Feminist Security and Security Studies

Laura Sjoberg

The Oxford Handbook of International Security
Edited by Alexandra Gheciu and William C. Wohlforth

Print Publication Date: Mar 2018
Subject: Political Science, International Relations, Political Theory
Online Publication Date: Apr 2018 DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198777854.013.4

Abstract and Keywords

Feminist approaches use gender lenses to look for gender in international security, and observe what is then made visible. In Security Studies the word “gender,” refers to more than someone’s apparent sex; it refers to the divisions that we see and make between those understood to be men and those understood to be women and also the ways those traits operate in social and political life—at the individual level, in social interaction, in workplaces, in organizations, in politics, etc.This chapter takes stock of Feminist Security Studies, accomplishing three tasks: First, it situates Feminist Security Studies within and around security studies, substantively, intellectually, and categorically. Second, it discusses some of the major contributions of Feminist Security Studies, in general terms and with examples. Finally, it looks for the potential futures of Feminist Security Studies itself and security studies more broadly with the integration of feminist theorizing.

Keywords: feminist theory, international security, feminist security studies, gender, security

IN 1988, J. Ann Tickner (1988) pointed out that “international relations is a man’s world, a world of power and conflict in which warfare is a privileged activity.”[1] Thirty years into feminist contributions to International Relations (IR), there is an extent to which that statement remains true, and is likely to be true well into the future. While even initial embraces predicted that feminist insights would “fundamentally change IR’s greatest debates” (Keohane 1989), the trajectory of feminist inquiry in IR generally and security studies specifically has been rocky.[2] The achievements of feminist research for advancing knowledge about security have been, in my view, nothing short of amazing, but “feminist theorists have rarely achieved the serious engagement with other IR scholars for which they have frequently called” (Tickner 1997), and many have stopped calling for engagement at all (e.g. Wibben 2011; Sylvester 2013). This chapter looks at the foundations and trajectory of Feminist Security Studies, engaging both its debates and its difficulties. It then considers security studies *as if* feminisms had transformed it, and uses that theorizing to consider futures for Feminist Security Studies.

The importance of feminist approaches is, as V. Spike Peterson (1992: 197) explains, that " 'real world' events are not adequately addressed by androcentric accounts that render women and gender issues invisible." Feminist approaches use *gender lenses* (Peterson and Runyan 1993: 21) to look for gender in international security, and observe what is then made visible.[3] When feminists in security studies use the word "gender," they are referring to more than what sex someone appears to be when you look at them. They are referring to the divisions that we see and the divisions that we make between those we understand to be men and those we understand to be women—but they are also referring to the ways that traits associated with those people *and* their perceived sex (which we call masculinities and femininities) operate in social and political life—at the individual level, in social interaction, in workplaces, in organizations, in politics, and everywhere else across the global that tropes, perceptions, and labels that we might identify as "gendered" exist. As Marysia Zalewski (1995) notes, "the driving force of (p. 46) feminism is its attention to gender and not simply women. . . . The concept, nature, and practice of gender are key."

But what does that mean? It means rather than focusing on what women do in the security realm and what men do, Feminist Security Studies is interested in "thinking about gendered social structures that select for and value gendered characteristics" (Sjoberg 2013: 47). Gendered social structures are applied to, and have effect on, people, but they are also applied to governments, organizations, corporations, behaviors, and other elements of global politics which people who associate the terms "gender" and "sex" (male and female) might not immediately think to analyze as gendered. Instead, Feminist Security Studies looks to consider where gendered assumptions, gendered labels, and gendered hierarchies impact how a wide variety of actors act, and are responded to, in global politics. Masculinization can be seen as a move of claiming or acknowledging power, while feminization can be used to devalue or devalorize, for example (Peterson 2010). Feminist Security work, then, asks "what assumptions about gender (and race, class, nationality, and sexuality) are necessary to make particular actions meaningful" (Wilcox 2009) in international security, and, indeed, to make international security itself meaningful (Shepherd 2008).

These sorts of questions are not commonly asked in traditional security studies. In 2009, I pointed out that there had been very little cross-pollination between feminist work addressing security issues and "mainstream" publications in security studies (Sjoberg 2009: 187). While, in the intervening years, some engagement has happened, that engagement remains both very new and very thin.[4] When I say that it remains very new, I mean both that the *term* Feminist Security Studies and the idea that security studies (proper) should engage with feminism is a product of this millennium, even though feminist scholars both inside and outside of disciplinary IR have been studying security for significantly longer.

This chapter proceeds in three sections., First, it looks to situate Feminist Security Studies within and around security studies, substantively, intellectually, and categorically. Second, it discusses some of the major contributions of Feminist Security Studies, in general terms and with examples. Finally, it looks for the potential futures of Feminist Security

Studies itself and security studies more broadly with the integration of feminist theorizing.

4.1 Situating Feminist Security Studies

Feminist Security Studies is both unique to IR and not unique to IR. The sense in which it is not unique to IR is that feminist researchers have been interested in security both broadly defined (personal safety, economic security, physical security) and in traditional terms (war, terrorism, conflict) since the inception of feminist theorizing. Early work such as Betty Reardon's (1985) *Sexism and the War System* and Birgit Brock-Utne's (1985) *Educating for Peace* linked sexism and conflict, feminism and the seeking of peace. Later (p. 47) analysis has been more complicated—asking how assumptions about sex, gender, and sexuality are embedded in both the phenomenon of international security and the study thereof (e.g. Wilcox 2009; Shepherd 2008).

Yet Feminist Security Studies *in* IR also directly and explicitly addresses the concerns and issues that IR scholars have engaged with over the years. For example, some have mapped Feminist Security Studies onto IR's grand theoretic, or paradigmatic, approaches. In this exercise, one might map feminist approaches onto different paradigmatic approaches to IR. Feminist realism is interested in gender, structure, and power.[5] Feminist liberalism is interested in including women in the legal and social structures of the international arena (e.g. Caprioli and Boyer 2001). Feminist constructivism focuses on the role of ideas about gender in global politics (e.g. Prugl 1999). Feminist critical theory explores gender significations in global politics (e.g. Chin 1998). Feminist poststructuralism explores how gendered meanings constitute global politics (e.g. Shepherd 2008). Feminist postcolonialism focuses on the intersection of colonial relations of domination and gender relations (e.g. Chowdhury and Nair 2002). These categories, though, are both oversimple (much work crosses their boundaries) and somewhat dated (for example, postcolonialism has given way to decolonialism, and not a lot of work self-identifies in these categories anymore). They also pin IR feminism to IR rather than feminist theorizing, which is a permissive condition of some shallow thinking about sex, gender, and sexuality.[6]
Alternatively, one might map contributions to Feminist Security Studies in terms of typologies of feminisms, where liberal feminisms focus on women's inclusion,[7] radical feminisms focus on the fundamental nature of women's oppression (e.g. MacKinnon 1982), socialist feminisms link sex and class oppression (e.g. Haraway 1987), eco-feminisms focus on the links between gender oppression and environments, queer feminisms focus on the intersections of gender and sexuality (e.g. Detraz 2009), and cultural feminisms highlight the deleterious effects of masculinized behaviors and stereotypes (e.g. Alcoff 1988). This typology also has a number of weaknesses, given that much feminist work in IR combines approaches in feminist theorizing, and that one of the key strengths of Feminist Security Studies is the ability to converse both with feminist IR (which has starting points in disciplinary IR) and disciplinary IR more generally.

As such, I argue that the exercise of categorizing different *types* of work in Feminist Security Studies is useful only as a heuristic exercise to detail and think about various potential contributions to the enterprise of studying security from a feminist perspective. That heuristic exercise demonstrates that there are a wide variety of directions, both commensurable and incommensurable, in which feminist sensibilities might lead security studies. Rather than rehearsing categorizations or segmenting incommensurabilities, this section will highlight commonalities that feminist approaches to security studies might hold, and some ways that different feminisms might follow that common ground to different theoretical contributions.

One thing that feminist work in security studies shares is "a normative and empirical concern that the international system is gender-hierarchical," where the normative concern is that gender hierarchy is wrong, and the empirical concern is that ignoring it gives inaccurate and incomplete explanations. The normative concern that gender (p. 48) hierarchy is wrong is just that—an understanding that gender (whether conceptualized as biological sex, social conditioning, or discursive signification) influences people's positions in the world such that people, things, and institutions associated with femininities are seen, and treated, differently than people, things, and institutions associated with masculinities. This difference is not equally distributed or randomly assigned—instead, associations with femininity *devalue* while associations with masculinity *add value* (Peterson 2010). This normative concern manifests in many forms of scholarly analysis, from advocacy for women's legal inclusion to advocacy to throw off the gender-subordinating chains of capitalist social and political order. In this way, "knowledge is contextual, contingent, and interested" (Maynard and Purvis 1994)—both in the context of the feminist normative commitment to rejecting gender hierarchy (however defined) and in feminist analysis of research which either refuses or neglects to reject gender hierarchy (which can be characterized as having a knowledge-interest in the status quo) (Tickner 1997; Sjoberg 2012).

The empirical concern that ignoring gender hierarchy gives inaccurate and incomplete explanations of how global politics works follows from the understanding that gender hierarchy is prevalent in global politics, but often ignored by scholars looking to account for the constitution of or explain causal processes in global politics. Most scholars whose work can be understood as being within Feminist Security Studies argue that gender is both constitutive and causal in global politics, where gender is a constitutive feature of the identity and interactions of actors as well as a proximate cause of political behavior (Sjoberg 2009: 196). Different scholars focus on different parts of that chain, but to all of them, gender is key to the analysis of global politics generally and international security specifically (Sjoberg 2013). This understanding of the centrality of gender to the processes of international security inspires feminist scholars to "ask what assumptions about gender (and race, class, nationalist, and sexuality) are necessary to make particular statements, policies, and actions meaningful" in global politics, at various levels of analysis (Wilcox 2009).

Going from the abstract to the specific requires asking how the orientation of looking for what gender means and how it functions in global politics shapes definitions of and understandings of security. In 2009, as a number of feminist scholars were looking to understand the contours of Feminist Security Studies, I argued that four manifestations of their common foundations could be found (Sjoberg 2009). First, I argued that different areas of Feminist Security Studies work shares a "broad understanding of what counts as a security issue and to whom security should be applied" (Sjoberg 2009: 199). In this argument, I was referencing the debate in security studies between those who would "broaden" the definition of security beyond interstate war (e.g. Krause and Williams 1996) and those who would limit the study of security to the study of the actions of state militaries (e.g. Walt 1991). In that debate, feminist work has largely been in the camp of the wideners. Feminists have argued that threats to women's security can and often do come from members of their own households or representatives of their own states (e.g. Nussbaum 2005). Feminist have pointed out that threats to women's security come not only from guns, bombs, and fists but also from inadequate access to (p. 49) nutrition, health care, and birth control (e.g. Cohn 2013). They have shown that statist views of global politics marginalize women (e.g. Hudson 2005). Feminist have demonstrated that broader definitions of what constitutes threats to security can provide broader paths to tempering security threats, especially by recognizing the importance of foregrounding values associated with femininities.

Second, I argued that Feminist Security Studies researchers share an interest in understanding the gendered nature of the values prized in the realm of international security (Sjoberg 2009: 200). This also manifests in different ways in different Feminist Security Studies research, but can be found across wide varieties of the work. For example, liberal feminists often see the gendered nature of values prized in the international arena in sex-based or even primordial terms. This can be seen in the recent increase of work using an FEA (feminist evolutionary analytic) to think about security, where scholars argue that the evolutionary drive to heterosexual sex positions men and women in a way that both subordinates women ("naturally") and causes war and conflict ("instinctually") (e.g. Hudson et al. 2011). By contrast, recent work looking at masculinities in war and conflict has suggested that expectations about the sex, gender, and sexuality of members of militaries are necessary features both of the constitution of military organizations and the ability to convince soldiers and citizens of hierarchies among both states and militaries (e.g. Belkin 2012). In this analysis, association with values understood to be masculine and association with values understood to be feminine are *constitutive of rank* and *determinative of result* in security situations in important, if complicated, ways.[8]

The third commonality I suggested was that scholars in Feminist Security Studies recognize "the broad and diverse role that feminists see gender playing in the theory and practice of international security" where "it is necessary, conceptually, for understanding international security, it is important in analyzing causes and predicting outcomes, and it is essential to thinking about solutions to promoting positive change in the security realm" (Sjoberg 2009: 200–1, 201). Early feminist work in peace studies as well as IR tended to suggest the availability of *degendering* global politics, suggesting that it is pos-

sible to recognize the ways in which gender subordination structures political interactions and then correct for them in a straightforward way. Feminist Security Studies work of all paradigmatic or epistemological stripes has tended to characterize this relationship as more complicated, arguing that gender is interwoven in international processes at almost every step of political interaction, and should be treated as both multi-faceted and embedded (e.g. Wibben 2011; Sjoberg 2013). As Laura Shepherd (2016) notes, this shared tenet also looks different in practice when it is carried out by different researchers. She explains that "some FSS scholars take the lives and experiences of women in the context of security politics and practices as their central concern, while others engage with FSS as a series of critical investigations of how the category of gender itself and the corollary identities we associate with subjects come to have meaning in the world through security politics and practices" (Shepherd 2016). *Both* of these disparate approaches argue that the influence of gender in security is widespread and embedded, but they treat its widespread nature substantively differently and see a different source of its embeddedness.

(p. 50) The fourth commonality that I noted in 2009 was that Feminist Security Studies work shares the view that "the omission of gender from work on international security does not make that work gender-neutral or unproblematic" (Sjoberg 2009: 202). This might be the most radical tenet Feminist Security Studies shares. In this view, Feminist Security Studies is not another paradigm like realist work or constructivist work—where it offers a different perspective than other paradigmatic alternatives based on a different worldview. Instead, it argues that security studies *across paradigmatic approaches* is incomplete and exclusive inasmuch as it is blind to the gendered nature of the analysis it undertakes and the gendered nature of the global political phenomena that it observes. In this view, Feminist Security Studies is not seeking the *inclusion* of gender, either as a variable of analysis or as a perspectival approach, but instead the *transformation* of security studies.

While I think that these categories that I developed in 2009 still have utility in accounting for some of the dimensions of Feminist Security Studies, my views have expanded and the field has both changed and diversified in the intervening time. First, I started to see the substance of Feminist Security Studies as residing more in the argument than in the resolution of the argument between different feminisms (Sjoberg 2011). Second, Carol Cohn's question about whether Feminist Security Studies is "feminist security" studies (with an emphasis on the security concerns inspired by feminist theorizing) or feminist "security studies" (with an emphasis on feminist interpretations of the traditional concerns of security studies) led to a discussion of the pros and cons of engaging with disciplinary IR.

Some feminist scholars have cautioned against engaging with, or intellectually "facing" toward, disciplinary IR generally and security studies specifically. Early in the development of feminist theorizing in IR, Sarah Brown (1988) warned that "the danger in attempts to reconcile international relations and feminism … lies in the uncritical acceptance by feminists of objects, methods, and concepts which presuppose the subordination of women." In response to this danger, as Judith Squires and Jutta Weldes (2007: 185) note, feminist "scholars are now actively reconstructing IR without reference to what the

mainstream asserts rightly belongs inside the discipline … it is more effective to refuse to engage in disciplinary navel-gazing." This leads to Feminist Security Studies focused on "feminist security" that looks different to Feminist Security Studies focused on "security studies" (Cohn 2011).

Others have argued for the full integration of sex and gender into the traditional concerns of security studies, treating gender as a variable to analyze security situations and strategic decision-making (Hudson et al. 2009). The position that I have taken is a middle ground between the two—looking for a Feminist Security Studies that both cannot be ignored by security studies and does not fundamentally alter its intellectual orientations to fit with traditional assumptions either about the form of security inquiry or about the appropriate subject matter of security analysis. I label this approach "constructive engagement" with disciplinary IR and security studies—looking for conversation and perhaps even compromise while insisting on the importance of studying the gendered dynamics of security politics on the global level, rather than conflating sex and gender or ignoring either or both (Sjoberg 2013).

(p. 51) If how to situate Feminist Security Studies within or around the constructs of "mainstream" IR or security studies is the subject of some controversy, so is the relationship between Feminist Security Studies and other critical approaches to the study of security in global politics. While there are some who assume that feminist theorizing is akin to or subsumed within "broader" (read: malestream) critical approaches to security (e.g. Booth 2007), others worry that critical approaches to security often replicate the gender-blindnesses of "mainstream" security studies. For example, Christine Sylvester (2007) points out that the widely-lauded CASE Collective (2006) manifesto of the theoretical and political tenets of Critical Security Studies (CSS) does not include feminist or gender-based concerns in the article-length text at all, and mentions them only as an aside in a footnote. Sylvester (2007) argues that this is a visible instantiation of a deeper problem in critical security, where male scholars who self-identify as critical engage in a self-congratulatory refusal to acknowledge remaining gender concerns in their otherwise-emancipatory intellectual frameworks.

Even were other critical approaches to security to engage feminism more directly, it is not immediately clear that Feminist Security Studies has an easy intellectual affinity with other approaches generally understood to be critical. Feminist Security Studies has been distinguished, for example, from human security theorizing, by the recognition that the "human" is a gendered concept and that human bodies have gender-distributed needs and significations.[9] Feminist Security Studies has been distinguished from the Copenhagen school by the recognition that there are gendered power dynamics in securitization (Sjoberg 2009: 208–11). Feminist Security Studies has been distinguished from practice theory by the gendered implications of embodiment for notions of practice (e.g. Wilcox 2013). Still, for as many times as Feminist Security Studies has been distinguished from or critical of other critical approaches to the study of security, it has been likened to or paired with them as frequently.

All of this is to say that there is no *one* Feminist Security Studies, no *one* position of Feminist Security Studies in the field, and no *one* on-balance normatively correct way to handle feminist security theorizing around global politics. Instead, the contributions of Feminist Security Studies revolve around some common assumptions, handled differently, and explored differently, to produce a wide variety of insights for security studies.

4.2 Feminist Insights for Security Studies

With these various ontological, epistemological, and methodological approaches, feminists have shown gender bias in security's core concepts—the state, violence, war, peace, and even security itself, and have urged redefinition and reinterpretation (Sjoberg 2009: 197). They have shown that seeing women and gender in war and conflict is crucial to understanding both how those conflicts came to be and what happens in them (p. 52) (Sjoberg 2009: 198). This has been as true for "traditional" security issues like nuclear strategy and the non-combatant immunity principle as it has been for traditionally hidden security issues like marriage and household finance.[10] The breadth and depth of feminist work in international security has touched almost all (imaginable) parts of the field of security studies—from arguing that gender hierarchy is a system-level influence in global politics (Sjoberg 2012) to seeing that global security politics takes place in the everyday living of women's lives (Enloe 2010; Parashar 2013). There is not sufficient space in this chapter to explore each contribution, or to find representative categories, for the diversity of this work. Instead, I will briefly discuss four diverse examples, and their contribution to the study of security.

First, I discuss a book that pre-dates the use of the term "Feminist Security Studies," Ann Tickner's (1992) *Gender in International Relations.* Tickner (1992) draws a picture of "global security" (which is the subtitle of the book) that includes not only military issues and what is traditionally thought of as state security, but also (and with equal weight), human rights issues, political economy issues, and environmental issues. Tickner's (1992) claim is that those issues affect the viability and security of people's lives (especially women's) as much, if not more than, traditional military security issues, both on a macro-level and everyday. It is Tickner's contention that it is important to pay attention to *insecurity* as the flip side of "security," and that *insecurity* is gendered. When she characterizes insecurity as gendered, Tickner is making parallel claims that *women* are more likely to be in insecure positions in global politics, and that women's insecurity is often shaped by negative treatment *because of* their gender. Tickner provides evidence for this claim both by showing how women are similarly situated across a wide variety of security issues, and by showing how associations with femininity signify devalorization in many security discourses. Both of these insights have been used, built on, and complicated in the more than two-decade development of Feminist Security Studies since the writing of this crucial book.

The second piece of work that I will highlight is a very different one—Aaron Belkin's (2012) *Bring Me Men*. Like Tickner, Belkin (2012) suggests that gender stereotypes are

key to understanding how people's roles are cast in security politics. Unlike Tickner, however, Belkin is interested in how gender stereotypes frame *men's* roles in security politics. While Tickner allows for the possibility, it is not her focus. Belkin observes a particular militarized masculinity that he demonstrates governs perceptions of individual fitness for participation in, and success in, the United States military—something that work before this book had looked into in some depth (e.g. Enloe 2000; Hooper 2001). Belkin (2012) explains, however, that this militarized masculinity is not simple and unidirectional, but instead *built on* its opposite—a culture of sexualization and homoeroticism. Contending that understanding *both* the image of the straight, brave, masculine soldier *and* the homoerotic undertones that render that image possible is key to understanding not only how the US military functions, but also the United States' self-perception of its place in the world, Belkin (2012) argues for careful tracing of the relationships between gender tropes and security structures.

The third piece of work that I would like to highlight—Megan MacKenzie's (2012) *Female Soldiers in Sierra Leone*, also argues that careful tracing of the relationships between gender tropes and security structures is key, though in a very different (p. 53) environment. While Belkin (2012) explores the complexity of stereotypical *and lived* masculinities; MacKenzie (2012) explores the differences between stereotypical and lived femininities. By paying attention to female soldiers who both defied and lived with/through stereotypical expectations of what women can and/or should be, MacKenzie (2012) demonstrates that the category of "woman" is broader than is often perceived. *Female Soldiers in Sierra Leone* also shows that policies that underestimate and/or pigeonhole women are not only inaccurate but can have deleterious effects—where Disarmament, Demobilization, and Reconstruction (DDR) programs that failed to take account either of the existence of female soldiers or of the complexity of their lived gender roles were ineffective in demobilizing combatants. MacKenzie (2012) argues that a sex-aware approach will not suffice in such situations, nor will an approach that makes traditional assumptions about what women are and what they need. Instead, looking at the multifaceted and multidirectional influences of gender socialization and gendered expectations is key to understanding not only what is going on in any given security environment, but also how to improve security (MacKenzie 2012).

The fourth book that I will highlight situates the study of gender in global security with the study of race and colonialism. In *Gender and Global Politics in the Asia-Pacific,* editors Bina D'Costa and Katrina Lee-Koo (2009), along with the chapter authors, make the argument that many of these nuances about the ways that gender works in global security can be found in people's everyday lives, or the "low politics" of the global arena. The book uses localized and contextualized knowledge to argue both for the importance of context itself and for the intersection of race, gender, geography, and political economy in shaping security/insecurity in both personal life and global politics (D'Costa and Lee Koo 2009). The authors suggest that feminist approaches to security include feminist politics of region (Pettman 2009), feminist and decolonial politics of resistance (George 2009; Huynh 2009), and political economies of gendered and raced security *as constitutive of security* (Peterson 2009). This work (D'Costa and Lee Koo 2009), and work like it, shows that the

feminist interest in contextualization can reach both thinking about gender and thinking about the many other factors that surround gender in global security.

These four examples are not meant to be either comprehensive or representative—instead, they are meant to show some of the many approaches to feminist theorizing about security generally, and Feminist Security Studies specifically, that can contribute to security theorizing generally and security studies specifically an understanding of both the centrality and contextuality of gender analysis. This shared contribution across diverse (and even divergent) feminist work on security can, I argue, provide insights into future paths for Feminist Security Studies.

4.3 Looking Forward for Feminist Security Studies

One of the questions that inspired Feminist Security Studies specifically and Feminist International Relations generally was articulated by Cynthia Enloe when she looked at (p. 54) the cannon of IR scholarship at the time. She asked—"where are the women?"—a question that at once suggests that the study of global politics paid attention to *the men* and *where the men are*, rather than to *the women* and where they are. When Enloe asked that question 30 years ago, IR and security studies could be characterized as neglecting the existence and roles of women in global politics.

Now, if we looked for women in global politics, they would be both much more visible and much more frequently analyzed than when Cynthia Enloe first inquired about where women were, and J. Ann Tickner characterized International Relations as a man's world. There are those who would say that the increased visibility of women in global politics has changed the mission of, or even the need for, feminist work in security studies. I would argue that this is an overstatement. While women have become increasingly visible in global politics, it is all the more important now to ask which women remain invisible, where the women who remain invisible are, and how they are made invisible by perceptions of what women are and perceptions of what security is. Women who engage in political and even sexual violence in global politics, for example, often remain invisible because of an attachment to the idea that there is a relationship between women and peace (e.g. Sjoberg and Gentry 2007; Sjoberg 2016). Minority women are often either invisible or sensationalized in security situations (where states either ignore them or claim to be fighting *for* them) (e.g. Spivak 1988). Asking "where are the women?" might be a more nuanced question now for security studies than it was when there were *no* women identifiable in security scholarship, but it is still an important question in a variety of ways.

Even to the extent that security studies has "discovered" some of the women in international security, I argue that feminism in security studies is increasingly relevant. Even when women are visible in security, as I mentioned in the previous paragraph, questions addressing which assumptions about gender (and race and class) make particular understandings about how the world works possible remain (and even become more) impor-

tant. Instead of looking *just* for where women are and where men are, Feminist Security Studies moving forward looks for where *gender* is—gendered tropes, gendered perceptions, the assignment of gendered traits, and gendered significations. While the answer to the question "where are the women?" is *everywhere*, and never more visible, J. Ann Tickner's (1988) characterization of global security as a man's world also, importantly, remains true. If Feminist Security Studies has succeeded in calling attention to the existence and importance of women in international security, as well as questioning the boundaries of what counts as security, it has not yet succeeded in *transforming* security studies.

By *transforming* security studies, I mean that Feminist Security Studies (and feminist IR more generally) have suggested that no part of security studies should remain undisturbed and unchanged by the understanding that not only sex but also gender matters. Realists should have different understandings of power; liberals should have different understandings of cooperation and regimes; constructivists should have different understandings of the social; critical theorists should have different understandings of the emancipatory—all informed by the notion that the phenomena they study are (p. 55) heavily influenced by ideas and practices of and about gender. In Caron Cohn's (2011) words, this Feminist Security Studies is both "Feminist Security" Studies (that is, with a feminist perspective about what constitutes security being the main object of study) and Feminist "Security Studies" (looking to transform disciplinary and/or mainstream security studies. Looking forward, pursuing both of these paths for Feminist Security Studies is key to making the most use of the insights that the diverse field has already brought to the study of global politics.

Pursuing the first path might mean a transformation of Feminist Security Studies that puts its emphases and its attention more squarely outside the purview of traditional security studies—demonstrating the importance of *feminist* security concerns such as women's lives, household security, economic stability, and freedom from sexual assault while refusing to link them to interstate or civil war or terrorism. The idea behind this path would be to draw security studies outside of its own thinking with compelling arguments about the major sources of *insecurity* in global politics. It would rely on the changed subject matter of security studies to change the conceptual and epistemological contours of current thinking. Pursuing the second path, on the other hand, requires more hybrid work—work that does not forget what is *feminist* about Feminist Security Studies, but uses those tools to engage with and perhaps even individually transform work in security studies. The idea behind this path would be to (continue to) produce work that looked to contribute to different areas of security studies *by* questioning the epistemological and empirical assumptions in the current work in those areas. It would rely on convincing current security scholars that their work (on its own terms) is incomplete. Both paths are currently being pursued to one degree or another; in my view, they should both continue to be pursued. Both face Herculean odds if they are looking to change the face of security studies. Barriers include narrow definitions of policy relevance (e.g. Desch 2015); narrow understandings of the appropriate subject matter of security studies (e.g. Walt 1991); a drive to quantify gender and fit it into positivist epistemological assump-

tions (e.g. Reiter 2015); path-dependence in a field that has been resistant to change (e.g. Waltz 2000); and just plain sex-essentialist assumptions about how the world works (e.g. Thayer 2000). I do not see these barriers as insurmountable, though I cannot deny frustration at confronting them constantly. But I see the work produced by those confrontations as both valuable in itself regardless of its transformative success *and* important because of the importance of pursuing transformation even against potentially insurmountable odds. If thinking about gender really is key to thinking about security, as I believe it is, I think it is neither possible nor ethical to stop trying to convince others to understand.

References

Alcoff, Linda. 1988. Cultural Feminism Versus Post-Structuralism: The Identity Crisis in Feminist Theory. *Signs*, 13(3): 405–36.

Belkin, Aaron. 2012. *Bring Me Men: Military Masculinity and the Benign Façade of American Empire, 1898-2001*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Booth, Ken. 2007. *Theory of World Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brock-Utne, Birgit. 1985. *Educating For Peace*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Brown, Sarah. 1988. Feminism, International Theory, and International Relations of Gender Inequality. *Millennium*, 17(3): 461–75.

Caprioli, Mary and Mark Boyer. 2001. Gender, Violence, and International Crisis. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 45(4): 503–18.

CASE Collective. 2006. Critical Approaches to Security in Europe: A Networked Manifesto. *Security Dialogue*, 37(4): 443–87.

Chin, Christine. 1998. *In Service and Servitude*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Chowdhury, Geeta and Sheila Nair (eds.). 2002. *Power, Postcolonialism, and International Relations*. New York: Routledge.

Cohn, Carol. 1987. Sex and Death in the World of Rational Defense Intellectuals. *Signs*, 12(4): 687–718.

Cohn, Carol. 2011. “Feminist Security Studies”: Toward a Reflexive Practice. *Politics & Gender*. 7(4): 581–6.

Cohn, Carol (ed.). 2013. *Women and Wars*. London: Polity.

D’Costa, Bina and Katrina Lee-Koo (eds.). 2009. *Gender and Global Politics in the Asia-Pacific*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Desch, Michael. 2015. Technique Trumps Relevance: The Professionalization of Political Science and the Marginalization of Security Studies. *Perspectives on Politics*, 13(2): 377–93.

Detraz, Nicole. 2009. Environmental Security and Gender: Necessary Shifts in an Evolving Debate. *Security Studies*, 18(2): 345–69.

Elshtain, Jean Bethke. 1985. Reflections on War and Political Discourse: Realism, Just War, and Feminism in a Nuclear Age. *Political Theory*, 13(1): 39–57.

Enloe, Cynthia. 2000. *Maneuvers*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Enloe, Cynthia. 2010. *Nimo's War, Emma's War: Making Feminist Sense of the Iraq War* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Enloe, Cynthia. 2016. A Flick of the Skirt: A Feminist Challenge to IR's Coherent Narrative. *International Political Sociology*, 10(4): 320–31.

(p. 57) George, Nicole. 2009. Shifting Terrains of Transnational Engagement. In Bina D'Costa and Katrina Lee-Koo (eds.), *Gender and Global Politics in the Asia-Pacific*, pp. 175–94. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Haraway, Donna. 1987. A Manifesto for Cyborgs: Science, Technology, and Socialist Feminism in the 1980s. *Australian Feminist Studies*, 2(3): 1–42.

Hooper, Charlotte. 2001. *Manly States*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hudson, Heidi. 2005. "Doing" Security as though Humans Matter: A Feminist Perspective on Gender and the Politics of Human Security. *Security* , 36(2): 155–74.

Hudson, Valerie, Mary Caprioli, Bonnie Ballif-Spanvill, Rose McDermottl, and Chad F. Emmett. 2009. The Heart of the Matter: The Security of Women and the Security of States. *International Security*, 33(3): 7–45.

Hudson, Valerie, Donna Lee Bowen, and Perpetua Lynne Nielsen. 2011. What is the Relationship between Inequity and Violence against Women? Approaching the Issue of Legal Enclaves. *Politics & Gender*, 7(4): 453–92.

Huynh, Kim. 2009. One Woman's Everyday Resistance. In Bina D'Costa and Katrina Lee-Koo (eds.), *Gender and Global Politics in the Asia-Pacific*, pp. 129–42. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Keohane, Robert. 1989. International Relations Theory: Contributions of a Feminist Standpoint. *Millennium*, 18(2): 245–53.

Krause, Keith and Michael C. Williams. 1996. Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies: Politics and Methods. *Mershon International Studies Review*, 40(Supplement 2): 229–54.

MacKenzie, Megan. 2012. *Female Soldiers in Sierra Leone: Sex, Security, and Post-Conflict Development*. New York: New York University Press.

MacKinnon, Catharine A. 1982. Feminism, Marxism, Method, and the State: An Agenda for Theory. *Signs*, 7(3): 515–44.

Maynard, Mary and June Purvis (eds.). 1994. *Researching Women's Lives from a Feminist Perspective*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Nussbaum, Martha. 2005. Women's Bodies: Violence, Security, and Capabilities. *Journal of Human Development*, 6(2): 167–83.

Parashar, Swati. 2013. What Wars and "War Bodies" Know about International Relations. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 26(4): 615–30.

Peterson, V. Spike. 1992. 'Transgressing Boundaries: Theories of Knowledge, Gender, and International Relations. *Millennium*, 21(2): 183–206.

Peterson, V. Spike. 2009. Gendered Economies in the Asia-Pacific. In Bina D'Costa and Katrina Lee-Koo (eds.), *Gender and Global Politics in the Asia-Pacific*, pp. 39–56. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Peterson, V. Spike. 2010. Gendered Identities, Ideologies, and Practices in the Context of War and Militarism. In Laura Sjoberg and Sandra Via (eds.), *Gender, War, and Militarism*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger Security International.

Peterson, V. Spike and Anne Sisson Runyan. 1993. *Global Gender Issues*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Pettman, Jan Jindy. 1996. A Feminist Politics of Region? In Bina D'Costa and Katrina Lee-Koo (eds.), *Gender and Global Politics in the Asia-Pacific*, pp. 211–32. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Prugl, Elisabeth. 1999. *The Global Construction of Gender*. New York: Columbia University Press.

(p. 58) Prugl, Elisabeth. 2015. Neoliberalising Feminism. *New Political Economy*, 20(3): 614–31.

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

Reiter, Dan. 2015. The Positivist Study of Gender and International Relations. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 59(7): 1301–26.

Shepherd, Laura J. 2008. *Gender, Violence, and Security*. London: Zed Books.

Shepherd, Laura J. 2016. Feminist Security Studies. In Jill Steans and Daniela Tepe-Belfrage (eds.), *Handbook on Gender and World Politics*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Sjoberg, Laura. 2006. Gendered Realities of the Immunity Principle: Why Gender Analysis Needs Feminism. *International Studies Quarterly*, 50(4): 889–910.

Sjoberg, Laura. 2009. Introduction to *Security Studies:* Feminist Contributions. *Security Studies*, 18(2): 184–214.

Sjoberg, Laura. 2011. Looking Forward, Conceptualizing Feminist Security Studies. *Politics & Gender*, 7(4): 600–4.

Sjoberg, Laura. 2012. Gender, Structure, and War: What Waltz Couldn't See. *International Theory*, 4(1): 1–38.

Sjoberg, Laura. 2013. *Gendering Global Conflict: Towards a Feminist Theory of War*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Sjoberg, Laura. 2014. *Gender, War, and Conflict*. London: Polity.

Sjoberg, Laura. 2016. *Women as Wartime Rapists* New York: New York University Press.

Sjoberg, Laura and Caron Gentry. 2007. *Mothers, Monsters, Whores*. London: Zed Books.

Sjoberg, Laura, Kelly Kadera, and Cameron G. Thies. 2016. Reevaluating Gender and IR Scholarship: Moving Beyond Reiter's Dichotomies toward Effective Synergies. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 59(7): 1301–26.

Spivak, Gayatri. 1988. Can the Subaltern Speak? In Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (eds), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, pp. 271–313. London: Palgrave.

Squires, Judith and Jutta Weldes. 2007. Beyond Being Marginal: Gender and International Relations in Britain. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 9(2): 185–203.

Sylvester, Christine. 2007. Anatomy of a Footnote. *Security Dialogue*, 38(4): 547–58.

Sylvester, Christine. 2013. Passing American Security. *International Studies Perspectives*, 14(4): 444–6.

Thayer, Bradley. 2000. Bringing in Darwin: Evolutionary Theory, Realism, and International Politics. *International Security*, 25(2): 124–51.

Tickner, J. Ann. 1988. Hans Morgenthau's Principles of Political Realism: A Feminist Reformulations. *Millennium*, 17(3): 429–40.

Tickner, J. Ann. 1992. *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Global Security*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Tickner, J. Ann. 1997. You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements Between Feminists and IR Theorists. *International Studies Quarterly*, 41(4): 611–32.

True, Jacqui. 2010. Feminism and Realism in International Relations, Paper presented at OCIS IV, Auckland, New Zealand.

True, Jacqui. 2012. *The Political Economy of Violence against Women*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Walt, Stephen. 1991. The Renaissance of Security Studies. *International Studies Quarterly*, 35(2): 211–39.

Waltz, Kenneth. 2000. Structural Realism after the Cold War. *International Security*, 25(1): 5–41.

Wibben, Annick. 2011. *Feminist Security Studies: A Narrative Approach*. London: Routledge.

(p. 59) Wilcox, Lauren. 2009. Gendering the Cult of the Offensive. *Security Studies*, 18(2): 214–40.

Wilcox, Lauren. 2013. Impossible Queer Practices, presented at the 2013 International Feminist Journal of Politics at the University of Sussex, May 17–20, 2013.

Zalweski, Marysia. 1995. Well, What is the Feminist Perspective on Bosnia? *International Affairs*, 71(2): 339–56.

Notes:

(1.) This piece was in the special issue on “Women and IR,” often seen as the launch of feminist IR.

(2.) See extensive discussion in Sjoberg (2009)

(3.) For a discussion of visibility, see Sjoberg (2016).

(4.) see, e.g., recent discussion in Sjoberg et al. (2016)

(5.) In very different ways, Elshtain (1985), Tickner (1988), True (2010), and Sjoberg (2012) have done feminist realist analysis, though this is a less-used category than the others that follow here.

(6.) See, e.g., discussion in Brown (1988).

(7.) See discussion in Prugl (2015).

(8.) See further discussion in Sjoberg (2014).

(9.) E.g., discussion in Sjoberg (2009).

(10.) For traditional security issues, see, e.g., Cohn (1987); Sjoberg (2006). For traditionally hidden security issues, see, e.g., True (2012); Enloe (2016).

Laura Sjoberg

Laura Sjoberg is Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Florida.