
Gender and peace: towards a gender inclusive, holistic perspective

Tony Jenkins and Betty A. Reardon

Introduction: toward a new phase of the inquiry into gender and peace

The authors of this chapter are peace educators who believe that peace knowledge in all its forms constitutes one field from which multiple forms of learning relevant to the tasks of educating and acting for peace can be gleaned. We have drawn upon all of them, the fruits of peace research, the substance of university peace studies, the methodologies of peace education and practical peace action in the development of the pedagogies we practise. We adhere to educational methods consistent with the values of justice and nonviolence that inform the pursuit of peace knowledge. These are built upon a verifiable knowledge base, informed by sound theories, and directed toward developing the capacities of learners to make normative judgements based on the values, apply the knowledge and verify or refute the theories through inquiry and communal learning. These methods imbue the approach we take to gender and peace as considered in this essay as well as in our professional practice. They reflect adherence to principles of holism in inquiry into problems and in exploration of possible resolutions of or means to transcend the problems of peace that we take in sum to be the problematic of violence.

These are the premises that underlie the following discussions that will reflect upon the possibility that gender, the social roles of and social distinctions between men and women, when fully perceived, is not only as the United Nations refers to it, a cross-cutting issue, affecting most problems and areas of concern to peace knowledge, but also one possible core of a holistic study of the central problematic of violence. Because of this cross-cutting character and the universality of gender concerns, might not gender also serve as an organizing concept around which to build studies not only of gender equality and peace, but as the potential core of a systematic inquiry into the possibilities for the transformation of the present violent world order? We also ask whether such a transformation is possible without recognizing, dismantling and forswearing various institutions and habits of patriarchy that we perceive as integral to the present global culture of violence, a major factor affecting such problems as denial of human rights, economic inequity, ecological deterioration and armed conflict. Taken as a whole these problems comprise all that we have come to consider as the war system, those pervasive habits and institutions of political, economic, social and cultural violence that are a major impediment

to peace and human security. We hope that others concerned with the role of gender in the creation and dissemination of peace knowledge would join in an inquiry into the illumination of contemporary forms of patriarchy as a complement and extension to what has gone before in the evolution of the field of gender and peace. We define patriarchy, as does Joshua Goldstein, as the 'social organization of men's control of power'.¹ The topic as presented in this volume is classified as knowledge supporting peace; we, however, ask is not this problematic of gender as constitutive to peace knowledge as are conflict studies or any of the other topics here categorized as central to the substance of peace studies?

Overview of some significant developments in the field

The field of gender and peace has evolved through various phases, each with a perspective based on the concerns of its time. All phases, however, found some roots in the problematic of patriarchy, a social and cultural construct that has not only privileged men over women, but can be seen as a paradigm for other forms of authoritarianism, hierarchy and inequality. It is precisely the 'patriarchal privilege' as it is termed by Michael Kaufman,² that is the common thread that runs through the development of the field as it does through women's and men's struggles for gender justice. Through this century we see the field as evolving over the following chronology on which scholarship responds to and influences social movements for gender equality.

This chronology is developmental rather than uniquely event based. It underlies an organic view of the evolution of the field in which all realms of peace knowledge interact around the 'cross-cutting issue' of gender. Peace action, research and education on the subject of gender evolved in a process of reciprocal influence that illustrates the holistic nature of peace knowledge that informs our approach to peace education. The periods delineated below are not discrete, nor do the developments, even when viewed from a global perspective, evolve simultaneously in all areas of the world. We offer it here as a general framework for the narrative which will, by nature of the topics addressed, weave in and out of the various developmental phases we designate as follows.

The years 1900–45 were decades of the articulation of the problematic of women's subordinate social and political status, and in the years preceding both world wars of the articulation of intuitions regarding women's lack of political power as an obstacle to peace. Women's primary political activities were devoted to achieving suffrage. From 1945–70, attention was focused on the ongoing subordination of women and the limitations on their legal rights that existed, in some cases, even where women had the vote. The United Nations established a Commission on the Status of Women and later a more proactive agency, the Division for the Advancement of Women. A number of foundational works in modern feminism were published.

From 1970–85, the activism of women directed toward the realization of equality in all spheres, both public and private, energized the United Nations to launch efforts to set standards and goals for women's equality. These efforts were significantly advanced by two international decades on women and three international conferences, held in 1975, 1980 and 1985, organized around the themes of 'Equality, Development and Peace'. A major landmark of the period was the adoption of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). These were also the years of the first academic inquiries into women and peace and the emergence of what was to become a significant body of literature on the topic.

The final developmental phase of the century occurred from 1985–2000. There was intense

interest and activity around the denial of the human rights of women, resulting in campaigns to implement and augment CEDAW, one result of which was the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Violence against Women. The 1995 Beijing Fourth World Conference on Women set a range of standards to assure that women's rights were recognized and implemented as universal human rights. Feminist theory on women and peace was further developed and was complemented in the 1990s by the initiation of masculinities studies, making an actual gender perspective on the peace problematic possible. The culminating development of this phase was the adoption of Security Council Resolution 1325 on 'Women, Peace and Security'.

The first decade of the twenty-first century saw the beginning of inquiry and action around the vestiges of traditional patriarchy that continue to pose significant obstacles not only to gender equality but to a range of problems addressed by the fields of peace knowledge. The Patriarchy Project we describe in the last section of the essay was launched at the UN Conference on Racism held in 2002 in Durban, South Africa and carried to global civil society at the World Social Forum held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in 2004. It is carried on by a worldwide network of scholars and activists, committed to the achievement of universal gender justice and an end to war.

In the first sections of our essay we offer a selective account from our own particular perspective of issues and developments in action, research and education that have influenced the place of gender in the realms of peace knowledge. Starting with some consideration of women's resistance to war, we will move to noting how taking a political perspective to women's secondary status in most societies led feminists to proposing integral links between women's exclusion from policy-making and the continued recourse to war as a mechanism for the conduct of international conflict. Next, we will observe how international attention to the status of women led to the development of international agreements intended to achieve gender equality. Then, we take note of how the international cooperation among women that produced the agreements bought about an even wider view of the relationship between gender inequality and gender violence and a more holistic gender analysis of the problematic of the global culture of violence currently being informed by masculinities studies. These sections of our chapter serve as a preface to a statement of the new more inclusive dimension we hope to see integrated into this essential field of inquiry into the conditions of peace as a means to more fully illuminate the problematic of patriarchy.

We place our account in the framework of the twentieth-century international women's movement and peace actions interacting with scholarship on gender and peace. While taking this international view, we acknowledge that our own experiences, knowledge and interpretations derive primarily from developments in the United Nations, the United States and various international civil society initiatives. The global movement that contributes to knowledge about gender and peace we know to be far wider and more varied than our limited account. We see this chapter as an invitation to exchanges with others that might broaden and deepen gender and peace knowledge so that we may be more effective inquirers into the conditions and consequences of patriarchy and some alternative approaches to transcending them.

From the mid twentieth century to the last decade, the academic field evolved primarily out of the theoretical frameworks of feminist scholarship introduced into international relations, peace studies and peace research, and United Nations policies. The earlier phases (1945–70) were focused on legal and political and later economic equality of women, dealing with the manifestations more than the causes of women's subordination, and seeing remedy primarily in the changing of women's legal status. Feminist perspectives that focused more on the underlying structural and cultural causes came in the later decades of the century as the term gender

came to replace woman and the descriptor of the problematic. The recent addition of masculinities studies, addressing the consequences of men's socialization for peace issues and the consequences to men of the expectations and responsibilities that devolve to them in the war system, now gives validity to 'gender and peace' as the designator of a field, still referred to in some cases as 'women and peace' or 'women and world order'.³

The roots of the field lie, as noted, in women's experience of and response to war, documented in literature and history as the experience of loss, mourning, heroic maternal sacrifice and – most important to the field – dissent and resistance. Study of these universal experiences and responses came out of concern with women's secondary position in human society, noted as a problematic since the outset of Western democratic experiments with representative government. The relevance of the status of women to peace was somewhat acknowledged when raising the status of women was undertaken as a task for international society in the mid twentieth century by the United Nations, largely at the behest of a few women diplomats, such as Helvi Sippila of Finland who became chair of the first UN World Conference on Women in 1975 and Margaret Bruce of the UK who served in the 1970s as director of the UN Division for the Advancement of Women and women's NGOs. Feminist discourse around the connections between women's political status and war, however, date to the early decades of the century in Europe and the United States, and while neither vigorous nor prominent, it laid the foundation for the scholarship that gained attention with the new mid-century interest in the status of women. This interest inspired an outpouring of critiques of the gender blindness of the established field of international relations and the emerging field of peace knowledge, comprising research, studies, education and action.⁴

The gender blindness was first attributed to the limited participation of women in these fields, in policy-making, scholarship, and, especially from the lack of women's perspectives in the research and teaching of the two interrelated but distinct fields, international relations and peace studies. Largely as a consequence of the two UN declared International Women's Decades (1975–95), these critiques brought about attempts to remedy gender bias through a set of international standards set forth by the United Nations. These standards were introduced into the substance of a growing body of research and courses in women's studies, some of them including issues related to women, war and peace and violence against women. While it was in the area of human rights scholarship that this body of normative standards – including references to violence against women and women in armed conflict – received most academic attention, some scholars began to integrate feminist theories and peace theories in work that ultimately became a sub-field in peace studies and a major pedagogical influence on peace education. These standards are an essential component of the inclusive, integrative approach to gender and peace we, the authors, now take in our research and teaching.

Feminist arguments, bolstered by international human rights norms, gave public validation to assertions concerning the negative effects of women's exclusion from analysis and policy-making on matters of peace and security. Taken up by scholars who explored the ways in which gender arrangements contributed to the perpetuation of the social and political uses of violence and the rationalization of war as an instrument of national policy, the links among women's secondary status, war and gender violence became more widely accepted as a given of the problematic of war, and a body of literature on these connections began to emerge and continues to grow. However, there was at first only minimal integration of the work done by feminist scholars and activists working on peace with that of those focusing on human rights. The mainstream women's studies, for the most part perceived these particular inquiries as somewhat more specialized than their own more general study of women's issues and women's history.⁵

One of the most politically effective aspects of the international women's movement focused on the human rights of women and the use of the international standards to defend and implement them. Efforts were led by the Rutgers University Center for Women's Global Leadership and its executive director, Charlotte Bunch. It was from these efforts, mainly on the part of women scholar-activists, that intensive public attention was brought to violence against women.⁶ Inquiry into issues of pervasive social and cultural gender violence and later into the effects of armed conflict on women by feminist scholar-activists in the human rights movement contributed to the articulation of a more general theory of violence, encompassing multiple forms and arenas of violence from interpersonal and domestic violence to organized warfare. The gendered aspects of violence became an important area of inquiry for a number of feminist scholars who sought to develop theories addressing male aggression as a factor in cultures of violence and the inclination toward war. Some argued that male aggressivity was socially and culturally cultivated in men and problematized male dominance in science – among them, Brian Easlea and Evelyn Fox Keller – as well as politics as a major causal factor in the origins and continuation of the arms race.⁷

Inquiries on social and gender violence, a significant aspect of the emerging field of the study of masculinities, have increased the numbers of male scholars in the field and led to the conceptualization of an inclusive gender perspective now taking hold. Recent developments have deepened and extended the arguments advanced on the issue of gender violence by feminist scholarship through the twentieth century to the present day in which institutionalized patriarchy itself is becoming more widely viewed as a central problematic.

We see this latest development to be infusing new possibilities for the transformational learning pursued by the education realm of peace knowledge. We would suggest that this currently developing phase of the field could integrate masculinities studies with human rights norms and concepts in a framework of inquiry into patriarchy. We have a particular interest in issues of gender inquiry of this type because of its relevance to the fundamental elements in the puzzle of peace as well as the transformative learning possibilities it offers. The gender issue itself is at once challenging, comprehensive and, we believe, highly amenable to positive change through learning facilitated by the critical and reflective pedagogies practised in peace education.

Gender refers to the culturally defined and socially sanctioned roles in human affairs played by men and women and the characteristics attributed to each that have rationalized these roles. Gender here is construed as it has been defined by the United Nations in the Beijing Platform for Action, the Swedish report on patriarchal violence quoted below, and in such documents as those calling for gender mainstreaming – including a gender perspective in the consideration of all issues and in all programmes addressed and conducted by the world body. We believe that the systematic nature of patriarchal gender designations and roles constitutes a highly significant and much neglected aspect of the study of gender and peace. Because we perceive gender aspects in virtually every issue and problem addressed by peace and conflict studies, we are attempting to integrate elements of these issues into all our work in peace education.⁸

This concept of gender and our assumptions about the connections of gender violence and patriarchy were articulated by the government of Sweden. In a 2005 report of a survey 'Patriarchal violence – an attack on human security', identified as a major global issue, they define gender as:

The totality of ideas and actions that combine to create social gender identity in individuals.
A cultural process that collectively attributes traditionally male/masculine or female/feminine

qualities to individuals. Also used in queer theory, which to a greater extent emphasizes gender as a diverse concept in which heterosexuality is seen as the basis of the gender order.⁹

Lysistrata to Greenham Common and Okinawa: women's resistance to war and militarism

The Lysistrata phenomenon, our designation of women's resistance to war – taken from the classical work by the Greek playwright, Aristophanes – gave rise to discussion of some gender concepts that have been largely repudiated as essentialism, the notion that there are essences or essential characteristics within each sex that significantly influence how they respectively view the world and behave in it. Women's purported tendency to avoid or prevent violence is one such characteristic, sometimes attributed to the perceptions that women have less physical strength than men, and are therefore more timid and fearful of violence. As recent experiences of the men of the Christian Peacemakers Team held hostage in Iraq in 2005 attest, nonviolence is not an exclusively 'womanly' behaviour.¹⁰

Women's resistance has involved a range of strategies of active nonviolence, which while not intended to harm those whose power, policies or ideas are being resisted, involves significant risks on the part of the resisters.¹¹ Withholding sexual access in a patriarchal society risks the wrath of the patriarchs who control the destinies of the women resisting. The strategy is largely based on the essentialist assumption that men cannot or will not live without sexual gratification. While this strategy is said to have been employed by pre-colonial Native American women, and maybe others in addition to women of ancient Greece, it is not credited with ending any particular war and certainly has not limited or weakened the institution of war. However, such actions have helped to feed the essentialist notion that women are more 'civilized' or morally developed than men, and that this quality rather than a considered judgement on the political efficacy of war has accounted for women's resistance.¹²

Resistance as a strategy to avoid or end war has continued to be practised in other forms by women peace activists, often in highly visible forms such as the Greenham Common Women, encamped around the US military bases in the UK during the early 1980s to demonstrate their opposition to the presence of the bases, and to the nuclear weapons stored beneath the common. Within this particular initiative there were strong separatist elements that rejected men's participation in the resistance. There were elements of radical feminism, one school of which, articulated by Andrea Dworkin, held that misogyny and the binary gender designations that came from the assumption of heterosexuality as 'normal' served to perpetuate patriarchal control over women and children as it oppressed and repressed all other forms of sexuality and gender identities.¹³ Those who held these views insisted that women's actions should be separated from men's actions (indeed, that it was the behaviours of men that formed the problematic) in various women's acts of resistance to war. This position was reinforced by women's relegation to secondary or auxiliary roles in many peace movement activities by the lack of acknowledgement of women's taking primary responsibility in the organizing of major peace campaigns and actions, and by the exploitation of women's efforts by some men in the peace movement – such as the major anti-base manifestations in Okinawa, and one of the largest peace marches in history in New York on 12 June 1982 – and by instances of sexual harassment experienced by some women in the movement.

The experience of the marginalization, even the exclusion, of women was not unknown in the other realms of peace knowledge and peace action. While the first efforts to introduce the question of the relationship of women's status to peace into the International Peace Research

Association (IPRA) were undertaken in 1975, it was not until a decade later that the Women and Peace Commission was established, officially recognizing the topic as a field of peace research. In Okinawa, women who sought to call attention to the gender security problems posed by the long-term presence of US military on that island were rebuffed as distracting from the goal of base removal by male activists who could not understand the repeated gender violence against women committed by US service personnel as another argument to place before the Japanese government to induce it to request base closings. These women organized Okinawa Women Act Against Military Violence (OWAAM) in 1995 in launching protests about the rape of a twelve-year-old girl by three US servicemen. This and subsequent actions of resistance and opposition were taken within an analytic framework that placed this gender violence, which OWAAM termed military violence – violence committed by military against civilians or outside the realm of combat – within a framework of patriarchal militarization. A similar analysis of the militarization of society informed the resistance efforts of the Israeli women who organized New Profile.¹⁴ Both groups continue to resist as the Israeli occupation of Palestinian territory continues, and US bases, while somewhat changed by moving forces from one base to another, still occupy large, formerly agricultural areas of Okinawa.¹⁵ New Profile also facilitates men's nonviolent resistance in its support of conscientious objectors' refusal of service in the occupied territories of Palestine.

Accounts of Greenham Common and similar encampments in other countries were widely admired by the international women's peace movement that proliferated along with the proliferation of nuclear weapons during the Cold War, and so were included in some peace studies as well women's studies courses. These actions along with the 'gender gap', a phrase used to describe the purported tendency of women to vote for more peace-oriented candidates and policies while men tended to support policies of 'strength' and armed force, were included among other such types of evidence to explore the sources of these differences. The notion that women's experience as mothers, if not their reproductive biology per se, accounted for these manifestations of resistance, or that women were by nature more peaceful than men was, as noted, rejected by most feminist as essentialism, reducing the phenomenon to the reproductive difference between the sexes. Some, such as Christine Sylvester, argued that women had warrior capacity and inclination equal to that of men.¹⁶ These manifestations took on political forms such as the women's delegation to European leaders on the eve of The First World War that attempted to persuade them to continue to follow the diplomatic path to spare their countries the inevitable suffering that any war brings.

The 'motherhood' rationale for resistance was articulated during the mid-nineteenth century in the wake of the American Civil War when the 'Mothers Proclamation', pledging to raise sons who would not take the lives of other mothers' sons was promulgated, and Mothers' Day declared as an anti-war holiday. It continued into the twentieth century and found its manifestations in such movements as the US Women Strike for Peace, a movement initiated to protect children from the health consequences of nuclear testing that brought about the 1963 Test Ban Treaty and the Soldiers' Mothers' Movement in Russia through which women resisted their sons' serving in the armed conflict in Afghanistan in the 1990s.¹⁷ More recently, in 2006 the organizers of Code Pink, a women's group organized in opposition to the Iraq war, circulated the Proclamation in observance of the third anniversary of the American invasion of Iraq, reminding the public that Mothers' Day had political significance beyond the commercialism and sentimentality that it has come to manifest.¹⁸

While it was evident that the motherhood concept was an organizing principle for such actions, feminist peace scholars and educators generally refuted it as being inconsistent with the theory of gender as a socially or culturally constructed category of human identity as indicated

in the definition used in the previously cited report from the Office of the Swedish Government. While not uncontested, this argument gained ascendancy in the growing field of peace knowledge that focused on women's roles in and perspectives on war and peace. We, the authors, do not deny the differences in behaviours and inclinations that research suggests may be biologically based. So, too, we find interesting and potentially useful toward our own purposes of challenging the patriarchal paradigm of enforced heterosexuality, male dominance and militarized security, the theoretical propositions published by Myra J. Hird of Queens University in Canada:

In contemporary society, the conceptual division between 'sex' as the biological differences, and 'gender' as the social, cultural, economic and political differences is largely taken for granted
. . . current concern with the fragmentation of identities is crucially linked to questions concerning the continued viability of [this differentiation]. . .
Nature . . . offers shades of difference and similarity much more often than clear opposites.¹⁹

As peace educators, we find this discourse on diversity in sex and gender promising of new possibilities into the many forms of diversity which we believe must be understood and defended against the onslaughts of fundamentalist reductionisms in the realms of gender, culture and religious and political ideology. In fact, we expect that wider and deeper inquiries into the political valences of gender will offer possibilities to educate for a humanly diverse as well as a more just and less violent global order.

With regard to the issues raised by the relevance of motherhood to gender and peace, we tend to believe it is the experience rather than the biological fact of motherhood, the learned caring and nurturing more than the biology of reproduction that influences mothers' pleas and actions for peace.²⁰ The biological factors under discussion indicate that the evident differences between men and women in regard to war and peace are far more complex than either of the two explanations of biology or social construction of gender or men's and women's actual roles in conducting war can account for.²¹ This complexity, as we will see below in the account of the emergence of masculinities studies, is what gives this area of peace knowledge its special cogency for peace education. The multiple concepts and constructions of masculinities in various cultures and during different historic periods, not only continue to challenge biological determinism and essentialism, they illustrate that human behaviour and characteristics are susceptible to the influence of context and circumstance and, we believe, can be affected by intentional education as much as by traditional socialization.

Peace education is concerned with developing pedagogies that enable learners to think in terms of complexities beyond the standard curricula on controversial issues that usually teach students to consider little more than the two major opposing positions involved in the public discourse on the issues in question. It also seeks to enable learners to confront and explore some highly charged social issues that have personal valence for most people in as deeply reflective and socially responsible a manner as possible. Gender and the contending theories about its formation and significance is such an issue.

It is well known that the peace education has been influenced by Freirean pedagogy.²² The Brazilian educator, Paulo Freire, advocated practice of a dialogic pedagogy of reflection and action that was one of the foundations of critical pedagogy practised by many peace educators. But it is not so widely known that feminist pedagogy that addresses the significance of the personal dimensions to classroom discussion and learning has also had a profound effect on the work of many peace educators. In this regard, the work of Belenky et al. described in *Women's Ways of Knowing* and the work of Carol Gilligan on gender differences in moral decision

making are very relevant to peace education practice.²³ Gender differences in ways of learning and knowing, which we believe to be, largely but not entirely, the consequence of gender relations and the differences in the socialization experiences of boys and girls, provide some of the multiple ways of thinking that are essentially human. They offer the same possibility as cultural differences for broadening the learning and knowing repertoire necessary to understanding and analyzing the complexities of the challenges of overcoming violence and achieving peace. Gender differences are a primary basis for understanding both multiple ways of knowing and varying perspectives on peace problems.

For feminist peace scholars these complexities were further evidence of the need to include in the growing 'canon' of peace studies the issues and perspectives they had argued to be integral to addressing the central purposes of the field, developing the knowledge necessary to reduce violence and advance justice. They argued that the failure to include these considerations militated against achieving the purposes for which peace knowledge was being produced and advanced through research and education. It took over a decade of professional discussions and arguments to gain general recognition of the cogency of the feminist arguments. Some specifics of these developments will be noted below as we discuss some of the political dimensions of gender and peace.

Connecting women, war and political participation

The national and military valorization of motherhood was poignantly evident during the two world wars of the twentieth century. The value that patriarchal, nationalist popular culture placed on motherhood and its vital contribution to the maintenance of fighting forces served as a means to deflect the potential influence of the more political anti-war arguments women were advancing and to impede the drive for women's suffrage, seen as a way for women to have more political influence over war, peace and other public matters. Lack of the vote, however, did not prevent the American and European women's active political involvement, not only in forms of passive resistance, but in instances of political intervention such as the aforementioned international women's campaigns to avert the First World War that produced the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF). Launched in this Euro-American peace initiative, WILPF now has national chapters throughout the world, with significant leadership from developing countries.²⁴

WILPF, in a framework of values of justice and peace, made a significant contribution to the development of the integrated, holistic approach that the international peace education movement began to advocate in the 1980s. From its earliest days WILPF made clear connections between what later became recognized as the integral relationship between peace and human rights and contributed to the growing belief that more democratic governments would be less likely to engage in warfare.²⁵ This argument advanced by others has also been put forth by feminists who argue that the extreme underrepresentation of women in most spheres of government documented in UN studies precludes claims of the majority of states to be democracies.²⁶ Interpretations of the rationale for the Second World War, which saw the Western democracies allied in the war, tended to strengthen rather than undermine the argument since the popular interpretation was that these nations had taken up arms to defend democracy against dictatorship. This argument, along with the 'gender bending' contributions women made to the successful conduct of the war, was taken up by some in the women's movement in the post-Second World War period in a new phase of feminism. What was to become the international women's movement along with anti-colonialism and anti-racism movements,

arose to demand the fulfillment of the promises of the avowed purposes of the war, to defend democracy, and in the aftermath, to assure human rights as one means to prevent further wars.²⁷

The issues of anti-colonialism and to some extent issues of racial justice found their way onto the research agendas and into the syllabi of peace scholars, but such was not the case with feminist or women's issues. Well into the 1970s questions that we now refer to as gender issues were considered by all but a very few peace researchers – those few were mainly feminists – to have little or no relevance to peace. In the first three editions published in 1972, 1978 and 1981 of the compendium of peace studies syllabi, *Peace and World Order Studies*, no courses on women's or gender issues or approaches were included. The next issue, published in 1983 – the only one edited by a woman – contained five syllabi on the topic in the section with the least entries of any of the topics included. In the edition of 1989, the topic is one of four sections containing only three syllabi – the other three being: ecological balance, alternative futures, education and teacher training, all topics which gender perspectives on peace education considers integral to the holistic approach it favours.

Through these two decades of the 1970s and 1980s feminists and activists with WILPF in the lead insisted on a significant, undeniable interrelationship among the various justice issues of the post-war era that ultimately became the domain of positive peace. One of the unifying concepts was exclusion from and marginalization in politics of disempowered groups. Most of the groups becoming engaged in struggles to achieve a voice in policy-making, participation in their own governance, their places on research agendas and in university and school curricula previously had been for the most part excluded from all these policy realms. Some saw this exclusion as the intentional dominance of the powerful over the powerless to maintain their privileges, rationalized by their greater capacity for the exercise of power. But others began to take a more system-based view, suggesting that the international power-based system itself was the major impediment to justice and peace, bringing the question of alternatives and system change into classroom inquiries and to the design of research projects.²⁸ The questions that formed this inquiry lead to theorizing the links among these forms of exclusions, the economic and political oppressions they rationalized and the institution of war, and, ultimately, to a more systematic analysis of patriarchy and its hold on so many social and institutional systems from school curricula, to church hierarchy, to the corporate world, governmental structures and the security establishment

Advances in international standards: women's equality and peace

WILPF, along with various other women's organizations, took a leading role in the activities surrounding the United Nations' International Decades for Women from 1975–85, 1985–95. Under the general themes of equality, development and peace, concerted efforts were made by the UN and associated NGOs to advance women's legal equality, political participation and involvement at all levels of economic development from planning through assessment. It was in the arena of development that the negative consequences of gender inequality and gender-biased cultural practices became so evident. Issues of advancing the roles and participation of women in the UN system and setting standards to increase their participation in the politics and economies of the member states achieved wider public attention. They were also given more consideration in the field of peace knowledge by those who believed that the UN diagnosis of the relationship between gender and development and the assessments of the consequences of women's marginalization in the development process vividly illustrated the concept of structural violence.

Severe critiques of the almost total lack of attention to the actual effects of prevailing development policy on women – similar to criticisms still raised today about globalization and the economic burdens it imposes on the poor, especially women – were most acutely evident in such basic practices as the UN accounting system that failed to include the unpaid work of women that formed the very foundations of a society's capacity for economic production.²⁹ Especially forceful criticisms came from scholars of women's productive activities. A pioneering work in this field was Ester Boserup's 1970 study on women in development.³⁰ The research on women's economic impoverishment and exclusion from economic policy-making was to become a significant factor in both feminist and human rights arguments on the definitions of human security and what comprises it that arose in the 1990s.

For our purposes of illuminating the peace knowledge consequences of these exclusions, the most significant critiques came from feminist political scientists and international relations scholars. We find the most relevant to our perspective to be the works of Cynthia Cockburn of the UK and Anne Tickner and Cynthia Enloe of the US who offer strong argumentation that much of what peace research and most of the peace movement consider wrong headed and destructive policies and practices in the international system. They suggest that the failure to give adequate consideration to alternatives to the politics of force can be attributed to a significant degree to the limitation on and in many cases exclusion of women and women's perspectives from the security policy discourse.³¹ These assertions informed the efforts of UN-associated NGOs to convene the October 2000 open session of the Security Council that issued Security Council Resolution 1325 (SC 1325), calling for the equal representation of women in peace and security negotiations and policy-making.

Gender exclusion refers not only to lack of women's participation, but also and especially ignoring the human consequences of gender-blind policies as they are experienced by both men and women. Such exclusion has also negatively impacted men, especially those at lower levels of political power, a problem not yet systematically addressed. Recognition of the impact of gender exclusion set into motion innovations in UN policy and norm setting that reciprocally affected and were affected by women's studies and a bit later by feminist scholarship such as that noted above.

The most significant of UN normative gender standards were the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW 1980), the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Violence against Women (1993), the Beijing Platform for Action (1995) and Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000).³² These documents constitute a line of awareness and assertion of public responsibility for the achievement of women's equality in political, economic, social and cultural arenas, complementing and extending the preceding major emphasis on legal equality – although this still remains a significant and controversial issue in various societies. With the latter two documents, protection of women from gender-based violence, including and especially military violence, was designated as a fundamental human right. The inclusion of women in peace and conflict negotiations and security policy-making was declared by the UN to be essential to democracy and the achievement of this right. SC 1325 has become an important basis of action to implement all these gender relevant international norms, serving as a political tool for international peace groups as well as women's NGOs. It is also a powerful example of collaboration between NGOs and the UN, and between women and men. The developments making the resolution possible were set in motion in 1999 by Anwarul K. Chowdhury, who was then the UN Ambassador from Bangladesh and president of the UN General Assembly. His words quoted below attest to his commitment to its purposes:

The potential of Resolution 1325, its implications and impact in real terms are enormous. That

women make a difference when in decision- and policy-making positions is no longer in dispute. When women participate in peace negotiations and in the crafting of a peace agreement, they keep the future of their societies in mind. They have the broader and longer-term interest of society in mind. Whereas, historically in post-conflict situations, men are interested in ensuring that the peace process will give them the authority and power that they are seeking. A lasting peace cannot be achieved without the participation of women and the inclusion of gender perspectives and participation in peace processes.³³

Thus, through this human rights route over the terrain of positive peace, the issue of gender as it relates to negative peace, the actual gendered experiences and consequences of war and peace within the sphere of traditional concepts of security became an important focus of the international gender discourse. With a particular focus on the multiple forms of sexist violence suffered by women in most societies and the effects of armed conflict on women, came recognition that these multiple forms of violence both in times of apparent peace as well as in times of war were interconnected in a global culture of violence. These trends illuminated and brought wider attention to the gender inequality-war interconnections. Understanding the interconnections in turn led more feminist scholars, researchers and peace activists, among them those in the Peace Education Commission of the International Peace Research Association, to adopt as a working premise the assertion that gender violence is one component of an essentially violent patriarchal international system. These interconnections were integral to a statement from the 1983 consultative meeting of what was to become IPRA's Women and Peace Commission. The statement identified the interconnections as 'a continuum of violence which links the violence against women to the violence of war.' The consultation also asserted that there were, 'connections between patriarchy, militaristic structures and values and direct violence. . . .'³⁴ The assertion was that patriarchy has been maintained through the monopoly on power held by the men at the top of the hierarchical order rationalized by a claim of male superiority. The power is manifest in the hierarchy's control of force. These assertions were later to become a subject of further analysis by masculinities scholars in exploration of the connections between masculine identities and aggressivity. Some of their conclusions will be elaborated on later in this chapter. Similar assertions were also echoed in a statement from a preparatory meeting for the Beijing Fourth World Conference on Women organized by the United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women in December 1994.³⁵

During the 1980s when there was a quantum leap in literature on women, peace and security there was also a wider acknowledgement that violence, the institutions, habits of mind and behaviours that perpetuate it comprise what had been defined as the war system.³⁶ We now argue that war is an essentially patriarchal institution. But patriarchy itself was not the subject of wide study for some years to come. Only now is it emerging as a central focus among scholars in masculinities studies, feminist peace and human rights activists whose analytic attention has turned to a more concentrated and systematic consideration of patriarchy as it manifests in contemporary institutions, policies and phenomena.³⁷

We use the phrase 'apparent peace' above to describe the context for which violence against women occurs outside actual war and to call attention to the on-going conditions of structural violence endured by vulnerable groups under the present global economic system, also, and especially, to take note of the gendered nature of the social and cultural violence that has been described as 'the war against women'.³⁸ This war rages in most times and places whether or not societies are engaged in armed conflict. We would argue that there has been an invisible theatre of combat in this gender war, 'the war against men'. Patriarchy is an 'equal opportunity' destroyer of both women and men. As we recommend below, an inclusive gender perspective

that takes into account patriarchy's disadvantages to both men and women offers a unique opportunity to engage in transformational learning toward a peaceful, just and gender equal global order. We believe that a transformation process would require the extension of human rights standards intended to achieve gender justice to include all men and women of all sexualities, gender orientations and identities.³⁹

Violence against women: gendered link between human rights and peace

CEDAW, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the 1980 'women's human rights convention', was a culmination of the campaign for equality women's groups have been waging since the founding of the United Nations. It comprises a review of most of the forms of discrimination and oppression of women as they had been perceived and studied to that point. Its emphasis on the economic, social and cultural factors underlying the lack of legal and political equality echoed the concerns of the larger human rights movement that this sphere of rights had too long taken a back seat to civil and political rights. The separation between the two spheres of human rights impeded the holistic view of the field that a growing number of human rights advocates argued to be essential to the institutionalization and realization of universal human rights. It became the preferred framework for the UN's human rights efforts when it was noted as constitutive to the field in the final document of the 1993 International Conference on Human Rights held in Vienna.

As peace educators, we advocate this holistic perspective as a comprehensive framework for the study of positive peace, arguing that the realization of human rights is the most practical means to the achievement of positive peace. We also consider that a holistic human rights perspective is integral to a truly inclusive gender perspective that in the mode of holism includes the whole spectrum of sexualities, heterosexual, transsexual, bisexual and homosexual, all gender identities. CEDAW is not adequate to the fulfillment of human rights as they would pertain to all these groups; nor does it address the problem of gender violence of any type, not even that perpetrated against women that became a focus of a women's human rights campaign in the next decade.

The origins of the Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women, issued by the Vienna International Conference on Human Rights in 1993, initially lacked systematic focus on the institution of war, but it achieved a major breakthrough in demonstrating that the phenomenon of gender violence was global, pervasive and constituted a long-ignored gross violation of human rights. It eliminated the distinction between women's rights and human rights that had ghettoized gendered aspects of both the discourse on human rights and the struggle for their universal realization. The Beijing Platform for Action, the product of the 1995 Fourth World Conference on Women, viewed as a human rights document made the connections that irrevocably integrated the issue of war into the analysis of and action on issues of gender equality. It paved the way for the campaign organized and conducted by women's NGOs for an open session of the Security Council on 'Women, Peace and Security', which in Resolution 1325 called for the representation of women in all matters concerned with peace and security official UN policy.⁴⁰

The declaration and the resolution are clear illustrations of the ways in which women's movements have bridged the gap between civil society and the interstate system, and achieved a Freirean integration of research, education and action. In the early 1990s, the statistics on violence against women became the subject of even the popular press, producing some

governmental response among Western states. Grassroots women's organizations throughout the world gathered multiple thousands of signatures calling for the international legal acknowledgement that gender violence was in serious contradiction of the international human rights norms.⁴¹ The signed petitions were delivered to the UN Secretary General and facilitated the agreement to the declaration by the Vienna Conference on Human Rights, further strengthening the claim that women's rights are human rights, articulated in the 1995 Beijing Declaration that introduces the Platform for Action (BPFA). In recent years that has been the discussion of the development of a legally binding international convention on gender violence, so that its prohibition would be established within the body of international human rights treaty law.

The Global Framework of the Beijing Platform is organized around 12 areas of critical concern, three of which provided the precedents that made possible SC 1325. The areas of concern referring to violence against women, women and armed conflict, and women in power and decision making make up the main substance and imperatives put forth in that Security Council resolution that in terms of gender and peace is the most significant international document issued to date. The Platform offers an illuminating definition of violence against women, bringing specificity to the more abstract definition of the Declaration on Violence against Women. For peace educators it is a useful tool for demonstrating how conceptual definitions of problems such as gender injustice can and should be derived from and help to explain the lived realities of those who suffer the problems.

With the two short and simple statements quoted below, the Beijing Platform for Action demonstrates international acceptance of an inclusive concept of gender as a social construct, indicating it is a requisite factor of consideration in all areas of critical concern:

... the differences between women's and men's achievements are still not recognized as the consequences of socially constructed gender roles rather than immutable biological differences.⁴²

An even more significant statement supporting our assertion of the inseparable integral interdependence between gender equality and peace first argued as between women's equality and peace by one of the authors is articulated in the Platform quote below:⁴³

The maintenance of peace and security at the global, regional and local levels, together with the prevention of policies of aggression and ethnic cleansing and the resolution of armed conflict, is crucial for the protection of the human rights of women and girl-children, as well as for the elimination of all forms of violence against them and their use as weapons of war.⁴⁴

The assertion reflected in this quote, as it is in SC 1325, is that viable peace in the absence of democratic politics, providing equal participation to all citizens, is not possible. The unequal representation of women in policy-making is a serious obstacle to peace as indicated in this quotation. Without significant representation of women in the political process abuses listed are not likely to be adequately addressed. The emergence of these concepts that linked women's situation to peace and violence against women to the larger systems of structural and armed violence and the developments that introduced them into the actions of international civil society and the policies of the UN system were – to an extent that may not exist around any other global issue – informed by the involvement of feminist scholars and peace researchers. A symbiotic partnership among the UN agencies such as the Division for the Advancement of Women, UNIFEM (the women's development agency), UNESCO, women's organizations and the academy, produced problem-relevant policies, sharpened research questions, enriched courses with contemporary international developments, and gave this arena of peace research

significant valence in international politics. As noted above, these years, the 1980s in particular, saw a plentiful harvest of literature on women, war and peace and women's human rights that brought a number of scholars together as participants in international civil society, further internationalizing the field, strengthening its global perspective and enriching courses in women's studies and peace studies with research and theorizing around the long-neglected sphere of gender and peace. It also offered particularly fruitful substance for pedagogical developments in peace education, especially among those practitioners who perceived human rights as essential and integral to the field.⁴⁵

From our perspective, this literature's relationship to developments in international civil society and their combined relevance to peace education and the deconstruction of patriarchy, especially, as noted, the feminist critiques of prevailing international relations theory and peace research perspectives, are the most significant. When viewed in terms of the consequences of the lack of women's perspectives and consideration of women's experiences in the analyses and prevailing theories of international relations and interstate conflict since the end of the Second World War, these critiques significantly compromised the conclusions and paradigms in which international security policy was made, analyzed and assessed.⁴⁶ While there are now various critiques of the realist school of international politics, feminist scholar Jane Tickner offered a groundbreaking perspective that remains relevant to our concerns:

In realism's subject matter, as well as in its quest for a scientific methodology, we can detect an orientation that corresponds to some of the masculine-linked characteristics . . . such as the emphasis on power and autonomy and claims to objectivity and rationality. But among realism's critics, virtually no attention has been given to gender as a category of analysis. Scholars concerned with structural violence have paid little attention to how women are affected by global politics or the workings of the world economy, nor to the fact that hierarchical gender relations are interrelated with other forms of domination they do address.⁴⁷

Feminist criticisms such as Tickner's were among the most challenging leveled at the realist school of international politics. Their work was prescient, anticipating criticisms that now are voiced even in mainstream discourse. Similar interpretations of the international significance of hierarchical gender relations later emerged in masculinities studies. Together they have made a significant place for gender in the global peace movement. The Hague Agenda for Peace and Justice in the 21st Century, issued by the end of century civil society peace movement conference held in the Netherlands in 1999, put an inclusive gender perspective in a prominent place in a statement that echoes many similar criticisms of the realist – we would say patriarchal – paradigm of international relations:

The costs of the machismo that still pervades most societies are high for men whose choices are limited by this standard, and for women who experience continual violence both in war and peace. The Hague Appeal for Peace supports the redefinition of distorted gender roles that perpetuate violence.⁴⁸

Towards an inclusive gender perspective: the emergence of masculinities studies

From the earliest days of women's striving for equality there have been men who accepted the arguments, sympathized with the goals, and some few joined in the efforts. Clearly, without

cooperation from a significant number of men in the respective systems, women's national political rights would never have been legally established nor would any of the international gender equality norms been introduced into the body of international human rights standards. While some men ridiculed, reviled and resisted, some also publicly and vigorously assisted. While some men sought to understand and respond to men's violence against women, others felt threatened by changes bringing a wider range of life choices to women.

These challenges produced several distinct responses, some of them referred to as men's movements. In the US, phenomena such as 'Iron John' encouraged men to reclaim their traditional 'male values' of courage, assertion and leadership. Other American initiatives such as the 'Promise Keepers' and the 'Million Man March' called for re-assuming the responsibilities of fatherhood and family. These developments were largely in response and reaction to what were seen as the social and cultural dislocations brought about by women's movements in general and feminism in particular. They focused on men's self image and to some degree on reclaiming male pride of place in traditional society. Such projects we would describe as masculinist.⁴⁹ Masculinism is the reassertion of the masculine characteristics and values of the patriarchal gender order. Australian scholar R. W. Connell writes of the way in which that order is now global and profoundly affected by globalization in a way that reflects present power relations in the international system:

Clearly, the world gender order is not simply an extension of traditional European-American gender order. That gender order was changed by colonialism, and elements from other cultures now circulate globally. Yet in no sense do they mix on equal terms, to produce a United Colors of Benetton gender order. The culture and institutions of the North Atlantic countries are hegemonic within the emergent world system. This is crucial for understanding the kinds of masculinities produced within it.⁵⁰

As so much of the women's movement focused on women's distinct and separate experience, some men's approach to gender issues also emphasized the injustices integral to gender roles focusing on the particular experiences of men. As noted, one strand of the men's movements was related to perceptions that loss of exclusive right to certain social functions and positions was imposing inequality on men. But only masculinities studies worked within a relational or systemic framework that provides an inclusive gender perspective. As Connell states, 'Masculinities do not first exist and then come into contact with femininities; they are produced together in a process that constitutes a gender order.'⁵¹

Another strand of men's response to the gender problematic, the White Ribbon Campaign, a Canadian organization, responding to the growing body of data and policy concern with violence against women, took an approach of acknowledging individual responsibility for and societal acceptance of violence against women in North America.⁵² Some masculinities scholarship, as did some feminist theory, contextualized gender violence with a framework of violence in a male-dominated hierarchy. Michael Kaufman describes interrelationships among forms of men's violence:

Men's violence against women does not occur in isolation but is linked to men's violence against other men and to the internalization of violence that is a man's violence against himself . . . male dominated societies are not only based on a hierarchy of men over women but some men over other men. Violence or the threat of violence among men is a mechanism used from childhood to establish that pecking order.⁵³

Other male activists and scholars looked to the socialization of men, in the framework of

gender as a social construction, undertaking research that became the foundation of masculinities studies. The social construction theory provided a foundation for masculinities studies to explore the cultural, social and biological influences in the formation of masculine identities. They inquired into influences from historical myths, cultural messages, family, biological assertions, ritual, laws, customs, media and sports on male assertiveness and claims to power. Taken together, these messages formed expectations of how a man should behave.

Peace scholars were particularly concerned with the dominant masculine identities that reinforced social hierarchies and the exertion of power by men at the upper levels of hierarchies over women and other men. Gender identities such as the warrior, breadwinner or adventurer, and characteristics such as valour and toughness, served to inspire violent approaches to dealing with conflict and legitimated militarized approaches to peace and security.⁵⁴ During the world wars joining the army was a rite of passage to full American manhood – a phenomenon not unique to the US, as has been documented by Turkish and Israeli scholars.⁵⁵

The manhood myth of the warrior was confronted during the Vietnam War as the anti-war movement decried sending a generation of young men to die in an unjust war. This issue, along with the mandatory military conscription, opened a small window for challenging the valorization of war in forming men's identities. It also manifested another problem as US military recruitment practices began targeting poor, urban and rural youth, particularly African Americans, demonstrating hierarchies among men based on race and socio-economic status.

Over the 1990s and the first decade of this century, scholars began to consider the concept of 'multiple masculinities' in which gender could be seen as constructed differently in different contexts, cultures, historic periods, and under unique circumstances. Multiple masculinities were defined establishing alternatives to the concept of the masculine ideal as the warrior. Especially in times of war, masculinity norms are strongly influenced by patriotism and military service, nurturing strong hero and protector identities, and denigrating male war resisters as less masculine, often meaning humanly inferior. Even in less conflict plagued times, hierarchies exist among masculinities, and in most contexts a hegemonic or most desired form of masculinity emerges.⁵⁶ Within the hierarchies privileged exemptions from the ideal are possible. During the Vietnam War, for example, white middle-class American men could forestall, even avoid going to war by going to college. Upon graduation, the privileged were more likely to gain important positions in society. The poor who served in the military often returned to a jobless civilian life. Hierarchies among masculinities involving race and class as manifest in military service, are further evidence that gender is as rooted in social constructs as it is in biology. The Vietnam war also made more evident the relationship between gender and the institution of war and demonstrated the possibility that both gender inequality and war are amenable to change through socialization and education.

Most masculinities studies were undertaken in the light of the social construction theory of gender. The gendered nature of various institutions and other social arrangements was illuminated, exposing the power and subordination arrangement of patriarchy as one that exists and is sustained largely through the unequal status of men and women. Gender inequality, as asserted earlier by feminist scholarship, an assertion now shared by masculinities studies, pervades virtually all formal and informal institutions, playing a significant role in sustaining the gendered world order and the institution of war. Therefore, any approach to the transformation of the war system will require taking into account the gendered nature of the entire system, inclusive of all the component institutions, social, economic and political. In sum, it calls for a broad and critical social education. We advocate for the inclusion and mainstreaming of gender in all social education, as has been advocated for UN policy and programmes. Gender mainstreaming is:

... assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies and programmes, in any area and at all levels ... making women's as well as men's concerns and experiences integral [to education as well as policy-making] ... so that woman and men benefit equally. The ultimate goal is gender equality [and positive peace].⁵⁷

Especially in the realms of peace studies and peace education, a focus on developing new thinking about gender should become integral to all study and inquiry, cultivating learning that will enable men and women to understand how their gender identities are informed by and sustain the larger system of violence in which war and all forms of gender violence are imbedded. A major task is raising awareness regarding the gender and peace problematic and how all are implicated in it. Women need not perceive themselves as subjects of discrimination or oppression to understand their subordination in the patriarchal hierarchy. Most men do not identify themselves, nor do they perceive their actions, as sustaining gender disparities. Education should elicit understanding of the complex realities of gender inequality. Men do not need to directly contribute to or behave in ways that sustain patriarchal society to the beneficiaries of male privilege. Building awareness of the patriarchal structures that account for gender disparities and male privilege are core learning goals of an inclusive gender perspective in peace education.

We think it significant that it was in the field of education that some of the earliest and most significant work on gender disparities was conducted. It is, therefore, not surprising that some of the leading scholars in masculinities studies are from the discipline of education. Indeed, as noted earlier, the first formal discussion of these issues within the International Peace Research Association were initiated and introduced to peace researchers by IPRA's Peace Education Commission. One of the first works in the field was by the distinguished Norwegian educator Birgit Brock-Utne, a member of that commission, and had concluded that the socialization of boys in ways that promoted cooperation and care for others as valorized in girl's socialization had significant potential as a means to educate for peace.⁵⁸ Male socialization became a fruitful area of inquiry pursued as well by American educators and introduced into international research and policy discussion by UNESCO.⁵⁹

Reflection on the insights and knowledge produced by masculinities studies and their potential integration into an inclusive gender perspective in peace studies and peace education is one of the main tasks that should be high on the agenda of peace knowledge professionals. We need to take into account all of the complexities constitutive to gender and peace. Peace education could utilize the framework of patriarchy to illuminate various forms of hierarchy and to reveal the relational view of gender in which masculinities and femininities – as described above in the quotation from Michael Kimmel – are defined in terms relative to each other in a social construct built into institutions, cultures, power relations and social arrangements. In this context gender construction can be seen as varied, active and dynamic, an example of possibilities for truly significant change in the human condition. Whereas gender roles were formerly defined as dichotomous and static, they may now be conceived as mutable and subject to intentional, normative change. As social constructs, gender roles and relations are revealed to be the product of masculine and feminine identities being formed in parallel social processes. Neither these qualities and identities nor attitudes toward violence and war are formed in isolation from their social and cultural contexts. To understand the contexts toward changing them, it is essential to understand gender and the gender order conditioned by patriarchy.

Moving toward an inclusive gender perspective requires institutionalizing democratic practices and relations that promote tolerance of a range of sexual and gender identities,

understanding the significance of gender to the social order and recognition of the potential peace contributions of what have been previously defined as masculine and feminine qualities. Peace education can play an important role in fostering this perspective through developing critical inquiry that examines various gender identities for both the positive gender attributes that can contribute toward nurturing a culture of peace, and the negative attributes that sustain and promote a culture of violence. Through such a process, conducted in open discourse, respectful of difference, learners may gain confidence in their own critical abilities and a sense of personal responsibility for the achievement of a just social order that could enable them to challenge the gender orders that have so long stifled the aspirations of men and women. As growing awareness of and action on the subordination of women produced historic strides toward gender equality, study of the consequences men suffer in a system of inequality can bring about new strides toward the authentic and inclusive human equality we are denied by patriarchy.

Challenging the patriarchal paradigm: gender equality and human security

Peace educators and peace researchers favouring holistic and integrated approaches to the tasks of building and transmitting peace knowledge have for some time focused attention on paradigms as heuristic devices to clarify characteristics and components of systems of thought, the cultures that produced them and the institutions that sustain them. Until the advent of the concept of a culture of peace, promulgated by UNESCO, the objective had been to develop knowledge to facilitate change in peace and security policies and institutions that would reduce violence and increase justice. Among some of the feminist scholars and activists who have recognized gender equality as a requisite for peace, the premise of the social construction and cultural derivation of gender is now leading to a more focused inquiry into patriarchy itself and how, as we have noted, it is manifested in various contemporary institutions, in cultural practices, both traditional and contemporary, and in social behaviours and relationships. This inquiry – like that which led to the normative and policy changes regarding gender violence and women’s political participation – has been taken up mainly by feminist human rights activists. They argue that the achievement of full and authentic gender equality calls for an inquiry into assumed, enforced and encoded inequalities of the patriarchal paradigm within which neither men nor women are fully free human beings. The patriarchal system is not only a source of gender violence and inequality but of many egregious human rights violations, oppressive to both men and women. We would add to that argument that it also constitutes the most fundamental impediment to peace at all levels of the social order. The failure to name it as such, to fully analyze it as a primary obstacle to the kind of just global order that most would agree to be peace, is what keeps us caught in the war system and mired in the global culture of violence which it nurtures and by which it is nurtured.⁶⁰

A major action research project to remedy this failure is being undertaken by the People’s Movement for Human Rights Education (PDHRE), an NGO that advocates for human rights learning as the means to capacitate populations to achieve social justice, economic equity and political agency. In a document circulated to NGOs and UN agencies, PDHRE states a rationale for the project to which we would adhere and which we would augment:

Throughout recorded history in most human societies some form of patriarchy has prevailed,

reinforced by cultural values derived from systems of male dominance. It has been so commonly and continually practiced as to appear natural rather than a humanly constructed social order that is both changing and changeable. In its present forms patriarchy has become more an ideology and belief system than the explicit social and political systems of earlier times. Even in countries where legal equality of women and men has been established, the deep psychological and cultural roots of patriarchy survive as a belief system in the minds of many women and men. [It] asserts the superiority of all males to all females and arranges this fundamental inequality in a hierarchal order in which middle aged men now hold primary power over all others, controlling economies, militaries, educational and religious institutions. Men in general are more powerful and advantaged than women. Western men have more power in the global order than men from other world regions. Women of higher economic class have power over both men and women of lower income and poverty status. At the very bottom of this hierarchy are the vulnerable and oppressed of the world, most the aged, all children, and women; with most vulnerable being aged, poor women. [Global] threats are made the more complex and difficult to address because of the limits imposed on human capacities and creativity by the gendered power divisions that comprise [patriarchy.] [It] is the antithesis of the ideology of human rights . . . human rights is the core of an alternative belief system that can transcend the limits [patriarchy] imposes on the realization of human possibilities and the enjoyment of human dignity.⁶¹

This statement comprises the normative core of an alternative to the patriarchal paradigm. Human rights, as we have seen, are the inspiration and the practical tool for confronting and overcoming injustice. They have provided the most significant progress to date in gender equality. But, in and of themselves human rights, even under stronger possibilities for enforcement, cannot transcend the violence problematic of patriarchy. Patriarchy maintains itself not only through the patriarchal mind set that has prevailed through centuries, but also and more evidently through the power of armed force, most especially that which is conducted by the hands of the state, exercised through police and military, mirrored in the use of force by non-state actors. Clearly the state itself is a patriarchal institution, and those who aspire to its powers also manifest patriarchal characteristics such as control, force used in self-interest and disregard for the humanity of others. So, an alternative paradigm must elaborate an alternative to military security, pursue the reduction of violence through the reduction of armed forces and weaponry and seek to assure the human dignity of all.

If human rights can be the instruments of progress as it has, even within the patriarchal paradigm, under an effort to simultaneously reduce the primary tools and means of violations while advancing the realization of human rights, the international norms and standards are far more likely to provide actual human security. As peace educators, we endeavour to introduce consideration of these possibilities and to pose elements of the kind of inquiry PDHRE now invites civil society groups throughout the world to engage in as a form of human rights learning. Human rights learning and study of the conditions and possibilities for human security are central to peace education.

We believe that gender can serve as the conceptual core of a comprehensive study of these issues, exploring the problems, the possibilities, the institutions, the values, the concepts and the human experiences that comprise the complexities of the peace problematic. We hope that the field of gender and peace will become central to all realms of peace knowledge, and that all who seek ways to peace through these realms will join in a global inquiry into possible alternatives to the patriarchal paradigm. This paradigm conflates hierarchy with order and command of armed force with virtue as it coerces others into its own image. An alternative human equality paradigm rests on authentic democracy, nonviolent approaches to conflict and assurances of the human dignity of all.

Notes

- 1 Goldstein, J. (2001) *War and Gender*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 2 Kaufman, M. (1999) *The Seven P's of Men's Violence*, at: <http://www.whiteribbon.ca>.
- 3 As it is referred to in a series of compendia of peace studies course outlines, see: Thomas, D. and Klare, M. (eds) (1989) *Peace and World Order Studies: a Curriculum Guide*, 5th edn, New York: World Policy Institute. This is the final of five editions issued by several publishers.
- 4 For distinctions among the realms of peace knowledge, see: Reardon, B. (1998) 'The urgency of peace education: the good news and the bad news', *Japan Peace Studies Bulletin*, 17, at: http://www.soc.nii.ac.jp/psaj/05Print/e_newsletter/1998/reardon.html.
- 5 The master comprehensive work in women's history by a peace researcher is: Boulding, E. (1976) *The Underside of History*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- 6 This work led by the Center for Women's Global Leadership at Rutgers University was disseminated through the annual trainings on the human rights of women they conducted for women activists from the global south and women's NGOs associated with the United Nations.
- 7 Such arguments inform: Easlea, B. (1983) *Fathering the Unthinkable: Masculinity, Scientists and the Arms Race*, London: Pluto Press, and Cohn, C. (1987) 'Sex and death in the rational world of the defense intellectuals', *Signs*, Winter: 687–718; and Fox Keller, E. (1983) *A Feeling for the Organism*, New York: W.H. Freeman and Co.
- 8 Course syllabi demonstrating this inclusive, integrative approach developed by the authors are available at: www.tc.edu/PeaceEd/portal.
- 9 Gerd Johansen-Latham, translated by Stephen Croall (2005) *Patriarchal Violence – An Attack on Human Security*, Stockholm: Government Offices of Sweden.
- 10 The four peace activists were kidnapped on 26 November 2005.
- 11 See especially: McAllister, P. (1991) *The River of Courage: Generations of Women's Resistance and Action*, Philadelphia, PA New Society Press.
- 12 Harvey Mansfield, the author of the recently published *Manliness* in a radio interview with New York Public Radio's Leonard Lopate on 21 March 2006, opined that it is women's task to civilize men. Mansfield, H. (2006) *Manliness*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- 13 Dworkin, A. (1974) *Woman Hating*, New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc.
- 14 Members of both of these movements informed one of the authors that their frameworks were consistent with the arguments and analysis put forth in: Reardon, B. (1995) *Sexism and the War System*, New York: Syracuse University Press.
- 15 New Profile (2006) at: <http://www.newprofile.org/default.asp?language=en>. For more on Okinawan Women Against Military Violence, see: Akibayashi, K. (2001) 'Okinawa Women Act Against Military,' unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- 16 Sylvester, C. (1989) 'Patriarchy, peace and women warriors', in L. Rennie Forcey, (ed.) *Peace: Meanings, Politics, Strategies*, New York: Praeger P.
- 17 See: Swerdlow, A. (1993) *Women Strike for Peace: Traditional Motherhood and Radical Politics in the 1960s*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press; and Zdravomyslova, E. (1999) 'Peaceful initiatives: the Soldiers' Mothers Movement in Russia', in Breines I. et al. *Toward a Women's Agenda for a Culture of Peace*, Paris: UNESCO.
- 18 Code Pink, at: <http://www.codepink4peace.org>.
- 19 Hird, M.J. (2005) *Sex, Gender and Science*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 24–5.
- 20 See: Ruddick, S. (1995) *Maternal Thinking: Towards a Politics of Peace*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press; Noddings, N. (1993) *The Challenge to Care in Schools: An Alternative Approach to Education*, New York: Teachers College Press; Noddings, N. (1984) *Caring, a Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education*, Berkeley: University of California Press; and Hamburg, B. and Hamburg, D. (2004) *Learning to Live Together*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- 21 A relevant discussion of testosterone and aggression is found in Goldstein, op. cit., 148–53.
- 22 Freire, P. (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, New York: Herder and Herder.
- 23 Belenky, M.F., McVicker Clinchy, B., Rule Golberger, N. and Mattuck Tarule, J. (1986) *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind*, New York: Basic Books. See also: Gilligan, C. (1993) *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*, Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- 24 Foster, C. (1989) *Women for all Seasons: The Story of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom*, Athens: University of Georgia.

- 25 The integral and essential relationships among peace, human rights and gender equality are foundational to the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
- 26 See: Gierycz, D. (1999) 'Women in decision-making: can we change the status quo?', in I. Breines et al. *Toward a Women's Agenda for a Culture of Peace*. The argument that democracies don't wage war on each other has been advanced by Rudolf Rummel, author of Rummel, R.W. (1994) *Death by Government*, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- 27 How the society reneged on this promise and the meaning of the war work experience to the modern women's movement is dealt with in Honey, M. (1984) *Creating Rosie the Riveter: Class, Gender and Propaganda During World War II*, Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press.
- 28 Notable among these was the World Order Models Project. Most active during the 1970s and 1980s, it brought together an international team of scholars to research and propose alternatives to the existing order.
- 29 See: Waring, M. (1988) *Counting for Nothing*, Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books Limited.
- 30 Boserup, E. (1970) *Woman's Roles in Economic Development*, New York: St Martins Press.
- 31 The work of Cynthia Enloe, J. Anne Tickner and Cynthia Cockburn have been especially helpful. Their arguments are among the influences leading to our advocacy of the inclusion of gender perspectives in the study of and inquiry into all issues of peace, security and other related topics of the peace problematic. See especially, Enloe, C. (1989) *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Relations*, Berkeley: University of California Press; Enloe, C. (2000) *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*, Berkeley: University of California Press; Cockburn, C. (1998) *The Space Between Us: Negotiating Gender and National Identities in Conflict*, London: Zed Books; and Tickner, J.A. (1992) *Gender in International Relations*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- 32 We do not list the documents issued by the UN women's conferences of 1980 and 1985 for we do not find that they made substantive contributions to either the knowledge or normative base of an inclusive, holistic approach to gender and peace. The 1985 Forward Looking Strategies, however, did note that violence against women was an obstacle to peace (paragraph 258).
- 33 Anwarul K. Chowdhury, United Nations Under-Secretary General, Presentation at the 816th Wilton Park Conference, Sussex, England, 30 May 2005.
- 34 International Peace Research Association (1983) *Conclusions of the Consultation on Women, Militarism and Disarmament*, Hungary: Győr, 3.
- 35 United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women, 'Report of the Expert Group Meeting on Gender and the Agenda for Peace', United Nations Headquarters, New York, 5-9 December 1994.
- 36 Reardon, *Sexism and the War System*, op. cit.
- 37 The first and definitive work on patriarchy was by historian Gerder Lerner. Lerner, G. (1986) *The Creation of Patriarchy*, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press. It is Lerner who made the clearest distinction between sex as biologically determined and gender as a cultural construct.
- 38 French, M. (1992) *The War against Women*, New York: Summit Books.
- 39 We recognize that this chapter does not deal with human rights violations and violence against persons of other than heterosexual identities, but we believe it is a significant manifestation of gender violence, also largely attributable to patriarchy.
- 40 An open session of the Security Council is one in which non-member states and UN staff may address the Council. These sessions are often preceded by preparatory non-formal sessions in which Council members who wish to do so hear from NGOs qualified in the subject of the open session. The People's Movement for Human Rights Education (PDHRE) developed a workbook using the comprehensive framework of the BPFA that demonstrates the holistic nature of human rights as a tool for action in the achievement of full equality (PDHRE (2003) *Passport to Dignity*, New York: PDHRE); this issued Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security. See: United Nations (2000) *Security Council Resolution 1325*, at: <http://www.peacewomen.org/un/sc/1325.html>.
- 41 See: Heise, L. (1994) *Violence Against Women: The Hidden Health Burden*, Washington, DC: World Bank.
- 42 Beijing Platform for Action, Global Framework, para 27.
- 43 Reardon, *Sexism and the War System*, op. cit.
- 44 Beijing Platform for Action, Global Framework, op. cit., para 12.
- 45 See: Reardon, B. (2005) 'Peace and human rights education in an age of global terror', in *International House of Japan Bulletin*, 25, 2.
- 46 See especially the work of Spike Peterson and J. Anne Tickner. Peterson, V.S. and Runyan, A. (1999)

- Global Gender Issues*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press; and Tickner, J.A. (1992) *Gender in International Relations*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- 47 Tickner, op. cit., 14.
- 48 Hague Agenda for Peace and Justice for the 21st Century: Root Causes of War/Culture of Peace Agenda, at: <http://www.haguepeace.org/index.php?action=resources>.
- 49 We take this term from the language of the Japanese scholar, Kinheide Mushakoji, who used it in summarizing the gender perspective assertions regarding male dominance made in an international scholars' statement to the Independent Commission on Human Security in 2003. It is also used by many masculinities scholars.
- 50 Connell, R.W. (1998) 'Masculinities and globalisation', in *Men and Masculinities*, I, 1: 3–23.
- 51 Connell, op. cit., 7.
- 52 The White Ribbon Campaign was launched in Canada to build awareness and responsibility among young men.
- 53 Kaufman, op. cit., 1.
- 54 An excellent study on how men form their gender identities and how those identities influence their behaviour was conducted by peace educator, Ian Harris. Harris, I. (1995) *Messages Men Hear*, London: Taylor and Francis.
- 55 Altinay, A.G. (2004) *The Myth of the Military-nation: Militarism, Gender, and Education in Turkey*, New York: Imprint & Houndmills; and Gor, H. (2003) 'Education for war in Israel: preparing children to accept war as a natural factor of life', in K. Saltzman and D. Gabbard (eds) *Education as Enforcement: The Militarization and Corporatization of Schools*, New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- 56 R.W. Connell has been influential in the development of masculinities and gender studies, particularly through contributions to theories of multiple masculinities. See: Connell, R.W. (2000) *The Men and the Boys*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 57 United Nations, Economic and Social Council (1997) *Draft Agreed Conclusions on Mainstreaming the Gender Perspective into All Policies and Programmes in the United Nations*, Paris: UNESCO.
- 58 Brock-Utne, B. (1989) *Feminist Perspectives on Peace and Peace Education*, 1st edn, New York: Pergamon Press; and Brock-Utne, B. (1985) *Educating for Peace: A Feminist Perspective*, New York: Pergamon Press.
- 59 See: Miedzian, M. (1991) *Boys will be Boys: Breaking the Link Between Masculinity and Violence*, New York: Lantern Books; Breines, I., Connell, R. and Eide, I. (2000) *Male Roles, Masculinities and Violence: A Culture of Peace Perspective*, Paris: UNESCO; and Reardon, B. (2001) *Education for a Culture of Peace in a Gender Perspective*, Paris: UNESCO.
- 60 A fundamental aspect of the core argument in Reardon's *Sexism and the War System* regards the relationship of reciprocal causality that exists between women's oppression and war.
- 61 People's Movement for Human Rights Learning (2006) *Transforming the Patriarchal Order to a Human Rights System: A Position Paper*, New York: PDHRE.