

SOCIETAL VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN & NATIONAL INSECURITY: THE NEED FOR GENDERED SECURITY

James M. Minnich

Societal violence against women in peace and conflict is an assault upon humanity, communities, and countries as it causes national insecurity.¹ In other words, a society's peace, prosperity and stability are conditional to the treatment of its women, men, girls, and boys.² The purpose of this chapter is twofold. First, it examines global manifestations of societal violence against women in peace and conflict through an analysis of violations of bodily integrity, inequalities in family law, and disparities in decision-making councils.³ Second, it argues that security practitioners who are educated in gendered security can affirmatively counter the endangerment and exclusion of women in peace and conflict as identifiable in wellsprings of societal violence, which promotes domestic and transnational insecurities.

In a U.S. Defense Department-funded study, female empowerment and subordination were identified as determinants to national security that directly affects the security dimensions of political stability and governance, security and conflict, economic performance, health and well-being, demographic security, public education, environmental protection and social progress.⁴

TRIPLE WELLSPRINGS OF SOCIETAL VIOLENCE

Building upon the works of political scientists Johan Galtung, Ted Gurr, Gregory Raymond, and Charles Tilly,⁵ American political scientist Mary Caprioli postulated that cultural and social norms of intolerance and inequality perpetuate violence to resolve conflict.⁶

Former United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan's address to world leaders is quintessential in understanding the ramifications of gender inequalities in peace and conflict. Said he, "The world is starting to grasp that there is no policy for progress more effective than the empowerment of women and girls. And ... no policy is more important in preventing conflict, or in achieving reconciliation after a conflict has ended."

Norwegian scholar Johan Galtung, a founder of the discipline of peace and conflict studies, postulated a trifurcated societal violence that is shaped by direct violence, structural violence, and cultural violence.⁷ Direct violence is incident oriented and actor (individual, group, state) perpetrated; structural violence is an institutionalized process of discrimination and exclusion; and cultural violence is an invariant that makes structural violence acceptable, or at least tolerated.⁸ In view of Galtung's typology, societal violence against women could be defined as *direct* when a woman is assaulted, which manifests in violations of bodily integrity; *structural* when thousands of women are kept in dependency, which presents through inequalities in family law; and *cultural* when the subservience of women is perpetrated in religion, language, norms, and symbols, and persists in gender disparities such as decision-making councils.

VIOLATIONS OF BODILY INTEGRITY

Direct violence against women is the nadir of unequal gender manifestations as it dehumanizes women, and tears at social unity.⁹ The United Nations General Assembly defined violence against women as "violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or psychological harm or suffering to women," and stipulated violence against women as a leading social mechanism by men to subordinate women.¹⁰ Bodily integrity is an inalienable right of self-autonomy over one's own body.¹¹

In Peace. Subordination of women is universal among all nation-states as all share ideologies and constructs of male dominance, and is globally manifested irrespective of social variances or forms of governance.¹² Women suffering, although global in occurrence, is not universal in its uniformity.¹³

Papua New Guinea is an independent state in Oceania and ranks very high in women's inequality. Women's inequality, as measured by incidents of sexual and physical abuse, is estimated to have been inflicted on two-

thirds of all females in Papua New Guinea, which is higher than reported global averages of one in three women.¹⁴ In Papua New Guinea, 59% of surveyed men admitted to raping a sexual partner.¹⁵ In a United Nations Development Programme survey of 10,000 men in nine Indo-Pacific states, half who admitted perpetrating rape claimed to have first raped as a teenager, of whom upward of 97% claimed to have never been indicted for their crimes.¹⁶ Overwhelmingly, all nine surveyed sites identified sexual entitlement—the right of sex irrespective of consent—as the principal motivation for rape.¹⁷ This United Nations study concluded that violence against women is a manifestation of gender inequalities and subordination of women in domestic and public domains. Galtung would ascribe the abuse of one woman as direct violence, and the abuse of two-thirds of all females in a society as both structural and cultural violence.¹⁸

American anthropologist Peggy Reeves Sanday correlated male dominance with group insecurity and instability. American professor of gender and violence Gwen Hunnicutt ascribed male violence toward women as an outgrowth of patriarchal systems. The late American anthropologist and prolific writer Marvin Harris postulated that male dominance originated in warfare from a monopoly of weapons, but discounted genetics or convention as its source.

In Conflict. For centuries, rape as a form of violence against women was generally accepted by many as the cost of war, and largely overlooked as a crime against humanity.¹⁹ Neither the Nuremberg trials of 1945-46 nor the Tokyo trials of 1946-48 convicted a single person solely on the charge of sexual violence against women, despite well over one million women raped during World War II.²⁰

Rape as a tactic of war was perpetrated in the 8-year French Indochina War from 1946, India's 1948 operation to subdue Hyderabad, the 3-year Korean War from 1950, America's 10-year Vietnam War from 1964, and the Bangladesh Liberation War of 1971 that witnessed the rape of as many as 200,000 Bengali women in just nine months of fighting.

With past as prologue, the international community remained silent as mass incidents of rape persisted in military conflicts over the 50 years following World War II. As the Soviet Union collapsed in December 1991, former Yugoslavia reft in a series of ethnic wars and insurgencies that witnessed Europe's most brutal conflict since 1945. In April 1992, the Bosnian War erupted in a torrent of ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity, which promulgated the systematic rape and sexual enslavement of

as many as 50,000 women and girls before the war's end 44-months later.²¹ As the Bosnian War raged in Europe, the Hutu government in Rwanda led a 100-day genocidal war against its Tutsi population, which included the deliberate rape of some one half million women and girls.²²

To prosecute war crimes from these two horrific wars, the United Nations established the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) in May 1993,²³ and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) in November 1994.²⁴ The charter for both these judicial bodies included the charge of rape as a crime against humanity, the first time in history the international community classified rape as a crime of war.²⁵ Classifying rape as a crime against humanity was the first step. Convicting war criminals of rape would prove to be the court's true test.

Since its inception, ICTR has indicted 93 people for genocide and other serious violations of international humanitarian law committed in Rwanda in 1994;²⁶ of those, 17 were convicted for crimes against humanity for rape.²⁷ In September 1998, Mr. Jean Paul Akayesu, former mayor of Taba, was the first person ever convicted internationally of crimes against humanity for rape.²⁸ This conviction was anything but proforma, as Judge Navanethem Pillay, the only female judge on the ICTR bench, is reported to have refocused the line of questioning about evidence toward sexual violence, which eventually brought an amended indictment for charges of sexual violence by Akayesu.²⁹ In a statement after the verdict, Judge Pillay offered these remarks: "From time immemorial, rape has been regarded as spoils of war. Now it will be considered a war crime. We want to send out a strong message that rape is no longer a trophy of war."³⁰

Twenty-nine months following the ICTR conviction of Akayesu in Rwanda, ICTY issued its first convictions for crimes against humanity for rape. In the verdict read by Presiding Judge Florence Mumba, she stated that Dragoljub Kunarac, Radomir Kovac, Zoran Vukovic, as well as other Bosnian Serb troops in Foca, used rape as "an instrument of terror,"³¹ during the Bosnian War. In the prosecution of war crimes in Rwanda and Bosnia, ICTR and ICTY collectively convicted nearly 70 perpetrators of crimes against humanity for rape.³² While these are landmark convictions, given the systematic approach to rape brutally some one-half million women on two continents, the conviction of a mere 70 people rings hollow.

Spurred by the horrors of the Bosnian War, the United Nations General Assembly promulgated Resolution 48/104 in December 1993, which

called upon states to condemn, prevent, and punish violence against women. American lawyer Tamara Tompkins postulated that rape is fixed in the male domination of women, and is manifested in aggression, discrimination, inequality, and misogyny.³³ American feminist author Susan Brownmiller suggested that rape is a male method of social control through “a conscious process of intimidation by which *all men* keep *all women* in a state of fear” [emphasis in original].³⁴ The nature of warfare in the 21st century has shifted from nationalist to ethnoreligious, with its deeply conservative and reactionary treatment of women and their rights.³⁵ Consequently, widespread disregard for bodily integrity in today’s conflicts has subjected millions of women and girls to horrible direct, structural, and cultural violence.³⁶ While violations of bodily integrity scream injustice and demand accountability, inequalities in family law silently sow seeds of societal violence against women.

INEQUALITIES IN FAMILY LAW

Family or matrimonial law is based on customs and codified by statutes to govern family relationships, rights, duties, and finances. Customary and statutory laws are often underpinned by social and religious practices.³⁷ American professors Valerie M. Hudson, Donna Lee Bowen, and Perpetua Lynn Nielsen ascribed statutory or customary family laws that preference male over female as the source of structural violence against women, which in conflict tends toward its meanest manifestations.³⁸

In Peace. Family, societies’ primordial unit, has universally advantaged men over women and boys over girls.³⁹ Despite worldwide promulgation of women’s suffrage, anachronistic family law across the globe continue to bias women and preference males.⁴⁰ Whereas social inequalities manifest worldwide, they are glaringly obvious in family laws. Family law addresses issues of marriage, divorce, custody, and inheritance, but reflects societal devaluation of women by its inequalities. Gender inequalities are self-evidenced when males are held superior to females; girls are married younger than boys; polygyny is embraced; marital rape is non-criminalized; female infanticide is accepted; men divorce more easily than women; and men are advantaged over women in rights of property and inheritance.⁴¹

Male dominance is a condition where men retain most of the power and influence; or more precisely, a structural and ideological system of male domination and female subordination.⁴² Hoy suggested three defining characteristics of male dominance: authoritarian aggression by men

American anthropologist Peggy Sanday suggested that there are two social orders: diarchy and patriarchy (male dominance). Her adaption of the term diarchy, as defined by American anthropologist Janet Hoskins, described a male-female political system of shared authorities that fluctuates in control, and is formalized by principles of interdependence and mutuality. Of these two social orders, male dominance prevails globally, which is viewed by many to be deleterious to state security, stability, and prosperity.

against women, authoritarian submission of women to men, and a hierarchical social structure where men overwhelmingly control political power.⁴³ Male dominance and patriarchy are synonymous terms. Macro-patriarchy occurs in governments, bureaucracies, markets, academia, and religion; and micro-patriarchy occurs in families, relations, social interactions, and organizations. Sanday asserted that male dominance is either authentic or imposed, but either way, it is evidenced by a litany of social ills.⁴⁴ An enumeration of such ills includes the valuation of fear, conflict, and warfare; the preference for sons over daughters; the pervasiveness of domestic violence; the diminution of women in public life; the bias toward gender segregation; the perpetuation of creation myths that impute women as a source of evil; the acceptance of polygyny; and the convention of bride-price or dowry that consigns women as chattel and economic liabilities.

Caprioli affirmed that states enlarge their probability of internal conflict through such practices of gender inequality, which she assessed through an analysis of reproductive health, empowerment, and labor force.⁴⁵ The United Nations Development Programme defined and measured the societal impact of each of these three indicators.⁴⁶ Reproductive health can be quantified using the rates of maternal death and adolescent pregnancy, which at high rates manifests societies' devaluation of women. When broadly considered, reproductive health is more precisely viewed as a distillation of inequalities that transcends rates of maternal death and adolescent pregnancy to affect opportunities for education, employment, and decision-making authority.⁴⁷ Empowerment can be measured using the percentage of women in parliament, with a recognition that political access enables decision-making over life.⁴⁸ A labor force analysis measures gender diversity in labor markets, and denotes gender inequalities, discrimination, and structural violence.⁴⁹ Compelling empirics indicate that 38.3% of all nations embrace structural violence-based family laws that tend between high and very high in women's inequality, which strongly correlates with states that are less peaceful and more fragile.⁵⁰

In Conflict. Linkages between sexism (male-dominant societies) and militarism are well-researched.⁵¹ In a demographic analysis of 112 societies, Divale and Harris considered tribal warfare as the chief cause of institutional and ideological supremacy of males.⁵² Male supremacy or dominance is inherent to gender-based divisions of labor; is manifest in gender-based asymmetry of political, economic, military, police, and religious institutions; and is ascribed to the sexual dimorphism that engenders males with greater stature, weight, and hormones that are useful in dominance that propagates structural violence.⁵³

While violations of bodily integrity scream injustice and demand accountability, and inequalities in family law silently sow seeds of societal violence against women, it is disparities in decision-making councils that perpetuate disdain for women while meting cultural violence against one half of the global population.

American anthropologists William Divale and Marvin Harris correlated occurrences of war and male supremacy; American anthropologist Keith Otterbein drew relationships between incidence of war and societal norms of patrilocality, patrilineality, and polygyny; American anthropologists Peggy Sanday strongly associated frequency of war with a society's incidence of female rape; and American political scientist Marc Ross identified prevalence of war with exclusion of women from public leadership.

DISPARITIES IN DECISION-MAKING COUNCILS

Decision-making is the power to influence private and public life.⁵⁴ Patriarchy, however, proscribes women from ascending to decision-making councils, particularly councils with mandates extending beyond issues that affect women and children. O'Neil and Domingo suggested that institutions (norms and rules), structures (social, economic, and political endowments), and capabilities (education, class, and profession) are chief determinants in women's ascent to political power.⁵⁵ Discriminatory socio-cultural institutions and structures, however, delimit women's opportunities to develop requisite capabilities that improve access to professional organizations, labor markets, and decision-making councils.⁵⁶ Consequently, it is hoary gender roles in peace and conflict that perpetuate bad policies of cultural and structural violence, which persistently broadens the gender gap.⁵⁷

In Peace. The United Nations leads international advancement of women's rights through reform advocacy of gender discriminatory practices, policies, and structures. In 1979, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women as an international bill of rights for women, which is legally binding in 189 states that ratified it (UN, 1979). The Convention specifically prohibits gender-based discrimination in all fields to include political, economic, social, cultural, and civil; and calls upon the ratifying states to take all measures, including legislation, for the advancement of women on a "basis of equality with men" (Article 1). Women's rights of marriage and family life are codified in Article 16 of the Convention; and if signatory states would adhere to the injunctions, family law discriminations would end. Absent an enforcement mechanism, however, the 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women remains more aspirational than foundational.

Gender inclusion, a half-step toward gender equality, is an affirmative approach to include female presence and perspectives in this male-dominated sphere.⁵⁸ Gender inclusion is not tokenism, but a deliberate international policy approach to achieve universal gender equality in political, economic, and societal spheres by adopting policies and programs that further equality and arrest inequality.⁵⁹ The United Nations General Assembly termed gender inclusion as gender mainstreaming, which it formally adopted as a policy approach at the Fourth World Conference on Women in 1995.⁶⁰

As the twenty-first century dawned, the international community proffered hope for greater gender inclusivity in peace and conflict, with the promulgation of United Nations Security Council resolution (UN-SCR) 1325 on *Women, Peace, and Security* (WPS) in 2000; a landmark global resolution that affirmed women's essential participatory and decision-making roles in conflict prevention and resolution, and the importance of women's equal involvement in the advancement and preservation of peace and security. Since implementation of resolution 1325, only nine Indo-Pacific countries have promulgated WPS National Action Plans (NAP). These nine countries with a WPS NAP represent less than 11% of the 84 UN member states with an enacted WPS NAP, or 4% of the 193 total UN member states who as signatories are legally bound to implement a WPS NAP.⁶¹ Equally illustrative of state inaction in advancing real reform for women in peace and conflict, is the reality that only 17 UN member

states with a WPS NAP have allocated a budget to implement their legal obligations under UNSC resolution 1325 on WPS.⁶²

In 2010, the United Nations General Assembly established UN Women, the UN Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women, to advance needs of women.⁶³ However, as advocate and bellwether for gender mainstreaming, the United Nations stands in stark contrast to the ideal with only 8% of its senior staff appointments being filled by women.⁶⁴ This degree of gender disparity is equally manifest at lower operational levels where women account for fewer than 4% of military and 10% of police deployed on 36 UN peace operations.⁶⁵ American political scientist Helene Silverberg cautioned against an “add women and stir” approach to gender mainstreaming, observing that this practice tends toward polarization not amalgamation, and wrongly ascribes gender issues as being germane only when women are included in decision-making councils.⁶⁶

An aversion to gender integration in decision-making councils is evidenced when measured globally by the low percentage of women who have attained seats in national parliaments. In July 2018, only 24.2% of national parliamentarians were women, which increased from 17.9% in July 2009 and from 11.7% in July 1999.⁶⁷ Obstructed pathways to attain national power for women perpetuates patriarchy and is emblematic of cultural violence through gender exclusion.⁶⁸ Gender exclusion is a promulgation of the offensive maxim that women should be seen and not heard.⁶⁹ This hoary adage was a national refrain carried in the press when Jeannette Pickering Rankin (1880-1973) was elected a U.S. congresswoman in 1916.⁷⁰ Despite more than 100 years having transpired since Rankin became the first woman to hold U.S. federal office, the press continues a hostile policy toward women seeking public office,⁷¹ as it trivializes them as being more decorative than substantive.⁷² For women who persevere a biased press to become elected, many must then endure overt sexism that emanates from within parliament.⁷³

In Conflict. Practices of discrimination, patriarchal structures, and exclusion perpetuates women as superfluous as it delimits them from being agents of a better peace and security.⁷⁴ Women are societies’ most vulnerable group in peace and conflict, making them susceptible to violence, displacement, and exclusion.⁷⁵ Despite international opprobrium for gender inequality and violence, recent publications⁷⁶ and datasets⁷⁷ elucidate that nation-states have taken little more than a façade of substantive actions to affirmatively advance gender mainstreaming, and end societal violence

against women with its deleterious effects on national and transnational security.

Problems associated with underrepresentation of women in decision-making councils are manifested in violence against women in peace and conflict,⁷⁸ and undervaluation of gender-perspectives in peace and peacebuilding.⁷⁹ While formal or tacit agreements terminate war, successful war termination is measured by five or more years of conflict cessation permanency.⁸⁰ American international relations scholar Michael Doyle and political scientist Nicholas Sambanis compiled a dataset of war terminations since 1944 to 1996 and noted that 65% of 124 civil wars relapsed into fighting within five years of war termination.⁸¹ Despite evidence that women's participation in peace negotiations yields greater success in war termination, women continue to be excluded in large part from negotiating peace agreements.⁸² American researcher Laurel Stone studied 182 peace agreements signed between 1989 and 2011 and determined that peace processes, which included women as witnesses, signatories, mediators, or negotiators demonstrated a 20% increase in the probability of a peace agreement lasting at least two years, with 35% of those agreements lasting at least 15 years.⁸³ Canadian professor Fen Osler Hampson identified the necessity of addressing women's needs as one of seven essential factors in realizing a durable peace settlement,⁸⁴ which underscores Stone's findings that women peacemakers achieved a more durable peace as they routinely promoted peace settlement provisions that advanced women's rights and equality.⁸⁵

If gender mainstreaming in peace and conflict can be approached or achieved, it will require nation-states to denounce all violations of bodily integrity as direct violence against women; dismantle inequitable family laws that perpetuate structural violence against women; and transform gender culture, which trivializes women's voices, weakens their presence in decision-making councils, and propagates cultural violence against women.⁸⁶

IMPLEMENTING GENDERED SECURITY TO IMPROVE NATIONAL SECURITY

Coalesced around the principles of protection, prevention, participation, relief and recovery, the UNSCR 1325 on Women, Peace and Security (WPS) charged global leaders to protect women and their rights in peace, peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peacebuilding.⁸⁷ The dissonance between

government inaction and legal obligations toward implementing WPS suggests that states may not intuitively correlate societal violence against women with insecurity in peace and conflict.⁸⁸

Two factors—traditional concepts of security and male-masculine dominance of security sectors—feature prominent in inert approaches toward this exigent problem of practice.⁸⁹ The WPS mandate confronts the cultural model of the male-dominated security sector by directing all nations to address and resolve issues of women's roles in peace and security. Security sectors, or the public, national, and collective safety and security institutions that provide for security, are soundly representative of the male domain and their interests, which well aligns to traditional security issues that scarcely consider vulnerable populations fundamentally or the women's security issue expressly.⁹⁰ Traditional security issues imply threats against a sovereign state's citizenry, territory, polity, economy, and interests, and views the coherence of this juridical entity as the referent of security while often discounting individual welfare or gendered security.⁹¹ By shifting the security referent from the polity to the people, policymakers and practitioners alike can more distinctly discern security threats and aptly adopt policy priorities to sensibly focus security resources.⁹²

The WPS mandate is the global framework that gives rise to a theory on gendered security. *Gendered security* is a methodology to strengthen solutions to state and human security issues through an approach that frames individuals as the security focus while accounting for gender-based needs and interests of women, men, girls, and boys in all security situations.⁹³ Frames are mental models for making sense, and reframing is a technique for seeing issues anew, or from alternative perspectives.⁹⁴ Applying a gendered security frame, or gendered security perspective to security issues of peace and conflict offers security practitioners a means to examine crises beyond a traditional security frame as they consider gender-nuanced collective interests. Adeptly selecting security frames comes from familiarity of various approaches and perspectives, and experience in application. Frames are akin to a manual transmission: the more experienced the user at shifting gears, the more effortless and smooth the ride. Like transmission gears, frames have unique functions and are applied based on needs.

Security practitioners can learn a gendered security frame and its application value in peace and conflict by considering gendered security principles of gendered security perspective, prevention, protection, and participation in the analysis and implementation of security missions. While

gender analyses of operational environments may vary, an effective technique is to crosswalk the eight operational variables of political, military, economic, social, information, infrastructure, physical environment, and time (PMESII-PTI) with the four gendered security principles of gendered security perspective, prevention, protection, and participation (Gendered Security Principles Four, or GSP4).⁹⁵

To analyze the security environment through a *gendered security perspective* is fundamental to understanding security's broader contexts, and its implications toward a gendered inclusive security that responds to the diverse security needs of all. *Gendered security prevention* is substantially more than the absence of conflict as it confronts cultural and structural catalysts that divide, devalue, demean, and degrade people across a gendered social hierarchy. *Gendered security protection* opposes a trifurcated societal violence of direct violence, structural violence, and cultural violence in times of peace and conflict as it protects access, engagement and participation in all aspects of society. *Gendered security participation* empowers the diverse and inclusive meaningful involvement of all genders in all areas, at all levels, and at all times.

Weakened approaches toward implementing gendered security include those that view women's perspectives and participation as an additive to conventional security methods. Equally delimiting to the value of a gendered security approach is its detachment as a peripheral consideration or afterthought from security discussions, plans, and operations. This is evidenced as security practitioners outsource to their nominal members the gender analysis task for purposes of additively applying gender considerations to conventional security. A gendered security perspective is so much more than the practice of soliciting women's views on security matters predicated on the prospect that men and women perceive differently. Such limited efforts are incredibly circumscribed and forfeit opportunity for a gendered security approach that considers the complex security needs of a community in an effort to create a better security for all.

The premise of gendered security is that implementation of its principles by security practitioners in peace, peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peacebuilding will advance the security, stability, and prosperity that improves the collective security of societies, nations, and regions. This is evidenced when security practitioners counter society's power relations of gender to advance each genders engagement as equals in areas of influence, representation, and perspective in family, society, culture, religion, law, civic-life, decision-making, conflict resolution, resource distribution,

<p style="text-align: center;">PMESII-PT/GSP4 GENDERED SECURITY ANALYSIS TOOL (GSAT)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">July 26, 2020</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>INSTRUCTION: Assess the security environment for each gender by crosswalking the operational variables (PMESII-PT) of political, military, economic, social, information, infrastructure, physical environment, time with the gendered security principles (GSP4) of preventive (responds to diverse security needs of all), preservative (confirms cultural, structural catalysts that divide, devalue, demean, degrade), protective (opposes violence & protects access, engagement, participation in all aspects of society and in the application of its laws, rules, regulations), participatory (empowers diverse & inclusive involvement of all). This tool defines 32 aspects of gendered security in an operational environment.</i></p>								
	Political	Military/Police	Economic	Social	Information	Infrastructure	Physical Environment	Time
	Distribution of power and responsibility at all levels of governance.	Forces and capabilities of the national military, paramilitary and police forces.	Individual and group behaviors related to producing, distributing, consuming resources.	Cultural, religious, ethnic makeup of a society and its members' behaviors, beliefs, values, customs.	Nature, scope, effects of individuals and systems that use, collect, process and disseminate info.	Facilities, services, and installations needed for development & function of a community/society.	Ecosystem/geographic area's plants, animals, soil, water, air, sunlight, temperature & climate.	Time use and duration of activities, events, and conditions.
Perspective	Political Perspective Engagement as equals in areas of influence, representation and perspective in law, civic life, decision-making, conflict resolution, and resource distribution.	Mil-Police Perspective Engagement as equals in areas of influence, representation and perspective in the military, paramilitary, and police forces.	Economic Perspective Engagement as equals in areas of influence, representation and perspective in economic and livelihood empowerment of finance, agriculture, industry, etc.	Social Perspective Engagement as equals in areas of influence, representation and perspective in family, society, culture, and religion.	Information Perspective Engagement as equals in areas of influence, representation and perspective in the production and access of information.	Infrastructure Perspective Engagement as equals in areas of influence, representation and perspective in infrastructures that provide for health, well-being and care of common resources.	Environment Perspective Engagement as equals in areas of influence, representation and perspective in the physical environment that provides for health and well-being.	Time Perspective Engagement as equals in areas of influence, representation and perspective in the use of individual time.
Prevention	Political Prevention Equal access to justice and political power through voting, and decision-making.	Mil-Police Prevention Equal access to military and police institutions with established norms, roles, and rules that uniformly engage people.	Economic Prevention Equal access to jobs, loans, financial services, property rights, legal services, representation for sustainable incomes and livelihoods.	Social Prevention Equal access to family, social, cultural & religious services to act on issues of own importance; and special access to sexual assault counselors, maternal health.	Information Prevention Equal access to literacy, information, knowledge, print media, TV, radio, Internet, telecom and gender sensitive information to include early warning alerts.	Infrastructure Prevention Equal access to sources of food, water, sanitation, hygiene, health, energy, education, utilities, transportation and communication.	Environment Prevention Equal access to the ecosystem's benefits of food, freshwater, fiber, shelter, medicine, fuel, pest & disease control, and spiritual, cultural & recreational uses.	Time Prevention Equal access to paid productive time and unpaid reproductive time to maintain domestic life and to bear and rear children.
Protection	Political Protection Equal protection under all laws, rules and regulations.	Mil-Police Protection Equal protection for safety & security; and protection from harassment, assault, coercion, exploitation, crime and trafficking.	Economic Protection Equal protection as consumers and merchants in bazaars, markets, businesses.	Social Protection Equal protection in society, culture and religion; and special protection from infanticide, child marriage, intimate partner violence.	Information Protection Equal protection to use and manage personal, private and public information.	Infrastructure Protection Equal protection in the use of publically provided infrastructure and in public places and refugee camps.	Environment Protection Equal protection using ecosystems and equal protection from diseases and climate impacts on health and well-being.	Time Protection Equal protection of individual time for engagement in and access to the family, society, governance, economy, and security.
Participation	Political Participation Equal participation in elections, governments, councils, meetings, and capacity to change institutions.	Mil-Police Participation Equal participation in military, paramilitary, and police forces.	Economic Participation Equal participation in economic and financial institutions.	Social Participation Equal participation in families, communities, schools, places of worship.	Information Participation Equal participation in information agencies.	Infrastructure Participation Equal participation in services, development and construction.	Environment Participation Equal participation in ecosystems and benefit distributions.	Time Participation Equal participation in paid productive time & unpaid reproductive time to maintain domestic life and to bear and rear children.

Source: James M. Mimmich, "Societal Violence against Women and National Insecurity: The Need for Gendered Security," in Alexander L. Yuning, ed., *Hindsight, Insight, Foresight: Thinking about Security in the Indo-Pacific* (Honolulu, HI: Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies, 2020).

Figure 5.1: PMESII-PT/GSP4 Gendered Security Analysis Tool (GSAT)

economics, livelihood, health, well-being, and more. Factors of equal engagement are the essence of the gendered security perspective principle. Each gender's equal engagement is contingent on equal access to justice, education, employment, resources, institutions, and the power to influence private and public life; these too must be safeguarded by security practitioners in every domain. Factors of equal access are the essence of the gendered security prevention principle. Absent equal protection from direct, structural, and cultural violence and protection for equal access, engagement, and participation in all aspects of society and in the application of its laws, rules, and regulations, security does not exist. Factors of equal protection are the essence of the gendered security protection principle. Structural and cultural exclusion from equal participation in families, societies, cultures, and religions perpetuates structural and cultural violence upon society's vulnerable genders as it proscribes meaningful participation in elections, governments, councils, and meetings, which denies power or capacity to change policies, practices, and institutions that advance a better security for all. Factors of equal participation are the essence of the gendered security participation principle.

A gender analysis tool is an analytical framework that aids thinking toward the identification of gender-based vulnerabilities, risks, and needs from impacts of peace, crisis, and conflict upon each gender. Figure 5.1 is the PMESII-PT/GSP4 Gendered Security Analysis Tool (GSAT), which defines 32 aspects of gendered security in an operational environment through a crosswalk of the operational variables and gendered security principles. The PMESII-PT/GSP4 GSAT (or GSAT) is both comprehensively descriptive and sectorally specific for use in gendered security analyses of operational environments that are either large-and-complex or small-and-simple. Viewed horizontally, the GSAT comprehensively describes the application of a single gendered security principle across all operational variables. Viewed vertically, the GSAT sectorally describes the application of all gendered security principles within a single operational variable of an operational environment. The GSAT holistically defines a standard of applied gendered security throughout a notional operational environment. Using the GSAT as an implemented standard for gendered security, analysts can benchmark to assess the gender-based vulnerabilities, risks, and needs of an assessed operational environment.

Militaries use PMESII-PT operational variables to conduct analysis of operational environments. The PMESII-PT/GSP4 GSAT was developed to meet security practitioners' pressing need to describe and analyze an

operational environment through a gendered security lens or framework. The GSAT will be taught to security practitioners for their considered application. The author will also institute feedback and data collection mechanisms to better help security practitioners understand and implement gendered security principles. The Figure 5.1 PMESII-PT/GSP4 GSAT concisely defines the operational variables, gendered security principles, and 32 aspects of gendered security in an operational environment.

Using the GSAT, consider the PMESII-PT/GSP4 factors to understand the gendered security aspects of an operational environment. For a gendered security perspective of political structures, consider each gender's engagement as equals in influence, representation, and perspective in law, civic life, decision-making, conflict resolution, and resource distribution. For gendered security prevention by the military and police, consider each gender's equal access to military and police institutions with established norms, rules, and jobs that uniformly engage people. For gendered security protection in economic areas, consider each gender's equal protection as consumers and merchants in bazaars, markets, and businesses. For gendered security in social participation, consider each gender's equal participation in social organizations of families, communities, schools, and places of worship. For a gendered security perspective of infrastructure, consider each gender's engagement as equals in areas of influence, representation, and perspective in infrastructures that provide for health, well-being, and care of common resources. For gendered security prevention in information, consider each gender's equal access to literacy, information, knowledge, print media, TV, radio, Internet, telecommunication and gender sensitive information that includes early warning alerts. For gendered security protection in the physical environment, consider each gender's equal protection in the use of ecosystems and equal protection from diseases, and climate impacts on health and well-being. For gendered security participation in time, consider each gender's equal participation in paid productive time and unpaid reproductive time to maintain domestic life and to bear and rear children.

Sixty years ago, French counterinsurgent theorist David Galula asserted that in conflict people are the prize, an axiom that military leaders have repeatedly ignored by acting as if people were either the problem or the playing field.⁹⁶ This article proffers that gendered security esteems people as the priority and considers that security practitioners share duty and necessity to enlarge peace, prosperity, and stability by opposing so-

cietal violence against women in peace and conflict. Obligated to uphold UNSCR 1325 on WPS, countries should seek to enlarge their national peace, prosperity, and stability by adopting a gendered security approach and implementing their own WPS national action plan.

Notes

- 1 Mary Caprioli, "Primed for Violence: The Role of Gender Inequality in Predicting Internal Conflict," *International Studies Quarterly* 49, no. 2 (June 2005): 161-178. Heidi Hudson, "Peace Building Through a Gender Lens and the Challenges of Implementation in Rwanda and Côte d'Ivoire," in *Gender and International Security: Feminist Perspectives*, ed. Laura Sjoberg (New York: Routledge, 2010), 256-279. Valerie M. Hudson, Bonnie Ballif-Spanvill, Mary Caprioli, and Chad F. Emmett, *Sex and World Peace* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012).
- 2 Valerie M. Hudson, "What You Do to Your Women, You Do to Your Nation," *New York Times*, March 6, 2020, <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/06/opinion/global-womens-rights.html>. UN Women, "The United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women," September 1995, <https://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/platform/plat1.htm>.
- 3 Hudson et al., *Sex and World Peace*, 19.
- 4 Valerie M. Hudson, Donna Lee Bowen, and Perpetua Lynne Nielsen, *The First Political Order: How Sex Shapes Governance and National Security Worldwide* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2020), 7.
- 5 Johan Galtung, "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research," *Journal of Peace Research* 6, no. 3 (1969), 167-191. Johan Galtung, "Cultural Violence," *Journal of Peace Research* 27, no. 3 (1990): 291-305. Ted R. Gurr, "Peoples against States: Ethnopolitical Conflict and the Changing World System: 1994 Presidential Address," *International Studies Quarterly* 38, no. 3 (1994), 347-377. Gregory A. Raymond, "International Norms: Normative Orders and Peace," in *What Do We Know about War?* ed. John A. Vasquez (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000), 281-297.
- 6 Caprioli, "Primed for Violence," 161.
- 7 Johan Galtung and Dietrich Fischer, "Violence: Direct, Structural and Cultural," *Johan Galtung Springer Briefs on Pioneers in Science and Practice* 5 (2013), 35-40, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-32481-9_3.
- 8 Galtung, "Cultural Violence," 294.
- 9 Hudson et al., *The First Political Order*, 108. Susan Hawthorne, "Radical Feminism," in *Gender Inequality: Feminist Theories and Politics*, ed. Judith Lorber (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 127-150.
- 10 United Nations General Assembly, "Resolution 48/104: Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women," article 1, December 20, 1993, <https://undocs.org/A/RES/48/104>.
- 11 Pratt v. Davis, 118 Ill. App. 161, 166 (1905), affirmed 224 Ill. 30, 79 (1906).
- 12 Simone de Beauvoir, Constance Borde, and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier, *The Second Sex*, (New York: Vintage, 2011), 152. Hudson et al., *The First Political Order*, 21-22, 38. Laura Nader, "The Subordination of Women in Comparative Perspective," *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development* 15, no. 3/4 (1986): 382.

13 “Toward Gender Equality in East Asia and the Pacific: A Companion to the World Development Report,” World Bank (2012), 3, <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/12598>.

14 Charlotte Alfred, “The Shocking Reality of the Sexual Violence Epidemic in Papua New Guinea,” *The WorldPost*, March 5, 2016, https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/papua-new-guinea-sexual-violence_us_56d9fca1e4b0ffe6f8e974f2.
World Health Organization, “Violence against Women: Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence against Women,” November 2016, <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs239/en/>.

15 Katelyn Fossett, “How Does a Country Develop a 60 Percent Rape Rate?” *Foreign Policy*, September 11, 2013, <http://foreignpolicy.com/2013/09/11/how-does-a-country-develop-a-60-percent-rape-rate/#>. Rachel Jewkes, Emma Fulu, Tim Roselli, and Claudia Garcia-Moreno, “Prevalence of and Factors Associated with Non-partner Rape Perpetration: Findings from the UN Multi-country Cross-sectional Study on Men and Violence in Asia and the Pacific,” *The Lancet Global Health* 1, no. 4 (2013): 208-218.

16 United Nations Development Programme, “UN Survey of 10,000 Men in Asia and the Pacific Reveals Why Some Men Use Violence against Women and Girls,” September 10, 2013, <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/presscenter/pressreleases/2013/09/10/un-rape-survey-of-10-000-men-in-asia-and-the-pacific-reveals-why-some-men-use-violence-against-women-and-girls.html>.

17 Jewkes et al., “Rape Perpetration,” 208. UNDP, “UN Survey of 10,000 Men.”

18 Galtung, “Violence, Peace,” 171.

19 Kate Nahapetian, “Selective Justice: Prosecuting Rape in the International Criminal Tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda,” *Berkeley Women’s Law Journal* 14, no. 1 (2013): 128.

20 Cassidy L. Chiasson, “Silenced Voices: Sexual Violence during and after World War II” (Honor Theses Paper 340, University of Southern Mississippi, 2015), https://aquila.usm.edu/honors_theses/340/. Nahapetian, “Selective Justice,” 127.

21 Wendy S. Hesford, “Documenting Violations: Rhetorical Witnessing and the Spectacle of Distant Suffering,” *Biography* 27, no. 1 (2004): 137.

22 Binaifer Nowrojee and Human Rights Watch/Africa, *Shattered Lives: Sexual Violence during the Rwandan Genocide and Its Aftermath* (New York: Human Rights Watch, 1996), 16, <https://www.hrw.org/reports/1996/Rwanda.htm>.

23 United Nations Security Council, “Resolution 827 (1993) [establishing International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia] (S/RES/827),” May 25, 1993, [https://undocs.org/S/RES/827\(1993\)](https://undocs.org/S/RES/827(1993)).

24 United Nations Security Council, “Resolution 955 (1994) [establishing International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda] (S/RES/955),” November 8, 1994, [https://undocs.org/S/RES/955\(1994\)](https://undocs.org/S/RES/955(1994)).

25 United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Division for the Advancement of Women, “Women2000: Sexual Violence and Armed Conflict: United Nations Response,” April 1998, <https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/1998/4/women2000-sexual-violence-and-armed-conflict-und-nations-response>.

26 James Karuhanga, “UN Urges World to Arrest ICTR-indicted Genocide Fugitives,” *New Times*, January 2, 2016, <http://www.newtimes.co.rw/section/read/195778/>.

27 Lauren Wolfe, “The Index: Justice for Rape in War,” Women’s Media Center, May 2, 2014, <http://www.womensmediacenter.com/women-under-siege/the-index-justice-for-crimes-of-rape-in-war>.

- 28 UN DESA, "Women2000."
- 29 Nienke Grossman, "Sex on the Bench: Do Women Judges Matter to the Legitimacy of International Courts?" *Chicago Journal of International Law* 12, no. 2 (2012): 656.
- 30 G.S. Venumadhava, "Violent Crimes against Women," *Reviews of Progress* 1, no. 6 (2013): 6.
- 31 "Historic War Crime Verdict Vindicates Women," *CNNfyi.com*, February 23, 2001, <http://www.cnn.com/2001/fyi/news/02/23/war.crime.verdict/>.
- 32 Wolfe, "The Index."
- 33 Tamara L. Tompkins, "Prosecuting Rape as a War Crime: Speaking the Unspeakable," *Notre Dame Law Review* 70, no. 4 (1999): 850-851.
- 34 Susan Brownmiller, *Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape* (New York: Random House, 1975), 15.
- 35 United Nations Women, "Preventing Conflict, Transforming Justice, Securing the Peace: A Global Study on the Implementation of the United Nations Security Resolution 1325" (2015), 21, <http://wps.unwomen.org/>.
- 36 Michael W. Doyle and Nicholas Sambanis, "International Peacebuilding: A Theoretical and Quantitative Analysis," *American Political Science Review* 94, no. 4 (December 2000): 779-801. Galtung and Fischer, "Violence: Direct," 35-40.
- 37 Rosa Kim, "The Legacy of Institutionalized Gender Inequality in South Korea: The Family Law," *Boston College Third World Law Journal* 14, no. 1 (1994), 146. Abdulwahed Zia Moballeg, "Family Law in Afghanistan: Past Experiences and Future Landscape" (unpublished manuscript, 2009): 6. Arab Naz, Ibrahim, and Waqar Ahmad, "Socio-cultural Impediments to Women Political Empowerment in Pakhtun Society," *Academic Research International* 3, no. 1 (2012): 164, [http://www.savap.org.pk/journals/ARInt./Vol.3\(1\)/2012\(3.1-21\).pdf](http://www.savap.org.pk/journals/ARInt./Vol.3(1)/2012(3.1-21).pdf).
- 38 Valerie M. Hudson, Donna Lee Bowen and Perpetua Lynne Nielsen, "We Are Not Helpless: Addressing Structural Gender Inequality in Post-conflict Societies," *PRISM: A Journal of the Center for Complex Operations* 6, no. 1 (2016): 127.
- 39 Laura A. McCloskey and Riane Eisler, "Family Structure and Family Violence and Nonviolence," in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, and Conflict*, vol. 2, eds. Lester Kurtz and Jennifer Turpin (San Francisco, CA: Academic Press, 1999), 1-11.
- 40 Hudson, Bowen and Nielsen, "We Are Not Helpless," 127.
- 41 Hudson, Bowen and Nielsen, "We Are Not Helpless," 123-137. McCloskey and Eisler, "Family Structure," 1-11.
- 42 Gwen Hunnicutt, "Varieties of Patriarchy and Violence against Women: Resurrecting 'Patriarchy' as a Theoretical Tool," *Violence against Women* 15, no. 5 (May 2009): 553-573.
- 43 Andrew R. Hoy, "The Relationship between Male Dominance and Militarism: Quantitative Tests of Several Theories," *World Cultures* 8, no. 2 (1994): 40-57.
- 44 Peggy Reeves Sanday, "Socio-cultural Context of Rape: A Cross-cultural Study," *Journal of Social Issues* 37, no. 4 (1981): 5-27.
- 45 Caprioli, "Primed for Violence," 171.
- 46 United Nations Development Programme, "Human Development Report 2016: Human Development for Everyone," 2016, <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-report-2016-human-development-everyone>.

- 47 “Toward Gender Equality,” World Bank, 1.
- 48 Tam O’Neil and Pilar Domingo, *The Power to Decide: Women, Decision-making and Gender Equality* (London: Overseas Development Institute, April 2015), 4, <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/9848.pdf>.
- 49 Caprioli, “Primed for Violence,” 161. Galtung and Fischer, “Violence: Direct,” 35-40.
- 50 Hudson, Bowen and Nielsen, “We Are Not Helpless,” 127. WomanStats, “WomanStats Database Codebook,” 2014, <http://www.womanstats.org/CodebookCurrent.htm>. World Bank, “Proportion of Seats Held by Women in National Parliaments (%),” 2016, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SG.GEN.PARL.ZS>.
- 51 Caprioli, “Primed for Violence,” 161-178. William T. Divale and Marvin Harris, “Population, Warfare, and the Male Supremacist Complex,” *American Anthropologist* 78, no. 3 (1976): 521-538. Hoy, “The Relationship.” Keith F. Otterbein, “Internal War: A Cross-cultural Study,” in *The War System: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, eds. Richard A. Falk and Samuel S. Kim (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1980, original work published 1968), 204-223. Marc H. Ross, “Female Political Participation: A Cross-cultural Explanation,” *American Anthropologist* 88, no. 4 (1986): 843-858. Sara Ruddick, “Pacifying the Forces: Drafting Women in the Interests of Peace,” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 8, no. 3 (Spring 1983): 471-489. Sanday, “Socio-cultural Context,” 5-27.
- 52 Divale and Harris, “Population, Warfare,” 524.
- 53 Divale and Harris, “Population, Warfare,” 526.
- 54 O’Neil and Domingo, *The Power to Decide*, 1.
- 55 O’Neil and Domingo, *The Power to Decide*, 2-3.
- 56 Pilar Domingo et al. *Women’s Voice and Leadership in Decision-Making: Assessing the Evidence*. (London: Overseas Department Institute, April 2015), 4, <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/9627.pdf>.
- 57 Galtung and Fischer, “Violence: Direct,” 35-40.
- 58 United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women, *Gender Mainstreaming: An Overview* (New York: United Nations, 2002), 1.
- 59 United Nations General Assembly, “Report of the Economic and Social Council for 1997 (A/52/3),” September 18, 1997, 27-35, <https://undocs.org/A/52/3>.
- 60 UNGA, “Economic and Social Council,” 28.
- 61 Peacewomen, “National Actions Plans for the Implementation of UNSCR 1325 on Women, Peace, and Security,” 2019, <http://www.peacewomen.org/member-states>.
- 62 “Women, Peace, and Security Index,” Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace, and Security, 2018, <https://giwps.georgetown.edu/the-index/>.
- 63 United Nations Women, “UN Creates New Structure for Empowerment of Women,” July 2, 2010, <http://www.unwomen.org/en/news/stories/2010/7/un-creates-new-structure-for-empowerment-of-women>.
- 64 Melissa Labonte and Gaynel Curry, “Women, Peace, and Security: Are We There Yet?” *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations* 22, no. 3 (2016): 316.
- 65 Megan Roberts, “UN Peacekeeping: Where Are All the Women?” Council on Foreign Relations, June 20, 2017, <https://www.cfr.org/blog/un-peacekeeping-where-are-all-women>.

- 66 Helene Silverberg, "Organizing a Course that Is Attentive to Issues of Racial and Sexual Difference," *PS: Political Science & Politics* 27, no. 4 (December 1994): 718-719.
- 67 "Women in National Parliaments," Inter-Parliamentary Union, 2019, <http://archive.ipu.org/wmn-e/classif.htm>. World Bank, "Proportion of Seats."
- 68 Galtung and Fischer, "Violence: Direct, Structural and Cultural," 35-40.
- 69 Martha J. Cutter, *Unruly Tongue: Identity and Voice in American Women's Writing, 1850-1930* (Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi, 1999).
- 70 Teri Finneman, *Press Portrayals of Women Politicians, 1870s-2000s: From "Lunatic" Woodhull to "Polarizing" Palin* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2015), 43-78.
- 71 Elizabeth Rigby, "Hostile Press Blamed for Lack of Women MPs," *Financial Times*, April 25, 2014, <https://www.ft.com/content/bfd14ab2-cc51-11e3-9b5f-00144feabdc0>.
- 72 Julia Baird, "Palin and Being 'Palinized,'" *Newsweek*, November 20, 2009, <http://www.newsweek.com/palin-and-being-palinized-76663>.
- 73 Barbara Castle, "Analysis of the Political, Social and Economic Progress of Women," in *Women of the Revolution: Forty Years of Feminism*, ed. Kira Cochrane (London: Guardian Books, 2010), 105-108. Deirdre O'Neill, Heather Savigny, and Victoria Cann, "Women Politicians in the UK Press: Not Seen and Not Heard?" *Feminist Media Studies* 16, no. 2 (2015): 293-307. Nicholas Watt, "Westminster for Women: Neanderthal Leering and Unwanted Advances," *The Guardian*, February 25, 2013, <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2013/feb/25/westminster-politics-sexism-women-work>.
- 74 Robert Egnell, "Gender Perspectives and Military Effectiveness: Implementing UNSCR 1325 and the National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security," *PRISM: A Journal of the Center for Complex Operations* 6, no. 1 (2016): 72-89.
- 75 United States Agency for International Development, "Women and Conflict: An Introductory Guide for Programming" (2007), 7, http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pnadj133.pdf.
- 76 Mary Caprioli, "Gender Equality and Civil Wars. Social Development Papers. Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction Series (CPR Working Paper No. 8). (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2013, September), <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/989601468762305507/pdf/270910Gender0e1PR0Wp0no10801public1.pdf>. Hudson et al., Sex and World Peace. Jewkes et al., "Rape Perpetration," 208-218. Labonte and Curry, "Are We There Yet?" 311-320. O'Neil and Domingo, *The Power to Decide*. Laurel Stone, "Annex II: Quantitative Analysis of Women's Participation in Peace Processes," in *Reimagining Peacemaking: Women's Role in Peace Processes*, eds. Marie O'Reilly, Andrea O. Súilleabháin, and Thania Paffenholz (New York: International Peace Institute, 2015), 34-35, <https://www.ipinst.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/IPI-E-pub-Reimagining-Peacemaking.pdf>. Wolfe, "The Index."
- 77 Roberts, "UN Peacekeeping." World Bank, "Proportion of Seats." "Women in National Parliaments," Inter-Parliamentary Union. "Women, Peace, and Security Index," GIWPS.
- 78 Hudson, Bowen and Nielsen, "We Are Not Helpless," 129.
- 79 Sarah Taylor, "A Better Peace? Including Women in Conflict Negotiations" (PhD diss., The New School, 2015).
- 80 J. Joseph Hewitt, Jonathan Wilkenfeld, and Ted R. Gurr, *Peace and Conflict 2010* (New York: Paradigm, 2010).
- 81 Doyle and Sambanis, "International Peacebuilding," 779-801.

- 82 United Nations Women, "UN Creates New Structure." United Nations, Department of Political Affairs, "DPA Gender Factsheet," April 2016, https://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/GenderFactsheet-US-Format_April%202016.pdf.
- 83 Stone, "Annex II," 34-35.
- 84 Fen O. Hampson, "Peace Agreements," in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, and Conflict*, vol. 2, eds. Lester Kurtz and Jennifer Turpin (San Francisco, CA: Academic Press 1999), 618-619.
- 85 Stone, "Annex II," 34-35.
- 86 Hudson, Bowen, and Nielsen, "We Are Not Helpless," 123-137. Kim, "The Legacy," 145-162. Moballeg, "Family Law in Afghanistan," 1-7.
- 87 UN DPA, "DPA Gender Factsheet."
- 88 United Nations Women, "UN Creates New Structure."
- 89 Jennifer K. Lobasz, "Beyond Border Security: Feminist Approaches to Human Trafficking," in *Gender and International Security: Feminist Perspectives*, ed. Laura Sjoberg (New York: Routledge, 2010), 214-234. J. Ann Tickner, "Feminist Security Studies: Celebrating an Emerging Field," *Politics & Gender* 7, no. 4 (December 2011): 576-581.
- 90 Eric M. Blanchard, "Gender, International Relations, and the Development of Feminist Security Theory," *Signs* 28, no. 4 (Summer 2003): 1289-1312, <https://doi.org/10.1086/368328>. United Nations Security Council, "Resolution 1325 (2000) [on Women, Peace, and Security] (S/RES1325)," October 31, 2000, [https://undocs.org/S/RES/1325\(2000\)](https://undocs.org/S/RES/1325(2000)).
- 91 Clara Eroukhmanoff, "Securitisation Theory," in *International Relations Theory*, eds. Stephen McGlinchey, Rosie Walters, and Christian Sheinpflug, (E-International Relations Publishing, 2017), 109, <http://eprints.uwe.ac.uk/34087>.
- 92 Lobasz, "Beyond Border Security," 215.
- 93 Jill Steans, *Gender and International Relations: An Introduction* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1998), 5. Laura Sjoberg, "Introduction," in *Gender and International Security: Feminist Perspectives*, ed. Laura Sjoberg (New York: Routledge, 2010), 1-14.
- 94 Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal, *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership*, 4th ed. (San Francisco: John Wiley & Son, 2008), 11.
- 95 *Army Doctrine Publication 3-0: Operations* (Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, July 31, 2019), 1-3.
- 96 Thomas E. Ricks, "In Iraq, Military Forgot Lessons of Vietnam Early Missteps by U.S. Left Troops Unprepared for Guerrilla Warfare," *Washington Post*, July 23, 2006, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/2006/07/23/in-iraq-military-forgot-lessons-of-vietnam-span-classbankheadearly-missteps-by-us-left-troops-unprepared-for-guerrilla-warfare-span/df5a64ff-b27e-4b93-acc0-63ff75f6da32/>.

