nongovernmental organizations for effecting change in these norms as well as its policy implications. Finally, I discuss some of the feminist literature that is beginning to rethink both the importance of the state and models for a more genuine democracy, and how such models might contribute to conceptualizing a world order that could lessen gender and other oppressive social hierarchies and thus promote international security and peace, broadly defined.

Democratization and the Democratic Peace

While the commitment to promote democracy around the world is, at least ostensibly, an important aspect of U.S. foreign policy, democratization has not received a great deal of attention from conventional IR. The realist tradition, with its assumptions about states as unitary actors that look alike, does not depend on the identities of political regimes for constructing explanations about state behavior in the international system. Realists postulate an international anarchy rather than a global society: the potential for political community beyond the state is minimized by what realists see as an

unbridgeable gap between domestic society and international power politics. Realists would agree with Martin Wight's claim that it is only possible to talk about society within the context of the sovereign state. Indeed, Wight was skeptical about the possibility of a progressive politics in the international system.[5] There is also validity to the realist claim that the promotion of democracy and human rights in U.S. foreign policy is sacrificed to the national interest when it is expedient to do so.

The traditional split between international relations and comparative politics as subdisciplines of political science has further reinforced this tendency in IR to focus on the state as a unitary actor rather than the effect of its domestic political institutions and interest groups on its international behavior. Levels of analysis, popular in IR theorizing, emphasize the gap between domestic politics and international relations. James Caporoso suggests two reasons for this gap; first, an academic division of labor that has ever-more-specialized subfields; and second, that both comparative politics and international relations are intellectually autonomous, each standing on its own conceptual and theoretical foundations.[6] An important theoretical bridge was made in 1993 when Robert Putnam introduced the concept of two-level games; Putnam attempted to explain the foreign-policy behavior of democratic states by focusing on their inward and outward behaviors and the intersecting influences that face them—that is, from both the international system and from domestic constituencies.[7]

While the liberal interdependence literature of the 1970s introduced actors other than states, contemporary neoliberalism or neoinstitutionalism has refocused attention on the state as the most important actor in international politics and on formal international governmental institutions (IGOs).[8] Its preference for rational-choice theory has given primacy to interests, rather than identities, for understanding state and international institutional behavior. With their goal of explanation over prescription and shared assumptions about the self-interested behavior of states as well as the absence of a genuine international society, both realists and neoinstitutionalists have avoided postulating preferred world orders. Given its ideological hegemony and its claim about the durability of the state system and the ever-present likelihood of conflict, realism (and neorealism) has generally branded those who celebrate democratization or attempt to articulate alternative world orders as idealists.[9] Challenging this label, world-order critics counter that realism's commitment to a statist ontology is a conserving move that contributes to the perpetuation of the world as it is.

Democratization: Liberal and Critical Perspectives

Liberals, who are celebrating the recent wave of democratization, point to the positive factors associated with the realization of Western-style democratic institutions based on liberal values, such as limited government, civil and political rights, and individualism. For these liberals, an important aspect of democratization is the consequent opening up of national economies to the global market (discussed in chapter 3); this is seen as enhancing economic growth and prosperity as well as promoting human rights and political participation. Asserting that Western liberal democracy is the final form of human government, Francis Fukuyama claims that, although inequality still exists in democratic states—he uses the United States as his example—it cannot be attributed to their legal and social structures, which remain fundamentally egalitarian and moderately redistributionist.[10] Liberals see the collapse of the Soviet Union and the consequent predominance of the United States and its liberal values as further reinforcing the belief that this trend toward the universalization of democracy will be sustained. They claim that this type of democracy both promotes and is promoted by the development of capitalist markets, as is witnessed in democratic transitions in Central and East Europe. With its roots in the political modernization literature of the 1950s and 1960s, which was avowedly anti-Communist, a related literature in comparative politics has examined the validity of the claim that democracy and development are related. Przeworski and Limongi have asserted that, although the emergence of democracy is not a by-product of economic development, once democracy is established, economic constraints play a role: the chances for the survival of democracy are greater when the country is richer.[11]

The literature on democratization has generated responses from a variety of critical perspectives. These include neoclassical political theorists, world-order scholars, and critical theorists. Scholars in these traditions are generally less committed to a statist ontology; therefore, they do not assume the sharp distinction between the domestic and the international. With a normative commitment to democracy broadly defined, they see the necessity of crossing levels of analysis when postulating world orders that could foster more genuine democracy at all levels, not only that of the state. While generally supportive of democratization, many of these scholars doubt the likelihood of building a genuinely democratic world order on the foundations of Western liberal democracy in its present form.

Given the growing strength of regional organizations such as the European Union (EU), certain scholars see an emergent international society where universal norms and rules for human behavior are eroding national sovereignty.[12] Coming out of a critical-theory tradition, Andrew Linklater has postulated a cosmopolitan democracy that seeks to extend the boundaries of political community beyond the nation-state: he outlines some accounts of global citizenship that take up the idea of moral equality in the concept of obligations to the rest of humankind, such as obligations to the poor and duties to the natural environment. This form of citizenship involves rights of access to international bodies to seek redress against abuses of sovereign power. Although this vision of global citizenship is far from realized in the contemporary world, Linklater does see some evolution toward it in the European Union's conception of citizenship, which offers certain legal rights and entitlements to individuals.[13] David Held also sees challenges to state sovereignty in the internationalization of human-rights standards to which individuals can appeal.[14] But these and other critics of liberalism are quite skeptical of modern forms of citizenship, whereby citizenship for those inside boundaries is constructed through its negation for outsiders. Critics also question the emergent notion of global citizenship, celebrated by liberals such as Kenichi Ohmae, which is conferring privileged rights of citizenship and representation on corporate capital while constraining the true democratization process—a process that has involved struggles for representation over hundreds of years.[15]

While critics of democratization have claimed that economic and political liberalization is being accompanied by an illiberal interstate order, others have gone further, questioning whether the modern state, whatever its political form, has the capacity to cope with contemporary global problems. Richard Falk, while acknowledging the extraordinary resilience of the state and the states system, has questioned to what extent it is serving the cause of human betterment, which he defines, according to the preferred norms of his world-order approach, as demilitarization, the elimination of poverty, and the realization of basic human rights. Falk is critical not only of the normative dimensions of state viability but also of its functional capacity, particularly with respect to ecological concerns. Falk sees a "post-statist possibility" (albeit a weak one) in transnational social movements that are struggling to bring forth new conceptions of a more just world order based on global civil society and in movements from below, as seen in the transitional politics in East Europe and the former Soviet Union.[16]

Does Democracy Foster International Peace?

Democratization has also been heralded by a literature on the democratic peace, a literature that its neo-Kantian supporters believe has important implications for future international-security issues. The connection between Kant's ideas about the peaceful nature of democracies (which was based on the notion that citizen participation in the decision-making process predisposed against war) and the recent interest in the claim that democracies do not fight each other was introduced into IR in the early 1980s.[17] In the late 1990s, certain scholars have claimed that the gender gap in voting in some democracies, with women somewhat more disposed toward peace than men, as well as greater overall political participation by women, has further reinforced the plausibility of the democratic peace.[18]

Limiting his definition of democracy to states with a broad franchise that hold contested elections, Bruce Russett has claimed that, while democracies may, in general, be as belligerent as nondemocracies, they do not go to war with each other. Russett defines war as interstate war with more than one thousand battle fatalities.[19] His claims are supported by an extensive examination of historical and contemporary cases; explanations for the peaceful relations between democracies are framed in terms of democratic political culture and institutional constraints, particularly the constraining influence of public opinion.[20] Although most would agree that democracies are involved in as many wars as other types of political systems, in a world where the number of democratic states is increasing, supporters of Russett's thesis believe that this finding has important implications for the diminution of international conflict.[21] It is also an important departure from neorealism and neoliberalism, which do not depend on the identity of states for explanations about their behavior.[22]

The empirical evidence for the claim that democracies do not fight each other is quite strong, within a context of Russett's limited definitions of democracy and of war. Critics of this argument have ranged from those who claim that wars between democracies have not escalated for realist reasons, rather than liberal reasons,[23] to those who object to its overall implications.[24] Given that covert operations were not included in Russett's definition of war, that interstate war has comprised only a small fraction of conflict since World War II, and that democracies have been some of the largest sellers of arms, certain critics have questioned the meaning of the term *peaceful*, as well as the theory's relevance for most contemporary conflicts.[25] Moreover, the

"democratic peace" argument has tended to further reinforce the North/South split, which, I have argued, is becoming evident in IR more generally.

The literature on the democratic peace has also stimulated interest in a broader, more explicitly normative literature in the neo-Kantian tradition that hypothesizes emergent world orders and new forms of global governance based on a broader definition of democracy than Russett's. Also building on Kant, political theorist David Held has postulated his preferred model of "cosmopolitan democratic community," an international community of sovereign states committed to upholding public law both within and across the members' own boundaries; such a community depends on the creation of a "pacific" federation of states that have renounced war between them.[26] However, Held is somewhat pessimistic about the potential for this type of genuine democracy in the current world order where national democracy still prevails. In a world of regional and global interconnectedness celebrated by liberals, Held sees national, as opposed to cosmopolitan democracy, as a questionable form of political organization. Even where democracy exists within states, nondemocratic relations prevail between them. Decisions made at the regional or supranational level, where accountability is low, are diminishing the range of choices open to national democracies. For weaker states in particular, outcomes of decisions made by other states, or by international institutions dominated by more powerful states, can have far-reaching implications beyond their control. Therefore, for Held, globalization is a dialectical process, rather than the teleological one postulated by liberals; as local groups find themselves buffeted by global forces beyond their control, their demands for autonomy increase.[27]

Feminists have expressed similar reservations, both with respect to current manifestations of democratization and the contemporary state system more generally; they also see possibilities in emergent forms of a more genuine participatory democracy and are concerned with rethinking the meaning of democracy across all levels of analysis.

Feminist Perspectives on Democratization

Feminist IR scholars have paid a great deal of attention to the gendered identities of political, economic, and social institutions and the interaction of these institutional structures at all levels. As Spike Peterson has claimed, if we fail to embed state politics in a global context, we neglect how glob-

alization problematizes the meaning of politics; evidence of oppressions that women face worldwide negates the claim that politics is only possible within territorially bounded states.[28] Motivated by an emancipatory normative agenda, IR feminists have been particularly concerned with redefining and reframing the political; to this end, they have built on the work of feminist political theorists and begun to apply their ideas to their examination of democratization as well as the meaning of democracy beyond the boundaries of the state. Confirming Cynthia Enloe's claim that the personal is international, IR feminists have investigated how households, states, international institutions, and the global economy are linked structurally and ideologically, and how gendered identities and gendered divisions of labor define and structure the building of institutions locally, nationally, and globally. They have also examined whether emerging world-order norms and principles, such as those relating to human rights, exhibit a gender bias. Given these concerns, their investigations often cross traditional boundaries between international relations and comparative politics. Drawing heavily on feminist political philosophy and paralleling some of the normative IR critiques of liberal versions of democratization discussed earlier, feminists have been concerned with rethinking the meaning of democracy and democratization at all levels, from the state up to international organizations and down to grassroots social movements.

Democratization: A Gendered Concept

As discussed in chapter 3, feminist literatures on globalization are nearly unanimous in their claim that structures of patriarchy, evidenced in a global gendered division of labor and certain international institutions, as well as within states, democratic and otherwise, can operate in various ways to constrain women's life chances. Therefore, feminists have claimed that transitions to democracy and the literature that describes and celebrates it must be treated with caution. Reexamining democratic transitions through gendered lenses reveals the extent to which definitions of democracy are constrained and limited.

Feminists are also suspicious of efforts to link the democratic peace with the gender gap in political opinion and an increased participation of women in the political process. Since there are very few states, democratic or otherwise, where women hold positions of political power anywhere close to

parity with men, this hypothesis is hard to test. Feminists are particularly skeptical about the influence of women on security policies and, as discussed in chapter 2, they are very suspicious of arguments that link women unproblematically with peace. Moreover, linking the peacefulness of democracies with women's participation does little to further more important agendas of trying to reduce oppressive gender hierarchies at all levels.[29]

Nevertheless, since democratization does open political space for groups not previously heard and offers possibilities for political change, it has been a central focus for feminist scholars. However, the mainstream literature on democratization has rarely acknowledged this feminist literature or focused on what happens to women during democratic transitions. The orthodox political-science literature on democratization has made little mention of gender and women; its top-down focus on leadership and agency gives primacy to the actions and decisions of political leaders during democratic transitions.[30]

Analyses of democratization are built on traditional definitions of democracy that are based on the legacy of Western liberal democracy, a legacy that has been problematic for women. Feminist political theorists have reexamined the meaning of democracy and its gendered implications by going back to the origins of Western democratic institutions. In her reevaluation of social contract theory, Carole Pateman has outlined how the story of the social contract as articulated by seventeenth- and eighteenth-century European political theorists has been treated as an account of the creation of a public sphere of civil freedom in which only men were endowed with the necessary attributes for entering into contracts. Liberal definitions of citizens as nonsexed autonomous individuals outside any social context abstract from a Western male model. Evolving notions of citizenship in the West were based on male, property-owning heads of households: thus, democratic theory and practice have been built on the male-as-norm engaged in narrowly defined political activities.[31]

Women, Pateman claims, were not party to the original contract; rather, they were incorporated into the private sphere through the marriage contract as wives subservient to their husbands, rather than as individuals. The private sphere, a site of subjection, is part of civil society, but separate from the "civil" sphere; each gains meaning from the other and each is mutually dependent on the other.[32] This separation of the public and private spheres has had important ramifications for the construction and evolution of political and economic institutions at all levels; feminists see them as intimately

related, however. What goes on in the public sphere of politics and the economy cannot be understood as separate from the private. Historically, therefore, terms such as *citizen* and *head of household* were not neutral but associated with men. Even in states where women have achieved formal or near-formal equality, feminists have claimed that this historical legacy still inhibits their political and economic participation on an equal basis with men. As feminists from the South have pointed out, what is "public" in one society may be "private" in another; it is true, however, that women's activities, such as reproduction and child rearing, tend to be devalued in all societies.

Nevertheless, the evolution of democratic practices and institutions and their attendant notions of individual rights have certainly had benefits for women; the concept of rights and equality were important rationales for the suffrage movements of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the West as well as for movements for women's liberation and human rights in various parts of the world today. But, as Pateman's analysis suggests, the liberal tradition continues to present particular problems for women; as she points out, aspiring to equality assumes that individuals can be separated from sexually differentiated bodies.[33] Deep structures, upheld by the public/private divide, have continued to keep women in positions of subordination, even after the acquisition of the vote or other legal gains; despite the fact that women have always participated in the public sphere as workers, they do not have the same civil standing as men in most societies. For example, in twentieth-century welfare laws in the West, men have generally been defined as breadwinners and women as dependents; likewise, immigration laws and rules governing refugees define women as dependents with negative implications for their legal status. In the United States, the concept of first-class citizen has frequently been tied to military service, a disadvantage for women running for political office.[34]

Studies of democratic transitions in Russia, East Europe, and Latin America demonstrate some of the problems associated with the legacy of the Western liberal tradition.[35]

Transitions in Russia and East Europe

That democratic transitions may actually be negative for women was most evident in the former Soviet Union and some states in East Europe: gender

relations associated with the public/private divide there became more pronounced. Because of the elimination of quota systems in legislatures in this region, the number of women in institutional politics was sharply reduced after transitions to democracy, with the proportion of women elected to representative bodies declining from an average of 33 percent to 10 percent.[36] This decline was especially significant given that legislative bodies began to play a real role in policymaking. It is important to note, however, that women's representation under Communist regimes was largely window dressing: women were equally marginalized from real centers of power before and after democratic transitions.[37]

In East Europe and Russia, the drop in political participation of women during the transition was accompanied by a loss of economic status. Applauded by liberals, the transition to market economies and structural adjustment associated with the opening to the global economy took disproportionate numbers of women out of the labor force because of the need to shed labor to adjust to market competition; as in other cases of structural adjustment, the state sector, where women are often employed, shrank dramatically. In the early 1990s, in all of eastern Central Europe except Hungary, women constituted 50 to 70 percent of total unemployed; in post-Soviet Russia, in 1992 they constituted 70 percent.[38] Where women were working, they tended to be confined to traditional, low-paying "female" occupations. Given the diminishing demand for labor and the erosion of state-provided social services such as day care and health care, women were reconstructed as dependent wives, mothers, consumers, and caregivers; with child-care and maternity leave being dismantled, women were cast as "unreliable" workers. Under socialism, the family played the role of an embryonic civil society representing antistate freedom; following democratization, the family was reconstructed, along lines consistent with the liberal tradition, as male-dominated, female-dependent. At the same time as women were reassigned to the private sphere, the public sphere was being revalued, thus accentuating the public/private divide.

Barbara Einhorn has claimed that these developments were a return to the nineteenth-century liberal version of citizenship based on property-owning males (outlined by Pateman), which reinforced a patriarchal concept of roles. Einhorn suggests that these roles are profoundly undemocratic.[39] In short, women's rights in East Europe and post-Communist Russia eroded; women began to be constructed as passive beings rather than mature political subjects. In the 1990s, as is often true in times of major political change,

there was also a sense that women's rights were peripheral and that working to improve them was a luxury, given the economic difficulties of transition. In a critique of feminist literature of socialist transitions, Jaqui True has questioned its emphasis on women's victimization; she claims that this literature runs the risk of creating a victimized identity for the women of East Europe that is not unlike the category *Third World women*—one that postcolonial feminists object to strongly. True's study of women in the Czech Republic suggests that they were both winners and losers in the transition. Nevertheless, she points to the masculinization of a growing high-paid private sector, with women being disproportionately located in lower-waged public-sector occupations; she concludes that women have generally been more disadvantaged than men by structural changes.[40]

As small, grassroots movements—often reluctant to identify themselves as feminist—began to emerge in postsocialist societies, for many women the legacies of totalitarian regimes made political participation unattractive. Given their triple burden under state socialism, as workers, mothers, and homemakers, many women did not regret giving up paid work, particularly at a time when domestic labor was even more demanding than before. Indeed, new idioms of emancipation have emerged in postsocialist states: some women express their freedom in being able to choose traditional female roles associated with domesticity.[41] Nevertheless, triple burdens, which exist in capitalist and socialist societies alike, support the assertions about the prevalence of patriarchy. Consistent with the feminist critique of liberal democracy, there is a sense that formal democratic rights are not necessarily synonymous with the representation of women's real interests; yet democracy without women's participation is not real democracy.[42]

Democratic Transitions in Latin America

Assessments of democratic transitions in Latin America have suggested a mixed but more positive picture. The region has a long history of women's political mobilization, and the democratic transitions of the 1980s coincided with the reemergence of feminist movements. Many of them, it is true, had started under previous authoritarian governments; in any event, women's human-rights groups, feminist groups, and organizations of poor urban women were all important in the democratic transitions.[43] Human-rights groups became active in the late 1970s in countries campaigning against

abuses perpetrated by military regimes (e.g., Argentina and Chile). Urban-based movements were responding to the economic crises of the 1980s exacerbated by the implementation of structural-adjustment programs. Although these movements were tolerated because military governments did not see women's activities as dangerous enough to warrant their acting to suppress then, some of them actually became increasingly marginalized after the advent of democracy; the reinstatement of political rights was not accompanied by a widening of social rights.

Although civilian rule in Latin America opened up new opportunities for women to influence policy formation, the political visibility of women did not result in success at the polls. Many political parties of the center and the left put women's issues on their agenda, but there was no significant increase in electoral representation.[44] Women's groups were faced with the dilemma of autonomy versus integration: should they work within new institutions and parties and risk being co-opted? Or should they preserve their independence by remaining outside and risk marginalization?

It is clear, therefore, from both post-Soviet and Latin American cases, that in assessing gender relations in postauthoritarian rule it is necessary to distinguish between institution-level democracy, which is the focus of the literature on democratic transitions, and broader conceptions of democracy.

Rethinking Democratization with Gendered Lenses

Proponents of democratization have adopted and supported a narrow and restricted institutional definition of democracy that is focused on the political system seen as separate from the economy and civil society; this top-down definition of democracy sidesteps issues raised by feminist political theorists concerning the distribution of power, social and economic equality, and definitions of citizenship beyond a restricted political form. It ignores activities outside the conventional political arena in which women are more likely to be involved. For example, women involved in social movements that are working to improve economic redistribution and human rights and to effect social change more generally do not appear as political actors. Feminists are also analyzing the extent to which the gendering of political concepts such as rights and equality that come out of the Western liberal tradition are transposed to the international level.

When proponents of liberal democracy and marketization speak of the spread of human rights based on Western notions of individualism, feminists have cautioned that both definitions of human rights and the kinds of violations that get attention from Western states and their human-rights communities may be gender biased. Since basic needs and welfare provision so often fall to women, and since women are disproportionately economically disadvantaged, the preference by Western liberal states for political rights over economic rights may also present particular problems for women. In addition, since human-rights violations are usually defined as violations by officials of the state, domestic violence has not been a priority on the international human-rights agenda.

In order to understand the role of gender—the effects of democratic transitions on women and their activities in these transitions—we need a redefinition of democracy that starts at the bottom. Generally women are better represented in local politics; often they are working outside regular political channels. Georgina Waylen has claimed that any analysis of democratization that fails to incorporate a gendered perspective—ignoring the actions of certain groups—will be flawed.[45] Therefore, the liberal democratic state must be reexamined for its gender biases, as well as its class and racial biases; definitions of representation and citizenship in the spaces in which political life occur need to be rethought. Arguing that patriarchal structures are deeply embedded in most types of political regimes, democratic and otherwise, certain internationalist feminists have looked beyond the state to build institutions and networks that are more likely than the state to diminish gender and other social hierarchies. Given the barriers to formal political office that exist for women in most states, including democracies, women activists frequently bypass the state by working either at the grassroots level or by joining forces transnationally to work for women's rights at the global level.

Gender Issues in Global Governance

Women in International Organizations

Although women have a long history of organizing internationally, their presence in formal intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) has not been high. During the time of the League of Nations, which operated from 1920

to 1946, no woman ever served on the League Council or sat on the World Court. In the early years of the United Nations, which took the place of the League after World War II, the presence of women was minimal; women comprised fewer than 5 percent of delegates to the United Nations General Assembly in 1946.[46] In fact, women's representation in intergovernmental organizations has generally been lower than in state institutions. Some women were included in the 1945 Conference in San Francisco to draw up plans for the founding of the United Nations, but they were channeled into committees that dealt specifically with the equality of women or other social issues. Although there was some commitment to gender equality in the UN Charter, this had little effect on the early United Nations. Where women had the most success was in the establishment of the Committee on the Status of Women in 1947, a committee responsible to the Economic and Social Council, but UN members ensured that the committee had a narrow scope within which to work. The target of 25 percent of professional women in the UN Secretariat was not met, and representation of women in senior positions has continued to prove difficult since states are reluctant to put forward women for top posts.

By the 1990s, the position of women in the UN Secretariat had improved somewhat. In 1998, the percentage of women at the professional level subject to geographical distribution had reached 36.8 percent; nevertheless, women were generally concentrated at lower staff levels and it has proved difficult for women to break into upper management.[47] In both the UN General Assembly and Security Council, women have remained almost invisible; in 1997, women headed the delegations of only 7 of the 185 member countries. Because so few women have served on the Security Council, women's voices and perspectives have been virtually excluded from the major political and security decisions of the last fifty years, even though women have a strong history of organizing around issues of war and peace.[48] Where women have been granted a role in the diplomatic branch of the United Nations, it has tended to be in what are perceived as traditional women's activities, thus reinforcing established gender roles; for example, the highest concentration of women diplomats has been on the Commission on the Status of Women, where only a few men have served.

Women's low rate of participation in the United Nations, particularly in states' diplomatic missions—a pattern that has been replicated in many other IGOs—suggests that women's attempts to gain leverage at this level has, in many cases, been less successful than at the national level. As Anne Runyan

warns, there is a danger of trading gendered nationalism for gendered internationalism.[49] Since intergovernmental organizations represent the views of governments of their member states rather than their populations, this lack of transparency compounds the underrepresentation of women's voices, as well as those of men from excluded or marginalized groups. As the United Nations has begun to pledge to "mainstream a gender perspective," the question becomes: Whose perspective will be represented, when groups with the most resources are the most likely to gain access?[50]

International organizations such as the United Nations have played an important role in promulgating universal norms and standards of conduct that, as discussed earlier, have been seen by certain world-order scholars as indicating the beginnings of a global society or an extension of the boundaries of political community beyond the nation-state.[51] While feminists also assume the possibility of community beyond statist boundaries, they question the extent to which these universalizing norms are based on male experiences. Both feminist theorists and women organizing through social movements and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) have worked hard to bring these gender biases to light and to try to reframe norms and rules in ways that get beyond them. One such example has been the reformulation of the meaning of human rights.

Women's Rights as Human Rights

The spread of a Western concept of human rights that focuses on civil and political rights has been applauded by liberals. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights has also been an important concept for normative political theorists, who see, in the promulgation of universal norms of human behavior, possibilities for a nascent world community. David Held has claimed that the UN Charter system has provided a vision of a new world order—that of a supranational presence championing individual human rights over the exclusivity of state sovereignty.[52] Since human rights is one of the few concepts that articulates a transnational concern about the lives of people beyond the confines of the state, it would seem like a useful framework for dealing with gender abuse and one that connects the global and the local. Indeed, human rights have been a central concern for feminist IR scholars and activists; they have also been important for feminist legal

perspectives that began to be introduced into the field of international law in the mid 1980s.[53]

Article 2 of the UN Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 declared that all individuals, without distinction of race or sex, are entitled to equal rights; for its time, it was a progressive document (it included calls for universal suffrage and equal rights for men and women in marriage). There are contradictions in the document, however: for example, in Articles 23.1 and 25.1, men are defined as heads of families.[54] Women from Latin America, along with Eleanor Roosevelt, fought hard for the inclusion in the declaration of the term *sex*, in the hope that it would address women's subordination. In spite of these early efforts, the inclusion of women's rights within the human-rights framework has proved difficult. Given the privileging of the Western liberal definition of human rights favored by advocates of democratization, the rights that have received the most attention from the international community have been the abuse of individuals' civil and political rights by government agents. The right to liberty and security in Article 9 of the Civil and Political Covenant operates only in the context of direct action by the state; it has not been interpreted to take account of gender-specific harm.

By definition, the term *civil and political rights* applies to the public sphere and thus tends to reinforce the public/private divide. Although the Declaration of Human Rights described the family as the natural and fundamental group unit of society entitled to protection, what goes on inside families has generally been deemed a private matter beyond the reach of law. Thus family violence, even though it is the most pervasive human-rights violation against women, was not included in the definition of human-rights abuses. Claiming that states must be held accountable for actions of private individuals, feminists have argued that violence against women is not a "private" issue but one that must be understood as a structural problem associated with patriarchy.

Hilary Charlesworth, a feminist international lawyer, has suggested that being a woman is life-threatening in special ways due to social practices that put women at risk by virtue of their sex.[55] Assault, female infanticide, denial of access to health and nutrition, rape, forced marriage, and trafficking are rights violations that women suffer because of their sex. Moreover, the privileging of civil and political rights over economic rights relegates abuses such as poverty and economic deprivation to lesser importance—abuses from which, in many countries, women suffer disproportionately due to their subordinate status. Further reinforcing this gender bias, the definition of

economic rights in the Economic and Social Covenant is confined to work in the public sphere, thus ignoring women's unpaid labor. The belief that cultural rights are a private matter further reinforces the public/private distinction.

Given that mainstream definitions and implementation of human rights have tended to ignore these and other issues relating to women's human rights, women and feminists, many of them outside formal governmental institutions, began taking up these issues during the UN Decade for Women (1975–85). Due to these women's lobbying efforts, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) was adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1979; by 1993, 120 states had ratified the convention. Unlike the Human Rights Covenants that separate economic and political rights, CEDAW draws together civil, political, economic, and social rights as a single instrument. CEDAW defined discrimination on the basis of sex internationally for the first time, giving women an important legal instrument.[56] However, while CEDAW made reference to trafficking in women, it made no explicit references to violence against women.

In 1993, the UN Declaration on Elimination of Violence against Women was adopted by the UN General Assembly—a convention that finally acknowledged the structural roots of violence against women. This declaration was an important advance in that it required the state to regulate behavior in the private sphere. Associated with specific practices in both the public and private spheres, violence against women is an issue that crosses societies and cultures and is global in nature; it ranges from the United States (where, for example, there is rape and domestic battering) to India (dowry deaths) and from Latin America (torture of political prisoners) to Europe and Asia (sexual slavery) and to Africa (female genital mutilation). There is evidence that a number of national governments have taken initiatives to decrease gender violence since the issue was put on the international agenda.[57]

Despite these important advances, women's human rights have continued to face discrimination. As long as they are dealt with in special conventions and institutions, they tend to be labeled as "women's issues" and, consequently, be marginalized, allowing the mainstream to ignore them. Women's voices are still struggling to be heard by mainstream human-rights organizations, and the prioritizing of civil and political rights, reinforced by the liberal agenda, tends to obscure the discriminatory practices faced by women. The institutions that deal with women's human rights are more

fragile than those in the mainstream; they are underfunded and have weaker implementation possibilities. For example, when ratifying CEDAW states have attached more reservations than they have to any other UN convention.[58] Charlesworth has argued that even CEDAW is based on a male measure of equality since it focuses on women's rights in public life, such as in the formal economy, the law, and education.[59] Indeed, certain feminists have claimed that the whole notion of rights is based on a Western male norm and male experience; typically, rights do not respond to the risks that women face by virtue of being women. With certain exceptions, rights-based discourse has generally ignored oppression in the private sphere, thus tending to reinforce the public/private distinction that, while it is defined differently in different societal contexts, is consistent in its devaluation of women's rights. In other words, the definition of *human* manifests a male bias.

Following the 1993 World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna, where women's human rights was recognized as an issue, the focus on human rights at the UN Women's Conference in Beijing in 1995 demonstrated an increasing concern with women's rights, as well as an ongoing controversy among women and feminists about how to define these rights. Tensions between notions of universal rights and respect for cultural difference abound among women. Non-Western feminists have rightly questioned the whole notion of rights as being based on Western standards and Western liberal political discourse. Non-Western women may well be ambivalent about the rejection of cultural practices that they see as useful for fighting Western domination. This is an area of considerable disagreement, however. Many women from all parts of the world share the view that the language of rights gives them leverage to fight a variety of oppressions; and, although women are divided by race, class, and culture, women share an exclusion from decision making at all levels.[60]

The recognition of women's rights as human rights demonstrates that the international community has responded to a certain extent to calls for amelioration of women's subordination. Discourse around women's human rights has revealed the gendered distinction between public and private and the gender biases of definitions of human rights, as well as the selective enforcement of violations more generally. But, while some steps have been taken toward integrating gender into the UN treaty system on rights, very few institutionalized advances have taken place. Alice Miller claims that this is because there is still very little concrete understanding of exactly what gender analysis is with regard to rights. She goes on to suggest that better

understandings of these issues will come from NGOs.[61] Indeed, much of the success that has already occurred with respect to women's human rights, as well as the increased visibility of other gender issues in international organizations, must be credited to women organizing in arenas outside formal governmental institutions. This lack of initiative on the part of states suggests that transitions to formal democracy within states does not necessarily translate into articulating gender issues at the international level.[62]

Women in Social Movements and Nongovernmental Organizations

Given women's relative absence in formal political institutions at both the national and international level, their political organizing has tended to take place in social movements or in international nongovernmental organizations.[63] The growth of these activities has been coincidental with a more general increase in transnational movements that Falk has termed "globalization from below." According to Falk, these movements began to articulate a new meaning of democracy that included cultural and social practices. Transnational social movements are animated by environmental concerns, human rights, and hostility to patriarchy; they are articulating a new vision of human community that includes diverse cultures seeking an end to poverty, oppression, and violence. Falk sees this as the emergence of a global politics that is producing a kind of transnational political consciousness starting at the grassroots level; it may be intensely local in concern, but it is not tied specifically to one country.[64] Many of these movements are beginning to articulate opposition to globalization and the negative effects of global market processes on sustainability, democracy, and the environment.[65]

This vision, as well as these global concerns, have much in common with the concerns of women's social movements and NGOs that have grown up outside formal political channels but that are making transnational linkages around issues related to women's subordination. While many of these movements focus on women's practical daily needs, they are coming to see themselves as feminist in that they are focusing on women's subordination more generally, as well as on strategies for its elimination.[66] Motivated by these wider concerns, these movements are attempting to bridge the domestic/international and public/private divides and are redefining the meaning of the political to include noninstitutional politics at the global and local levels. For these movements, politics includes people's everyday experiences of sub-

ordination and attempts to change power relationships at all institutional levels.

Women have a long history of nongovernmental political engagement at the international level. In the nineteenth century, women began to organize internationally over a broad range of issues such as antislavery, temperance, peace, and women's suffrage. The first formal international women's organization, the International Congress of Women, was established in 1888. It brought together middle- and upper-class women engaged in moral and social reform, but avoided confrontational issues. The International Women's Suffrage Association, founded in 1904, was intended as an organization working specifically for women's suffrage. Subsequently, the International Congress of Women at The Hague in 1915 provided an important foundation for an international women's peace movement, the roots of which extend well back into the nineteenth century.[67] All these movements were comprised of elite women from the North, thus setting a precedent that international women's movements have tended to reflect the priorities of those in Western liberal states; this has given rise to legitimate claims from women from the South that their concerns have been ignored or misunderstood. The concerns from which these movements grew tended to reinforce the separation of public and private spheres at the international level; women's activities, both governmental and nongovernmental, were seen as an extension of their roles as wives and mothers, while the politics of international affairs and war were the purview of men, a pattern that still exists today.

While's women's international organizing continued throughout the twentieth century, there was an increase in the activities of women's social movements associated with the UN Decade for Women. At the first UN women's conference in Mexico City in 1975 (the first year of the Decade), the United Nations International Women's Year was proclaimed; governments agreed on a global public policy to end discrimination against women. However, the exclusively statist form of the meeting motivated representatives from NGOs to organize separately, a pattern that has continued and grown at subsequent women's conferences.

Women in NGOs from all parts of the world played a large role in organizing the Women's Conference in Nairobi in 1985, the meeting that came at the end of the Decade; in Nairobi, there were fifteen thousand nongovernmental participants. In NGO circles, there was an increasing recognition of the multiple experiences of women depending on their class,

race, and nationality; feminist concerns with difference and cautions about universalism were articulated by the activist community. A wide variety of issues was raised, including women's participation in informal labor markets, environmental issues, and violence against women. At the formal intergovernmental meeting, the Forward Looking Strategies on the Advancement of Women were adopted; this document was intended to express women's views on world affairs, ranging from peace and war to family and children. The themes of equality, development, and peace, similar to the norms articulated by world-order scholars, were declared to be interrelated and mutually reinforcing. The definition of peace was tied to a broad conception of security that included not only the absence of war but the achievement of social and economic justice.[68] There was not much attention to gender or women's empowerment in the official government document, however; amelioration of women's lives was framed in terms of liberal feminism's goal of achieving equality within existing structures.

The end of the Cold War provided new opportunities for attention to issues on feminist agendas.[69] Less preoccupied with traditional security concerns, the United Nations held conferences in the early 1990s on the environment (1992), human rights (1993), and population (1994); women's voices were strong at all these conferences. At the international women's conference in Beijing in 1995, thirty thousand women attended the NGO forum; in terms of numbers, representation, and a broad agenda, Beijing was a success. Although the conference witnessed a backlash from male-dominated groups that ranged from conservative Christian groups in the United States to the Vatican and fundamentalist Muslim governments, the platform of the governmental meeting included an acceptance on the part of the United Nations that gender perspectives are essential to all its programs and issues.[70] This position was reinforced at the "Beijing plus five" meeting in New York in 2000.

Women's NGOs and social movements more generally have, therefore, played a crucial role in developing feminist agendas at the international level. Fears of cultural imperialism due to the predominance of white Western women in leadership positions have abated somewhat as women from the South have increasingly begun to organize and define feminism for themselves. Using women's human-rights groups as an example, Brooke Ackerly and Susan Okin claim that feminist activists have become agents for social change by developing a method of social criticism that is inclusive of diverse perspectives but has critical teeth. Working at the grassroots level,

NGOs promote what Ackerly and Okin call "deliberative inquiry" and self-knowledge; this allows local people to speak for themselves, while international networks can convey this knowledge across the world.[71] At the NGO meeting in Beijing, the openness of the forum and a sense of participatory democracy challenged the hierarchical structures of the masculinized tradition fostered by governmental conferences.[72]

Yet, for many feminists, there is a sense that Falk's optimistic assessment of the potential in social movements for a new global democracy must be tempered. Even though women from the South have succeeded in broadening the agendas and representation of women's social movements, they are still led by what Elise Boulding has called an elite of the powerless.[73] Existing power relations often determine leadership within social movements. Women based in the North, who are primarily white and middle-class, have more available resources and thus have moved into leadership roles.[74] Deborah Stienstra has pointed to the interconnections between social movements and states that produce "norms" and "standards" of social practice that reflect dominant power relationships. Because liberalism of privilege was one of the most influential norms of the 1990s, when women's groups outline their proposals they do so in response to the framing of the agenda in liberal terms; this influences the way they are able to respond. Because globalization and liberalization have relied heavily on existing unequal gender and race relations, Stienstra concludes that, unless unequal power relations are changed, there will not be any fundamental change in global governance.[75]

The tensions and contradictions to which Stienstra has pointed are evident in the successes and failures of women's organizing. While the internationalization of feminism has been very successful in raising issues of discrimination and has made considerable strides in getting gender issues recognized by international organizations, in concrete terms women are doing less well than men in all societies. There was a recognition at the Beijing Conference that, in spite of the attention to these issues over the twenty years since the beginning of the UN Decade for Women, women's global status was not improving significantly. A significant reason for these inequalities, which continue, is that women must operate within "masculinized" organizations and structures.[76] Since global organizing is far removed from the realities of many women's lives, there is a sense that, although social movements are used to promote solutions that criticize the state, a return to the state is probably necessary to meet the dislocations and

poverty generated by the economic globalization of the late twentieth century.[77]

Rosi Braidotti has claimed that the feminist vision of women as citizens of the world articulated by Virginia Woolf and first adopted by women in international movements at the beginning of the twentieth century is a white, ethnocentric one, far removed from the lives of most women. She sees dangers in Woolf's metaphor of exile from the state; the reality of exile, given the large numbers of refugees and migrants from war-torn homelands, is too urgent an issue to be taken as metaphor.[78] Likewise, Katharine Moon has suggested that Woolf's assertion that "the whole world is our country" is irrelevant when applied to prostitutes serving U.S. military bases in Korea. Those who challenge the tradition of sovereignty, including transnationalists, feminists, and world-order advocates, usually live in wealthy states and are empowered enough to call sovereignty a myth. Poor women do not have this power; for them, the fate of their lives is tied to the economic and political fate of their own state.[79] For these reasons, certain feminists have begun to explore the potential for emancipatory politics within the state itself. Similar to other critics of liberalism of privilege (see chapter 3), they are articulating a very different kind of democratic state.

Rethinking the State

Given the enormous distance between the local and the international, feminists from various parts of the world have begun to rethink women's relationships to the state. While they are quite critical of most contemporary states, feminists are increasingly looking to the state as a potential buffer against the detrimental effects of global capitalism. While some feminists believe that capitalism has the potential to improve women's welfare, the majority see dangers in global markets that tend toward inequality and a lack of democratic accountability. Drude Dahlerup has suggested that women are more dependent on the state than men, particularly in industrialized countries, where women have greater need of the state's redistributive functions. Dahlerup has claimed that women can gain more power through the state than through the market.[80] Although they would agree with critics of globalization that states and international institutions are often working in the interests of global capital, feminists are beginning to explore the possibilities of a different kind of state—one that, since it does have the potential

for democratic accountability, may be the most likely institution within which to articulate new visions of global security and less-hierarchical social relations.

Although democratization has not been universally beneficial for women, in certain parts of the world democratic transitions have been heralded as opening up space for leveraging the state in women's interests. Maria Nzomo has reported that, while it is premature to speak of women's roles in institutional politics, the 1980s and 1990s in Africa witnessed a phenomenal increase in women's associations that were responding to economic, social, and political crises within the region. Whereas African governments previously discouraged women's involvement in political activities, it was with the beginning of political pluralism and liberalization at the end of the 1980s that women's movements began to emerge and lobby the state over human rights and gender-sensitive political agendas.[81]

There are in Africa many women's groups that do not engage the state directly but that grew up during the era of democratization. In Tanzania, programs for training, education, and raising the consciousness of women and men on gender issues were set up after the return of political pluralism. Women have been operating primarily outside the centers of power: their strategy to influence public decision making has depended on first empowering themselves, using the openings in political space offered by democratization. However, women are aware that incursions at the formal level of politics does not mean that women's issues will be placed on "man-made" agendas. But certain feminists believe that with democratization and increased opportunities for women in the economy, states are more likely to create new institutions based on gender equality. April Gordon has claimed that state intervention is necessary to the promotion of gender equality by breaking down institutionalized patriarchy and creating new institutions based on gender equity. She has also suggested that the state cannot achieve gender equality without the improvement of the overall economic development of society. Clearly, this type of strategy involves a much more interventionist state than liberals would envisage.[82]

While liberalization may allow space for women's organizing, the issue then becomes: What kind of state will best serve not only women's interests but peace and security, broadly defined? The liberal state, which is characterized by market democracy rather than social democracy, is clearly not the kind of state that feminists have in mind. Liberal democracy has not inspired feminists who work outside the liberal tradition because of deep structures

of gender inequality; these deep structures, they claim, have kept women unequal even after they received the vote and other formal rights. An important issue for feminist theorists, therefore, is whether inequality can be addressed within a liberal-democratic framework or whether the model is fundamentally flawed, given the structural problems of the public/private divide.[83]

As suggested by Pateman's analysis, certain feminist political theorists see a deep gender bias in democratic theory. For them, seeking equality in a man's world is problematic because it assumes a standard of normality that is male; in the West, this standard is that of white, privileged males.[84] The model of the abstract individual, behind which this gendered representation is hidden, is a powerful impediment to the recognition of gender as a salient political factor. The association of citizenship with masculine characteristics such as rationality and autonomy is problematic for women's citizenship; women cannot be included in categories associated with public-sphere activities that are themselves defined by the exclusion of female traits and identities.[85] For women to be equal political actors, this must be recognized.

Many feminists have, therefore, been suspicious of what they have claimed are "gendered states," a term used to convey their belief that political, economic, and social structures work in the interests of certain groups over others. However, the reasons they give for the gender—and class and racial—biases caused by state policies differ according to their perspective. Liberal feminists have argued that equal rights could put an end to discriminatory policies, but the more-radical feminists of the 1960s and 1970s saw states, democratic and otherwise, as patriarchal institutions; states, they claimed, are part of an overall structure of male repression institutionalized through the public/private divide. Socialist feminists have asserted that states represent dominant-class interests as well as gender interests. Feminists have also investigated the extent to which women of different races have differential access to the state.[86]

Drawing on the experience of British colonial rule, Chandra Mohanty, a postcolonial scholar, has argued that the Western colonial state created racially and sexually differentiated classes conducive to a ruling process grounded in economic-surplus extraction. Although the colonial state often transformed existing patriarchies, it instituted new ones; one important example is the colonial regulation of agrarian relations through the granting of property rights to men—a policy that aggravated existing gender inequal-

ities. In contrast to the colonial state, Mohanty contends that the contemporary liberal state operates through "unmarked discourses" of citizenship and individual rights that mask patriarchal policies.[87]

More recently, certain feminists undertaking empirical studies in a variety of states have challenged these structural accounts of states' gendered and racialized policies and drawn more nuanced conclusions. Some see states as contingent and historically variable. R. W. Connell has claimed that, while states have historically been patriarchal, they are not essentially so; since they are constantly changing and dynamic, there is room for new political possibilities. States are active players in gender politics, regulating gender relations in various ways—through family policies, population policies, child care, and education. These policies have different implications for different groups inside states; the way states regulate gender and race also filters up into international institutions such as the United Nations and the International Labor Organization. While it is true that, in most liberal states, gender policies have reinforced the public/private divide that has worked in the interests of men, Connell believes that variability allows room for change.[88] He hypothesizes replacing the liberal state with a demilitarized and participatory democracy; however, this would not be possible until the gender distinctions between public and private are abolished. Clearly, this would mean a very different kind of state, one with an expansion of the realm to which democracy applied.[89]

A different kind of democracy would demand a different concept of citizenship and one that is not dependent on public-sphere masculine characteristics. Anne Phillips rejects the notion that citizens must leave their bodies behind when they enter public life; democracy must be reconceptualized with gender difference (as well as other differences) in mind.[90] Suspicious of dichotomies that have served to reinforce gender hierarchies, most feminists prefer a form of citizenship that is not based on the notion of insiders versus outsiders; however, they are wary of concepts of global citizenship that hide difference and bypass local politics. For example, writing in the European context, Rosi Braidotti has cautioned against thinking about citizenship in the European Community before women come to terms with national politics and local realities. She claims that such notions of citizenship need not be nationalistic or ethnocentric; following Donna Haraway, she suggests that women are best thought of as being locally situated and multiply located in ways that allow for cultural diversity without losing sight of commonalities and universal notions of humanity.[91]

Acknowledging that prospects for the realization of new models of democracy are still far away, can these feminist models offer any guidance for conceptualizing new or emergent world orders? L. H. M. Ling has cautioned against focusing on internal sources of gender discrimination without taking the international context into account. Ling believes that sexism, racism, and classism are deeply embedded in international institutions that influence local institutions through internationalization. She argues for what she calls an "interstitial" approach that focuses on the intersection of domestic institutions and the international context and that is aware of the need to build gender-sensitive institutions under conditions of internationalization.[92] In other words, any attempt to postulate a more democratic state must acknowledge that local and national politics are embedded in the norms and practices of the international system and global politics.

World-order and normative IR theorists have challenged us to think about the meaning of democracy beyond its narrow statist form. They have argued that a true "democratic peace" cannot be built on exclusive forms of national democracy but must be conceptualized in global terms. Drawing on feminist literatures in democratic theory and empirical examinations of the experiences of states that have recently undergone democratic transitions, IR feminists have reanalyzed democratization and exposed its gender biases. They have also pointed out that the norms and rules upon which Western democracy has been built and that have been carried up into international organizations are gendered.

Universalist claims embodied in such international norms as human rights are based on male definitions of rights. Although not normally included in conventional IR agendas, democratization at all levels, from the local to the global, has been central to IR feminist analyses. In calling for a form of democracy that dismantles oppressive social hierarchies, feminists have begun to build models of democracy that rethink the state and its international security policies.

5 Conclusions and Beginnings: Some Pathways for IR Feminist Futures

As the preceding chapters have shown, feminist perspectives on IR take us on paths that venture far from the conventional discipline. The topics with which IR feminists have been centrally concerned during the last ten years—security, broadly defined; economic globalization; and democratization—do not readily fit into conventional statist boundaries. Many of them have to do with human security, economic inequality, democracy, and human rights. All these issues have been investigated using gender analysis; many analyses show feminists in critical dialogue with liberalism, defined as an ideology with a strong belief in the benefits of a global capitalist economy and minimal state intervention. Asking how feminism and gender analysis can offer new understandings of these issues, IR feminists are generally working within the context of global politics, rather than international relations. Frequently, they have found many more points of engagement with world-order, critical, normative, and postmodern literatures than with conventional IR. Feminists and conventional IR scholars see very different worlds, they ask different questions about these worlds, and use different methods to go about answering them.

Drawing on but going beyond previous chapters, I now summarize these various differences and their implications for feminist research agendas and their methodological choices, as well as for the future of feminist inquiry within IR. I elaborate on my claim that conventional IR and feminist IR come out of very different knowledge traditions and disciplinary perspectives, with feminism being transdisciplinary, rather than situated primarily within

political science. I outline some of the research questions that feminists are posing and offer some examples of methods they are using to answer them. These examples are by no means exhaustive; rather, they are exemplars intended to demonstrate difference from the mainstream. Since critical perspectives also draw on different knowledge traditions, their worldviews, epistemological claims, and methodologies are closer to feminist approaches; however, they do not generally include gender as a category of analysis. Hence, it is a mistake to place feminist approaches with other critical approaches; they need to have a separate voice as well as separate paths.

As I have shown, feminists frequently draw on local knowledge to construct their theories. Emphasizing the need to listen to marginal voices, they often use the term *conversation* to describe the way in which they generate knowledge. Knowledge grows out of experience at the grass roots. With this in mind, I begin this chapter by drawing on some examples of conversational engagements, or nonengagements, between IR scholars and feminists as a way of elaborating on my claim that, in order to answer the very different questions they pose, these two groups go about constructing knowledge in quite different ways.

Why Do Conversations Frequently Fail?

In 1992, in a university setting in the United States, I attended two conferences on environmental issues. The first was organized by a women's-studies program; it focused on environmental problems as they related to local communities in the United States. Panelists spoke of the siting of toxic waste dumps and nuclear and other weapons' facilities in the midst of poor, often minority, communities; sometimes the nature of the work being done in these weapons' facilities was unknown to local populations. The conference was not specifically focused on women's issues, nor were the panelists necessarily feminists; however, most of them were women, as was most of the audience.

The second conference, which was held at the same university, was on global environmental issues. It was conducted on a much grander scale, with a larger audience, including top university administrators. The panelists (mostly men) came from policy and academic elites dealing with the environment; they included the head of the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP) and a number of leading scholars in relevant scientific and

public-policy fields. The two conferences seemed like different worlds; when I suggested to someone involved in the second one that its participants might gain some insights from material presented at the women's-studies conference, I was told that that was unlikely since the work discussed at that conference was not considered "scientific." Ironically, this judgment was corroborated by one of the activists at the women's-studies conference who had undertaken a study of environmental pollution in her small Midwestern community; she and her colleagues had stuck pins into a map to correspond to cases of childhood cancer that turned out to be higher than expected in the path of prevailing winds carrying emissions from a nuclear-weapons factory. When she and other community residents presented their findings to a congressional committee in Washington D.C., they were told that their presentation was not "scientific" and, therefore, could not be considered relevant evidence for shutting down the offending facility.

Seven years later, in 1999, I attended a very different kind of conference on the subject of women's rights—one to which some IR scholars who had not previously incorporated gender into their work were invited to dialogue with some feminist scholars. Most of the feminists were not IR scholars; some of them were activists who had worked on issues of women's rights in countries of the South. Although I had previously attended a number of conferences that included IR scholars and feminists where conversations were difficult, this time the discussions between these very different communities took place in a friendly, constructive atmosphere.

The meeting, held in the eastern United States, began with one of the IR scholars outlining a realist world; he claimed that, since durable, impersonal structures determine states' actions, the presence of more women in international politics would not make much difference to the behavior of states. Another IR scholar outlined some of the hypotheses generated by the literature on democratic peace (discussed in chapter 4), correctly asserting that it would be hard to test whether, at this point in time, significant numbers of women in power would make much difference to the behavior of states. A third speaker distinguished between the anarchy and violence often generated by contemporary ethnic nationalisms and a more civic and legitimating form of Western nationalism; further confirming the notion of a North/South divide, he also suggested that the South is more patriarchal than the North.

The feminists at this conference were concerned less with the behavior of states in an anarchical international system and more with social justice.

Coming from grassroots perspectives, they talked of inequality as one of the greatest problems in the world. Outlining how policies at the global level can detrimentally affect local communities, and deeply concerned with international politics (although not in the IR disciplinary sense), they talked in terms of human security rather than national security, and they offered different definitions of democracy. Given the elitist nature of international politics and the low number of women in foreign-policy positions in most states, they rejected the implicit assumption made by scholars of the democratic peace that U.S. foreign-policymaking is democratic.

One grassroots activist suggested that people in the countries of the South were hesitant to come to the United States because they perceived it as being a very violent, and hence dangerous, society; many, who had worked in rural communities in the South, were unwilling to concede to the idea of implicit but overgeneralized North/South boundaries between order and anarchy, and to that of less-patriarchal versus more-patriarchal societies. Participants were reluctant to type unproblematically all countries in the South as more dangerous and oppressive. This tendency, to objectify certain societies, all too easily is translated into seeing the women of these societies as undifferentiated victims, rather than as agents variously located in terms of place, class, and race. Also, when feminists use terms like *South* and *Third World*, they are often referring not only to a differentiated geographical region but to the South within the North.

The question as to whether more women in power would have an impact on global politics is one that is frequently raised during these types of conversational encounters, and it was central to the IR participants at this conference. This issue was so far from the lived reality of many of the women with whom these feminists worked that it was not at the center of their agenda. Many of them were quite mystified by their first encounter with IR and the issues that IR scholars raised.

In spite of these differences, this particular meeting was cordial and genuine learning took place on both sides. Since the intellectual distance was so great, why was this the case? I believe that, since each of these groups came from such different starting points, in terms of their views of the world and their academic backgrounds, there was no sense of paradigm threat that frequently occurs when feminists claim to be "doing IR." The power differential between mainstream IR and IR feminists, so apparent within the discipline, was also less noticeable; since these feminists were not in IR, they asked questions that are difficult to answer within an IR research

framework. Although the subject matter focused on women, there was not much discussion of gender, a concept that frequently leads to misunderstanding; the feminists took gender as given in their presentations, and the IR scholars avoided it, beyond some assertions that they did not believe in bad men/good women oppositions, a claim on which all could agree.

So what can be learned from each of these conversational encounters? All of them exhibited a degree of mystification or disconnection—a phenomenon to which I have referred throughout this book. After attending the two environmental conferences in 1992, the slogan "think globally, act locally," first coined by the environmental movement, kept going through my mind. Although this was not the intent of those who first formulated this slogan, I began to see it, and have continued to see it, as an idea that is profoundly gendered. As I have demonstrated throughout this book, men predominate in elite positions of power in the realm of international politics, both at the intergovernmental and state levels; not only do they make the important decisions, they also set the policy agendas, particularly in matters of international politics and security. Global citizenship is more likely to be a concept associated with global corporate elites, most of whom are men, than with cosmopolitan notions of obligation beyond state boundaries.[1] While it is less true today, men in the academy have historically set academic agendas, defining the disciplines in ways that draw boundaries around knowledge—a practice that has the effect of allowing some questions to be asked but not others, and the relative merits of research to be judged in terms of its claims to be "scientific."

Women, as I have also shown, have predominantly "acted locally," overrepresented at the grassroots level in peace, environmental, women's, and other social and economic movements. Even though they have had a great deal to say about international politics, they have not been counted among the worlds' great scholars or knowers; frequently, they have been called idealists who lack the toughness and practicality needed to operate in the "real world" of international politics. By making this claim, I am in no way implying that women are "not thinking"; but the type of practical knowledge that comes out of working at the local level, which was so evident in the women's presentations at both conferences and that is very typical of feminists' beliefs that theory and practice cannot be separated, is often discounted in the name of scientific objectivity.[2] In IR, the ethnographic methods that IR feminists are beginning to employ in their research have similarly been

discounted as not having much bearing on understanding the behavior of states and the international system.[3]

While there was more willingness to listen to different voices and respect different types of knowledge at the third conference, these difficulties persisted; the two groups were still talking about different realities—the feminists focusing on the grassroots and local levels and the IR scholars on states, their decision makers, and international structures. I found myself wondering how the kind of questions that the feminists were asking or the kind of knowledge about ordinary people's lives that they had gained in the field could be incorporated into the discipline of international relations. Would their questions be seen as legitimate? Would their knowledge be judged "scientific"? In other words, the language each group used, the way each saw the world—local versus global, human versus state security, and gendered versus nongendered—meant that the questions that each group considered important and the ways they went about answering them were quite different. Since the feminist approaches described in chapter 1 come out of quite different knowledge traditions, these are issues that IR feminists face more generally.

Different Knowledge Traditions

Whose Disciplinary Boundaries?

A discipline can be defined as a group of scholars and the body of knowledge they share, discuss, add to, revise, and transmit to their successors. Its boundaries, specialized vocabularies, and research practices are generally agreed upon by scholars within it. While disciplines may contain competing research programs, as is evident in IR today, they share a common language and understanding of the meanings of the discipline's central concepts. This language is understood by those on the inside, but it can seem quite mystifying, and sometimes even alienating, to those on the outside, thus making transdisciplinary communication quite difficult. IR scholars sometimes suggest that feminists use unfamiliar language, terms, and methods that are hard to understand; however, the same could be said about the scientific discourse of conventional IR by those not so trained. Not only are our disciplinary languages often inaccessible to those on the outside; for those on the inside,

they help define the questions or research puzzles that can be investigated and the methods that can be used to answer them. Some of these difficulties are evident in my descriptions of conversational encounters.

As discussed in chapter 1, conventional IR has generally, in the United States especially, been situated within the discipline of political science and has been concerned with political rather than social life. This accounts for its focus on the state and the politics of interstate relations. Neorealism and neoliberalism have taken the state as given, claiming that international structures are more important than domestic behavior for understanding international politics. For realists, sharp boundaries exist between a domestic space of political governance and an international anarchy where no enforceable rules exist and state interests and security are the prime motivators for state behavior. IR has been quite "top-down" in its analysis, assuming that a great deal of states' international behavior can be explained in terms of structural constraints; individual human beings, except for policy leaders and decision makers in the subfield of foreign-policy analysis, have not been central to its investigations.

In IR discussion, the term *scientific* has generally been assumed to mean that political science can develop and utilize methods based on the natural sciences to understand international politics. Where IR has gone outside political science, those seeing themselves as scientifically motivated have tended to use frameworks associated with liberal economics, which is considered to be the most "scientific" of the social sciences. Mainstream IR and liberal economics share assumptions about individualist, self-interested behavior and the utility of rational-choice theories for understanding the behavior of individuals and states. Radical or critical Marxist traditions of inquiry have been seen as less "scientific" or more "narrative."

Disciplinary conformity is always under challenge, however. As I have demonstrated in each chapter, this was particularly true of IR in the 1980s and 1990s, when scholars from a variety of theoretical approaches on the critical side of the third debate mounted a major challenge to conventional assumptions, worldviews, and explanations, as well as "scientific" methodologies. Many of the scholars who are challenging conventional IR, some of whose work I have discussed in earlier chapters, are located outside the United States and have been suspicious of the quest for "scientific" explanation that has characterized U.S. IR since the 1950s.[4] These scholars are more transdisciplinary, drawing from fields such as sociology, history, and political philosophy in their investigations; they are generally skeptical of

positivist methodologies and prefer critical, normative, constructivist, and poststructural approaches. Given the growing strength of these critical approaches, it is probable that IR will be characterized by a variety of competing approaches well into the future.

Like these critical traditions, feminist IR is also interdisciplinary. As described in chapter 1, feminist IR draws on sociology, psychology, history, and anthropology as well as more broadly within political science from normative political theory and comparative politics. Recently, philosophy and the humanities have had a greater influence on feminist theory. Rejecting rationalist explanations, IR feminist analysis is often sociological: it understands individuals' behavior as embedded within a network of structures that are socially constructed. Feminists investigate how the intersection of race, class, gender, and other hierarchical social structures at the global level affect, and are affected by, social life within and between individuals and states. These structures, rather than states, are the key unit of analysis; as discussed in chapter 4, states must be problematized and examined for their gender biases. Frequently, boundaries are conceived in terms of social groups rather than states—one reason why communications at the women's-rights conference described earlier were problematic.

For these reasons, IR feminists, like those feminists at the women's-rights conference, are uncomfortable with statist boundaries and North/South divides; most feminist work is either implicitly or explicitly questioning the very constitution of a field constructed around rigid boundaries such as domestic/international, public/private, and state/society. Drawing geographical boundaries between degrees of patriarchy in terms of an unproblematic North/South axis serves to reinforce ideas, prevalent in the West, that women's subordination tends to "take place over there but not here."

Even feminist analyses can create these hierarchical distinctions; as Jindy Pettman has suggested, these boundaries are at work in feminist IPE, where North/South divides are reproduced in knowledge making by the separation of IPE studies of women in the First World from the women in development (WID) literature that focuses on the South. "Development" then becomes a study of Third World "difference," which disguises the extent to which all people's lives are contained within similar global processes and structures.[5]

Given their discomfort with levels of analysis, feminists describe security in multidimensional terms and interpenetrating levels, beginning with the security of individuals situated within broader social and global structures. As outlined in chapter 2, security is as much about the standard of living—

that is necessary for a good life—and freedom from various types of subordination as it is about military security. Since they are particularly concerned with how people's lives and actions are embedded in material structures as well as in structures of meaning, feminists prefer to work from the bottom up, rather than from the top down.[6] With less of a focus on structures, states, and traditional security issues, the above reasons are also why so many IR feminists have engaged with issues having to do with economic globalization and democratization rather than with more conventional IR agendas.

Nevertheless, as I have also pointed out, if feminist approaches can be described as transdisciplinary, they have had an uneasy relationship with all the academic disciplines. It is not only in IR that feminists have revealed and critiqued gendered disciplines whose knowledge has been constructed by men and based on the lives of men. Similar critiques have been mounted in all the social as well as the natural sciences.[7] Feminists claim that the lack of attention to women and gender seriously undermines claims to objectivity and universality in all disciplines; however, just adding women to existing forms of knowledge is not sufficient to counter these gender biases. Knowledge constructed in terms of binary distinctions such as rational/emotional, objective/subjective, global/local, and public/private, where the first term is often privileged and associated with masculinity, the second with femininity, automatically devalues certain types of knowledge. Therefore, doing feminist research is not about adding more details to existing disciplines but about constructing knowledge that fundamentally challenges or alters existing androcentric theories.

Feminists have also questioned the possibility of doing research that postulates an external reality, the regularities of which can be explained by a detached neutral observer. Claiming that all knowledge is situated, and therefore political, feminists believe that such epistemological orientations, as well as the omission of certain types of knowledge about women and disempowered people more generally, have important and often negative consequences. However, given the power differential between IR and feminist scholars, feminist epistemologies face the problem of being judged as less than adequate by the advocates of dominant approaches or epistemologies. But feminism is not just another approach; rather, it seeks to uncover the limitations of approaches that do not consider gender when making claims to objectivity. These epistemological differences have caused serious miscommunication with conventional IR scholars. So, too, have different understandings of the meaning of gender.

Putting Gender In When It Is Already There

For those unfamiliar with feminist perspectives, the term *gender* is often synonymous with women. Adding a gendered perspective generally means talking about women—often the "famous few" who are visible as decision makers—or including some women's issues in one's investigations. Used in this sense, gender is a descriptive category rather than an analytical tool; it is about individuals rather than international politics. Since the subject matter of IR is concerned with states and markets rather than individuals, it is often difficult for IR scholars to see how gender or women could be included in the field at all, except to talk about the effects of women decision makers or women's votes on foreign-policymaking. And, since gender constitutes the identities of all individuals, talking about it can be very personal and threatening, often leading to assertions that feminists are implying that men are bad/aggressive and women are good/peaceful. This is a tendency that, as mentioned above, tends to surface when conversations between IR scholars and feminists do occur.[8]

As outlined in chapter 1, feminist definitions of gender include, but go well beyond, issues of personal identity. Importantly for feminists, gender is an analytical tool rather than merely a descriptive category. As issues discussed in this book have demonstrated, gendering is a mechanism for distributing social benefits and costs;[9] therefore, it is crucial for analyzing global politics and economics, particularly with respect to inequality, insecurity, human rights, democracy, and social justice—issues with which feminists at the 1999 women-rights conference described above were centrally concerned. To talk about putting gender into IR is an impossibility because it is already there; it is evident in the hierarchical social structures that feminists seek to both expose and understand how they came into being and are sustained. But gender as a category of analysis cannot be abstracted from a particular context while other factors are held stable; it must be understood as a component of complex interrelationships having to do with class, race, and culture.[10]

As I have also noted, feminists claim that gender is as much about men and masculinity as it is about women; since, at the elite level, international politics is a masculine world, it is particularly important that attention be paid to the various forms of masculinity that have so often legitimated states' foreign and military policies. Although all of us are accustomed to thinking of women and minorities as groups that we study and hold conferences

about, we are not used to thinking about privileged men in these same group terms; yet, as I have shown, it is their identity that has served as the foundation of claims about the meaning of security, human rights, and democracy. Studies about men have been used to advance general theories of human behavior, whereas studies about women have been used only to support limited knowledge about women.[11] Inviting IR scholars to conferences about women will not change this until the IR discipline has a deeper understanding of the meaning of gender relations. In other words, we need to make gender visible in order to move beyond its oppressive hierarchies.

Sandra Harding has suggested that members of marginalized groups must struggle to explain their own experiences for themselves in order to claim the subjectivity that is given to members of dominant groups who have been granted legitimacy as speakers and historical agents for us all.[12] Until this happens, women will always be characterized as problems or victims. It is for these reasons that subjectivity is an important issue for feminist theory: when women have been included in knowledge construction, it has generally been as objects or victims, rather than subjects.

Subjectivity

It is ironic that just as IR is beginning to discover women, feminist theorists are increasingly reluctant to talk about women as a single, generalized category, a reluctance that is quite justifiable for reasons outlined in chapter 1, but one that can leave IR scholars mystified. Given their assertion that universal knowledge claims have too often been based on the lives of elite men, feminists are unwilling to substitute another universalist model based on the lives of elite women. As already discussed, postcolonial and postmodern feminists have drawn our attention to how often knowledge about women is based on lives of white, Western women, who are seen as having agency, while others do not. Forms of subordination may depend on race, class, and culture, but they do not fit neatly into geographical boundaries such as those between North and South (conventionally defined). As Christine Chin discusses in her work on domestic servants in Malaysia, it is sometimes women who oppress other women, thus complicating essentialized notions of patriarchy.[13] Too often Third World women have been portrayed as poor, powerless, and vulnerable, and in need of enlightenment from "liberated" Western feminists.

A key issue for feminists, therefore, has been how to construct knowledge that acknowledges difference but allows claims that can be generalized to be made. These issues are deeply troubling to those concerned with positivist, empiricist research that strives for universality and objectivity. These questions have also been important methodological issues in sociology and anthropology, whose ethnographic methods IR feminists are beginning to employ. Acknowledging the postcolonial aversion to Western women speaking for others, feminist anthropologist Margery Wolf avers that, as much as Western feminists must acknowledge accusations of colonialism and racism, these accusations should not stand in the way of Western women working to create a more equitable world; this can be done by constructing forms of knowledge that are sensitive to the researcher's perceived status.[14] Allowing subjects to speak for themselves can partially be achieved by the ethnographic method of recording women's testimonies; Marianne Marchand explores the possibility that Latin American women can gain subject status through their testimonies that produce knowledge about gender and development that delegitimizes dominant discourses.[15]

If feminism becomes paralyzed by women not being able to speak for others, then it will only reinforce the legitimacy of men's knowledge as universal knowledge, a position that, as we have seen, has been prevalent in IR. Mridula Udayagiri has claimed that it is not possible to reject the category *women* in a world that continues to treat women on this basis.[16] Hilary Charlesworth has suggested that feminists should focus on common problems that women face, whatever their cultural background—although the process of identifying and defining what are common problems is not an easy one.[17] These attempts to construct knowledge that is sensitive to difference but that recognizes that there are structures and processes that contribute to various forms of subordination is particularly important, given that feminism is an emancipatory political project as well as a form of knowledge construction.

What Is Knowledge For?

Marysia Zalewski has identified three types of theory; theory as a tool for understanding the world; theory as critique, or understanding how the world got to be as it is so that it can be changed; and theory as practice, in which people engage as they go about their everyday life.[18] Conventional IR usually employs theory as a tool. IR feminists, along with other critical theorists,

have generally used theory in Zalewski's second and third sense, as critique for emancipatory purposes or to investigate the practices of everyday life in order to understand how individuals affect and are affected by global politics.

One of the main goals of knowledge in conventional IR has been to develop explanations for the political and economic behavior of states in the international system. Defining theory as a tool, Robert Keohane has claimed that theory is a guide for cause-and-effect relationships; it provides valuable propositions that can prove useful in specific situations. Theories are important to cope with the complexities of world politics, where reality needs to be ordered into categories and relations must be drawn between events.[19] For those who define theory in this sense, its separation from political practice and, as far as possible, from the values of the researcher are thought to be important goals.

For many feminist theorists, however, knowledge construction is explicitly linked to emancipatory political practice. Sandra Whitworth has claimed that contemporary feminism has its roots in social movements; feminism is a politics of protest directed at transforming the unequal power relationships between women and men.[20] Therefore, a key goal for IR feminist theory used in this sense is to understand how the existing social order—one many feminists believe is marked by discrimination and oppression—came into being and how this knowledge can be used to work toward its transformation. For many IR feminists, knowledge is explicitly normative; it involves postulating a better world without oppressive social hierarchies and investigating how to move toward such a world. Christine Chin has claimed that these emancipatory concerns suggest the need for restructuring the ways in which we conceive and execute research problems. She suggests that we need to move toward undoing received disciplinary and epistemological boundaries that segregate the pursuit of knowledge. Disciplinary boundaries, as well as the way in which we pursue knowledge, have had the effect of marginalizing voices within the academy that strive to present a more "human" and, therefore, more complex picture of social change.[21]

Claiming that knowledge emerges from political practice, many feminists do not believe in, nor see the need for, the separation between theory and practice. Theory as practice, Zalewski's third definition of theory, means that we need to take into account many more human activities than would be thought necessary by those who use theory as a tool. Zalewski claims that scholars who use theory in this sense think of it as a verb, rather than a noun; as was the case with the women at the first of the two environmental meet-

ings discussed earlier, theorizing is something people do as they go about solving practical problems of everyday life.[22] Cynthia Enloe has suggested that to understand the world better, we must take seriously the experiences of ordinary women and men, following the trail from national and international elite decisions back to the lives of ordinary people.[23]

The goal of this type of practical knowledge, examples of which I have given in each of my preceding chapters, is not the improvement of theory but of practice; explicitly rejecting the separation between observers and observed, it is intended to yield greater understanding of people's everyday lives in order to improve them.[24] Enloe uses theory in this sense to understand the 1994 Zapatista uprising in Chiapas, Mexico, which occurred in the context of the ratification of the North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement. Noting that the Zapatistas understood the link between international trade and their own security, she outlines how peasant farmers of Chiapas were doing what so many international commentators were not; tracing causal connections between local political economies, state-system contradictions, and emergent interstate relationships—connections that had detrimental effects on their economic security. Enloe claims that the reason the uprising caught almost everyone by surprise was that these people had had difficulty making their voices heard.[25]

Building theory from the everyday practices of ordinary people focuses on marginalized people and sites not normally considered relevant for IR research. The study of women is not new, but studying them from the perspective of their own experiences so that they can understand themselves and the world is not typical for the way that knowledge has been constructed.[26] This type of practical knowledge also helps us to understand that what appears on the surface as normal or natural must be questioned. As Enloe tells us, it takes power to keep people on what she calls "bottom rungs" where they cannot be heard.[27] Given these different definitions of theory with which many IR feminists are working, as well as the different goals of their research, feminists are going to be asking questions that are quite different from those of conventional IR scholars.

Different Questions

When presenting their work to IR audiences, IR feminists are frequently asked how their research could help to understand "real-world" issues such

as nuclear proliferation or war in or between particular states. While denying neither that these are important questions nor that feminists may have some useful answers to them, we must note that these questions are framed in such a way that our understanding of the meaning of "real-world" issues (in this case, the security of states) is taken as given. Deciding which questions are important and which are not is significant because it defines what count as issues worth researching and theorizing about.

The kinds of questions that IR feminists are asking are often considered irrelevant for explaining "real-world" issues or, at best, are judged as questions outside IR disciplinary boundaries, a judgment that can have the effect of delegitimizing the subject matter of the questions. As was evident at the women's-rights conference, feminists frequently ask questions aimed at investigating conditions necessary for achieving a more just world rather than those having to do with conditions important for the preservation of stability. Questions are often framed in terms that require investigations that begin at the local level, or level one, which, as I have suggested, is frequently judged by IR scholars as less likely to yield useful explanations.

A question with which feminists often begin their research is: Where are the women?[28] To ask this question is to reflect on whether we have taken as given which activities in the international realm are deemed important for understanding international relations. Acknowledging that we need to look in unconventional places not normally considered within the boundaries of IR, Enloe has asked whether women's roles—as secretaries, clerical workers, domestic servants, and diplomats' wives—are relevant to the business of international politics.[29] But, as Enloe notes, it is difficult to imagine just what these questions would sound like in the arena of international politics and whether they would be taken seriously.[30]

Locating women must include placing them within gendered structures. Typically, feminist research questions have to do with investigating how the international system and the global economy contribute to the subordination of women and other subjugated groups. As previous chapters have shown, this may involve rethinking traditional concepts such as security and the meaning of human rights. And, as my analysis of democratization has demonstrated, it is often the case that women's life opportunities tend to be constrained at times that traditional history has marked as the most progressive.[31]

Investigating how global structures and processes constrain women's security and economic opportunities requires asking what difference gender

makes in our understanding and practices of international relations. What kind of evidence might further the claim that the practices of international politics are gendered? Through what mechanisms are the types of power necessary to keep unequal gender structures in place perpetuated? Does it make any difference to states' behavior that their foreign and security policies are so often legitimated through appeals to various types of hegemonic masculinity? These are empirical questions that can be answered only with reference to concrete historical instances, taking into account that women are differently located in terms of race, class, and nationality. Answering these questions may enable us to see that what is so often taken for granted in how the world is organized is, in fact, legitimating certain social arrangements that contribute to the subordination of women and other disadvantaged groups.

Such questioning of the way we have come to understand the world, as well as the forms of power necessary to sustain dominant forms of interpretation, demands quite different methodologies from those generally used by conventional IR. Questioning the knowledge/power nexus and its normalized reproduction has been a focus of discourse analysis. Recovering the experiences of subjugated people demands methods more typical of anthropology and sociology than political science. Consequently, feminists are turning to methodologies such as ethnography and discourse analysis to answer their research questions, methodologies that have not traditionally been used in IR.

Feminist Methodologies

Charlesworth has described feminist methodology as an "archaeological dig" where different methods are appropriate at different levels of excavation.[32] No single methodology is sufficient for analyzing complex social phenomena. Since feminists are using tools that are rarely included in a standard IR methodological training, their methodologies tend to be eclectic. There is a sense that research should be grounded, whether it is in people's everyday activities or in the close reading of texts that can offer interpretations about how people construct their world and, therefore, act upon it. While it is important to do research, which is linked to concrete historical cases, it is also important to rethink the theoretical assumptions that led to consideration of these cases in the first place.

In order to answer the kinds of questions outlined above, feminist research looks both up and down, at both structures and agents; looking up enables the investigation of how structures of political and economic power as well as dominant forms of knowledge are created, upheld, and legitimated. Looking down involves investigations based on the lives of those not normally considered as bearers of knowledge; this type of research may involve looking in strange places for people and data—in households, factories, and farms—or "lower than low politics."[33] One methodology appropriate for such research is ethnography, a method more typical of anthropology and sociology than IR.

Ethnography

Anthropologist Clifford Geertz has described ethnography as "a stratified hierarchy of meaningful structures in terms of which human actions are produced, perceived and interpreted and without which they would not exist."[34] It is not an experimental science in search of law, but an interpretive one in search of meaning; its task is to uncover the conceptual structures and meanings that inform subjects' acts. Geertz speaks of an interpretive approach as an aid to gaining access to the conceptual world in which our subjects live so that we can converse with them.[35] Writing about the natural sciences rather than the social sciences, Evelyn Fox Keller describes the method used by biologist Barbara McClintock in a similar vein. She contrasts McClintock's work on genetic transposition in corn with that more typical of modern science, which is premised on a division between the observer and the observed and the search for a single law of explanation, a methodology that encourages researchers to overlook difference. Claiming that "there's no such thing as a central dogma into which everything will fit," McClintock talked of her scientific investigations in terms of "listening to the material" or "letting the experiment tell you what to do."[36] In describing her "conversational" relationship with plants, McClintock urged respect for difference; she used the words *affection* and *empathy* to describe her form of thought.[37] While Keller is careful not to conclude that McClintock was consciously doing feminist science, she does suggest that, being a woman with a commitment to personal integrity, McClintock had to insist on a different meaning of mind, nature, and the relation between them.[38] In other words, given that the meaning of these terms and their relation to

each other depend on gendered constructions, McClintock's science required a different construction of gender.

Empathy, *listening*, and *conversation* are words frequently used by IR feminists when describing their research. Christine Sylvester has used the term *empathetic cooperation* in connection with her fieldwork among women in Zimbabwe. She defines empathetic cooperation as the positional slippage that occurs when one listens seriously to concerns and agendas of those to whom we do not usually listen when building social theory. Quoting Trinh Minh-ha, Sylvester claims that empathy involves taking on the struggles of others by listening to what they have to say in a conversational style that does not push or direct; it is an ability to investigate questions in ways that open us up to the stories that have generally been bypassed.[39] Cooperation is "a process of negotiation that (real) theorists join because they have taken on board enough of the texture of marginalised identities that their Self-identity with canonical knowledge is disturbed."[40]

Similarly, Katharine Moon, an IR feminist doing second-generation empirical work, has described her fieldwork in Korea as an attempt to lift the curtains of invisibility that have shrouded Korean prostitutes' existence. Influenced by the work of Enloe, Moon's stories help us locate women in places not normally considered relevant to IR and to link their experiences to wider processes and structures that she investigated through the examination of national-security documents collected in the United States and Korea. Moon offers her research as a passageway for the voices of these women who were far from silent when she engaged them in conversation on topics that ranged from politics to child-rearing habits.[41] She claims that many of the thoughts and experiences former prostitutes shared with her in regular conversations informed her thinking and writing.[42] Her interviews are not intended to offer statistical evidence but "to give voice to people who most Koreans and Americans have never considered as having anything important to say or worth listening to."[43]

Christine Chin's work also responds to the question, Where are the women? Chin presents her fieldwork with domestic servants in Malaysia in a light similar to Moon's. Describing her ethnographic research—which involved living in various neighborhoods in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, over a six-month period, she, too, rejects the survey method, which in Chin's view oversimplifies complexities of life that cannot be distilled in a series of hypotheses to be tested. She describes her work as multimethod ethnographic research: she offers quotations from field notes that, she says, are a

style of evidence that allows her subjects to use their own words and speak about any issue they please. Chin writes about her efforts to establish trust and describes her analysis of her interviews as a study of narrativity, or how we come to construct our identities by locating ourselves within our life stories.[44] Narrative is a method sometimes employed by feminists to further their goal of constructing knowledge that comes out of people's everyday experiences. Such knowledge is important for reaching a level of self-understanding that can enable people to comprehend the hierarchical structures of inequality or oppression within which their lives are situated, and thereby move toward overcoming them.

Laurel Richardson, a feminist sociologist, has claimed that narratives are quintessential to understanding the sociological. She outlines some of the consequences of adopting a narrative form as a way of acquiring and representing knowledge, suggesting that it can empower individuals and support transformative social projects. Narratives display the goals and intentions of human actors and are the primary way that individuals organize their experience into temporally meaningful episodes; narratives make the connections between events that constitute meaning. Explanation in a narrative mode is contextually embedded, whereas scientific explanation is abstracted from spatial and temporal contexts.[45] Richardson describes narratives that give voice to those social groups who are marginalized—to what she calls the "collective story." While people talk of specific events rather than articulating how sociological categories such as race, class, and gender have shaped their lives, she believes that their stories have transcendent possibilities for social action and societal transformation.[46]

While IR feminists have employed ethnographic methods, often with these emancipatory goals in mind, they are not using ethnography only to narrate and understand people's lives at the local level. IR feminists provide multilevel, mutually constituted constructions. Importantly, their investigations link everyday experiences with wider regional and global political and economic structures and processes. As discussed in chapter 2, Moon's work demonstrates that military prostitution is not simply a women's issue, but a matter of national security and international politics. The challenge of her work is to analyze the interaction between foreign governments and among governments and local groups.[47] This type of understanding may reveal possibilities for social change.

Likewise, Chin uses a neo-Gramscian perspective to demonstrate how domestic service is an issue that, rather than being a personal, private one,

as is often assumed, involves the state and its international political and economic relations. Reinforcing the feminist claim of the interpenetration of the personal and political, Chin investigates the multicausal linkages between region (in this case, the East Asian region), state, and household. Although previous analyses have examined class and racial dimensions of what she calls the repressive developmental state, little work has been done on its gendered dimensions.[48]

Chin's critical political-economy approach, one used by other feminists, too, differs from rationalistic approaches in that it takes into account both the material and ideational dimensions of social relations. Chin claims that a focus on legislation is not sufficient to account for the repressive policies of the state; one must also examine the ideological hegemony necessary to formulate and legitimate such economic policies.[49] As these empirical studies demonstrate, gender is a system of meaning that comes to be expressed in legitimating discourses that keep prevailing power structures in place. For this reason, feminists have also been attracted to discourse analysis as a methodology.

Discourse Analysis

Claiming that discourse analysis is an emerging research program in IR, Jennifer Milliken outlines its three theoretical commitments: First, discourses are systems of signification in which discourse is structured in terms of binary oppositions that establish relations of power. As examples, she supplies terms such as *modern/traditional*, and *West/Third World* that are not neutral but establish the first term as superior to the second.[50] Second, discourses define subjects authorized to speak and to act; they also define knowledgeable practices by these subjects, which makes certain practices legitimate and others not. Discourses also produce publics or audiences for these actors; in this way, social space comes to be organized and controlled. This works to restrict experts to certain groups and to endorse a certain meaning of the way things should be done, excluding others.[51] Third, discourse analysis directs us toward studying dominating or hegemonic discourses and the way they are connected to the implementation and legitimation of certain practices. But more fundamentally, discourse produces what we have come to understand in the world as "common sense." Discourse analysis can also help us understand how such language works and when the predominant forms of knowledge embodied in such discourses are

unstable; this allows the study of subjugated knowledge or alternative discourses that have been silenced in the process.[52] Focusing on subjugated knowledges may involve an examination of how they work to create conditions for resistance to a dominating discourse.

Milliken claims that investigation of subjugated knowledge has the potential to show how the world could be interpreted differently; she claims that, since it requires fieldwork, often in non-Western-language environments, it is not a method that has been much used in IR. Nevertheless, some of the ethnographic work of IR feminists that brings marginal voices to light (see above) and the kinds of challenges that feminists are mounting to dominant discourses in development studies (discussed in chapter 3) demonstrate that this type of research is being done by feminists.

Not only have feminists investigated subjugated knowledges built out of the lives of ordinary people's everyday experiences, they have also examined dominant discourses, noting how frequently their legitimacy is created and sustained through types of hegemonic masculinity (see chapter 1). Carol Cohn has described her analysis of strategic discourse (discussed in chapter 2) as being transdisciplinary, using a methodology that combines textual cultural analysis and grounded methods of qualitative sociology and ethnographic anthropology. Echoing Charlesworth's metaphor of an archaeological dig, Cohn talks of her methodology as the juxtaposition and layering of many different windows. Her fieldwork with national-security elites allowed her to "follow gender as metaphor and meaning system through the multisited terrain of national security."[53] As a participant observer of national-security elites, Cohn was "studying up" rather than "studying down," or doing anthropological research about those who shape our attitudes and control institutional structures.[54]

Motivated by her claim that the power of language and professional discourse shapes how and what people think, Cohn also used textual analysis of U.S. Department of Defense official reports, military documents, and media accounts to investigate how national-security practices are "shaped, limited and distorted" by gender.[55] In these analyses, she asks how gender affects national-security paradigms, policies, and practices. Assuming that reality is a social construction available to us through language, Cohn has described her research in terms that she compares to Barbara McClintock's—learning, listening, and finding out what is there without imposing preconditions about subjects and issues. For this reason, she also rejects the idea of proving a point or testing a hypothesis.

Cohn acknowledges that the questioner's identity will shape the questions

as well as the answers respondents would be likely to give; she refers to her own shifting identities, from the time of her earlier work when she was a young woman in a male world of defense intellectuals, where her questions were heard as naive, to the time of her later research, when her identity had changed. Moving into the category of feminist college professor did not have a positive effect in terms of talking to the military; there was heightened sensitivity around gender issues and increased hostility to the term *feminist*.

Is There a Future for Feminism in IR?

"Studying up" takes feminists like Cohn into the world of national security and "high politics," where, frequently, the voices of women or the questions that feminists ask have not been regarded as legitimate. As I have shown, the same could be said about some of the questions feminists have asked of the discipline of international relations. In the late 1980s, when feminists began to bring their concerns to a discipline unaccustomed to thinking that gender had anything to do with international politics, their critiques and research agendas seemed out of place, given conventional disciplinary boundaries. Frequently, the feminists' own training did not adequately prepare them for investigating the kinds of issues with which they were concerned. In order to undertake their research, IR feminists have had to continue, supplement, or overturn their graduate, professional disciplinary education as they seek new methodolgies better able to investigate the kinds of questions they are attempting to answer.

IR feminists will continue to challenge disciplinary boundaries and methods that, they believe, impose limitations on the kinds of questions that can be asked and the ways in which they can be answered. For this reason, their work often seems disconnected from a discipline, centered in political science, that can appear as inhospitable terrain for gender analysis. A world of states situated in an anarchical international system leaves little room for analyses of social relations, including gender relations. Consequently, as this chapter has shown, feminists have gone outside political science and drawn upon methods, such as ethnography and discourse analysis, more prevalent in sociology and anthropology. Coming out of a long tradition of cross-disciplinary feminist theory, IR feminists are, therefore, building transdisciplinary knowledge rather than knowledge based in political science; they are beginning to establish their own research agendas, albeit using different

methodologies to do so. Listening to voices not previously recognized in the discipline has allowed IR feminists to see different worlds, ask new questions, and begin to build the kind of practical knowledge necessary to construct more democratic theories and practices.

However, these transdisciplinary excursions and methodological innovations have consequences. Power differences between conventional and critical approaches that often play out by drawing disciplinary boundaries around subject matter and methods will continue to render judgment of feminist approaches as less than adequate, and frustration with strategies of cooptation or attempted exclusion will persist. Nevertheless, as they set out on their own journeys through world politics, I believe that it is important that IR feminists stay connected to the IR discipline, particularly at a time when other critical voices are raising similar challenges. Critical questioning of the founding assumptions of IR and the investigation of issues such as human security, human rights, democratic participation, and economic justice are crucial if IR is to contribute to building a more peaceful and just world, a goal that has motivated the discipline since its founding.

Notes

Citations in the notes appear in abbreviated form. Please refer to the bibliography for details of the works cited.

Introduction

1. This is not to say that gender is not relevant to political/strategic issues. Feminist critiques of political realism, the state, and the discourse of national security are important issues for gender analysis. See Tickner, *Gender in International Relations*; Peterson, *Gendered States*; and Cohn, "Sex and Death."
2. For some examples, see Goldstein, *International Relations*; Art and Jervis, *International Politics*; Smith, Booth, and Zalewski, *International Theory*.
3. Booth, "Dare Not to Know," p. 336.
4. I am using the term *conventional* to define both subject matter and methodology. Conventional IR is generally concerned with the behavior of states in an anarchical international system. Methodologically, it is committed to empiricism and data-based methods of testing. Many of the scholars within this approach are from the United States. I use this definition throughout.
5. I am using the term *rationalistic* as defined by Robert O. Keohane in his article "International Institutions: Two Approaches." Keohane claims that rationalistic theory draws on Herbert Simon's conception of "substantive" rationality, meaning behavior that can be adjudged objectively to be optimally adapted to a situation. He contrasts this type of theory with what he calls "reflective" theory, which stresses the impact of culture, norms, and values that are not derived from calculation of interests. Most feminist theorists would probably consider themselves reflectivists, in the sense in which Keohane uses the term.

6. Lapid, "Third Debate," p. 236.
7. Holsti, "International Relations at the End of the Millennium."
8. Given their shared assumptions and methodologies, one of the major differences between these two schools is how much cooperation can be expected between states, given the assumption of anarchy. See Baldwin, *Neorealism and Neoliberalism*.
9. For some exceptions to the lack-of-engagement claim, see Keohane, "International Relations: Contributions of a Feminist Standpoint," Jones, "Does 'Gender' Make the World Go Round?" and Keohane, "Beyond Dichotomy."
10. For an elaboration of this point, see Tickner, "You Just Don't Understand," p. 612.
11. I am using the term *masculinity* in the social-constructivist sense. It refers to an idealized masculinity that is not characteristic of all men and that may also fit certain women. This is defined and discussed further in chapter 1.
12. See Baldwin, *Neorealism and Neoliberalism*.
13. For a discussion of the differences between these epistemological positions, see Hollis and Smith, *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*.
14. I am using the term *critical* broadly to define all postpositivist approaches; a variety of these approaches is discussed in chapter 1. These critical approaches have received somewhat more attention from conventional IR than has feminism.
15. Moon, *Sex among Allies*.
16. Enloe, *Morning After*.
17. See, for example, Fukuyama, "Women and the Evolution of World Politics."

1. Troubled Encounters: Feminism Meets IR

1. Parts of this chapter rely on Tickner, "You Just Don't Understand."
2. Rosenberg, "International Imagination," p. 103.
3. Lapid, "Third Debate."
4. Walker, "History and Structure," p. 166.
5. Here I use the term *IR feminists* to define a group of scholars who have critiqued and engaged with the discipline of international relations from a variety of feminist perspectives. I use the term *IR* in the disciplinary sense and, therefore, do not include all feminists who have written about international issues and global politics, although their work will be discussed in later chapters. As discussed below, it is important to emphasize that gender is not just about women but also about men and masculinity.
6. Many feminists, particularly in the 1960s and 1970s, have used the term *oppression*, rather than *subordination*. As I will discuss later, *oppression* is problematic because it denies agency and difference.

7. Okin, "Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?" p. 10.
8. My outline of these feminist approaches relies primarily on Tong, *Feminist Thought*, and Jaggar, *Feminist Politics and Human Nature*. For an outline of these approaches and how they relate to feminist IR, see Zalewski, "Feminist Theory and International Relations."
9. The term *standpoint* comes from the Marxist notion of a privileged political and epistemological standpoint. Standpoint feminism has been defined as a vision produced by the political conditions and distinctive work of women. For an important early definition of standpoint feminism, see Hartsock, *Money, Sex, and Power*. Given feminist concerns with difference, the question of a single feminist standpoint has been much debated, as I indicate below.
10. Tong, *Feminist Thought*, p. 1.
11. For a review of the work of early feminists and women political activists, see Pateman, "Conclusion: Women's Writing, Women's Standing."
12. Jaggar, *Feminist Politics and Human Nature*, p. 355.
13. I use *oppression* here because it was the term used by radical feminism. I will use it subsequently when it is the term used by the scholars to whom I am referring.
14. Jaggar, *Feminist Politics and Human Nature*, p. 365.
15. Ruddick, *Maternal Thinking*, chapters 1 and 9.
16. Gilligan, *In a Different Voice*, chapter 1.
17. Harding, *Science Question*, pp. 17–18.
18. See Connell, *Masculinities*, p. 70.
19. Hooper, "Masculinities in Transition," pp. 61–62. Hooper analyzes the *Economist*, the U.K. journal, to demonstrate how various hegemonic masculinities play out. For an extended discussion of masculinity and how it relates to IR, see Hooper, "Masculinist Practices and Gender Politics."
20. Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," p. 1069.
21. Flax, "Postmodernism and Gender Relations," p. 638.
22. This is particularly salient for feminist perspectives on IR. IR feminists have recently begun to explore masculinity more fully. See, for example, Zalewski and Parpart, *The "Man" Question*.
23. Braidotti et al. *Women, the Environment, and Sustainable Development*, p. 37.
24. For further elaboration of the problems of accepting a notion of gender equality and its implications for IR, see Brown, "Feminism, International Theory, and International Relations," p. 470.
25. Peterson, "Whose Crisis?" p. 193.
26. Jaggar, *Feminist Politics and Human Nature*, p. 382.
27. Hartsock, *Money, Sex, and Power*, pp. 231–46.
28. Harding, *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?*, pp. 231–46.
29. Ibid., pp. 142 and 149.

30. Heckman, "Truth and Method," p. 48. This issue of *Signs* (vol. 22, no. 2, 1997) contains a broader discussion of the merits of standpoint theory.
31. Yuval-Davis, *Gender and Nation*, p. 7.
32. Barrett and Phillips, introduction to *Destabilizing Theory*.
33. Collins, "The Social Construction of Black Feminist Thought," p. 747.
34. Mohanty, introduction to *Third World Women*.
35. Brah, "Questions of Difference," p. 168.
36. For further discussion of standpoint as a bridge between Anglo-American feminist theories and postmodernism, see Grant, *Fundamental Feminisms*.
37. Barrett, "Words and Things."
38. Zalewski, "Feminist Theory Meets IR Theory," p. 16.
39. Barrett, "Words and Things," p. 204.
40. Walby, "Post-Post Modernism?" p. 48.
41. Zalewski, "Feminist Theory Meets IR Theory," p. 16.
42. Parpart and Marchand, "Exploding the Canon," p. 6. This volume is particularly useful on IR feminism and its engagement with postmodernism. Parpart and Marchand outline ways in which feminist postmodernism can be useful for the literature on women and development. Their book aims, through a debate among its contributors, to "encourage the development of a more politicized and accessible version of postmodern feminist thought" that can address the problems of women in a complex world. (ibid., p. 20).
43. Nzomo, "Women and Democratization Struggles in Africa," p. 134.
44. Prügl and Meyer, "Gender Politics in Global Governance," pp. 5–6. See also Zalewski, "Where Is Woman in International Relations?"
45. Klein, "Passion and Politics," pp. 75–89.
46. Braidotti, *Women, the Environment, and Sustainable Development*, p. 61.
47. See, for example, McGlen and Sarkees, *Women in Foreign Policy*, and Stiehm, *It's Our Military Too!*
48. Brown, "Feminism, International Theory, and International Relations," p. 461.
49. For a comprehensive discussion of this issue, see various chapters in Zalewski and Parpart, *The "Man" Question*.
50. The debates I outline are largely Anglo-American. Those who are more reflective on the state of the discipline tend to be outside the United States and outside conventional approaches.
51. I use *so-called* in the definition because it was realists who gave this name to idealists. This has had the effect of disempowering idealists' political agenda. Misrepresentation of the views of scholars of the interwar period is now widely recognized. See Schmidt, *Political Discourse of Anarchy*, and Osiander, "Rereading Early Twentieth-Century IR Theory."
52. Schmidt, *Political Discourse of Anarchy*, pp. 29 and 191.
53. Morgenthau. *Politics among Nations*. For a feminist critique of Morgenthau, see Tickner, "Hans Morgenthau's Principles of Political Realism."

54. Lakatos and Musgrave, *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*.
55. Hollis and Smith, *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*, p. 40.
56. Ibid., p. 3.
57. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, p. 6.
58. Smith, "New Approaches to International Theory," p. 168. Not all IR theorists who associate themselves with the scientific tradition would agree with all parts of this definition. Few social scientists believe that their work is value-free or that universally valid generalizations are possible; nevertheless, they would probably agree that these are useful standards to which to aspire. Most would believe, however, that systematic social scientific research is possible and desirable and that methodologies borrowed from the natural sciences can be useful, although some have recognized the problems of applying natural-science methods to the social sciences.
59. See, for example, Keohane and Nye, *Power and Interdependence*.
60. See, for example, Galtung, *True Worlds*.
61. For an overview of the debates from which my discussion is drawn, see Waever, "Rise and Fall." Waever calls the interparadigm debate of the 1970s "the third debate" (which he defines as an informative metaphor for the history of the discipline in the 1970s and early 1980s). What I am calling the third debate, he terms "the fourth," and he claims that we are actually leaving the fourth (ibid., p. 174).
62. Ibid., p. 162.
63. Ibid. For further elaboration of this debate, see Baldwin, *Neorealism and Neoliberalism*.
64. Keohane, "International Institutions: Two Approaches." For a dissenting neorealist view, see Grieco, "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation."
65. Kegley, *Controversies*, p. 1. It is interesting to note that Kegley places IR feminist work in the idealist tradition, a label many feminists would disavow.
66. Mansbach, "Neo-This and Neo-That," p. 91. See also Peterson, "Transgressing Boundaries," p. 186.
67. Halliday, "Future of International Relations," p. 319.
68. Lapid, "Third Debate." For more discussion of this debate, see other articles in the same issue: *International Studies Quarterly* 33, no. 3 (September 1989). The view of a discipline in disarray is attributed to Holsti *Dividing Discipline*, p. 1.
69. Smith, "Self-Images of a Discipline," pp. 24–26.
70. These terms are used by Smith, "Self-Images of a Discipline," and Keohane, "International Institutions: Two Approaches," respectively.
71. Keohane, "International Institutions: Two Approaches," p. 381.
72. This view is attributed to Steve Smith in "New Approaches to International

Theory," p. 184. Smith suggests that social constructivism may be the only approach capable of bridging this divide. Social-constructivists talk about the same issues as rationalists but are concerned with the meanings that actors give to their actions. This view is reflected in the title of an article by a social-constructivist, Emanuel Adler, "Seizing the Middle Ground." According to Adler, constructivism seizes the middle ground because it is interested in understanding how the material, subjective and intersubjective, worlds interact in the social construction of reality.

73. It is notable that most of the citations to epistemological debates are to non-U.S. scholars. There is somewhat more genuine debate in Europe, as reflected in the greater methodological pluralism of European journals. For further discussion of this debate, see Peterson, "Transgressing Boundaries," p. 185.
74. Sylvester, "Some Dangers."
75. Brown, "Feminism, International Theory, and International Relations," p. 469.
76. Whitworth, "Gender in the Inter-Paradigm Debate," p. 267. Whitworth does suggest that, since historical/classical realism recognizes that concepts, such as the national interest, are given meaning in their historical context, classical realism, as opposed to neorealism, could, in principle, be amenable to gender theory.
77. Enloe, "Margins, Silences, and Bottom Rungs," pp. 186–88.
78. Smith, "New Approaches to International Theory," p. 172. For example, Fred Halliday, while applauding the merits of historical sociology and feminism for the study of international politics, claims that there is little of value in post-modernism that he sees as a discredit to the discipline. Halliday, "Future of International Relations," p. 320.
79. Zalewski, "Feminist Theory and International Relations," p. 138.
80. For an example, see Beitz et al., *International Ethics*.
81. Falk, *Promise of World Order*.
82. Held, *Democracy and the Global Order*.
83. Brown, *International Relations Theory*.
84. Benhabib, "Generalized and Concrete Other," p. 81.
85. Benhabib, "Cultural Complexity," p. 250.
86. Many of the writers in this tradition are sociologists, rather than political scientists. Steve Smith suggests that historical sociology is now working with an empiricist methodology so he questions whether it is post-positivist. See Smith, "Positivism and Beyond," p. 35.
87. Tickner, *Gender in International Relations*, chapter 2.
88. Runyan and Peterson, "Radical Future," p. 87.
89. Peterson, "Security and Sovereign States," p. 33.
90. Linklater, "Problem of Community."
91. Cox, "Social Forces, States, and World Orders," pp. 242–43.

92. Harding, *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?*, pp. 142 and 149.
93. Cox, "Social Forces, States, and World Orders," p. 208. Richard Devetak claims that Cox's distinction between critical and problem-solving theories was a direct response to Waltz's *Theory of International Politics*. This outline of critical and postmodern theories draws from Devetak, "Postmodernism," and Devetak, "Critical Theory."
94. Cox, "Social Forces, States, and World Orders," pp. 210.
95. Peterson, "Security and Sovereign States," p. 57.
96. Brown, "Critical Theory and Postmodernism in International Relations."
97. Sylvester, *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era*, p. 12.
98. Devetak, "Postmodernism," p. 181.
99. Keller, *Reflections*, p. 89.
100. Peterson, "Transgressing Boundaries," p. 202.
101. Walker, "Gender and Critique," p. 185.
102. Runyan and Peterson, "Radical Future," p. 71.
103. Grant, "Sources of Gender Bias," p. 10, and Tickner, *Gender in International Relations*, pp. 45–46.
104. Ashley, "Powers of Anarchy."
105. True, "Feminism," p. 236.
106. Grant, "Sources of Gender Bias," p. 21.
107. Peterson, "Transgressing Boundaries," p. 189.

2. *Gendered Dimensions of War, Peace, and Security*

1. For an elaborated version of some of the issues raised in this chapter, see Tickner, "Re-visioning Security," Tickner, "Identity in International Relations Theory," and Tickner, "You Just Don't Understand."
2. Defense Manpower Data Center, "Distribution of Active Duty Forces."
3. There are relatively few women in conventional security studies, but it is interesting how many critical-security scholars are women, even though they are not using feminist approaches.
4. For examples of realist thinking, see Morgenthau, *Politics among Nations*, and Carr, *Twenty Years' Crisis*. For an important early neorealist analysis, see Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*. For an alternative history of the discipline that questions standard interpretations of the realist/idealist debate, see Schmidt, *Political Discourse of Anarchy*.
5. For differences between neorealists and neoliberals, see Grieco, "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation."
6. Grieco, "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation," p. 119.

7. Smoke, "National Security Affairs," p. 250.
8. Waltz, *Man, the State, and War*. Waltz uses as illustration Rousseau's story of a staghunt, where hunters set out to catch a stag cooperatively. When one hunter defects from the common enterprise to trap a hare, the stag escapes. pp. 167–69. Given an anarchical international system, neorealists believe the possibility of defection on the part of states to be high.
9. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, p. 82.
10. Walt, "Renaissance," p. 212.
11. Waltz, "Emerging Structure," p. 44. For a fuller elaboration of Waltz's views on the stability of bipolarity, see Waltz, "Stability of a Bipolar World."
12. Walt, "Renaissance," p. 221.
13. For a debate on this issue, see Forsberg, "Toward the End of War," and replies by a variety of scholars and policymakers in the same issue of *Boston Review*.
14. Mearsheimer, "Back to the Future."
15. Waltz, "Emerging Structure." The use of the word *normal*, with its association with weapons buildup and power projection, is interesting.
16. Kolodziej, "Renaissance in Security Studies?"
17. I am defining the South as that part of the world also called the Third World, a region that is now characterized by huge political, economic, and cultural diversity, but much of which shared a recent colonial experience and tended to be neutral during the East/West division of the Cold War. The term *Third World* is controversial; it has frequently been replaced by the term *South* to avoid its association with underdevelopment and inferiority as well as the ambiguity caused by the disappearance of the category *Second World*, which was used to describe the bloc of states associated with the former Soviet Union. Legacies of the colonial experience have had significant consequences for current security issues.
18. Mohammad Ayoob, "Security Problematic."
19. Ball, *Security and Economy in the Third World*, p. 40.
20. Jackson and Rosberg, "Why Africa's Weak States Persist."
21. Van Evera, "Hypotheses," p. 6.
22. See Russett, *Grasping the Democratic Peace*, and Singer and Wildavsky, *Real World Order*. For a view of the world in terms of potentially threatening civilizational clashes, see Huntington, *Clash of Civilizations*.
23. Schmidt, *Political Discourse of Anarchy*, p. 125.
24. Ullman, "Redefining Security," and Mathews, "Redefining Security."
25. See Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, *Common Security*, and World Commission on Environment and Development, *Our Common Future*.
26. Galtung, "Structural Theory of Imperialism."
27. Thomas, *In Search of Security*.

28. Walt, "Renaissance," p. 213.
29. Lipschutz, *On Security*.
30. Waever, "Securitization and De-securitization," p. 47. See also Walker, "Security, Sovereignty, and Challenge," and Deudney, "Case against Linking."
31. Dalby, "Security, Modernity, Ecology," p. 120.
32. Booth, "Security and Self," p. 111.
33. Kolodziej, "Renaissance in Security Studies?" p. 429.
34. Krause and Williams, "From Strategy to Security," pp. 36–37.
35. Ibid., pp. 39–41.
36. Jepperson, Wendt, and Katzenstein, "Norms, Identity, and Culture," p. 64.
37. Wendt, "Anarchy Is What States Make of It," p. 395.
38. Ibid., p. 396–97.
39. Dalby, "Security, Modernity, Ecology," p. 107.
40. Booth, "Security and Self," pp. 106–7.
41. Krause and Williams, "From Strategy to Security," pp. 44–45.
42. Booth, "Security and Self," p. 110.
43. Ibid., p. 105.
44. Walker, "Security, Sovereignty, and Challenge," p. 5.
45. Ibid., p. 24.
46. United Nations, *Human Development Report*, 1995, p. 45.
47. Quoted in Pettman, *Worlding Women*, p. 89.
48. UNHCR, *UNHCR by Numbers*, table 2.
49. Baines, "Gender Construction and the Protection Mandate," p. 249.
50. Royte, "Outcasts."
51. Bennett, Bexley, and Warnock, *Arms to Fight, Arms to Protect*, p. 94.
52. Pettman, *Worlding Women*, p. 101.
53. Enloe, *Morning After*, pp. 119–20.
54. Moon, *Sex among Allies*.
55. Haraway, *Primate Visions*, p. 4.
56. Grant, "Sources of Gender Bias," pp. 9–17. For a description of Rousseau's staghunt and how it has been used in IR theory, see note 8, above.
57. For further elaboration on this issue, see Tickner, *Gender in International Relations*, p. 82.
58. Carol Cohn asks these questions in "Wars, Wimps, and Women."
59. Milliken and Sylvan, "Soft Bodies, Hard Targets."
60. Obviously, certain women are achieving success in foreign-policymaking positions—as demonstrated by Madeleine Albright's rise to the position of U.S. secretary of state in 1997; nevertheless, the necessity to speak with a masculine voice in order to be taken seriously remains.
61. May, *Homeward Bound*, chapter 2.
62. Niva, "Tough and Tender." For elaboration on the issues of stereotyping Middle

Eastern women and contrasting them with Western "liberated" women, see Sharoni, "Gender and Middle East Politics."

63. Shiva, *Staying Alive*, p. 19.
64. Yuval-Davis, *Gender and Nation*, p. 46.
65. Peterson, "Politics of Identity and Gendered Nationalism."
66. Elshtain, *Women and War*, p. 166.
67. Jeffords, "Telling the War Story," p. 230.
68. Segal, *Is the Future Female?* p. 187.
69. Ruddick, "Toward a Feminist Peace Politics," p. 112.
70. For a discussion of military nursing, see Enloe, *Maneuvers*, chapter 6.
71. Rayner, "Warrior Besieged," p. 27.
72. Moore, "From Underrepresentation to Overrepresentation," p. 123. While African American women comprise 12 percent of the total female population in the United States, they comprise 30 percent of women in the armed forces, a percentage that held steady from 1988. Ibid., p. 129.
73. Swerdlow, "Motherhood and Subversion," p. 8.
74. Kirk, "Our Greenham Common." p. 117.
75. Enloe, *Maneuvers*, pp. 257-59.
76. Reardon, *Sexism and the War System*.
77. Ruddick, *Maternal Thinking*, chapters 4 and 5.
78. Segal, *Is the Future Female?* p. 168. See chapter 5 for a critique of maternal thinking. For an overview of women and peace movements and a critique of this association of women with peace, see Pettman, *Worlding Women*, chapter 6.
79. Fukuyama, "Women and the Evolution of World Politics."
80. For an elaboration on this critique of Fukuyama, see Tickner, "Why Women Can't Run the World."
81. hooks, "Feminism and Militarism," pp. 58–64; quote at p. 60.
82. Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases*, p. 3
83. Gallagher, "The Gender Gap in Popular Attitudes," p. 29. In December 1990, men were evenly divided (48 percent for and 48 percent against) on attacking Iraqi forces. Of women, 73 percent were opposed and 22 percent in support. Ibid.
84. Tessler and Warriner, "Gender, Feminism, and Attitudes," p. 275.
85. Burguieres, "Feminist Approaches to Peace."
86. Addams, Balch, and Hamilton, *Women at The Hague*.
87. Washburn, "Women and the Peace Movement," p. 140.
88. For examples, see Peterson and Runyan, *Global Gender Issues*; Sharoni, "Gender and Middle East Politics;" Tickner, *Gender in International Relations* and; Pettman, *Worlding Women*, p. 105.
89. Sylvester, *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era*, p. 183.

90. Tobias, "Shifting Heroisms," p. 164.
91. Sharoni, "Gender and Middle East Politics," p. 65.
92. The issue of family violence is a global one. In the United States, ten women are killed by batterers every day, 74 percent of them after they have left the relationship or sought a divorce or restraining order against the batterer. Seager, *The State of Women*, p. 26. In the United States in 1998, women were victims in 876,340 violent crimes committed by an intimate partner. Women were victims at a rate about five times that of males. Rennison and Welchans, *Intimate Partner Violence*, p. 2.

3. *Gender in the Global Economy*

1. Whitworth, "Gender in the Inter-Paradigm Debate."
2. Portions of this chapter rely on Tickner, "Feminist Perspectives on Globalization."
3. Williams, "Rethinking Sovereignty," pp. 117–18. Williams's definition of globalization relies on Robertson, *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*, and Giddens, *Consequences of Modernity*.
4. For an overview of these three paradigms, or "models," as he calls them, see Gilpin, *Political Economy of International Relations*, chapter 2.
5. Keohane and Nye, *Power and Interdependence*. For an elaboration of this overview of the development of IPE, see Biersteker, "Evolving Perspectives."
6. Krasner, "Structural Causes and Regime Consequences."
7. A notable exception is Krasner, a realist IPE scholar who has focused on North/South relations. See, for example, Krasner, *Structural Conflict*.
8. See, for examples, Arghiri, *Unequal Exchange*, and Frank, *Latin America*.
9. There is, however, a thriving neo-Gramscian school of critical theorists, such as Robert Cox and Stephen Gill, working within a materialist framework influenced by Marxist approaches. Although this approach is much cited in Canada and the United Kingdom, it has received only marginal recognition in conventional U.S. IPE. For further discussion of the issue of recognition, see Sinclair, "Beyond International Relations Theory."
10. For an outline of the major issues in the contemporary neo/neo debate, see Baldwin, *Neorealism and Neoliberalism* (esp. Baldwin's chapter 1, "Neoliberalism, Neorealism, and World Politics"), and Grieco, "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation" (reprinted, ibid.). Baldwin applauds the constructive conversation that the compatibility of these two approaches allows.
11. Denemark and O'Brien, "Contesting the Canon."
12. Long, "The Harvard School of Liberal International Theory," p. 504.
13. Fukuyama, "End of History?" Fukuyama notes also that most of the South still

remains "mired in history" and thus can expect to experience conflict for many years to come. Reinforcing the growing North/South division in IR, Fukuyama sees a division of the world between a part that is "historical" and a part that is "posthistorical," with conflict in the former and between the former and the latter.

14. Kothari, "Yawning Vacuum," p. 120.
15. Richardson, "Contending Liberalisms," p. 18. Richardson's liberalism of privilege is often referred to as neoliberalism. I am using Richardson's term to distinguish it from the conventional IPE (and IR more generally) neoliberal approach, just described, that starts from rather different assumptions. Neoliberals of the second type are sometimes referred to as neoinstitutionalists: they focus on international institutions and their potential for ameliorating the negative effects of anarchy. I have titled the section "Resurgent Liberalism" to emphasize its nineteenth-century roots, which can be found in the laissez-faire policies first espoused in Britain during its period of hegemony. This type of liberalism differs from what I am calling neoliberalism in that it is not state-centric and it maintains a stronger belief in the benign outcomes of market competition and the possibilities of cooperation.
16. This position is outlined in Hurrell and Woods, "Globalisation and Inequality," pp. 451–52.
17. Ohmae, *Borderless World*, p. xi.
18. Scholte, "Beyond the Buzzword," p. 53.
19. United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report*, 1996, p. 2.
20. United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report*, 1999, p. 40.
21. Youngs, "Dangers of Discourse," pp. 65–66.
22. Suggesting that the term is not new and that it has many meanings, Keohane and Nye prefer to use *globalism*, which they define as a state of the world involving networks of interdependence at multicontinental distances. Keohane and Nye "Globalization," p. 105.
23. Marchand and Runyan, "Feminist Sightings," p. 7.
24. Scholte, "Towards a Critical Theory of Globalization," p. 45.
25. See, for example, Cox, *Approaches to World Order*.
26. Ibid., p. 111.
27. Cox, "Global Restructuring."
28. Ruggie, "At Home Abroad, Abroad at Home," p. 523.
29. Cox, "Global Restructuring," p. 48.
30. Mittelman, "Dynamics of Globalization," p. 7.
31. Marchand and Runyan, "Feminist Sightings," p. 15.
32. Kapstein, "Workers and the World Economy," pp. 18–21.

33. Lipschutz, "Great Transformation Revisited," pp. 301 and 304.
34. Cox, *Approaches to World Order*, pp. 111–12.
35. Hurrell and Woods, "Globalisation and Inequality," p. 456.
36. Sassen, "Spatial Organization of Information Industries."
37. Panitch, "Rethinking the Role of the State," p. 85.
38. Gill, "Globalisation, Market Civilisation, and Disciplinary Neoliberalism," p. 399.
39. Kothari, "Yawning Vacuum," pp. 123–26.
40. This emancipatory goal is consistent with Cox's definition of critical theory outlined in chapter 1.
41. Gill, "Globalisation, Market Civilisation, and Disciplinary Neoliberalism," pp. 419–20.
42. Richardson, "Contending Liberalisms," p. 25.
43. Mittelman, "Dynamics of Globalization," p. 4, and Gill, "Globalisation, Market Civilisation, and Disciplinary Neoliberalism," p. 408.
44. For data that support this claim through an examination of IPE courses taught in the United States and the United Kingdom, see Denemark and O'Brien, "Contesting the Canon."
45. United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report*, 1995, p. 36. The fact that the United Nations has begun to disaggregate its data by sex has made it easier to undertake research about women. Although the 1995 report is not the most recent, I draw on it because its focus was specifically on women and gender issues and thus it has more relevant data.
46. Ibid., pp. 4 and 38–39.
47. Marchand, "Reconceptualising 'Gender and Development,' " p. 585.
48. Marchand, "Selling NAFTA," p. 257.
49. Mohanty, introduction to *Third World Women*, p. 11. For further discussion of postcolonial feminism, see various chapters in Marchand and Parpart, *Feminism/Postmodernism/Development*.
50. Krause, "Gender Inequalities and Feminist Politics," p. 235.
51. Braidotti et al., *Women, the Environment, and Sustainable Development*, p. 37.
52. Peterson, "The Politics of Identification in the Context of Globalization," p. 10.
53. Wallerstein, "Inter-State Structure," p. 97.
54. Chang and Ling, "Globalization and Its Intimate Other," p. 27. For further discussion of these two forms of globalization, see Wilkin, "Human Security and Class."
55. Pettman, "International Political Economy of Sex?" pp. 193 ff.
56. See, for example, Elaine Tyler May's analysis of the reestablishment of traditional gender roles in the United States in the 1950s, discussed in chapter 2. Part of the reason for an ideology that supported the return of women to the

household at this particular time was the need for jobs for men returning from World War II.

57. For further elaboration of the origins of the gendered division of labor, see Mies, *Patriarchy and Accumulation*, chapter 2.
58. Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases*, p. 174.
59. Holcomb and Rothenberg, "Women's Work." In one town in Mexico in the late 1970s, one-third of women employed in garment manufactures were heads of households: Safa, "Runaway Shops and Female Employment," p. 66. Holcomb and Rothenberg (p. 55) note, however, that statistics on the number of female-headed households in the world are notoriously unreliable. For an analysis that disputes the assumption that women-headed households are necessarily poor, see Jackson, "Rescuing Gender from the Poverty Trap," p. 44.
60. Evidence suggests that this percentage may be declining as automation increases and women are replaced by more technically skilled males. Runyan, "The Places of Women in Trading Places," p. 240.
61. Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases*, p. 162. This argument also pertains to the issue of child labor, an important phenomenon in today's global markets. For example, it has been estimated that one million children, 90 percent of whom are bonded laborers and some of whom are only five years old, work in the carpet industry of South Asia. Broad and Cavanagh, "Checking It Once, Checking It Twice," *Washington Post*, December 8, 1997, p. C1.
62. Harrison, "Women in Jamaica's Urban Informal Economy," p. 174.
63. Lim, "Women's Work in Export Factories," pp. 109–11. For a critical response to Lim's claims, see Pearson, " 'Nimble Fingers' Revisited."
64. That women (and men) in the global workforce are still being seriously exploited is undeniable, however. The *New York Times* (March 28 and 31, 1997) reported that, in Vietnam, in 1997, more than 90 percent of Nike workers were girls or young women aged fifteen to twenty-eight: their wages were below the cost of three small meals per day. All workers interviewed reported physical complaints and hunger; at one factory, women were punished by being forced to run around the factory in the hot sun because they had not worn regulation shoes to work.
65. True, "Gendering Post-socialist Transitions," p. 76.
66. Gordon, *Transforming Capitalism*.
67. Pearson, " 'Nimble Fingers' Revisited," pp. 171–76.
68. Prügl, "What Is a Worker?" See also Prügl, *Global Construction of Gender*.
69. Prügl, *Global Construction of Gender*, pp. 187 and 204.
70. Holcomb and Rothenberg, "Women's Work," p. 53.
71. Pettman, "International Political Economy of Sex?" p. 195.
72. Chin, *In Service and Servitude*.
73. Mies, *Patriarchy and Accumulation*, p. 115.

74. Harrison, "Women in Jamaica's Urban Informal Economy," p. 177.
75. Holcomb and Rothenberg, "Women's Work," p. 65.
76. For example, in Jamaica under structural adjustment, social-services expenditures fell 44 percent in real terms between 1981–83 and 1985–86. Elson, "Structural Adjustment," p. 47.
77. Ibid., p. 44.
78. Scott, *Gender and Development*, p. 80.
79. I use *Third World* here because I am referring to the work of postcolonial feminists who continue to use the term, although with a somewhat different meaning, as I indicate. While cautioning against subsuming the very diverse histories and struggles of women of color under one label, Mohanty and other postcolonial feminists use the term to introduce transnational issues of race and class into feminist analysis and to dissolve boundaries between North and South. See Mohanty, "Under Western Eyes."
80. Ibid., p. 55.
81. Gordon, *Transforming Capitalism*, p. 77.
82. Scott, *Gender and Development*. p. 5.
83. Gordon, *Transforming Capitalism*, pp. 82 and 137. See also Braidotti et al., *Women, the Environment, and Sustainable Development*, p. 78.
84. Beneria and Sen, "Accumulation, Reproduction, and Women's Role."
85. For elaboration on these approaches, see Moser, "Gender Planning in the Third World."
86. For critical perspectives on the WID literature, see various chapters in Marchand and Parpart, *Feminism/Postmodernism/Development*; Marchand, "Reconceptualizing 'Gender and Development'"; and Pettman, *Worlding Women*, chapter 8.
87. Goetz, "Feminism and the Claim to Know," p. 138.
88. Rathgeber, "Gender and Development in Action," p. 207.
89. Baden and Goetz, "Who Needs [Sex] When You Can Have [Gender]?" p. 25.
90. Parpart, "Deconstructing the Development 'Expert,' " p. 222.
91. Braidotti et al., *Women, the Environment, and Sustainable Development*, pp. 116–17. The original report of the DAWN group was published as Sen and Grown, *Development, Crises, and Alternative Visions: Third World Women's Perspectives*.
92. Marchand, "Reconceptualising 'Gender and Development,' " p. 115.
93. Braidotti et al., *Women, the Environment, and Sustainable Development*, p. 146.
94. Ibid., chapter 3.
95. Parpart and Marchand, "Exploding the Canon," p. 17.
96. Udayagiri, "Challenging Modernization," p. 162.
97. Braidotti et al., *Women, the Environment, and Sustainable Development*, pp. 120–21.

4. Democratization, the State, and the Global Order: Gendered Perspectives

1. Huntington, *Third Wave*.
2. Huntington, *Clash of Civilizations*, p. 193.
3. See Richardson, "Contending Liberalisms," for a historic overview of the tension between "the liberalism of privilege" and "the liberalism of egalitarian democracy."
4. The term *global governance* indicates a move beyond the study of international governmental organizations to include political processes that engage nongovernmental organizations as well as norms and rules that arise out of global practices. See Prügl and Meyer, "Gender Politics in Global Governance," p. 4.
5. Wight, "Why Is There No International Theory?" In this piece, Wight presents a realist worldview. However, it is difficult to place Wight exclusively within any one theoretical tradition.
6. Caporoso, "Across the Great Divide," p. 564. This article, which was a plea for bridging this divide, was based on Caporoso's 1997 presidential address to the International Studies Association. Caporoso uses Waltz's *Theory of International Politics* as an example of the theoretical divide in that Waltz argues for the nonreducible character of systemic IR theory. Attempts to bridge this divide had been made earlier; for a well-known example, see Gourevitch, "Second Image Reversed."
7. Putnam, "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics." For further elaboration on the literature on two-level games, see Caporoso, "Across the Great Divide."
8. Neoliberalism, or neoinstitutionalism, as it is sometimes called, is not to be confused with Richardson's two types of liberalism (see note 15, chapter 3), discussed in chapter 3. As indicated in chapter 1, neoliberalism has moved closer to neorealism and its assumptions about the state and the international system.
9. Falk, *Western State System*, p. 6.
10. Fukuyama, "End of History?" p. 11.
11. Przeworski and Limongi, "Modernization," p. 165. For the earlier iteration of the political modernization approach, see Almond and Powell, *Comparative Politics*.
12. This literature has its roots in the English school, which comes out of the Grotian tradition and is closer to realism than other world-order perspectives. See Bull, *Anarchical Society*, and Linklater, "Rationalism."
13. Linklater, "Citizenship and Sovereignty in the Post-Westphalian State." For further discussion of the rights of individuals under EU law, see also Caporoso's model of "constitutionalization" in Caporoso, "Across the Great Divide."
14. Held, *Democracy and the Global Order*, pp. 101–7.

15. Gill, "Globalisation, Market Civilisation, and Disciplinary Neoliberalism," p. 413.
16. Falk, *Western State System*, p. 1.
17. See Doyle, "Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs," and idem, part 2.
18. See, for example, Fukuyama, "Women and the Evolution of World Politics," pp. 24–40.
19. Russett, *Grasping the Democratic Peace*, p. 12.
20. Ibid., p. 38.
21. Rummell has gone further and argued that democracies are less warlike in their relations with all types of political systems. See Rummell, "Less Warlike."
22. For a social-constructivist interpretation of the democratic peace, which focuses more explicitly on norms and identity, see Risse-Kappen, "Democratic Peace—Warlike Democracies?"
23. Layne, "Kant or Cant."
24. For example, Gowa, "Democratic States and International Disputes."
25. Rengger, "On the Liberal Democratic Peace," p. 15.
26. Held, *Democracy and the Global Order*, p. 229.
27. Held, "Democracy: Past, Present, and Possible Futures," For a later version of some of these arguments, see Held, *Democracy and the Global Order*, esp. chapters 5, 6, and 12.
28. Peterson, "Reframing the Politics of Identity," p. 3.
29. For an example of the liberal argument linking women with the democratic peace, see Fukuyama, "Women and the Evolution of World Politics." For critiques of his position, see Ehrenreich et al., "Fukuyama's Follies," and Tickner, "Why Women Can't Run the World."
30. Waylen, "Women and Democratization."
31. Pateman, *Sexual Contract*, chapter 1.
32. Ibid., p. 11.
33. Ibid., p. 17.
34. Tobias, "Shifting Heroisms," p. 164. The desirability of military service as a qualification for political office has somewhat diminished since the end of the Cold War. The 1992 election to the U.S. presidency of Bill Clinton, despite the knowledge that he was openly against the Vietnam War, would probably not have been possible during the Cold War. It is interesting to note, however, that in 1999, Senator John McCain opened his bid for the Republican presidential nomination by calling for a "new patriotic challenge." McCain emphasized his military service and his father's career in the navy. Mitchell, "With 'Patriotic Challenge' McCain Makes Run Official."
35. For a comparison of democratic transitions in the two regions, see Jaquette and Wolchik, *Women and Democratization*.
36. Waylen, "Women and Democratization," p. 347. In Czechoslovakia in 1990,

women comprised 6 percent of those elected to the statewide legislature; in Bulgaria it was 8 percent, a high proportion of whom were from the Communist Party. See Wolchick, "Women and the Politics of Transition," p. 31. According to the UN's *Human Development Report* for 1999, p. 238, the percentage of women in government in 1996 in the Russian Federation was 2.6 percent. In the Czech Republic it was 10.6 percent; in Poland 9.8 percent; in Hungary 6.9 percent. These figures are not strictly comparable with the Wolchik data since they are for all government positions, and Czechoslovakia split into two parts in 1993.

37. Jaquette and Wolchik, *Women and Democratization*.
38. Einhorn, *Cinderella Goes to Market*, p. 129. Jaqui True, "Gendering Post-Socialist Transitions," p. 83, disputes the claim that there was a mass withdrawal of women from the labor markets of East Europe after 1989.
39. Einhorn, *Cinderella Goes to Market*, chapter 3. Arguments have been made in the Czech parliament that women should be forced to stay home to care for children under ten. See Moghadan, *Democratic Reform and the Position of Women*, p. 5.
40. True, "Gendering Post-Socialist Transitions," pp. 80 and 89.
41. Ibid., p. 77.
42. Einhorn, "Democratization and Women's Movements."
43. Jaquette, *The Women's Movement in Latin America*, chapter 1.
44. In 1987, 5.3 percent of parliamentary seats in Brazil were held by women; in Peru, the figure was 5.6 percent. In 1991, 5 percent of seats in Chile were held by women and 6.7 percent in Argentina. Waylen, "Women and Democratization," p. 341. For further discussion of gender and democratization in Brazil, see Alvarez, "Contradictions of a 'Women's Space.' "
45. Waylen, "Women and Democratization," p. 327.
46. D'Amico, "Women Workers in the United Nations," p. 20.
47. Ibid., pp. 26–28.
48. Ibid., pp. 31–33.
49. Runyan, "Third World Women in the Global Factory."
50. D'Amico, "Women Workers in the United Nations," p. 38.
51. Linklater, "Citizenship and Sovereignty in the Post-Westphalian State."
52. Held, *Democracy and Global Order*, p. 88.
53. For an early articulation of a feminist international legal perspective that, in many ways, parallels early feminist critiques of IR theory, see Charlesworth, Chinkin, and Wright, "Feminist Approaches." Similar to IR, international law has a gendered hierarchy of issues, with war and security being the most important and, therefore, the most masculine.
54. D'Amico, "Women Workers in the United Nations," p. 22.
55. Charlesworth, "What Are 'Women's International Human Rights'?" p. 71.

56. Fraser, "Convention on Elimination of Discrimination."
57. Keck and Sikkink, *Activists beyond Borders*, pp. 171–72 and 195.
58. Twenty states have entered more than eighty reservations. In late 2000, the United States was one of a very few countries that had not ratified CEDAW.
59. Charlesworth, "What Are 'Women's International Human Rights'?" p. 64.
60. This claim is based on a statement made in 1991 by Peggy Antrobus, director of women and development at the University of the West Indies. Quoted in Charlesworth, "What Are 'Women's International Human Rights'?" p. 62. For a comprehensive discussion of the debate between universalism and cultural relativism, see Nussbaum and Glover, *Women, Culture, and Development*.
61. Miller, "Realizing Women's Human Rights," p, 168.
62. This is not true of all states. The Scandinavian countries have taken vigorous steps to place issues having to do with women and gender on the international agenda.
63. Deborah Stienstra distinguishes between social movements and nongovernmental organizations as two different levels of institutions within civil society. She defines social movements as groups with a self-consciousness or awareness of being a group and with some level of organization. Stienstra, "Of Roots, Leaves, and Trees," p. 263. NGOs are more formal; they comprise a wide range of not-for-profit groups that are constituted as independent, nonpartisan entities, usually with an identified mission. Miller, "Realizing Women's Human Rights," p. 163.
64. Falk, "Making of Global Citizenship," pp. 39–50.
65. Lynch, "Social Movements and the Problem of Globalization."
66. Waylen, "Women and Democratization," p. 336.
67. For histories of these movements, see Stienstra, *Women's Movements and International Organizations*, chapter 3, and Meyer, "The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom."
68. Pietilä and Vickers, *Making Women Matter*, chapter 3. See also West, "UN Women's Conferences."
69. Joachim, "Shaping the Human Rights Agenda," p. 151.
70. West, "UN Women's Conferences," pp. 187–89.
71. Ackerly and Okin, "Feminist Social Criticism."
72. West, "UN Women's Conferences," pp. 191–92.
73. Quoted in Stephenson, "Women's International Nongovernmental Organizations," p. 138.
74. Stienstra, "Of Roots, Leaves, and Trees," p. 265.
75. Ibid., pp. 266–71. See also Runyan, "Women in the Neoliberal 'Frame.' "
76. West, "UN Women's Conferences," p. 177.
77. Lynch, "Social Movements and the Problems of Globalization," p. 160.
78. Braidotti, "The Exile, the Nomad, and the Migrant." Virginia Woolf articulated her views on women as citizens of the world in *Three Guineas*, pp. 108–9.

79. Moon, *Sex among Allies*, p. 158.
80. Dahlerup, "Learning to Live with the State." See also Eisenstein, *The Color of Gender*. Eisenstein claims that privatization narrows the prospects of democracy for women.
81. Nzomo, "Political Economy of the African Crisis."
82. Gordon, *Transforming Capitalism and Patriarchy*, p. 121.
83. Phillips, *Democracy and Difference*, chapter 6.
84. Mendes, "Loosing the Faith." See also Pateman, *Sexual Contract*.
85. Peterson, "Politics of Identification," p. 12.
86. Yuval-Davis, "Women as Citizens."
87. Mohanty, introduction to *Third World Women*, pp. 18–21.
88. Connell, "The State, Gender, and Sexual Politics." pp. 527 and 532.
89. Ibid., p. 538.
90. Phillips, *Engendering Democracy*, p. 149.
91. Braidotti, "The Exile, the Nomad, and the Migrant," p. 9. Braidotti wrote this before the European Community changed its name to the European Union in 1993.
92. Ling, "Democratization under Internationalization," pp. 140–57.

5. Conclusions and Beginnings: Some Pathways for IR Feminist Futures

1. This notion of obligation in IR can be found in the cosmopolitan approach. See, for example, Linklater, "Problem of Community."
2. I realize that this dichotomous way of presenting these two different types of knowledge is an oversimplification that can in itself play into gendered ways of thinking. In fact, these different types of knowledge are not mutually exclusive but embodied in each other. For elaboration on this claim, see Haraway, "Situated Knowledges," p. 588.
3. Ethnographic methods are typically "level one" analysis. Level one has not been favored by most IR scholars. For a description of levels of analysis and a justification for preference for analysis at the level of the structure, see Waltz, *Man, the State, and War*.
4. For further elaboration on this issue, see Hoffmann, "An American Social Science."
5. Pettman, *Worlding Women*, p. 171.
6. For a discussion of feminist approaches in terms of their contributions to the reconfiguration of spatiality and levels of analysis, see Youngs, *International Relations in a Global Age*
7. For examples, see Keller, *Gender and Science*; Behar and Gordon, *Women Writing Culture*; Gilligan, *In a Different Voice*; Stacey, "Can There Be a Femi-

nist Ethnography?" Rose, *Feminism and Geography*; Ferber and Nelson, *Beyond Economic Man*.

8. Indeed, this assumption is important to Fukuyama's argument in "Women and the Evolution of World Politics," discussed in chapter 2. Since it is the only article on feminist IR that *Foreign Affairs* has published to date, views like this tend to get reinforced in the IR and policy-making communities.
9. Harding, *Is Science Multicultural?* pp. 85–86.
10. Alcoff and Potter, "When Feminisms Intersect Epistemology," p. 3.
11. Ketchum, "Female Culture and Women's Studies," p. 154.
12. Harding "Starting Thought from Women's Lives," p. 142.
13. Chin, *In Service and Servitude*.
14. Wolf, *Thrice Told Tale*, p. 13.
15. Marchand, "Latin American Women Speak on Development," pp. 70–71.
16. Udayagiri, "Challenging Modernization," p. 168.
17. She uses the issue of violence against women as an example, noting that there can be disagreement about what constitutes violence. Charlesworth, "Women's Rights and Traditional Law," p. 10.
18. Zalewski, "All Those Theories," pp. 341–51.
19. Keohane, "Realism, Neorealism," pp. 2–7.
20. Whitworth, *Feminism and International Relations*, p. 2.
21. Chin, *In Service and Servitude*, pp. 28–29.
22. Zalewski, "All Those Theories," pp. 346–47.
23. Enloe, *Morning After*, p. 6.
24. Toulmin, "Concluding Methodological Reflections." Toulmin's chapter is a useful summary of the method of practical knowledge.
25. Enloe, "Margins, Silences, and Bottom Rungs," pp. 196–97.
26. Harding, "Is There a Feminist Method?" p. 8.
27. Enloe, "Margins, Silences, and Bottom Rungs," p. 187.
28. Marchand and Runyan, "Feminist Approaches to Global Restructuring," p. 226. Marchand and Runyan also ask: Where are the men? They ask this question in order to ascertain how global economic restructuring has differential impacts on women and men. As I have demonstrated, women's lives must always be situated in the social structures within which they are embedded.
29. Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases*, p. 8.
30. Ibid., p. 5.
31. Harding, "Is There a Feminist Method?" p. 6.
32. Charlesworth, "Women's Rights and Traditional Law," p. 6. Marchand and Runyan, "Feminist Approaches to Global Restructuring," p. 226, also make this claim.
33. Sylvester, "Contributions of Feminist Theory," p. 257.
34. Geertz, "Thick Description," p. 312.

35. Ibid., p. 320.
36. Barbara McClintock, quoted in Keller, *Gender and Science*, p. 162.
37. Ibid., p. 164.
38. Ibid., p. 175.
39. Sylvester, "Empathetic Cooperation," p. 326.
40. Ibid., p. 327.
41. Moon, *Sex among Allies*, p. 2.
42. Ibid., p. 14.
43. Ibid., p. 15.
44. Chin, *In Service and Servitude*, pp. 20–21. The work of Chang and Ling, "Globalization and Its Intimate Other," also draws on ethnographic fieldwork conducted with Filipina domestic workers in Hong Kong between 1992 and 1997.
45. Richardson, "Narrative and Sociology," pp. 199–200.
46. Ibid., pp. 212–14.
47. Moon, *Sex among Allies*, pp. 10–12.
48. Chin, *In Service and Servitude*, pp. 5–7.
49. Ibid., p. 6.
50. Milliken, "Discourse in International Relations," p. 229.
51. Ibid., p. 229.
52. Ibid., p. 230. Milliken suggests there is no single method for discourse analysis. She outlines predicate analysis, a method that, she claims, is particularly useful for IR scholars. Predicate analysis focuses on verbs, adverbs, and adjectives that attach to nouns. It establishes certain meanings or background capabilities that are important in establishing the way actors perceive, and hence act, in certain situations. Milliken and Sylvan, "Soft Bodies, Hard Targets, and Chic Theories" is an example of predicate analysis used to analyze gender. It is discussed in chapter 2.
53. Cohn, *Wars, Wimps, and Women*, p. A3.
54. Cohn is using these terms as defined by anthropologist Laura Nader. See Nader, "Up the Anthropologist."
55. Cohn, *Wars, Wimps, and Women*, p. A2.

Bibliography

Ackerly, Brooke, with Susan M. Okin. "Feminist Social Criticism and the International Movement for Womens' Rights as Human Rights." In *Democracy's Edges*, ed. Ian Shapiro and Casiano Hacker-Cordón. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Addams, Jane, Emily G. Balch, and Alice Hamilton. *Women at The Hague: The International Congress of Women and Its Results*. New York: Macmillan, 1916.

Adler, Emanuel. "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics." *European Journal of International Relations* 3, no. 3 (1997).

Alcoff, Linda, and Elizabeth Potter, "When Feminisms Intersect Epistemology." In *Feminist Epistemologies*, ed. Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Almond Gabriel A., and G. Bingham Powell Jr. *Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach*. Boston: Little Brown, 1966.

Alvarez, Sonia. "Contradictions of a 'Women's Space' in a Male-Dominant State: The Political Role of the Commissions on the Status of Women in Postauthoritarian Brazil." In *Women, International Development, and Politics: The Bureaucratic Mind*, ed. Kathleen Staudt. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990.

Arghiri, Emmanuel. *Unequal Exchange: A Study of the Imperialism of Trade*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972.

Art, Robert, and Robert Jervis, eds. *International Politics*, 4th ed. New York: Harper Collins, 1996.

Ashley, Richard. "The Powers of Anarchy: Theory, Sovereignty, and the Domestication of Global Life." In *International Theory: Critical Investigations*, ed. James Der Derian. New York: New York University Press, 1995.

Ayoob, Mohammad. "The Security Problematic of the Third World." *World Politics* 43, no. 2 (1991).

Baden, Sally, and Anne Marie Goetz. "Who Needs [Sex] When You Can Have [Gender]? Conflicting Discourses on Gender at Beijing." In *Feminist Visions of Development: Gender Analysis and Policy*, ed. Cecile Jackson and Ruth Pearson. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Baines, Erin K. "Gender Construction and the Protection Mandate of the UNHCR: Responses from Guatemalan Women." In *Gender Politics in Global Governance*, ed. Mary K. Meyer and Elisabeth Prügl. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999.

Baldwin, David A. "Neoliberalism, Neorealism, and World Politics." In *Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate*, ed. David A. Baldwin. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

———, ed. *Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

Ball, Nicole. *Security and Economy in the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Barrett, Michele. "Words and Things: Materialism and Method in Contemporary Feminist Analysis." In *Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates*, ed. Michele Barrett and Anne Phillips. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press, 1992.

Barrett, Michele, and Anne Phillips. Introduction to *Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates*, ed. Michele Barrett and Anne Phillips. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press, 1992.

Behar, Ruth, and Deborah A. Gordon, eds. *Women Writing Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Beitz, Charles R., Marshall Cohen, Thomas Scanlon, and A. John Simmons, eds. *International Ethics: A Philosophy and Public Affairs Reader*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1985.

Beneria, Lourdes, and Gita Sen. "Accumulation, Reproduction, and Women's Role in Economic Development: Boserup Revisted." In *Women's Work: Development and the Division of Labor by Gender*, ed. Eleanor Leacock and Helen I. Safa. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey, 1986.

Benhabib, Seyla. "Cultural Complexity, Moral Interdependence, and the Global Dialogical Community." In *Women, Culture, and Development: A Study of Human Capabilities*, ed. Martha Nussbaum and Jonathan Glover. Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press, 1995.

———. "The Generalized and the Concrete Other." In *Feminism as Critique: Essays on the Politics of Gender in Late-Capitalist Societies*, ed. Seyla Benhabib and Drucilla Cornell. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press, 1987.

Bennett, Olivia, Jo Bexley, and Kitty Warnock. *Arms to Fight, Arms To Protect: Women Speak Out about Conflict*. London: Panos Press, 1995.

Biersteker, Thomas J. "Evolving Perspectives on International Political Economy: Twentieth-Century Contexts and Discontinuities." *International Political Science Review* 14, no. 1 (1993).

Booth, Ken. "Dare Not to Know: International Relations Theory versus the Future." In *International Relations Theory Today*, ed. Ken Booth and Steve Smith. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press, 1995.

———. "Security and Self: Reflections of a Fallen Realist." In *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*, ed. Keith Krause and Michael C. Williams. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Boserup, Ester. *Women's Role in Economic Development*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1970.

Brah, Avtar, "Questions of Difference and International Feminism." In *Out of the Margins: Women's Studies in the Nineties*, ed. Jane Aaron and Sylvia Walby. London: Falmer Press, 1991.

Braidotti, Rosi. "The Exile, the Nomad, and the Migrant: Reflections on International Feminism." *Women's Studies International Forum* 15, no. 1 (1992).

Braidotti, Rosi, Ewa Charkiewicz, Sabine Hausler, and Saskia Wieringa. *Women, the Environment, and Sustainable Development: Towards a Theoretical Synthesis*. London: Zed Books, 1994.

Broad, Robin, and John Cavanagh. "Checking It Once, Checking It Twice." *Washington Post*, December 8, 1997.

Brown, Chris. *International Relations Theory: New Normative Approaches*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.

———. "Critical Theory and Postmodernism in International Relations." In *Contemporary International Relations: A Guide to Theory*, ed. Margot Light and Fred Halliday. London: Pinter, 1994.

Brown, Sarah. "Feminism, International Theory, and International Relations of Gender Inequality." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 17, no. 3 (1988).

Bull, Hedley. *The Anarchical Society*. London: Macmillan, 1977.

Burguieres, Mary. "Feminist Approaches to Peace: Another Step for Peace Studies." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 19, no. 1 (1990).

Buzan, Barry. *People, States, and Fear*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1991.

Caporoso, James A. "Across the Great Divide: Integrating Comparative and International Politics." *International Studies Quarterly* 41, no. 4 (1997).

Carr, E. H. *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919–1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Chang, Kimberly A., and L. H. M. Ling. "Globalization and Its Intimate Other: Filipina Domestic Workers in Hong Kong." In *Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites, and Resistances*, ed. Marianne H. Marchand and Anne Sisson Runyan. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Charlesworth, Hilary. "What Are 'Women's International Human Rights'?" In *Hu-*

man Rights of Women: National and International Perspectives, ed. Rebecca J. Cooke. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994.

———. "Women's Rights and Traditional Law: A Conflict." *Third World Legal Studies* (1994).

Charlesworth, Hilary, Christine Chinkin, and Shelley Wright. "Feminist Approaches to International Law." *American Journal of International Law* 85 (October 1991): 613–45.

Chin, Christine B. N. *In Service and Servitude: Foreign Female Domestic Workers and the Malaysian "Modernity" Project*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.

Cohn, Carol. "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 12, no. 4 (1987).

———. "Wars, Wimps, and Women: Talking Gender and Thinking War." In *Gendering War Talk*, ed. Miriam Cooke and Angela Woollacott. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

———. *Wars, Wimps, and Women*. Berkeley: University of California Press, forthcoming.

Collins, Patricia Hill. "The Social Construction of Black Feminist Thought." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 14, no. 4 (1989).

Connell, R. W. "The State, Gender, and Sexual Politics: Theory and Appraisal." *Theory and Society* 19, no. 5 (1990).

———. *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Cox, Robert W. "Global Restructuring: Making Sense of the Changing International Political Economy." In *Political Economy and the Changing Global Order*, ed. Richard Stubbs and Geoffrey Underhill. London: Macmillan, 1994.

———. "Social Forces, States, and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory." In *Neorealism and Its Critics*, ed. Robert O. Keohane. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.

Cox, Robert W., with Timothy J. Sinclair. *Approaches to World Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Dahlerup, Drude. "Learning to Live with the State—State, Market, and Civil Society: Women's Need for State Intervention in East and West." *Women's Studies International Forum* 17, nos. 2/3 (1994).

Dalby, Simon. "Security, Modernity, Ecology: The Dilemmas of Post–Cold War Security Discourse." *Alternatives* 17 (1992): 95–134.

D'Amico, Francine. "Women Workers in the United Nations." In *Gender Politics in Global Governance*, ed. Mary K. Meyer and Elisabeth Prügl. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999.

Dean, Robert D. "Masculinity as Ideology: John F. Kennedy and the Domestic Politics of Foreign Policy." *Diplomatic History* 22, no. 1 (1998).

Defense Manpower Data Center. "Distribution of Active Duty Forces by Service,

Rank, Sex, and Ethnic Group." DMDC-3035. U.S. Department of Defense. August 31, 1999.

Denemark, Robert A., and Robert O'Brien. "Contesting the Canon: International Political Economy at UK and US Universities." *Review of International Political Economy* 4, no. 1 (1997).

Devetak, Richard. "Postmodernism." In *Theories of International Relations*, ed. Scott Burchill and Andrew Linklater. London: Macmillan, 1996.

———. "Critical Theory." In *Theories of International Relations*, ed. Scott Burchill and Andrew Linklater. London: Macmillan, 1996.

Deudney, Daniel. "The Case against Linking Environmental Degradation and National Security." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 19, no. 3 (1990).

Doyle, Michael W. "Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs." *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 12, no. 3 (1983).

———. "Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs, Part 2." *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 12, no. 4 (1983).

Ehrenreich, Barbara et al. "Fukuyama's Follies: So What If Women Ruled the World?" Symposium in *Foreign Affairs* 78, no. 1 (1999).

Einhorn, Barbara. *Cinderella Goes to Market: Citizenship, Gender, and Women's Movements in East Central Europe*. London: Verso, 1993.

———. "Democratization and Women's Movements in Central and Eastern Europe: Concepts of Women's Rights." In *Democratic Reform and the Position of Women in Transitional Economies*, ed. Valentine Moghadan. Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press. 1993.

Eisenstein, Zillah R. *The Color of Gender: Reimagining Democracy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Elshtain, Jean Bethke. *Women and War*. New York: Basic Books, 1987.

Elson, Diane. "Structural Adjustment: Its Effects on Women." In *Changing Perceptions: Writings on Gender and Development*, ed. Tina Wallace, with Candida March. Oxford, U.K.: Oxfam, 1991.

Enloe, Cynthia. *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

———. *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

———. "Margins, Silences, and Bottom Rungs: How to Overcome the Underestimation of Power in the Study of International Relations." In *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, ed. Steve Smith, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

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

Falk, Richard. *The Promise of World Order: Essays in Normative International Relations*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987.

———. *The Western State System*. World Order Studies Program Occasional Paper #23, Center of International Studies, Princeton University, 1992.

———. "The Making of Global Citizenship." In *Global Visions: Beyond the New World Order*, ed. Jeremy Brecher, John Brown Childs, and Jill Cutler. Boston: South End Press, 1993.

Ferber, Marianne A., and Julie A. Nelson, eds. *Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Theory and Economics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Flax, Jane. "Postmodernism and Gender Relations in Feminist Theory." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 12, no. 4 (1987).

Forsberg, Randall C. "Toward the End of War." *Boston Review* 22, no. 5 (1997).

Frank, Andre Gunder. *Latin America: Underdevelopment or Revolution*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1970.

Fraser, Arvonne. "The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women." In *Women, Politics, and the United Nations*, ed. Anne Winslow. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1995.

Fukuyama, Francis. "The End of History?" *The National Interest* 16 (summer 1989).

———. "Women and the Evolution of World Politics." *Foreign Affairs* 77, no. 5 (1998).

Gallagher, Nancy "The Gender Gap in Popular Attitudes Toward the Use of Force." In *Women and the Use of Military Force*, ed. Ruth Howes and Michael Stevenson. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1993.

Galtung, Johan. "A Structural Theory of Imperialism." *Journal of Peace Research* 8, no. 2 (May 1971).

———. *The True Worlds: A Transnational Perspective*. New York: Free Press, 1980.

Geertz, Clifford. "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture." In *Knowledge and Postmodernism in Historical Perspective*, ed. Joyce Appleby, Elizabeth Covington, and David Hoyt. New York: Routledge, 1996.

Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press, 1990.

Gill, Stephen. "Globalisation, Market Civilisation, and Disciplinary Neoliberalism." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 24, no. 3 (1995).

Gilligan, Carol. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Gilpin, Robert. *The Political Economy of International Relations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Goetz, Annemarie. "Feminism and the Claim to Know." In *Gender and International Relations*, ed. Rebecca Grant and Kathleen Newland. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991.

Goldstein, Joshua. *International Relations*. New York: Harper Collins, 1994.

Gordon, April A. *Transforming Capitalism and Patriarchy: Gender and Development in Africa*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1996.

Gourevitch, Peter. "The Second Image Reversed: The International Sources of Domestic Politics." *International Organization* 32, no. 4 (1978).

Gowa, Joanne. "Democratic States and International Disputes." *International Organization* 49, no. 3 (1995).

Grant, Judith. *Fundamental Feminisms: Contesting the Core Concepts of Feminist Theory*. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Grant, Rebecca. "The Sources of Gender Bias in International Relations Theory." In *Gender and International Relations*, ed. Rebecca Grant and Kathleen Newland. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991.

Grieco, Joseph M. "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism." *International Organization* 42, no. 3 (1988).

Halliday, Fred. "The Future of International Relations: Fears and Hopes." In *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, ed. Steve Smith, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Haraway, Donna. *Primate Visions: Gender, Race, and Nature in the World of Modern Science*. New York: Routledge, 1989.

———. "Situated Knowledges; The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective." *Feminist Studies* 14, no. 3 (1988).

Harding, Sandra. *Is Science Multicultural? Postcolonialisms, Feminisms, and Epistemologies*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998.

———. "Is There a Feminist Method?" In *Feminism and Methodology*, ed. Sandra Harding. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.

———. *The Science Question in Feminism*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1986.

———. "Starting Thought from Women's Lives: Eight Resources for Maximizing Objectivity." *Journal of Social Philosophy* 21, nos. 2/3 (1990).

———. *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Hartsock, Nancy C. M. *Money, Sex, and Power: Toward a Feminist Historical Materialism*. New York: Longman, 1983.

Harrison, Faye. "Women in Jamaica's Urban Informal Economy: Insights from a Kingston Slum." In *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, ed. Chandra Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991.

Heckman, Susan. "Truth and Method: Feminist Standpoint Theory Revisited." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 22, no. 2 (1997).

Held, David. *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1995.

———. "Democracy: Past, Present, and Possible Futures." *Alternatives* 18 (1993): 259–71.

Hoffmann, Stanley. "An American Social Science: International Relations." *Daedalus* 106, no. 3 (1977).

Holcomb, Briavel, and Tamar Y. Rothenberg. "Women's Work and the Urban Household Economy in Developing Countries." In *Women's Lives and Public Policy: The International Experience*, ed. Meredith Turshen and Briavel Holcomb. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1993.

Hollis, Martin, and Steve Smith. *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Holsti, Kalevi J. "International Relations at the End of the Millennium." *Review of International Studies* 19, no. 4 (1993).

———. *The Dividing Discipline: Hegemony and Diversity in International Theory*. Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1985.

hooks, bell. "Feminism and Militarism: A Comment." *Women's Studies Quarterly* 23 (fall/winter 1995).

Hooper, Charlotte. "Masculinist Practices and Gender Politics: The Operation of Multiple Masculinities in International Relations." In *The "Man" Question in International Relations*, ed. Marysia Zalewski and Jane Parpart. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1998.

———. "Masculinities in Transition: the Case of Globalization." In *Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites, and Resistances*, ed. Marianne H. Marchand and Anne Sisson Runyan. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Huntington, Samuel. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.

———. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993.

Hurrell, Andrew, and Ngaire Woods. "Globalisation and Inequality." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 24, no. 3 (1995).

Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues. *Common Security: A Blueprint for Survival*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1982.

Jackson, Cecile. "Rescuing Gender from the Poverty Trap." In *Feminist Visions of Development: Gender Analysis and Policy*, ed. Cecile Jackson and Ruth Pearson. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Jackson, Robert, and Carl Rosberg. "Why Africa's Weak States Persist: The Empirical and the Juridical in Statehood." *World Politics* 35 (1982): 1–24.

Jaggar, Alison. *Feminist Politics and Human Nature*. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman & Allanheld, 1983.

Jaquette, Jane. S. *The Women's Movement in Latin America: Feminism and the Transition to Democracy*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989.

Jaquette, Jane S., and Sharon L. Wolchik, eds. *Women and Democratization: Latin America and Central and Eastern Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1998.

Jeffords, Susan. "Telling the War Story." In *It's Our Military Too! Women and the US Military*, ed. Judith Hicks Stiehm. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996.

Jepperson, Ronald L., Alexander Wendt, and Peter J. Katzenstein. "Norms, Identity, and Culture in National Security." In *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, ed. Peter J. Katzenstein. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.

Joachim, Jutta. "Shaping the Human Rights Agenda." In *Gender Politics in Global Governance*, ed. Mary K. Meyer and Elisabeth Prügl. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999.

Jones, Adam. "Does 'Gender' Make the World Go Round? Feminist Critiques of International Relations." *Review of International Studies* 22 (1996): 405–29.

Kapstein, Ethan B. "Workers and the World Economy." *Foreign Affairs* (May-June 1996).

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

Kegley, Charles W., Jr. *Controversies in International Relations Theory: Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.

Keller, Evelyn Fox. *Reflections on Gender and Science*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

Keohane, Robert O. "Beyond Dichotomy: Conversations between International Relations and Feminist Theory." *International Studies Quarterly* 42, no. 1 (1998).

———. "International Institutions: Two Approaches." *International Studies Quarterly* 32, no. 4 (1988).

———. "International Relations Theory: Contributions of a Feminist Standpoint." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 18 (1989): 245–53.

———. "Realism, Neorealism, and the Study of World Politics." In *Neorealism and Its Critics*, ed. Robert O. Keohane. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.

———, ed. *Neorealism and Its Critics*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.

Keohane, Robert O., and Joseph S. Nye. "Globalization: What's New? What's Not? (And So What?)" *Foreign Policy* (2000): 104–19.

———. *Power and Interdependence*. 2nd ed. Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman, 1989.

Ketchum, Sara Ann. "Female Culture and Women's Studies." *Social Theory and Practice* 6, no. 2 (1980).

Kirk, Gwen. "Our Greenham Common: Feminism and Nonviolence." In *Rocking the Ship of State: Toward a Feminist Peace Politics*, ed. Adrienne Harris and Ynestra King. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1989.

Klein, Renate. "Passion and Politics in Women's Studies in the 1990s." In *Out of the Margins: Women's Studies in the Nineties*, ed. Jane Aaron and Sylvia Walby. London: Falmer Press, 1991.

Kolodziej, Edward. "Renaissance in Security Studies? Caveat Lector!" *International Studies Quarterly* 36, no. 4 (1992).

Kothari, Rajni. "The Yawning Vacuum: A World without Alternatives." *Alternatives* 18, no. 2 (1993).

Krasner, Stephen D. "Structural Causes and Regime Consequences: Regimes as Intervening Variables." In *International Regimes*, ed. Stephen D. Krasner. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1983.

———. *Structural Conflict: The Third World against Global Liberalism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.

Krause, Jill. "Gender Inequalities and Feminist Politics in a Global Perspective." In *Globalization: Theory and Practice*, ed. Eleonore Kofman and Gillian Youngs. London: Pinter, 1996.

Krause, Keith, and Michael C. Williams. "From Strategy to Security: Foundations of Critical Security Studies." In *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*, ed. Keith Krause and Michael C. Williams. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Lakatos, I., and A. Musgrave. *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Lapid, Yosef. "The Third Debate: On the Prospects of International Theory in a Post-Positivist Era." *International Studies Quarterly* 33, no. 3 (1989).

Layne, Christopher. "Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace." *International Security* 19, no. 2 (1994).

Lim, Linda. "Women's Work in Export Factories: The Politics of a Cause." In *Persistent Inequalities: Women and World Development*, ed. Irene Tinker. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Ling, L. H. M. "Democratization under Internationalization: Media Reconstructions of Gender Identity in Shanghai." *Democratization* 3, no. 2 (1996).

Linklater, Andrew. "Citizenship and Sovereignty in the Post-Westphalian State. *European Journal of International Relations* 2, no. 1 (1996).

———. "Rationalism." In *Theories of International Relations*, ed. Scott Burchill and Andrew Linklater. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.

———. "The Problem of Community in International Relations." *Alternatives* 15 (1990): 135–53.

Lipschutz, Ronnie D. "The Great Transformation Revisited." *Brown Journal of World Affairs* 4, no. 1 (1997).

———, ed. *On Security*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

Long, David. "The Harvard School of Liberal International Theory: A Case for Closure." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 24, no. 3 (1995).

Lynch, Cecelia. "Social Movements and the Problem of Globalization." *Alternatives* 23, no. 2 (1998).

Mansbach, Richard. "Neo-This and Neo-That: Or, 'Play It Sam' (Again and Again)." *Mershon International Studies Review* 40, no. 1 (1996).

Marchand, Marianne H. "Latin American Women Speak on Development: Are We

Listening?" In *Feminism/Postmodernism/Development*, ed. Marianne H. Marchand and Jane Parpart. London: Routledge, 1995.

———. "Reconceptualising 'Gender and Development' in an Era of Globalisation." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 25, no. 3 (1996).

———. "Selling NAFTA: Gendered Metaphors and Silenced Gender Implications." In *Globalization: Theory and Practice*, ed. Eleonore Kofman and Gillian Youngs. London: Pinter, 1996.

Marchand, Marianne H., and Jane L. Parpart, eds. *Feminism/Postmodernism/Development*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Marchand, Marianne H., and Anne Sisson Runyan, "Feminist Sightings of Global Restructuring: Conceptualizations and Reconceptualizations." In *Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites, and Resistances*, ed. Marianne H. Marchand and Anne Sisson Runyan. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Mathews, Jessica Tuchman. "Redefining Security." *Foreign Affairs* 68 (spring 1989): 162–77.

May, Elaine Tyler. *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era*. New York: Basic Books, 1988.

McGlen, Nancy E., and Meredith Reid Sarkees. *Women in Foreign Policy: The Insiders*. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Mearsheimer, John J. "Back to the Future: Instability in Europe after the Cold War." *International Security* 15, no. 1 (1990).

Mendes, Susan. "Loosing the Faith: Feminism and Democracy." In *Democracy: The Unfinished Journey, 508 BC to AD 1993*, ed. John Dunn. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Meyer, Mary K. "The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom: Organizing Women for Peace in the War System." In *Gender Politics in Global Governance*, ed. Mary K. Meyer and Elisabeth Prügl. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999.

Mies, Maria. *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale*. London: Zed Books, 1986.

Miller, Alice M. "Realizing Women's Human Rights: Nongovernmental Organizations and the United Nations Treaty Bodies." In *Gender Politics in Global Governance*, ed. Mary K. Meyer and Elisabeth Prügl. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999.

Milliken, Jennifer. "The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Method." *European Journal of International Relations* 5, no. 2: (1999).

Milliken, Jennifer, and David Sylvan. "Soft Bodies, Hard Targets, and Chic Theories: US Bombing Policy in Indochina." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 25, no. 2 (1996).

Mitchell, Alison. "With 'Patriotic Challenge' McCain Makes Run Official." *New York Times*, September 28, 1999, A20.

Mittelman, James H. "The Dynamics of Globalization." In *Globalization: Critical Reflections*, ed. James H. Mittelman. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1997.

Moghadan, Valentine. "Economic Restructuring, Identity Politics, and Gender." In Valentine Moghadan, ed., *Democratic Reform and the Position of Women in Transitional Economies*. Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press. 1993.

Mohanty, Chandra. Introduction to *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, ed. Chandra Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991.

———. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses." In *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, ed. Chandra Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991.

Moon, Katharine H. S. *Sex among Allies: Military Prostitution in U.S.-Korea Relations*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

Moore, Brenda L. "From Underrepresentation to Overrepresentation." In *It's Our Military Too! Women and the US Military*, ed. Judith Hicks Stiehm. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996.

Morgenthau, Hans J. *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. Brief ed. revised by Kenneth W. Thompson. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993.

Moser, Caroline O. N. "Gender Planning in the Third World: Meeting Practical and Strategic Needs." In *Gender and International Relations*, ed. Rebecca Grant and Kathleen Newland. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991.

Nader, Laura. "Up the Anthropologist: Perspectives Gained from Studying Up." In *Reinventing Anthropology*, ed. Dell Hymes. New York: Pantheon, 1972.

Niva, Steve. "Tough and Tender: New World Order Masculinity and the Gulf War." In *The "Man" Question in International Relations*, ed. Marysia Zalewski and Jane L. Parpart. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1998.

Nussbaum, Martha, and Jonathan Glover, eds. *Women, Culture, and Development: A Study of Human Capabilities*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Nzomo, Maria. "The Political Economy of the African Crisis: Gender Impacts and Responses." *International Journal* 51, no. 1 (1995/96).

———. "Women and Democratization Struggles in Africa: What Relevance to Post-Modernist Discourse?" In *Feminism/Postmodernism/Development*, ed. Marianne H. Marchand and Jane L. Parpart. London: Routledge, 1995.

Ohmae, Kenichi. *The Borderless World: Power and Strategy in the Interlinked Economy*. New York: Harper-Perennial, 1991.

Okin, Susan. "Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?" In *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women? Susan Moller Okin with Respondents*, ed. Joshua Cohen, Matthew Howard, and Martha C. Nussbaum. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Osiander, Andreas. "Rereading Early Twentieth-Century IR Theory: Idealism Revisited." *International Studies Quarterly* 42, no. 3 (1998).

Panitch, L. "Rethinking the Role of the State." In *Globalization: Critical Reflections*, ed. James H. Mittelman. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1997.

Parpart, Jane L. "Deconstructing the Development 'Expert': Gender, Development, and the 'Vulnerable Groups.' " In *Feminism/Postmodernism/Development*, ed. Marianne H. Marchand and Jane L. Parpart. London: Routledge, 1995.

Parpart, Jane L., and Marianne H. Marchand. "Exploding the Canon: An Introduction/Conclusion." In *Feminism/Postmodernism/Development*, ed. Marianne H. Marchand and Jane L. Parpart. London: Routledge, 1995.

Pateman, Carole. "Conclusion: Women's Writing, Women's Standing: Theory and Politics in the Early Modern Period." In *Women Writers and the Early Modern British Political Tradition*, ed. Hilda Smith. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

———. *The Sexual Contract*, Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1988.

Pearson, Ruth. " 'Nimble Fingers' " Revisited: Reflections on Women and Third World Industrialisation in the Late Twentieth Century." In *Feminist Visions of Development: Gender Analysis and Policy*, ed. Cecile Jackson and Ruth Pearson. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Peterson, V. Spike. "The Politics of Identification in the Context of Globalization." *Women's Studies International Forum* 19, nos. 1/2 (1996).

———. "The Politics of Identity and Gendered Nationalism." In *Foreign Policy Analysis: Continuity and Change in Its Second Generation*, ed. L. Neack, P. J. Haney, and J. A. K. Hey. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1995.

———. "Reframing the Politics of Identity: Democracy, Globalisation, and Gender. *Political Expressions* 1, no. 1 (1995).

———. "Security and Sovereign States: What Is at Stake in Taking Feminism Seriously?" In *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory*, ed. V. Spike Peterson. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1992.

———. "Transgressing Boundaries: Theories of Knowledge, Gender, and International Relations." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 21, no. 2 (1992).

———. "Whose Crisis? Early and Post-Modern Masculinism." In *Innovation and Transformation in International Studies*, ed. Stephen Gill and James H. Mittelman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

———, ed. *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1992.

Peterson, V. Spike, and Anne Sisson Runyan. *Global Gender Issues*. 2nd ed. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1999.

Pettman, Jan Jindy. "An International Political Economy of Sex?" In *Globalization: Theory and Practice*, ed. Eleonore Kofman and Gillian Youngs. London: Pinter, 1996.

———. *Worlding Women: A Feminist International Politics*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Phillips, Anne. *Democracy and Difference*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1993.

———. *Engendering Democracy*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991.

Pietilä, Hilkka, and Jeanne Vickers. *Making Women Matter: The Role of the United Nations*. London: Zed Books, 1990.

Przeworski, Adam, and Fernando Limongi. "Modernization: Theories and Facts." *World Politics* 49 (January 1997).

Prügl, Elisabeth. *The Global Construction of Gender: Home-Based Work in the Political Economy of the 20th Century*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

———. "What Is a Worker? Gender, Global Restructuring, and the ILO Convention on Homework." In *Gender Politics in Global Governance*, ed. Mary K. Meyer and Elisabeth Prügl. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999.

Prügl, Elisabeth, and Mary K. Meyer. "Gender Politics in Global Governance." In *Gender Politics in Global Governance*, ed. Mary K. Meyer and Elisabeth Prügl. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999.

Putnam, Robert D. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games." *International Organization* 42 (1988): 427–60.

Rathgeber, Eva M. "Gender and Development in Action." In *Feminism/Postmodernism/Development*, ed. Marianne H. Marchand and Jane L. Parpart. London: Routledge, 1995.

Rayner, Richard. "The Warrior Besieged." *New York Times Magazine*, June 22, 1997.

Reardon, Betty A. *Sexism and the War System*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1985.

Rengger, Nicolas. "On the Liberal Democratic Peace: Regime, Regimes, and the Domination of World Politics." Unpublished MS. Center for International Studies, School of International Relations, University of Southern California, spring 1995.

Rennison, Callie Marie, and Sarah Welchans. *Intimate Partner Violence*. U.S. Department of Justice, May 2000.

Richardson, James L. "Contending Liberalisms: Past and Present." *European Journal of International Relations* 3, no. 1 (1997).

Richardson, Laurel. "Narrative and Sociology." In *Representation in Ethnography*, ed. John Van Maanen. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 1995.

Risse-Kappen, Thomas. "Democratic Peace—Warlike Democracies? A Social Constructivist Interpretation of the Liberal Argument." *European Journal of International Relations* 1, no. 4 (1995).

Robertson, Roland. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage, 1992.

Rose, Gillian. *Feminism and Geography: The Limits of Geographical Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Rosenberg, Justin. "The International Imagination: IR Theory and 'Classical Social Analysis.' " *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 23, no. 1 (1994).

Rotter, Andrew J. "Gender Relations, Foreign Relations: The United States and South Asia, 1947–1964." *Journal of American History* 81, no. 2 (1994).

Royte, Elizabeth. "The Outcasts." *New York Times Magazine*, January 19, 1997.

Ruddick, Sara. "Toward a Feminist Peace Politics." In *Gendering War Talk*, ed. Miriam Cooke and Angela Woollacott. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

———. *Maternal Thinking: Toward a Politics of Peace*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1989.

Ruggie, John Gerard. "At Home Abroad, Abroad at Home: International Liberalisation and Domestic Stability in the New World Economy." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 24, no. 3 (1994).

Rummell, Rudolph. "Democracies ARE Less Warlike than Other Regimes." *European Journal of International Relations* 1, no. 4 (1995).

Runyan, Anne Sisson. "The Places of Women in Trading Places." In *Globalization: Theory and Practice*, ed. Eleonore Kofman and Gillian Youngs. London: Pinter, 1996.

———. "Third World Women in the Global Factory: Neither 'Victims' nor 'Saviors'." *Fletcher Forum* 17, no. 2 (1993).

———. "Women in the Neoliberal 'Frame.' " In *Gender Politics in Global Governance*, ed. Mary K. Meyer and Elisabeth Prügl. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999.

Runyan, Anne Sisson, and Marianne H. Marchand. "Feminist Approaches to Global Restructuring." In *Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites, and Resistances*, ed. Marianne H. Marchand and Anne Sisson Runyan. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Runyan, Anne Sisson, and V. Spike Peterson. "The Radical Future of Realism: Feminist Subversions of IR Theory." *Alternatives* 16, no. 1 (1991).

Russett, Bruce. *Grasping the Democratic Peace: Principles for a Post–Cold War World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Safa, Helen I. "Runaway Shops and Female Employment: The Search for Cheap Labor." In *Women's Work: Development and the Division of Labor by Gender*, ed. Eleanor Leacock and Helen I. Safa. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey, 1986.

Sassen, Saskia. "The Spatial Organization of Information Industries: Implications for the Role of the State." In *Globalization: Critical Reflections*, ed. James H. Mittelman. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1997.

Schmidt, Brian. *The Political Discourse of Anarchy: A Disciplinary History of International Relations*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998.

Scholte, J. A. "Beyond the Buzzword: Towards a Critical Theory of Globalization." In *Globalization: Theory and Practice*, ed. Eleonore Kofman and Gillian Youngs. London: Pinter, 1996.

Scott, Joan. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis." *American Historical Review* 91, no. 5 (1986).

Seager, Joni. *The State of Women in the World Atlas*. Rev. 2nd ed. London: Penguin, 1997.

Segal, Lynne. *Is the Future Female? Troubled Thoughts on Contemporary Feminism*. London: Virago Press, 1987.

Sen, Gita, and Caren Grown. *Development, Crises, and Alternative Visions: Third World Women's Perspectives*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1987.

Sharoni, Simona. "Gender and Middle East Politics." *Fletcher Forum* 17, no. 2 (1993).

Shiva, Vandana. *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology, and Development*. London: Zed Books, 1989.

Sinclair, Timothy J. "Beyond International Relations Theory: Robert W. Cox and the Approaches to World Order." In *Approaches to World Order*, ed. Robert W. Cox, with Timothy J. Sinclair. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Singer, Max, and Aaron Wildavsky, eds. *The Real World Order: Zones of Peace, Zones of Turmoil*. Chatham, N.J.: Chatham House, 1993.

Smith, Steve. "New Approaches to International Theory." In *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, ed. John Baylis and Steve Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

———. "Positivism and Beyond." In *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, ed. Steve Smith, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

———. "The Self-Images of a Discipline." In *International Relations Theory Today*, ed. Ken Booth and Steve Smith. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press, 1995.

Smith, Steve, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski, eds. *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Smoke, Richard. "National Security Affairs." In *Handbook of Political Science*, vol. 8: *International Relations*, ed. Fred Greenstein and Nelson Polsby. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1975.

Stacey, Judith. "Can There Be a Feminist Ethnography?" *Women's Studies International Forum* 11, no. 1 (1988).

Stephenson, Carolyn. "Women's International Nongovernmental Organizations at the United Nations." In *Women, Politics, and the United Nations*, ed. Anne Winslow. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1995.

Stienstra, Deborah. "Of Roots, Leaves, and Trees: Gender, Social Movements, and

Global Governance." In *Gender Politics in Global Governance*, ed. Mary K. Meyer and Elisabeth Prügl. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999.

———. *Women's Movements and International Organizations*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994.

Swerdlow, Amy. "Motherhood and the Subversion of the Military State: Women's Strike for Peace Confronts the House Committee on Un-American Activities." In *Women, Militarism, and War: Essays in History, Politics, and Social Theory*, ed. Jean Bethke Elshtain and Sheila Tobias. Savage, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1990.

Sylvester, Christine. "The Contributions of Feminist Theory to International Relations." In *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, ed. Steve Smith, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

———. "Empathetic Cooperation: A Feminist Method for IR." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 23, no. 2 (1994).

———. *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

———. "Some Dangers in Merging Feminist and Peace Projects." *Alternatives* 12, no. 4 (1987).

Tessler, Mark, and Ina Warriner. "Gender, Feminism, and Attitudes toward International Conflict: Exploring Relationships with Survey Data from the Middle East." *World Politics* 49, no. 2 (1997).

Thomas, Caroline. *In Search of Security: The Third World in International Relations*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1987.

Tickner, J. Ann. "Feminist Perspectives on Globalization." In *Globalization, Human Security, and the African Experience*, ed. Caroline Thomas and Peter Wilkin. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1999.

———. *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.

———. "Hans Morgenthau's Principles of Political Realism: A Feminist Reformulation." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 17, no. 3 (1988).

———. "Identity in International Relations Theory: Feminist Perspectives." In *The Return of Culture and Identity in International Relations Theory*, ed. Yosef Lapid and Friedrich Kratochwil. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1996.

———. "Re-Visioning Security." In *International Relations Theory Today*, ed. Ken Booth and Steve Smith. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press, 1995.

———. "Why Women Can't Run the World: International Politics According to Francis Fukuyama." *International Studies Review* 1, no. 3 (1999).

———. "You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements between Feminists and IR Theorists." *International Studies Quarterly* 41, no. 4 (1997).

Tobias, Sheila. "Shifting Heroisms: The Use of Military Service in Politics." In *Women, Militarism, and War: Essays in History, Politics, and Social Theory*, ed.

Jean Bethke Elshtain and Sheila Tobias. Savage, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1990.

Tong, Rosemarie Putnam. *Feminist Thought: A More Comprehensive Introduction*. 2nd ed. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1998.

Toulmin, Stephen. "Concluding Methodological Reflections." In *Beyond Theory: Changing Organizations through Participation*, ed. Stephen Toulmin and Bjorn Gustavsen. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1996.

True, Jacqui. "Feminism." In *Theories of International Relations*, ed. Scott Burchill and Andrew Linklater. London: Macmillan, 1996.

———. "Gendering Post-Socialist Transitions." In *Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites, and Resistances*, ed. Marianne H. Marchand and Anne Sisson Runyan. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Udayagiri, Mridula. "Challenging Modernization." In *Feminism/Postmodernism/Development*, ed. Marianne H. Marchand and Jane L. Parpart. London: Routledge, 1995.

Ullman, Richard. "Redefining Security." *International Security* 8 (1983): 129–53.

United Nations Development Programme. *Human Development Report*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995, 1996, 1999.

United Nations High Commission on Refugees (UNHCR). *UNHCR by Numbers*. http://www.unhcr.ch/unref/numbers/table2 (printed June 29, 2000).

Van Evera, Stephen. "Hypotheses on Nationalism and War." *International Security* 18, no. 4 (1994).

Waever, Ole. "The Rise and Fall of the Inter-Paradigm Debate." In *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, ed. Steve Smith, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

———. "Securitization and De-securitization." In *On Security*, ed. Ronnie Lipschutz. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

Walby, Sylvia. "Post-Post Modernism? Theorizing Social Complexity." In *Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates*, ed. Michele Barrett and Anne Phillips. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press, 1992.

Walker, R. B. J. "Gender and Critique in the Theory of International Relations." In *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory*, ed. V. Spike Peterson. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1992.

———. "History and Structure in the Theory of International Relations." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 18, no. 2 (1989).

———. "Security, Sovereignty, and the Challenge of World Politics." *Alternatives* 15 (1990): 3–27.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. "The Inter-State Structure of the Modern World-System." In *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, ed. Steve Smith, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Walt, Stephen M. "The Renaissance of Security Studies." *International Studies Quarterly* 35 (1991): 211–39.

Waltz, Kenneth N. "The Emerging Structure of International Politics." *International Security* 18, no. 2 (1993).
———. *Man, the State, and War*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
———. "The Stability of a Bipolar World." *Daedalus* 93, no. 3 (1964).
———. *Theory of International Politics*. Boston: Addison-Wesley, 1979.
Washburn, Patricia. "Women and the Peace Movement." In *Women and the Use of Military Force*, ed. Ruth Howes and Michael Stevenson. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1993.
Waylen, Georgina. "Women and Democratization: Conceptualizing Gender Relations in Transition Politics." *World Politics* 46 (April 1994).
Wendt, Alexander. "Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics." *International Organization* 46, no. 2 (1992).
West, Lois. "The United Nations Women's Conferences and Feminist Politics." In *Gender Politics in Global Governance*, ed. Mary K. Meyer and Elisabeth Prügl. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999.
Whitworth, Sandra. *Feminism and International Relations*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994.
———. "Gender in the Inter-Paradigm Debate." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 18, no. 2 (1989).
Wight, Martin. "Why Is There No International Theory?" In *Diplomatic Investigations*, ed. Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight. London: Allen & Unwin, 1966.
Wilkin, Peter. "Human Security and Class in a Global Economy." In *Globalization, Human Security, and the African Experience*, ed. Caroline Thomas and Peter Wilkin. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1999.
Williams, Marc. "Rethinking Sovereignty." In *Globalization: Theory and Practice*, ed. Eleonore Kofman and Gillian Youngs. London: Pinter, 1996.
Wolchik, Sharon. "Women and the Politics of Transition in Central and Eastern Europe." In *Democratic Reform and the Position of Women in Transitional Economies*, ed. Valentine M. Moghadan. Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press, 1993.
Wolf, Margery. *A Thrice-Told Tale: Feminism, Postmodernism, and Ethnographic Responsibility*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1992.
Woolf, Virginia. *Three Guineas*. New York: Harcourt Brace & World, 1966.
World Commission on Environment and Development. *Our Common Future*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
Youngs, Gillian. "Dangers of Discourse: The Case of Globalization." In *Globalization: Theory and Practice*, ed. Eleonore Kofman and Gillian Youngs. London: Pinter, 1996.
———. *International Relations in a Global Age: A Conceptual Challenge*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press, 1999.
Yuval-Davis, Nira. *Gender and Nation*. London: Sage, 1997.
———. "Women as Citizens." In *Women and Citizenship in Europe: Borders, Rights,*

and Duties: Women's Differing Identities in a Europe of Contested Boundaries, ed. Anna Ward, Jeanne Gregory, and Nira Yuval-Davis. Stoke-on-Trent, U.K.: Trentham Books, 1992.

Zalewski, Marysia. "All Those Theories Yet the Bodies Keep Piling Up." In *International Theory: Postivism and Beyond*, ed. Steve Smith, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

———. "Feminist Standpoint Theory Meets International Relations Theory: A Feminist Version of David and Goliath?" *Fletcher Forum* 17, no. 2 (1993).

———. "Feminist Theory and International Relations." In *From Cold War to Collapse: Theory and World Politics in the 1980s*, ed. Mike Bowker and Robin Brown. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

———. "Where Is Woman in International Relations? 'To Return as a Woman and Be Heard' " *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 27, no. 4 (1998).

Zalewski, Marysia, and Jane Parpart, eds. *The "Man" Question in International Relations*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1998.

Index