POSTSCRIPT

UNSCR 1325—Conundrums and Opportunities

CHANTAL DE JONGE OUDRAAT

SIPRI North America

UN Security Council Resolution 1325 (UNSCR 1325), adopted on October 31, 2000, recognized that women were not only inordinately affected by war, but were also an important resource for peace-building and post conflict reconstruction.

The adoption of UNSCR 1325 was the result of active mobilization of civil society groups—particularly women's groups—as well as a recognition by international policymakers that approaches to deal with violent conflict in the post-Cold War era had important shortcomings (Anderlini 2007; Cohn 2008). Indeed, conceptual shifts had begun to take root after the end of the Cold War, when a focus on state security turned to human security—that is, an emphasis on the security of individuals and groups within states.

However, the importance and meaning of UNSCR 1325, as well as related concepts such as human security, were eclipsed by the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 when international attention became consumed by military responses to counter terrorism in Afghanistan and Iraq.

By the end of the decade those wars had come to inconclusive endings and planned international departures. In addition, the tenth anniversary of UNSCR 1325 in 2010, the long awaited announcement by Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton that the United States would be developing its own National Action Plan "to accelerate" the implementation of UNSCR 1325, and the 2012/2013 UK initiative to prevent sexual violence in conflict, renewed political interest in gender equality and the idea of women as agents of geopolitical change (US National Intelligence Council 2008; World Bank 2012). This renewed interest provides researchers and practitioners with a unique opportunity to advance implementation of UNSCR 1325 and more generally to advance the women, peace and security agenda.

———————
Address correspondence to Chantal de Jonge Oudraat, Executive Director, SIPRI North America, 1111 19th Street, NW, 12th Floor, Washington, DC 20036, USA. E-mail: coudraat@sipri.org

Implementation of UNSCR 1325 and advancement of the women, peace, and security agenda has suffered from the lack of political commitment at the highest levels; the lack of strong systematic empirical evidence to infuse policy and inform best practices; and the lack of integration into mainstream international relations and security studies, including the lack of conceptual frameworks other than feminist conceptions of peace and security (Kuehnast, de Jonge Oudraat, and Hernes, 2011).

The authors of this issue of *International Interactions* make important contributions to the women, peace, and security agenda. They lay bare some of the problems related to this agenda, including the complex relationships between gender balancing and gender mainstreaming—between equality of rights and operational effectiveness. Many of the articles are focused on operational aspects of UNSCR 1325 and empirical data that can inform best practices. But, the articles in this issue also engage us on the theoretical underpinnings of UNSCR 1325 and make us realize that without a correct understanding of the gendered nature of our societies, operational policies will falter or may even become counterproductive.

I have organized this Postscript along three main issues that empirical research about UNSCR 1325 has to grapple with: gender balancing and gender mainstreaming, the underlying gendered nature of peace and security institutions; and the lack of sex-disaggregated data. I conclude this Postscript with thoughts about future tasks.

GENDER BALANCING AND GENDER MAINSTREAMING

Two powerful ideas are at the heart of UNSCR 1325—gender balancing and gender mainstreaming. Gender balancing has to do with equal rights and the rebalancing of the number of women and men engaged in international peace and security policies. UNSCR 1325 stressed the importance of women's "equal participation and full involvement in all efforts for the maintenance and promotion of peace and security, and the need to increase their role in decision making with regard to conflict prevention and resolution."

Gender mainstreaming has to do with operational effectiveness. It recognizes the role of gender integration in international peace and security, as well as the understanding that policies and programs may have different impacts on men and women.[1] Proponents of gender mainstreaming, including implementation of UNSCR 1325, argue that better understanding of the gendered nature (that is, the socially constructed nature) of relations and

---

[1]In 1997 the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) defined gender mainstreaming as "the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislations, policies or programmes, in any area and at all levels (. . .) The ultimate goal of mainstreaming is to achieve gender equality."

roles of men and women in societies leads to better policies to further peace and security and hence contributes to the maintenance and promotion of international peace and security. (See Gizelis and Pierre 2013, in this special issue, on the challenges facing gender mainstreaming in postconflict environments.)

Conventional wisdom has it that there is an intimate relationship between gender balancing and gender mainstreaming. However, research about the nature of this relationship is in its infancy and hence inconclusive. For most practitioners and policymakers gender mainstreaming remains first and foremost a question of gender balancing.

For example, Sabrina Karim and Kyle Beardsley (2013) in their study of UN peacekeepers show that the UN peacekeeping forces have begun a process of gender balancing—that is, including more female military personnel in operations—yet their analysis also shows that this gender balancing has taken place without gender mainstreaming. Indeed, most additional female military are not deployed to operations where they might have the potentially greatest impact. On the contrary, the increase of female peacekeepers may have even reinforced stereotypical gender roles—in that female military personnel tend to be deployed to areas with the least risk of physical danger. (See also the commentaries by Anita Schjolset 2013 and Louise Olsson and Frida Möller 2013 on Women's participation in NATO and UN, EU, and OSCE operations).

THE GENDERED NATURE OF PEACE AND SECURITY

Gender is about the dynamic power relations between men and women. Power relations that shape the roles and expectations of men and women as actors in society and which are amplified in institutional and ideological (gender) norms and behaviors (See also Carol Cohn 2013). National and international structures and institutions are vehicles of such norms and behaviors. It follows that international relations and questions of peace and security are also gendered—that is, they are made up of a complex web of power, inequities, and arrangements operating between and across the genders, within and among states.

War pushes gender relations to extremes—when men and notions of hyper masculinity lead to extreme violence, including sexual violence—and allows for shifts in those relations, when women move into positions of power and when new institutions are created to govern relations between members of society based on different principles and power (hierarchical) distributions.

International actors, when intervening in conflict or postconflict situations, need to be attentive to the gendered nature of the societies in which they intervene and understand how their actions may advance or

set back relations between men and women. For example, all too often peace negotiations and peace processes intended to stop violent conflict will focus on those groups who operate the guns at the exclusion of those who did not—it being assumed that those engaged in violent conflict are the key actors and the only ones who can stop it (Anderlini 2007). UNSCR 1325 challenges that assumption and posits that in order to establish lasting peace international actors should reach out to all actors in society, including those who have not actively or directly participated in the violent conflict.

Nevertheless, implementation of UNSCR 1325 proves challenging. Indeed, many policymakers ignore, or refuse to recognize, the gendered nature of peace and security questions and at best equate gender mainstreaming with gender balancing. In addition, policymakers often have short time-spans and are focused on short-term rather than long-term results. Empirical research by laying bare causal relations, as well as long-term consequences of policies, can become a powerful tool in a better understanding of reality and hence a powerful tool in the elaboration of policy to address international peace and security problems.

Kara Ellerby (2013), in *(En)gendered Security? The Complexities of Women's Inclusion in Peace Processes*, defines the level of (en)gendered security—that is, the level of women's inclusion in peace processes by looking at four forms of inclusion: representation, which focuses on women as decision makers; incorporation, which focuses on women's participation in day to day functions of a state and peacebuilding process; protection, which focuses on protection from direct violence, as well protection of rights and access; and recognition, which focuses on how a gender perspective informs the formation of policies. In her examination of recent peace agreements and the extent to which they are (en)gendered—that is, how and to what extent women are included in the peace process—Ellerby concludes that while we have seen a notable increase in the inclusion of provisions related to women after 2005, most agreements approach the inclusion of women in peace processes in a partial manner and emphasize representation. Ellerby also identifies a slight increase in concerns related to sexual violence in agreements post 2005. The adoption of UNSCR 1820 in 2008, which recognized sexual violence as an international peace and security issue, explains such greater concern.

Similarly, Helen Basini (2013) points out that most disarmament, demobilization, rehabilitation, and reintegration programs (DDRR) "aim to remove and destroy weapons from circulation through disarmament; disband military structures and provide interim medical/psychological care and basic civic education in demobilization camps; and to reintegrate the former fighters back into the community." These programs mainly target those who traditionally bear the arms—that is, men. They overlook the role of women in war, which may explain why many DDRR programs are not very effective.

The lack of a gendered analysis of the consequences of international actions may also end up hurting those groups who might be potential allies. For example, sanction regimes to change behaviors of warring factions will often exclude basis needs, so as not to hurt the population at large—yet, in the first years of the UN embargo on Iraq prenatal vitamins and baby milk were not considered basic needs and hence inordinately affected women and young babies, surely not the groups whose behavior international actors were trying to alter (Sjoberg and Via 2010:6).

The gendered nature of institutions, structures, and many national and international programs not only predetermines who participates or is targeted, but also affects what is being transmitted and/or dealt with. In the case of the DDRR programs in Liberia, a unique opportunity was lost to address issues of sexual violence and "disarm the mind-set" of rape. (See Basini in the special issue.)

THE LACK OF DATA

As the articles in this issue emphasize and as I and others have argued elsewhere, research on the gendered nature of peace and security—let alone, the relationship between gender balancing and gender mainstreaming—remains on the margins of international relations and lacks strong empirical data.

The lack of sex disaggregated data is an important obstacle to effective policies to implement UNSCR 1325 and more generally policies aimed at gender equality.

Former US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was keenly aware of the lack of data. At the launch in July 2012 of *Data 2X*, an initiative aimed at increasing the collection of sex-disaggregated data and closing the Gender Data Gap she stated:

> (. . .) we have strong evidence that women play roles in all kinds of things, and in particular in peacekeeping and conflict prevention. They raise issues in these kinds of negotiations, like human rights and human security, that are fundamental to forging a lasting and sustainable peace. But we need more internationally comparable data to examine how women's contributions affect conflict regions. And only then can we really create frameworks for making sure they are included. (. . .) we have neither invested enough in collecting gender-sensitive data nor in quantifying how increasing gender equality yields benefits to societies. (Clinton 2012)

The greater attention by national and international policymakers to the importance of data collection is a welcome development. Researchers and academics have important responsibilities to make sure that the data are

consistent and that we make the right inferences. For example, in this special issue Anita Schjølset (2013) points to inconsistencies in the NATO data. Elin Bjarnegård and Erik Melander (2013) point to issues of inferences and emphasize in their article on political representation and the decline of civil wars in East Asia that "political representation of women is not necessarily a valid measurement of a society's general level of gender equality." Their warning that "any statistical relationship needs a compelling causal story to underpin it" is also well taken.

TASKS FOR THE FUTURE

UNSCR 1325 is not a resolution about women or gender *per se*—but a resolution about how best to establish and maintain peace and security. Through this resolution members of the UN Security Council recognized that they needed to be more attentive to the effects of their policies on different groups in societies. They (the member states) recognized that they needed to be smarter when using their policy tools—be they coercive tools such as the use of force and economic sanctions, or cooperative tools such as peacekeeping, humanitarian relief, and postconflict reconstruction assistance.

Being smarter means recognizing that policy tools may have different effects on different groups in society and in particular on men and women. Violent conflict (wars) change gender relations and change needs and capacities. Policymakers and civil society actors active in those environments need to recognize these changes. Failure to do so may mean that the policy or action falls flat or, worse, backfires.

In this special issue, Elin Bjarnegård and Erik Melander (2013) express concern about the instrumentalization of UNSCR 1325 and the notion that gender balancing (gender equality and representation) is promoted as an effective instrument for establishing and maintaining international peace and security rather than as "issues of justice, in their own right." Melander and Bjarnegård also argue that claims for greater women's representation in peace negotiations "may reinforce, rather than eliminate, gendered stereotypes by essentializing women and nurturers, having a pacifying effect on peace negotiations and decision-making at large." I would argue that as compelling as the moral and justice argument may be, the effectiveness argument—particularly if backed up by solid evidence—will trump the justice argument and allow a broader coalition of actors to start paying attention. In addition, the stated objective of UNSCR 1325 is the restoration and maintenance of international peace and security—I do not know of a more important objective.

This seems self-evident—yet our conceptual tools to understand international relations often take issues at face value and presume that we are living in a gender neutral environment.

A first task for researchers and academics is to "mainstream" research on UNSCR 1325 within the broader international relations and security studies research agendas. All long-term security projections acknowledge that individual empowerment and gender equality are going to be key factors for peace and stability in the 21st century—if international relations and security studies want to remain relevant, they must start paying attention.

Second, researchers and academics have a unique opportunity in helping shape national and international efforts to collect new sex-disaggregated data. They have all recognized the paucity of our data collection efforts. Former US Secretary of State Clinton in launching *Data2X* emphasized, "Data not only measures progress, it inspires it." She went on to recall that "once you start measuring problems, people are more inclined to take action to fix them (. . .)" (Clinton 2011). There is currently a unique window of opportunity for researchers to be immediately policy relevant. As they create new data sets, researchers need to be attentive not only to statistical correlations but also to context and patterns that can lay bare causal relations. Quantitative analysis needs to be accompanied by qualitative analysis that can provide context.

Third, prevention, participation, relief and recovery, and protection are four key pillars of UNSCR 1325. All are key entry points when thinking about policies in Afghanistan, Central Asia, Syria and the Middle East, the DRC, or Mali, to name but a few pressing international crises. The issue of sexual violence cries out for particular attention. The research of Elizabeth Wood (2011) and Dara Cohen (2010) explaining variation is of particular interest in this regard and may help us uncover the underlying causes and conditions for sexual violence in conflict and post conflict settings (see Nordås and Rustad 2013, in this special issue). Researchers examining sexual violence in war have particular responsibility to show how such violence is a subset of gender-based violence. It is important in this regard not to decouple the different pillars of UNSCR 1325.

Last, researchers and academics need to think big. UNSCR 1325 is a unique and potentially transformative resolution. At heart it recognizes that the gap between men and women and violence against women (and men) in conflict and in preconflict or postconflict situations are indicative of dysfunctional and disruptive patterns of domination in states and that make interstate and intrastate aggression more likely. No task is more noble and pressing than helping uncover the conditions under which this is so.

REFERENCES

Anderlini, Sanam. (2007) *Women Building Peace: What they Do and Why it Matters.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Basini, Helen. (2013) Gender Mainstreaming Unraveled: The Case of DDRR in Liberia. *International Interactions* 39(4):533–555.

Bjarnegård, Elin, and Erik Melander. (2013) Revisiting Representation: Communism, Women in Politics, and the Decline of Armed Conflict in East Asia. *International Interactions* 39(5):556–572.

Clinton, Hillary R. (2012) Remarks on Evidence and Impact: Closing the Gender Data Gap. Available at http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2012/07/195244.htm.

Cohen, Dara K. (2010) Explaining Sexual Violence during Civil War. PhD dissertation, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA.

Cohn, Carol. (2008) Mainstreaming Gender in UN Security Policy: A Path to Political Transformation. In *Global Governance: Feminist Perspectives*, edited by S. M. Rai and G. Waylen. NewYork: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cohn, Carol. (2013) Women and Wars: Toward a Conceptual Framework. In *Women and Wars*, edited by C. Cohn. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Ellerby, Kara. (2013) (En)gendered Security? The Complexities of Women's Inclusion in Peace Processes. *International Interactions* 39(4):435–460.

Gizelis, Theodora-Ismene, with Nana Afua Pierre. (2013) Gender Equality and Postconflict Reconstruction: What Do We Need to Know in Order to Make Gender Mainsteaming Work? *International Interactions* 39(4):600–610.

Hudson, Valerie M., Bonnie Ballif-Spanvill, Mary Caprioli, and Chad F. Emmett. (2012) *Sex and World Peace*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Karim, Sabrina, and Kyle Beardsley. (2013) Female Peacekeepers and Gender Balancing: Token Gestures or Informed Policymaking? *International Interactions* 39(4):461–487.

Kuehnast, Kathleen, Chantal de Jonge Oudraat, and Helga Hernes, eds. (2011) *Women and War: Power and Protection in the 21st Century*. Washington, DC: USIP Press.

Nordås, Ragnhild, and Siri Rustad. (2013) Sexual Exploitation and Abuse by Peacekeepers: Understanding Variation. *International Interactions* 39(4):510–532.

Olsson, Louise, and Frida Möller. (2013) Data on Women's Participation in UN, EU, and OSCE Field Missions: Trends, Possibilities, and Problems. *International Interactions* 39(4):586–599.

Schjølset, Anita. (2013) Data on Women's Participation in NATO Forces and Operations. *International Interactions* 39(4):573–585.

Sjoberg, Laura, and Sandra Via. (2010) Introduction. In *Gender, War and Militarism: Feminist Perspectives*, edited by L. Sjoberg and S. Via. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Urdal, Henrik, and Chi Primus Che. (2013) War and Gender Inequalities in Health: The Impact of Armed Conflict on Fertility and Maternal Mortality. *International Interactions* 39(4):488–509.

US National Intelligence Council. (2008) *Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World*. Washington, DC: NIC.

Wood, Elisabeth Jean. (2011) Rape Is Not Inevitable during War. In *Women and War: Power and Protection in the 21st Century*, edited by Kathleen Kuehnast, Chantal de Jonge Oudraat, and Helga Hernes. Washington, DC: USIP Press.

World Bank. (2012) *World Bank Development Report on Gender Equality and Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank. Available at http://econ.world bank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTDEC/EXTRESEARCH/EXTWDRS/EXTWDR2 0120,contentMDK:23004468~pagePK:64167689~piPK:64167673~theSitePK:7778 063,00.html.