

Lecture 6
15 October 2009
Copyright: Ronald B. Mitchell, 2009

- I. News articles:
 - A. See article about Obama advisor consciously saying he was against including more *militarily-qualified* women in military operations.
- II. Introduction
 - A. "Much of contemporary feminism is also committed to progressive or emancipatory goals, particularly the goal of achieving equality for women through the elimination of unequal gender relations" [Tickner, 1997 #4440, 616].
 - B. Important concept: social theories cannot only describe and explain. They, by definition, also influence and change the social processes they attempt to describe and explain. Thus, claims by mainstream IR of simply explaining what is, are disingenuous since even if all they try to do is explain, they also reinforce existing reality in ways that make its continuity, rather than its change, more likely. Knowledge cannot be divorced from its political consequences [Tickner, 1997 #4440, 622].
 - 1. Morality in the sense of views about how the world should be are inextricably intertwined in attempts to explain how the world is.
 - 2. More interested in questions of the sort of "why this world and not some other world" rather than "how does this world work"
 - 3. Critical theory vs. problem-solving theory, with latter being theories like realist and institutionalist theory that "takes the world as it finds it and implicitly accepts the prevailing order as its framework" [Tickner, 1997 #4440, 619].
 - C. Conflict not only over what is studied in IR (leaving women out of the picture) but how we study IR, in that standard existing methodologies themselves can reproduce, perhaps unwittingly but nonetheless influentially, the existing world rather than re-creating a new one.
 - D. Explaining "the behavior of states run by men and an international system that is the result of the interactions of states run by men" rather than the "behavior of states and an international system that is the result of the interactions of those states"
 - E. By association of women with peace, they are essentially kept out of international politics and thereby disempowered not only in expressing themselves but also in helping re-create the world in whatever different ways it would be re-created if they were
- III. Basics of feminist IR theory
 - A. The "facts:"
 - 1. Men are 95% of the world's heads of state, Cabinet ministers and senior positions in national policymaking and intergovernmental organizations
 - 2. Women do 70% of world's productive work, grow half of world's food but receive 1/10th of world's income and own 2% of property.
 - 3. Women are disproportionately illiterate, impoverished, overworked, underrepresented and killed at birth.
 - 4. Not all sex-specific outcomes favor men.
 - a) Women's life expectancies are consistently higher.
 - b) Suicide, incarceration, alcoholism, conscription, occupational fatalities hit men harder than women.
 - c) Sex specific massacre
 - 5. Whether it works in men's or women's favor in any particular context, a defining characteristic is the stratification of human well-being and political power based on sex.
 - B. Feminist theory in a Nutshell:
 - 1. Structural inequality leads to individual insecurity
 - 2. If looking for patterns in the international system, one consistent pattern in the international system is the absence of women from both the practice of international relations and the scholarship of international relations and this is not an
 - C. Lysistrata tale - women have different perspective.
 - D. Three different meanings of feminist approach to IR. Proposed by Sandra Harding and applied to IR by Christine Sylvester. Feminist empiricism; Feminist standpoint; and Feminist postmodernism unified by notion that traditional IR has neglected attention to gender.

- E. Definition of security: security as "multidimensional and multilevel . . . – as the diminution of all forms of violence, including physical, structural, and ecological" (Tickner, 1997, 624).
 - 1. Definition of security – does state provide for the security of all its citizens as assumed in prior discussion of IR theory? Questionable realist/liberal construction: "Anarchy and danger on outside and security and order on the inside" (Tickner, 1997, 625). States provide security for the state but not for women.
 - 2. Military are often source of individual insecurity rather than security; they create national security but individual insecurity.
 - 3. Rape of noncombatants in war; "comfort women" of WWII
 - 4. Consider assaults of women both inside and outside the home
 - 5. Consider missing women from web page
 - 6. Consider continuity of this problem across states – compare to environmental problems which occur universally within states that its easy to see as appropriate subjects of IR
 - F. Gender vs. sex: "The data show that in the case of the Arab-Israeli dispute, women are not less militaristic than men, but both women and men who are more supportive of gender equality are also more favorably disposed to compromise" [Tickner, 1999 #4441, 11].
 - G. Would the goals of states be different not only if women were in power but if women, over a long period of time, had had a hand in constructing the overarching social structure.
- IV. An outline of feminist theories of IR
- A. Focus = global gender relations. Conflict between genders, rather than between states.
 - 1. "Unequal social hierarchies which contribute to conflict, inequality and oppression" [Tickner, 1999 #4441, 11]. Puzzle: across time and across cultures, why have women been consistently disempowered, oppressed and insecure?
 - 2. Inequality and individual security and consequences of war rather than causes (Tickner, 1997, 625). We have assumed so far that war leads to survival and security, at least for the winner. Feminists call this into question and demonstrate that may not be true for women, even in "winning" state.
 - B. Actors = gendered individuals; masculine and feminine (also men and women) are important focus and states and other social institutions as embodiments of gendered roles
 - C. Goals = individual security and well-being (different meaning than security and well-being of state)
 - 1. Can produce domination and subjugation of women, others, and environment and continuation of existing hierarchy
 - 2. Can be both clear and obvious domination
 - 3. But also lots of subtle, covert, unconscious, routinized, and structural domination
 - D. Means = use of gender identities, even by the state, in service of the state
 - 1. Conversion of men into soldiers through hyper-masculinizing them
 - 2. Gender as important tool of the state
 - 3. Use of women in western militaries to contrast liberated west from controlled Islamic women
 - E. Organizing principle = patriarchy or gendered hierarchical structure at all levels of social interaction
 - F. Dynamics of system = construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of gendered hierarchies at all levels
 - 1. Resistance and compliance with hierarchies and gender roles
 - G. Theories and social norms lead to women being victims and objects rather than agents and subjects
 - H. Note the relationship of agent and structure in feminist theory and how notions of transformation exist within feminist theories of IR By seeing masculinist theories as source of international relations theory and therefore also of international relations practice, allows for a transformative logic in which alternative conceptualizations can make room for social change.
- V. Is it causal: "The achievement of peace, economic justice, and ecological sustainability is inseparable from overcoming social relations of domination and subordination; genuine security requires not only the absence of war but also the elimination of unjust social relations, including unequal gender relations" [Tickner, 1992 #4257, 128]. Flip this to see the causal implications
- A. Feminist theory fits less well into the model (focus, actors, goals, means, org. principle, dynamics) I have been promoting
 - 1. Problems with applying this structure to capture this theory
 - 2. New tenet: Social implications of theory – transformative or reconstitutive?
 - a) Realist – reconstitutive of given structure
 - b) Institutional – revisionist of outcomes within given structure
 - c) Feminist – transformative of structure

- VI. Three variants of feminist theory
- A. Feminist empiricism: facts about women neglected
1. Same intellectual project, different facts. Critique of what we traditionally study in IR.
 2. Shift from exclusive attention to states and capitalist system to attention to social structures and attitudes that genderize IR.
 3. Forces focus on other dependent variables and consequences of IR system, e.g., use of state and international system to oppress women, not just make war.
 4. Women's Strike for Peace during CMC and Jody Williams with ICBL today.
- B. Feminist standpoint: perspectives of women neglected and marginalized
1. Same intellectual project, different theories. Critique of theories we use to explain what we traditionally study in IR.
 2. "Standpoint of people who have been systematically excluded from power" and power making positions (Keohane, 1989, 245). Provide different insights and perspectives onto the problem of understanding international relations. What we see depends on where we stand. New perspectives, if different even if not perfect, provide new insights that help improve vision. Triangulation on the truth.
 3. Charge that intellectual foundations of IR theory are gender-based notions of MAN's reasons for going to war. Primary focus of IR is war, which reflects a certain standpoint and set of priorities. Even terms of IR debate reflect non-feminist views.
 - a) "Power as control" rather than "power as concert in action" or ability to work together and cooperate.
 - b) Basic notion of realist "self-help system" starts from male-oriented view of people as separate and competing vs. feminist view of people as collective and connected entities. Hobbes "state of nature" involves men threatening each other rather than nurturing each other.
 - c) Dichotomous views vs. more open-minded views of world in which actors and concepts form networks rather than form opposing and contrasting sides.
 - d) Even the three categories Keohane creates posits this analytic category making. Likewise my own view of things. This viewpoint itself is inaccurate, according to feminist theory. My causal analysis of A ---> B is itself problematic.
 4. Rebecca Grant position: can women have a feminist standpoint once become part of the policy-making and war-making process. As women's empowerment and liberation succeeds, feminist standpoint erodes. E.g., women in Israeli army, Margaret Thatcher, Republican women in US Congress. "Feminist epistemology must take the experience of women as its starting point," but, as experience of women approximates that of men, then becomes harder to posit feminist standpoint different from male standpoint and "to be female is not necessarily to be feminist" (Grant, 93).
- C. Feminist postmodernism: deep notions of inquiry and truth are gendered.
1. Different intellectual project. Critique of methodologies by which we develop theories we use to explain what we traditionally study in IR.
 2. Most radical of three: questions notion of one true world "out there" which we can understand from any single perspective. Notion of single Truth entails male notion of hierarchy of knowledge that is epistemologically false, i.e., misunderstands what it is possible for people to know about the world, and misunderstands what "knowing something about the world" really means.
 3. Can only achieve interpretations of the world, rather than truths about the world. No impartial, objective viewpoint exists: all views are subjective and partial and therefore of equal validity. Objectivity is not possible.
 4. Refutes notion that we can generalize to other cases. Contingency rather than generalization matters.
 5. Social sciences differ from other sciences in the object of study - what we are studying has meaning for those who are creating it. Thus cannot study it independent of the meaning that those people have on it. There is no truth separate from that experience.
 6. Social construction of meaning: what is peace? what is war? If people are not fighting war, but you ask them and they say they are at war, how does one interpret it?
 7. In this view, no basis on which to evaluate different claims of truthfulness. This approach is more threatening to many because undermines the intellectual project and whole basis on which a debate can take place.
 8. Questions the "scientific" method as a coercive force in society that oppresses views other than the dominant male paradigm. This class itself is a means of indoctrination into that worldview.

- a) Increase connection with subject, avoiding distance. Empathy and self-knowledge rather than distance and analysis.
 - b) Engage other perspectives, esp. of disadvantaged
 - c) Avoid closure of scholarly debate by deciding "we know." Search for consensus rather than parsimony or rigor.
- D. Keohane differentiates between three feminist theories and privileges and evaluates two over the other one. Meanings we give to words like power, sovereignty, reciprocity, anarchy, etc. influence how we think about world. Critique by Weber
 - 1. Keohane sees only those aspects of feminist standpoint theory that accord and reinforce own agenda.
 - 2. Keohane performs a co-optation of feminist standpoint theory that simultaneously simplifies and misrepresents that view at the same time that it puts it to use to support neoinstitutionalism.
 - 3. Feminist empiricism is discounted as immature and unable to contribute.
 - 4. Keohane's obvious discomfort with feminist postmodernism arises from inability to comprehend and take it in.
 - 5. What I call analysis (vs. synthesis), Weber would call mutilation and fetishization.
 - 6. Keohane as disciplinary enforcer/gatekeeper/arbiter of what can and cannot contribute to IR theorizing and research.
- VII. Where do we see gender when we think about militaries? (This section thanks to Dr. R. Charli Carpenter)
 - A. Who gets conscripted into militaries? why primarily men? Are all men natural killers and rapists? NO. Why else would the state be forced to pour expenditures into training regiments designed to TURN THEM INTO killers? And how is this accomplished? By denigrating those aspects of men's behavior that are not conducive to the military project as womanly, as "gay" and as unpatriotic.
 - B. Women also have a role to play in making the modern military work. Mothers need to be convinced to take pride in their son's military careers rather than feel as if the state is stealing their children. Girlfriends need to be convinced to feel loyalty to their soldier-boyfriends overseas, to write them letters of support, because we know there is nothing worse for morale than lots of soldiers receiving letters of the other kind. If you want soldiers who feel good about dying for their women and children back home, they need to feel that the women and children back home are behind them.
 - C. How does gender play a role in the way we think about that state?
 - 1. States >>> What is a state? (authority, legitimacy, force, decision-making) The state is a masculinized concept. In IR theory for example, states(men) are rational, strategic, self-interested, autonomous, calculating, sovereign. We expect them to act in very masculine ways.
 - 2. Nations. Compare that thinking to the idea of the nation. A nation is not the same as a state, though we're sometimes tricked into thinking they're the same. The state is the sovereign decision-making authority; the nation is the people on whose behalf the state claims to act. The language of mnationalist is not a language of reason or self-interest; it is a language of sacrifice. Emotion. Kin. Homeland, blood, family: the nation is a feminized concept. We often visualize nations as beautiful women whose interest must be defended against the threat of domination or penetration by enemy forces. (E.g., "the rape of Kuwait.")
- VIII. Feminist theory contributions
 - A. Feminist postmodernism suggests that even the notion of evaluating its contribution rather than as replacing or providing a completely alternative vision becomes difficult.
 - 1. One way might be to see as explaining cooperation: if humans, including men, seen not as separate and oppositional but as altruistic and connected, then "puzzle" of cooperation vanishes.
 - 2. Alternatively, when men are in touch with their masculine sides they go to war, and when in touch with feminine sides they cooperate and find ways to resolve conflict without war.
 - B. Some questions
 - 1. How does inclusion of women in the practice of foreign policy, war, and international relations alter that practice?
 - a) Equality without transformation in Grant's terms.
 - b) Is there any distinction between men and women independent of their positions in society? If the distinctions of gender vanish once the distinctions of position vanish, then is gender really an important viewpoint? Perhaps it should be positional viewpoint?
 - c) Does war become unacceptable if women involved in combat?

- d) Does psychology of warfare change with women in combat support? But can ask here whether women are really any longer women or whether they are forced to become non-women by the roles they are forced to play within the military context.
 - 2. How does inclusion of feminist perspective in the study of foreign policy, war and international relations alter international relations make a difference? New perspective can make a difference even if subject of study remains constant.
 - 3. How does inclusion of feminist postmodern perspective influence methodologies by which we study international relations?
 - 4. Something new to say about war? Something new to say about cooperation?
 - 5. Both sides will need to work out what is the clear theory that feminists are posing as alternative to traditional IR approach
- IX. Summary of feminist theories of IR:
- A. Three linked feminist perspectives/approaches. Perhaps best seen as different levels in a single feminist critique of existing theories of IR.
 - B. Confront us with problematic nature of international relations itself, the study of international relations, and the methodology of the study of international relations and other social sciences.