# Fem IR updates

## Neg

### Uq

#### Feminist scholars have been collecting data and working to over throw the current system

Anne **Runyan**, 20**19** (Runyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Interview – Anne Sisson Runyan” E-International Relations. March 8, 2019. <https://www.e-ir.info/2019/03/08/interview-anne-sisson-runyan/> /// MF)

How has the way you understand the world changed over time, and what (or who) prompted the most significant shifts in your thinking?

I have lived long enough and through enough epistemological shifts that have chipped away at modernist understandings of the world to be wary of progress narratives. That it appears the world is being revisited by the ghosts of overt patriarchy, racism, and fascism and even the ghosts of nuclearism just when it seemed that all kinds of human rights, gender equality, humanitarian, and environmental protection norms were being secured at the international level is, on one level, dizzying, but on another level, not surprising. It is not as if feminist scholars have not been steadily documenting largely unabated levels of violence, impoverishment, and disposability experienced by women and feminized/racialized others throughout the world, but particularly in the Global South, which belies simplistic “success” stories. It is also not as if feminists have not been tracking the feminization of men’s labour and the self- and other- destruction associated with this. And it is not as if feminists have not also been repeatedly raising concerns about the enclosures and depoliticizations of feminism as it moves through the halls of power within the (neo)liberal order that can undermine it as an oppositional force and thus vulnerabilize it to assaults, particularly from the religious and nationalist right that have been going on for some time.

Knowing all of this, in recent work I have been doing with Marysia Zalewski we ask why the (re)emergence of what we shorthand as “Trump-time” has been met with such incredulity. We work with the spectral to consider how ghosts of virulent masculinity and constrained and constraining femininity are always with and haunting us, but also how other, more oppositional spirits are always present as well. In earlier work together (e.g.,[Taking Feminist Violence Seriously in International Relations](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14616742.2013.766102)), we raise the spectre of feminist violence, which seems to be an oxymoron given the normalized association between women and peace and the normative association between feminism and nonviolence. This brings to the fore the continued excesses of feminist thought to do epistemic violence to bounded and secured knowledge and attempts to bind and secure feminism and even render it “post” or dead.

#### Even if liberal feminism was somewhat successful, it coopted the true issue

Marysia **Zalewski**, 20**18** (Zalewshi, author and professor of International Relations at Cardiff University. “Feminist Approaches to International Relations Theory in the Post-Cold War Period” part of The Age of Perplexity: Rethinking the World We Knew <https://www.bbvaopenmind.com/en/articles/feminist-approaches-to-international-relations-theory-in-the-post-cold-war-period/> /// MF)

How has liberal feminism fared in global politics? There are many women political leaders now, still a minority if perhaps a decreasing one. Women serve in large numbers in militaries around the world and the bans on women serving in close combat are disappearing almost daily.5 Gender as a concept has been mainstreamed in the thinking and practice of many national governments and international organisations. The United Nations is a key actor here, not least since the ground-breaking Security Council Resolution 1325 introduced in 2000 which was the first formal and legal document from the Security Council that required parties in a conflict to prevent violations of women’s rights, to support women’s participation in peace negotiations and in post-conflict reconstruction, and to protect women and girls from sexual and gender-based violence.6 The two most recent relevant Resolutions include SCR 2106&SCR 2122 both in 2013.7

In many ways the success of liberal feminism seems clear. Though for many feminist international relations scholars, this success is dubious. It is the case that the majority of feminist scholars welcome inclusive practices for women, rather the troubling issue relates to the tacit acceptance of conventional (oftentimes articulated as ‘malestream’) political and theoretical agendas and practices. Plus, the acceptance of the standard of ‘human’, which is, by historical default, most often elite, white and male. As a corollary, liberal feminist work tends to support the invisibility and lesser worth of women’s traditional lives, behaviours and work, be default ignoring the imbalances and biases and discriminations this wreaks upon many women globally. In the current geo-political order, liberal feminism has, many argue, been co-opted in the service of neo-liberal agendas and practices. I will return to this point.

#### UN actions are too narrow and don’t really create any real change

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Gender and Global Security, pg. 105 /// MF)

Perhaps most problematic for disrupting the gendered division of violence is that gender and especially sexual violence is repeatedly reduced to violence against women in the WPS agenda, upholding the “sex essentialism” that renders the idea that women can be perpetrators, including rapists, unimaginable (Sjoberg 2016) and misrepresenting much wartime rape as organized, and thus controllable by international policy and punishments, rather than seeing it as part of the disorganization of war itself which is not placed under indictment (Baaz and Stern 2013). Indeed, as sexual violence and contraction of HIV/AIDS in war have become securitized, the agenda is simply to “protect women” from these in wartime (not in peacetime), increasing the power of already powerful states to punish others while regulating rather than actually addressing the inequalities and injustices that enable these violences (Jansson 2017). Ultimately, the WPS agenda reproduces very narrow constructions of gender and gender violence that do not disturb and, in fact, reinforce the international order that is productive of gender harms (Shepherd 2008).

#### Previous shifts are not enough, we need a full transition to overcome the mistakes of the past

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Gender and Global Governance, pg 53/// MF)

These points suggest how this shift in analysis, in turn, shifted strategies: from “adding women” to formal power structures to valorizing feminine traits in order to redefi ne politics from “power-over” to “power-to” (also known as “power-with” or enabling power) and change the standards of political behavior in favor of interdependence and cooperation. Still, this left intact a lingering and limiting referent to “women” that did not de-homogenize the category to recognize power diff erentials among women and the power some women hold over some men. It also left intact the association of embodied women with feminine values, which, on the one hand, led to essentialist assumptions about women as cure-alls for social (and global) ills and, on the other hand, positioned certain embodied men (largely non-Western, non-white, and/or lower class) as the villains of the piece. In the process, attention is defl ected from the complicity of both women and men—particularly those with the most power and privilege—in contributing to global ills. It also misrepresents feminist politics as exclusively about women rather than about resisting gender and gendered hierarchies and the ills they cause globally. This is not to say that raising the status of women and other subjugated people—in politics and other facets of life—is not necessary to increase formal representation and better equalize voice, but to note that it is insuffi cient if there is no attendant ideological shift away from politics as power-over to politics that enables resistance to and transformation of global politics-as-usual, which the power of gender sustains.

### Link

#### AI reinforces gendered hierarchies and ideas

Sophia **Ahn** and Amelia **Costigan**, 20**19** (Sophia, MPA in policy analysis, BA in political science and international studies, women’s rights advocate and research fellow of the Catalyst Information Center. Amelia, senior director at the Catalyst Information Center. “How AI Reinforces Gender Stereotypes (Trend Brief)” Catalyst. December 5, 2019. <https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/> /// MF)

AI is What We Design It to Be

Artificial intelligence (AI) has been heralded as a tool that can enhance human capacities and improve services,[1](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-1-23058) influence the future of work,[2](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-2-23058) create jobs,[3](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-3-23058) and serve as an equalizer by reducing bias in decisions by making predictions with algorithms based on data.[4](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-4-23058) Yet AI, ultimately, is what humans design it to be, learn, and do. This means that AI, by definition, is not neutral. Rather, it reflects the biases held by those who build it, reinforcing stereotypes based on those biases.[5](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-5-23058)

Stereotypes are widely held, oversimplified generalizations about a group of people.[6](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-6-23058) This sort of “shorthand” categorization is based on the assumption that all members of a particular group are the same. Whether explicitly or implicitly, when stereotypes influence our perceptions and decision-making, members of stereotyped groups can be disadvantaged, and damage can be done.[7](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-7-23058)

Women Take Care and Men Take Charge

Gendered stereotypes result in sexism and can create structural barriers that perpetuate workplace gender inequality.[8](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-8-23058) One example of a gendered stereotype is that women are more nurturing than men.[9](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-9-23058) Over time, the societally pervasive stereotype that “women take care, men take charge” can embed itself in organizational cultures and norms, and—whether at home or in the workplace—women are viewed as more likely to be caretakers, which often negatively impacts women’s careers.[10](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-10-23058)

As we interact with AI in our daily lives, AI has the power to unintentionally reinforce gendered stereotypes.[11](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-11-23058) Catalyst research finds that women leaders perceived as nurturing or emotional are liked but not considered competent. This “double bind” can lead to women’s occupational segregation and lack of advancement opportunities.[12](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-12-23058) A study on human-robot interactions found that AI reinforced the double bind dilemma. Participants rated robots that were assigned an explicit gender—either stereotypically male personality traits (confident and assertive) or stereotypically female personality traits (agreeable and warm). Participants rated the male-identified robot as more trustworthy, reliable, and competent than the female robot; the female robot was rated as more likeable.[13](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-13-23058)

While users do not necessarily prefer robots of a certain gender, they do prefer robots whose “occupations” and “personalities” match stereotypical gender roles.[14](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-14-23058) For example, people respond better to healthcare service robots identified as female and security service robots identified as male.[15](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-15-23058)

Digital voice assistants, such as Siri and Alexa, are often designed with female names and gendered voices. Their role is to perform tasks that have traditionally been assigned to women, such as scheduling appointments and setting reminders.[16](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-16-23058) Designing these assistants consistently with a female voice can reinforce traditional gender roles[17](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-17-23058) and may even lead to biased hiring of women in service or assistant-type jobs.[18](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-18-23058)

Additionally, how we speak to our digital assistants can influence societal norms. Abusive, insulting, or sexual language can normalize the way we speak to each other and particularly to women, while the tolerant or passive responses by feminized digital assistants to this language can reinforce stereotypes of the compliant and forgiving woman.[19](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-19-23058)

AI Reinforces Gendered Roles and Occupations

Word embedding is an example of how machine learning can reinforce gender stereotypes. AI identifies words close to each other and uses them as a frame of reference. Recently Apple’s iOS automatically offered an emoji of a businessman when users typed in the word “CEO.” When AI finds words like “CEO” near the word “man” multiple times, it learns this association and links these words going forward.[20](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-20-23058)

Princeton University found that AI’s word associations can reinforce stereotypes on everything from what internet search results we receive to hiring decisions we make. Princeton researchers measured AI’s word associations and found gender stereotypes in the word choices.[21](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-21-23058) The word “nurse,” for instance, was highly associated with the words “women” and “nurturing.” Meanwhile, the word “doctor” was more often associated with “men.” AI learns these contextual associations through the data provided to it by programmers who are predominantly white and male. It’s possible that gender bias could occur if an AI recruiting system begins to use these word associations to accept nurse candidates with female names at a higher rate. [22](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-22-23058)

Even AI translation services reveal gender-occupation stereotypes when translating languages without gender-specific pronouns, such as Chinese and Turkish. In this example, researchers found that AI also assumed “nurse,” “nanny,” and “teacher” all to be women.[23](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-23-23058)

Machines taught by photo-based image-recognition software also quickly learn gender bias. In a recent study at the University of Virginia, images that depict activities such as cooking, shopping, and washing were more likely to be linked to women while images of shooting or coaching were more likely linked to men. Researchers further tested the data sets and discovered that the AI not only reflected the unconscious stereotypes of its creators but actually amplified them.[24](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-24-23058)

Where Do We Go from Here?

AI Industry Diversification: As of 2018, women comprise only 22% of AI professionals globally.[25](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-25-23058) The lack of gender diversity in the AI field hinders the industry’s ability to catch gender bias and stereotyping during AI machine learning and database design.[26](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-26-23058) An important first step to begin to mitigate the impact of AI-reinforced bias and stereotypes is for the AI industry to increase representation of women and other underrepresented groups in its workforce.

Business Policies, Procedures, and Practices: The number of businesses using AI increased by 60% between 2017 and 2018, but “only half of businesses across the [United States] and Eope have policies and procedures in place to identify and address ethical considerations—either in the initial design of AI applications or in their behavior after the system is launched.”[27](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-27-23058) While providing clear benefits, AI is not a technological utopia. It is important for organizations to develop policies and procedures to address ethical concerns that arise from the application of AI in their business models. It is equally important that businesses identify and utilize tools to review for unwanted bias in their data sets and machine-learning models.[28](https://www.catalyst.org/research/ai-gender-stereotypes/#easy-footnote-bottom-28-23058)

### AT: binaries

#### Binaries are simply constructed – the k observes the social constructions around the ideas of gender, it doesn’t reinforce the ideas of binaries

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Introduction, pgs 6-7 /// MF)

Finally, the specifi c meanings and values conferred on masculinity and femininity have also changed over time as well as across cultures. For example, Western ideals of “manliness” have undergone historical shifts: from the early Greeks through the feudal period, the emphasis of idealized masculinity was on military heroism and political prowess through male bonding and risk-taking; whereas more modern meanings of masculinity have stressed “competitive individualism, reason, self-control or self-denial, combining respectability as breadwinner and head of household with calculative rationality in public life” (Hooper 1998: 33). This does not mean, however, that older meanings have gone away, as unbridled military toughness and financial risk-taking can come once again to the fore in times of war and economic restructuring. Moreover, not all cultures have associated such conceptions of masculinity with leadership qualities: “queen mothers” in Ghana and “clan mothers” in many Native American societies have been accorded power and leadership roles in these matrilineal contexts on the basis of the feminine quality of regeneration of the people and the land (Okojo 1994: 286; Guerrero 1997: 215). Furthermore, there is some play in gender roles even within patrilineal or patriarchal cultures, given that men are not exclusively leaders and warriors and women are not exclusively in charge of maintaining the home and caring for children. Cultures also vary in the play allowed to the display of non-conforming gender behavior, such as that not associated with a person’s assigned sex; sometimes even “third genders” are revered. Polities also vary in terms of acceptance of and resources available to people who choose to change their assigned sex. Due to the variation in meanings attached to femininity and masculinity, we know that expressions of gender are not “fi xed” or predetermined; the particulars of gender are always shaped by context.

Because models of appropriate gender behavior are diverse, we know that femininity and masculinity are not timeless or separable from the contexts in which they are embodied, acted out, and observed. This illustrates how gender rests not on biological sex differences but on interpretations or constructions of behavior that are culturally specific, that shift as contexts change, and that typically have little to do with biological differences, which themselves are not fixed as some bodies are born neither “male” nor “female” and gender and sex assignments can be altered. In short, there are multiple genders and gender orderings, but gender is always raced, classed, sexualized, and nationalized, just as race, class, sexuality, and nationality are always gendered. Hence, gender analysis must avoid stereotyping (or reducing people to unfounded caricatures), essentializing (or assuming “natural” and unchanging characteristics), and singling out any one identity as descriptive of a whole person. Instead, gender analysis must adopt intersectional analyses to make sense of our multiple, crosscutting, and differentially valorized identities. However, these variations still rest on concepts of gender differences and do not necessarily disrupt the power of gender as an oppositional dichotomy and as a relation of inequality.

#### A gendered lens is a prereq to solving the existing dichotomies – only the alt solves

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Gender(ed) Lenses on Global Politics, pgs 39-40/// MF)

This is what is meant by mutually reinforcing: the dichotomy of gender gains its natural-ness by being grounded in the assumption of essentialized sex diff erence; gendered orderings are normalized by being reproduced throughout social life; dichotomies gain their taken-for-granted and even desirable status by being privileged in modernist thought and acquiring credibility through the “reality” of pervasive gendered diff erentiation. The mutually reinforcing interplay of essentializing sex, dichotomizing gender, and the binary logic of positivism generates the constellation of dimensions of the meta-lens of the power of gender. Recog-nizing the power of these coding and fi ltering devices is crucial for improving our ability to see beyond essentialized identities and oppositional “wholes.” Thus, feminists argue that dichotomized thinking cannot be adequately understood, critiqued, or eff ectively transformed without addressing how sex-diff erentiated gender grounds, naturalizes, and reproduces binary thinking.

### AT: essentialism

#### A gendered lens for international relations avoids essentialism

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Introduction, pg 8/// MF)

Contemporary feminist scholars engage in intersectional analysis to avoid the practice of “essentialism,” or the assumption that, for example, all women or all men or all those within a given race or class share the same experiences and interests. Only by recognizing how, for example, some women have benefi ted by the racial, class, sexual, and national origin oppres-sion of other women, whereas many men subordinated by these very characteristics still exercise gender oppression, can we advance a more comprehensive notion of gender equality that sees it as indivisible from racial, class, and sexual equality and equality among nations. Thus, a sole focus on gender equality can fail to address other sources of inequality (such as race and class discrimination) that disadvantage certain groups of women. At the same time, when such eff orts blame only men, and mostly non-elite men, for gender inequality and fail to address forms of discrimination that subordinated men experience (based on class, race, and/or sexuality), then subordinated men may withhold support for gender equality. A narrow focus on gender equality also maintains the power of gender, even as the socio-economic positionings of some women and men may be somewhat altered, as is addressed more in this chapter.

#### A gendered lens avoids essentialism and universalism

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Introduction, pgs 8-9 /// MF)

Contemporary feminist scholars engage in intersectional analysis to avoid the practice of “essentialism,” or the assumption that, for example, all women or all men or all those within a given race or class share the same experiences and interests. Only by recognizing how, for example, some women have benefi ted by the racial, class, sexual, and national origin oppres-sion of other women, whereas many men subordinated by these very characteristics still exercise gender oppression, can we advance a more comprehensive notion of gender equality that sees it as indivisible from racial, class, and sexual equality and equality among nations. Thus, a sole focus on gender equality can fail to address other sources of inequality (such as race and class discrimination) that disadvantage certain groups of women. At the same time, when such eff orts blame only men, and mostly non-elite men, for gender inequality and fail to address forms of discrimination that subordinated men experience (based on class, race, and/or sexuality), then subordinated men may withhold support for gender equality. A narrow focus on gender equality also maintains the power of gender, even as the socio-economic positionings of some women and men may be somewhat altered, as is addressed more in this chapter.

Another reason to avoid essentialism is also to avoid “universalism,” or universal prescriptions for how to achieve comprehensive gender equality. Not only do women not share the same experiences or interests as a result of their multiple identities derive from their differing social locations in the world, but also the sociopolitical, cultural, and historical con-texts in which women live vary significantly, requiring varying strategies for social change. These complex realities have made many feminists skeptical of resorting to “global” solutions just as they have recognized that “global” problems take many and differing “local” forms to which agents of social change must be attentive to create context-specific and context-sensitive solutions that do not backfire (Grewal and Kaplan 1994).

#### Fem IR isn’t rooted in essentialism – rather its rooted in historical ways of thinking like activists

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Gender and Global Security, pg 84/// MF)

Feminist IR approaches to war and violence and peace and security, as refl ected in FSS scholarship, have their roots especially in the thinking of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century women peace theorists and activists. Many of these early thinkers and activists based their arguments against war on women’s maternalist desires to protect their children from the ravages of war, neither wanting their sons to become cannon fodder nor their daughters to suff er from the destruction of families and communities (Pierson 1987). For those who were steeped in the biological determinism characteristic of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century thought, these maternalist desires were seen as innate, making women “natural” peace support-ers and peacemakers. Maternalist arguments continued through the Cold War, when women’s peace organizations sought to protect future generations from the threat of nuclear war, and into the present day, but more recent feminist peace researchers and activists have argued that maternalism is not innate but rather the result of women being made largely responsible for “maternalist practices” or caring work, whether or not they have children (Ruddick 1984). This makes them more likely to have empathy for “others” and the world’s children and to be against war and its destructive power. Contemporary feminist IR scholars examining mater-nalism in national and international politics (Carreon and Moghadam 2015) refer to this as “political motherhood” and make a distinction between grassroots motherhood politics, which seek to emancipate the nation from unjust rule and/or to bring peace through increas-ing women’s political voice and agency, and state-led, patriarchal motherhood politics which advocate keeping women in the home or expecting them to uphold heteronormative patriarchal family values to serve as conservative symbols of the nation.

### AT: perm

#### Simply adding women into academia fails

Anne **Runyan**, 20**19** (Runyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Interview – Anne Sisson Runyan” E-International Relations. March 8, 2019. <https://www.e-ir.info/2019/03/08/interview-anne-sisson-runyan/> /// MF)

This year’s campaign theme [#BalanceforBetter](https://www.internationalwomensday.com/Theme) calls for a gender-balanced world. What do you think is the biggest barrier to achieving gender-balance in academia?

Of course, gender parity across all institutions is necessary as a matter of fair representation and non-asymmetrical access to power and resources that could potentially lead to reassessments of how power and resources are used. However, the appeal for gender balance does not take into account hierarchical differences among those who identify as women and those who identify as men (or neither) and it appears to summon a notion of gender complementarity as opposed to equality, which also appears to rest on essentialist notions of women and men. Moreover, it seems to occlude questions of gender balance for what and under what conditions.

Thus, when we consider gender balance in academia, we need to consider how it is being restructured as a site of more flexibilized and casualized labor (long referred to as the “feminization” of labor) and from which public resources are continually withdrawn. This is happening just as women are outpacing men as undergraduates and achieving parity with them in graduate and professional programs, with the exception of most of the STEM fields, in much of the global North and about half of the global South where women still outpace men as illiterates (see, for example, [UN Women’s Progress of the World’s Women 2015-2016 Report](http://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2015/4/progress-of-the-worlds-women-2015)).

In the US, [trends](https://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/08E023AB-E6D8-4DBD-99A0-24E5EB73A760/0/persistent_inequity.pdf) observed almost a decade ago and that have continued and continue to worsen include the rise of contingent faculty labour in academe, with three-quarters of instructional faculty not in tenure track positions and half working part-time, the majority of whom in both categories are women. Women are also least represented in the upper echelons of the professoriate, in university administration, and in professional organizations and over-represented in teaching positions and service work (vs. research-oriented jobs), the humanities (which have become increasingly devalued), and the least prestigious institutions and lowest level institutions, while pay gaps increase between women and men the higher the level of the position. Thus, where some level of parity is occurring it is at the lowest and most contingent levels and under deteriorating labour conditions for women and men in academe.

For gender parity in representation and pay in academe to have any meaning, there is a need to resist the feminization of labour in academe, which is deeply connected to the withdrawal of public resources for it and undermines career paths for the women who are now swelling the ranks of undergraduate and graduate students and taking on the greatest student debt in the process. This is also occurring as gender studies in the academy is under major attack in the context of the rise of illiberal democracies, with Hungary recently banning it outright.

#### Placing women in power as the solution inevitably fails – keeping a gender lens will result in the same violence that exists in the squo

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Gender(ed) Lenses on Global Politics, pg 27 /// MF)

In Chapter 1 , the concepts of a gender lens and more intersectional gendered lenses were introduced and elaborated on in terms of the immensity and complexity of power relations and structures we see in global politics when we use them and why it is important to not only attend to the masculine/feminine dichotomous and hierarchical dynamic at work in global politics past and present, but also the way this is enlarged upon and complicated by interre-lated dynamics of racial, sexual, class, and nationality divisions and hierarchies. In this chapter, background is provided on why and how gender and gendered lenses emerged in the study of IR, how they challenge conventional IR lenses, and what signifi cant understandings such lenses, and the research they have generated, have revealed about how the power of gender works in the study and practice of global politics.

As argued in the introductory chapter, the power of gender is an especially resilient and adaptive fi ltering and organizing mechanism, a meta-lens that produces particular ways of seeing, thinking, and acting in the world. Gender may feature in policymaking, women and men may be repositioned, and ideal forms of masculinity may shift, but as long as the power of gender as a meta-lens continues to operate, it will produce and reproduce inequalities, injustices, and crises of global proportion. Here the central case made is that feminist lenses , and particularly intersectional ones, often in concert with other lenses critical of conventional IR approaches, are necessary to reveal the extent of the power of gender to produce and obscure inequalities and the global crises that ensue from and sustain inequalities.

#### Addressing the structural issues, specifically the language used in IR is key to progress

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Gender(ed) Lenses on Global Politics, pgs 42-43/// MF)

Asking initially “Where are the women?” and subsequently “adding women”—and com-paring their positions to those of men—were and remain productive orientations. They make embodied women (and men) visible in our picture of world politics, illuminate how women and men are diff erently engaged with and aff ected by international politics, and reveal women as agents and activists, as well as victims of sociocultural, economic, and political oppres-sions. But adding women to existing paradigms also raised deeper questions by exposing how the conceptual structures themselves presuppose masculine experience and perspective. For example, women/femininity cannot simply be added to constructions that are constituted as masculine: the public sphere, rationality, political identity, objectivity, “economic man.” Either women as feminine cannot be added (e.g., women must become like men) or the con-structions themselves are transformed (e.g., adding women as feminine alters the masculine premise of the constructions and changes their meaning). In this sense, the exclusions of fem-ininity are not accidental or coincidental but rather are required for the analytical consistency of reigning explanatory frameworks.

The lesson that emerges from these studies is that we cannot systemically add women without rethinking gender—recognizing it not only as an empirical category or variable but also as an analytical category and governing code. Doing so requires acknowledging the constitutive power of language, which is most eff ectively addressed through a feminist poststructuralist (sometimes referred to as postmodern) lens. This redirects our attention from adding women and deploying sex as a variable to analyzing gender as a category of mental ordering that produces masculinity and femininity as hierarchical power relations. In eff ect, examining “the woman question” leads us to examine “the man question,” which, as argued in this text, leads us to examine questions of “race,” “class,” “sexuality,” and “nationality” as well. Doing so requires acknowledging intersectionality, derived from anti-racist and postcolonial feminist thought, as a necessary analytic, which is also further illuminated through poststructuralist lenses. As used in this text, poststructuralist lenses in general reject essentialized categories, unitary meanings, sovereign claims, universalizing solutions, and presumptions of (foundational) objectivity associated with positivist and modernist commit-ments. Moreover, feminist poststructuralists criticize the residual essentialism that haunts references to “women” and other “identity-based” groups, rendering them homogeneous, undiff erentiated wholes and erasing hierarchies within as well as across all groups.

#### Adding women reinforces essentialism and doesn’t result in change

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Gender and Global Security, pgs. 105-106 /// MF)

On the other side of the coin, as Whitworth (2004) argues based on her study of Canadian peacekeeping operations, the UN’s new interest in “adding women and stirring” simply grafts on (essentialist) gender analysis, which assumes women will just ease and assist the already predetermined business of peacekeeping and peace negotiations by bringing information on women and “women’s issues” into these activities. This predetermined business disregards any considerations of militarized masculinity as a major source of prolonged confl ict or such sources of structural violence as neocolonial economic and political relationships and neolib-eral economic restructuring that may lie at the heart of the confl ict (Whitworth 2004: 133, 137). Instead, this business focuses on “when the fi ghting broke out” and how to control, if not cease, it (Whitworth 2004: 133). Thus, rather than causing a rethinking of peacekeeping and peace negotiations, “analyses of women and of gender thus become part of the ‘programmatic solutions’ that form the UN repertoire of responding to confl ict and insecurity around the world, and, in this way, confi rm the appropriateness of the repertoire” (Whitworth 2004: 137). In this sense, like gender equality that is subsumed under neoliberal governmentality, gender perspectives on international peace and security are subsumed under a kind of security governmentality. Nine out of 11 peace agreements by 2005 had involved some focus on including women and providing for their security (mostly with respect to sexual violence), although that dropped to six out of nine agreements by 2010 (Ellerby 2017: 36–37). But the tenuous and minimalist nature of treating women as add-ons to an overall approach to simply managing confl icts underscores Whitworth’s conclusion that the issue is not so much adding more women to peacekeeping and peacemaking operations as it is questioning the sole reli-ance on militaries to do the job of peacekeeping and, by extension, on military leaders and civilian defense elites to do the job of peacemaking (2004: 183).

#### Fem IR has a larger agenda to solve for a litany of risk but the state co-opts it

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Gender and Global Security, pg. 88/// MF)

The too easy devolution of security into continual justifi cations for violence has also led to feminist wariness of new processes of “securitization” associated with a widening security agenda. On the one hand, the application of the term security to an issue elevates it to a matter of “high politics,” as security (matters of war and peace) has traditionally held pride of place in IR theory and practice. Thus, relatively new conceptions of human security and environmental security, and even more recently, food, water, energy, and health security, have brought welcome international attention to sources of structural violence that undermine the well-being of people and the planet. On the other hand, there is also a tendency to reduce these once again to state security matters to be handled not through more collective and more non-violent means, but more typically through war or some approximation of it. Resource wars, wars on terror, wars on AIDS, wars on drugs, and so on all follow a similar logic. As Zillah Eisenstein argues, the logic of war of any kind is “opposition, diff erentiation, and the other-ing of peoples” (2007: 25). Thus, gendering, racialization, classing, and sexualizing go on unabated (and become even more pronounced) in order to affi x blame and control, contain, and quarantine these “new” threats. For example, racial profi ling becomes a weapon in the “war on terror,” targeting sexual minorities and sex workers becomes the focus of the war on AIDS, and peasant farmers become casualties of the war on drugs. Still, some feminist IR scholars see value in employing such concepts as human and environmental security through an intersectional gender lens that reveals the interrelationships between a range of insecuri-ties produced by and through state security (Tripp, Ferree, and Ewig 2013; Detraz 2012, 2015).

### AT: already exists

#### Past feminist based analysis was too narrow –

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Gender(ed) Lenses on Global Politics, pgs 44-45/// MF)

As feminist IR lenses have shifted, combined, and recombined through a greater multiplicity of theoretical voices and orientations—creating their own productive tensions—subjects of feminist IR inquiry have also shifted. Tickner (2006) expresses this in generational terms: fi rst-generation feminist IR scholars tended to focus on deconstructing key concepts in IR—sovereignty, the state, security, development, and the economy—exposing or unpacking their masculinist bias and underpinnings. Through these openings that put gender inquiry on the IR map, second-generation scholars have applied gender analysis—often in more intersectional ways—to a range of global politics topics both familiar (alliance constructions, state militaries, peacekeeping, peace agreements, trade agreements, UN conventions) and unfamiliar (sex tourism and sex work, homework and domestic service, migration, social movements, and even world art, popular culture, and the cruise industry). 3 In doing so, these scholars have not only greatly expanded what global politics inquiry entails but also have rethought earlier approaches to gender theorizing in IR.

### Revolutions

#### Revolutions are key to incorporating feminist points of view into IR

Ann **Runyan** & V. Spike **Peterson**, 19**91** (Runyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. Peterson, professor of international relations in the School of Government and Public Policy at the University of Arizona. ‘The Radical Future of Realism: Feminist Subversions of IR Theory” Alternatives: Global, Local, Political, pgs 67-106. 1991 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40644702> /// MF)

Coalition politics, however, do not have to entail the modernist dictate of "merging" different interests and identities in pursuit of a uni- fied politics for some "higher" goal. In fact, Christine Sylvester strenu- ously warns of "some dangers in merging feminist and peace projects."84 By invoking the identities, experiences, and projects of women warriors, whether in service to the state or the revolution, she seeks to disrupt the too comfortable fit between Western pacifist femi- nist ideology and the humanist ideology of peace that ultimately sub- sumes it. Although Sylvester admits that "armed women warriors," regardless of why they fight, kill, and die, "do not get their due after the smoke clears,"85 she insists that if there are "no nonpeaceful feminist identities to inspire war on aspects of the humanist establishment which may deny women power" and "no rebellious feminists creating dangerous, disorderly, and somewhat irrational orders within the order,"86 the disruptive nature of feminist strategies will be under- mined and rendered impotent.

### Intersectionality

#### Fem ir is starting to take other marginalized perspectives into account

Anne **Runyan**, 20**19** (Runyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Interview – Anne Sisson Runyan” E-International Relations. March 8, 2019. <https://www.e-ir.info/2019/03/08/interview-anne-sisson-runyan/> /// MF)

Where do you see the most exciting research/debates happening in your field?

Since I have long worked at the intersection of International Relations (IR) and Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, heading both women’s studies and politics departments, my sense of what is most exciting is what cuts across those fields. Just as we have seen the emergence and growing centrality of queer, trans, and decolonial scholarship in feminist studies, so too are inroads being made in IR by these modes of inquiry, bringing with them a wider range of theoretical and methodological approaches, accounting in part for the narrative, affective, visual, and temporal turns in critical IR.

These developments are, on the one hand, blurring binaries and contesting coloniality in thought about gender and sexuality in feminist IR and feminist studies more generally. On the other hand, they are challenging the colonial, settler colonial, heterosexist, heteronormative, and gender normative foundational narratives underpinning IR more generally. These trends have emerged less out of debates (which suggests some measure of legibility between parties and either/or choices), but from an insistence by invisibilized, silenced, and/or marginalized bodies and perspectives to, not so much to be included within reigning orthodoxies, but to transform what constitutes the study of gender and the study of IR.

My earliest and continuing work also cuts across what is now referred to as feminist security studies and feminist international or global political economy (GPE). As those specializations emerged, they appeared to diverge, prompting recent work on how they can (re)inform each other, including my own efforts in this direction in the introduction to the second edition of [Gender and Global Restructuring](https://www.routledge.com/Gender-and-Global-Restructuring-Sightings-Sites-and-Resistances-2nd/Marchand-Sisson-Runyan/p/book/9780415776806) I co-edited with Marianne Marchand that put the war on terror in relation to neoliberal restructuring. This has also meant a better blending of discursive and materialist analysis within and across these subfields.

Again, such shifts are less the result of either/or debates, but rather a recognition that the politics of representation is never separate from the politics of redistribution, even as at times poststructural or materialist analysis has come more to the fore (with the latter gaining more traction again in these times of massive economic inequalities). The question of violence is particularly animating feminist resistances to false divisions between security (as high politics) and GPE studies (as low politics) that the discipline continuously re-imposes. While the heuristic distinction between direct and structural violence, with the former most often associated with security studies and the latter with GPE studies, feminists have been particularly adept at exposing their interrelations, particularly at the level of everyday bodily violence of all sorts, whether in times of “war” or “peace.”

#### Gendered lens that draws from intersectionality are key to solve

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Introduction, pg 1/// MF)

In this introductory chapter, an overview is presented of the contemporary relationships between gender and global politics. It begins with a conceptual discussion of gender as a dichotomous power relation and normative ordering power, referred to as the power of gen-der , a meta-lens that fosters dichotomization, stratification, and depoliticization in thought and action through the processes of masculinization and feminization , thereby sustaining global power structures and crises that prevent, militate against, or reverse meaningful advances in social equality and justice. It then addresses why adopting not only a gender lens , but more importantly a gendered lens , informed by intersectional thinking, is important for understanding how the gender interacts with other power relations, such as race, class, sexuality, and nationality (including power relations among nations as well as those based on national origin) to produce both gender and gendered divisions of power , violence , and labor and resources in global governance, global security, and global political economy, the principal areas of inquiry in the study of International Relations (IR). These divisions, in turn, keep in place and exacerbate the crises of representation, insecurity, and sustainability in global politics, which are also introduced.

In the remainder of this introductory chapter, how gender politics became more salient in national and international policymaking in recent decades is raised. A host of international institutions have been adopting some understandings produced by gender-centered research in IR that make links between raising the status of women worldwide and addressing global crises, including democratic deficits, armed conflict and other violence, and poverty and environmental degradation. However, as also raised, the deepening of such crises has also led to a backlash not only against international institutions, but also with respect to nascent attention to women’s rights with the recent rise of ethnic, economic, and belligerent nationalisms in several parts of the world. This rise of such new authoritarianisms associated with “strong man” politics, as also pointed out, is also a feature of contemporary global gender politics. Thus, a gendered lens is required to better understand these conflicting responses to global crises and the insufficiencies and problematics of both to address them.

#### Taking intersectionality into account is key to stopping the stereotypes that come with traditional ir

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Introduction, pg 7 /// MF)

Because models of appropriate gender behavior are diverse, we know that femininity and masculinity are not timeless or separable from the contexts in which they are embodied, acted out, and observed. This illustrates how gender rests not on biological sex differences but on interpretations or constructions of behavior that are culturally specific, that shift as contexts change, and that typically have little to do with biological differences, which themselves are not fixed as some bodies are born neither “male” nor “female” and gender and sex assignments can be altered. In short, there are multiple genders and gender orderings, but gender is always raced, classed, sexualized, and nationalized, just as race, class, sexuality, and nationality are always gendered. Hence, gender analysis must avoid stereotyping (or reducing people to unfounded caricatures), essentializing (or assuming “natural” and unchanging characteristics), and singling out any one identity as descriptive of a whole person. Instead, gender analysis must adopt intersectional analyses to make sense of our multiple, crosscutting, and differentially valorized identities. However, these variations still rest on concepts of gender differences and do not necessarily disrupt the power of gender as an oppositional dichotomy and as a relation of inequality.

#### Intersectionality takes into account more marginalized perspectives and considers the idea of hegemonic masculinity and hierarchies within hierarchies

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Introduction, pgs 5-6 /// MF)

Contemporary gender studies that partake of intersectional analysis, which holds that gender cannot be understood in isolation from other identity categories and relations of inequality, recognize that there are multiple genders, as well as sexes, in part because race/ethnicity, class, sexuality, and other cultural variations shape gender identities and performances. The concept of intersectional analysis emerged from the work of black US feminist theorists in the 1980s and beyond (Crenshaw 1991; Collins 1991) who recognized that the lives and experiences of women of color were underrepresented in dominant Western feminist theories about women’s subordination that were based on the experiences of largely white, Western, middle-class, and/or working-class women.

Because the particular characteristics associated with femininity and masculinity vary signifi cantly across cultures, races, classes, and age groups, there are no generic women and men, cis or trans. Our gender identities, loyalties, interests, and opportunities are intersected and crosscut by countless dimensions of “diff erence,” especially those associated with ethnicity/race, class, national, and sexual identities. “Acting like a man” (or a “woman”) means diff er-ent things to diff erent groups of people (e.g., trans people, heterosexual Catholics, Native Americans, British colonials, agriculturists versus corporate managers, athletes versus orchestra conductors, combat soldiers versus military strategists) and to the same group of people at diff erent points in time (e.g., nineteenth- versus twentieth-century Europeans, col-onized versus postcolonial Africans, pre-puberty versus elderly age sets, women during war versus women after war). Men may be characterized as feminine (e.g., Mahatma Gandhi, “fl amboyant” gay men) and women as “masculine” (e.g., Margaret Thatcher, “butch” lesbians). Gender is shaped by race (models of masculinity and femininity vary among Africans, Indians, Asians, Europeans), and race is gendered (gender stereotypes shape racial stereo-types of Africans, Indians, Asians, whites). Moreover, because masculinities and femininities vary (by class, race/ethnicity, sexuality, age), some expressions of gender (Hispanic in the US, Muslim in India, Turkana in Kenya) are subordinated to dominant constructions of ender (Anglo, Hindu, Kikuyu). There are thus multiple masculinities that not only vary across cultures but also confer diff erent levels of power. What is referred to as “hegemonic masculinity” (Connell 1987, 1995) is the ideal form of masculinity performed by men with the most power attributes, who not incidentally populate most global power positions. These are typically white, Western, upper-class, straight cismen who have conferred on them the complete range of gender, race, class, national, and sexuality privileges. “Subordinated masculinities” (Connell 1987, 1995) are embodied by those who lack one, some, or all these privileges and are consequently rendered feminized and thus devalorized (a process explored more in this chapter) on these scores. Although all femininities are subordinated to all mascu-linities, it is also the case that some femininities are subordinated more than or diff erently from others. The idealized image of Western femininity remains associated with Victorian notions of womanhood that celebrated the gentility, passivity, decorativeness, and asexuality imposed on white, middle- to upper-class women, who were the only ones who could enact such standards. Working-class women, women of color, and/or lesbians or trans women are either denied the (dubious) status of feminine because they cannot meet these standards or are feminized in other ways through processes of racialization and/or sexualization . For example, since the times of slavery and colonization, women of color have been labeled as naturally oversexual, thereby not only being unworthy of (white) male protection but also particularly open to (white) male sexual exploitation.

[Anne Sisson Runyan.Global Gender Politics]

#### A gender lens fails to view the complexity of the world, only through the use of intersectionality can we view the world more fully

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Gender(ed) Lenses on Global Politics, pgs 39-40/// MF)

These points are crucial to the arguments of this text because the perpetuation of dichotomized thinking and its gendered normalizations reproduces hierarchical divisions and, hence, antagonistic relations between groups. But the power of gender also operates to obscure intersectionality, and, thus, the gendered power relations and divisions discussed in Chapter 1 . When the power of gender focuses attention on essentialized notions of gender—masculinity and femininity—we fail to see these as constructed and crosscutting dimensions operating within any particular group and across groups. This is among the problems with the way in which gender has been taken up by international policymakers, not as a matter of equality and social justice, but rather instrumentalizing women’s empowerment to try to “fi x” serial crises without addressing deeper ones that arise from not only gender but also gendered divisions. Similarly, when essentialized notions of group identities erase the diff erentiations within them, we fail to see the complexity of social orders and how inequalities are often sustained by pitting subordinated groups against each other. We are seeing this now in the rise of illiberal democracies resulting from the cultivation of ethno-nationalist and masculin-ist political backlash, associated with some (typically white, global North, working-class, and heterosexual) men falling down the economic ladder and “strong man” political rhetoric that places the blame for this on groups also in increasing and often greater precarity. Such blaming defl ects attention from the global crises that are producing and are the result of vast and intersecting inequalities, while undermining the equality struggles of all subordinated groups. This militates against the potential for coalitions and more comprehensive resistances to unjust social and global political orders. Deploying intersectional analysis facilitates a more comprehensive notion of gender equality that is indivisible from racial, class, and sex-ual equality and equality among nations. It encourages contemporary feminist IR scholars to ask not just “Where are the women?” but also “Which women?” and “Where are the men and which men?”

### impact

#### Violence and exclusion of women is the most accurate way to predict which countries will deteriorate – the more the violence, the more instability

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Gender(ed) Lenses on Global Politics, pg 46 /// MF)

Recent generations of feminist IR researchers (some of whom have worked in or with international agencies) also engage in a signifi cant amount of quantitative research to have a greater and more meaningful impact on international policymaking (Den Boer 2016). Although feminist IR scholars have long relied on governmental, non-governmental, and UN gender-diff erentiated data produced during and continuously since the UN Decade for Women (which are also used in this text), but knowing how incomplete and insuffi cient this most often statistical information can be, some are now producing extensive and continuously expanded and updated databases, such as WomanStats (see Box 2.1 ). Some have also engaged in large-scale studies, drawing upon existing, and creating new, databases, on the impact of international policymaking on women and the relationship between women’s status and global problems. For example, in the last decade, such research has showed that women’s literacy, access to reproductive health services, and employment have increased in states that have ratifi ed and observed CEDAW, most markedly in secular states with eff ective legal systems (Simmons 2009), and that the higher the level of violence against women within a state, the higher the likelihood it will engage in war, with violence against women rates being more signifi cant than levels of democracy, religion, wealth, and racial disparities as predictors of state peacefulness or bellicosity (Hudson et al. 2008/9). Such research is positivist to the degree that it treats gender (as well as race, class, nationality, and so on) as a variable, operationalizing it often as female sex and women’s rights in relation to a host of other variables. While this has yielded major fi ndings which tell us gender not only matters, but centrally matters in global politics, fem-inist IR researchers cannot control if and how policymakers make use of such fi ndings, nor does it particularly challenge the preference for positivist, quantitative measures in inter-national policymaking.

#### War is done to protect the state and ignores structural violence

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Gender and Global Security, pg. 86 /// MF)

War—its causes and eff ects—animated and has long dominated the study of IR. Since the Cold War period, war has been studied in IR under the rubric of “security” studies. In (neo)realist security studies, the maintenance of security is understood as controlling and contain-ing, but not eliminating, direct violence between state militaries through balances of military power and nuclear terror as well as collective security measures that rely on sustaining both credible threats to use force and the actual use of force. Ironically and problematically, this ensures the continued growth of militaries and the continuation of war to promote security—but only the security of the state, not necessarily of people within or across states, and certainly not of the planet.

The early post-Cold War period of the 1990s brought more interest within the discipline in wider defi nitions of security, ranging from economic to human, environmental, and even food security. These redefi nitions occurred in the face of new “threats” to state security (such as globalization and global warming, discussed in the next chapter), but also newly recognized notions of security arising from critical perspectives (including feminist ones) entering the fi eld, which pointed out that state security often compromised the welfare of people and the planet. Nevertheless, conventional security studies enjoyed somewhat of a resurgence in the post-9/11 period because decisions to engage in interstate and intrastate confl ict and the globalized “war on terror” once again spiked militarized violence. The resurgent interest in direct violence has once again been at the expense of attending to structural violence and the insecurities generated by structural inequalities. We must be mindful that direct and indirect (structural) violence are not separate but interdependent. The inequalities of the latter shape the expression of the former. As dire as are the eff ects of direct violence, indirect violence shapes the lives of all of us all of the time—and especially injures women and other subordi-nated and marginalized people.

#### Only looking at the relations between different things can solve for structural violence and war – current lens creates violence

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Gender and Global Security, pgs. 86-87 /// MF)

Hence, feminists argue that to understand violence and insecurities, we must look not only within particular “levels” but also at the linkages among them. According to Ann Tickner,

Feminist perspectives on security would assume that violence, whether it be in the inter-national, national, or family realm, is interconnected. Family violence must be seen in the context of wider power relations; it occurs within a gendered society in which male power dominates at all levels . . .. Any feminist defi nition of security must therefore include the elimination of all types of violence, including violence produced by gender relations of domination and subordination.

(Tickner 1993: 58)

But as argued here, gender violence must also be seen in combination with racialized, sexual-ized, and class violence to reveal the interconnections between relations of domination and subordination that are present across all levels and constitute the conditions (structural violence) and goads for war (direct violence) as well as the eff ects of war or militarized confl ict. Unless these are taken seriously, even rival notions of (non-disaggregated) human security to state security will fail to recognize all the sources of insecurity (bred of the injustices of structural violence) and their diff erential eff ects.

At the same time, a more poststructural feminist view of security is that it is always “elusive and partial” because the quest for absolute security is in itself productive of violence: it relies on the eradication of all threats, real or imagined, and thus sets up a never-ending defensive and off ensive posture (Tickner 2001: 62). Such a posture is emblematic of the “sovereign man” (Ashley 1989), who, like the sovereign state that is fashioned upon this construct of hegemonic masculinity, thwarts connection and interdependence in fear of engagement with diff erence that might break down walls between the sovereign “self ” and the “other” on whom is projected all that one denies in oneself (Eisenstein 2007: 13).

### Gendered lens alt

#### A gendered lens solves better than the normative gender lens – it avoids the pitfalls of a gender lens and helps us see how gender interacts with other oppressive ideologies

Anne **Runyan**, 20**19** (Runyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Interview – Anne Sisson Runyan” E-International Relations. March 8, 2019. <https://www.e-ir.info/2019/03/08/interview-anne-sisson-runyan/> /// MF)

In my work with V. Spike Peterson over several editions of Global Gender Issues between 1993 and 2014 and in my most recent [Global Gender Politics](https://www.routledge.com/Global-Gender-Politics-5th-Edition/Runyan/p/book/9780813350851), I came to make a distinction between a gender lens, which foregrounds masculine and feminine dynamics through which hierarchical dichotomies are naturalized and enforced in world politics, and a gendered lens, which attends to the ways in which race, class, sexual, and national power relations intersect with gender power relations to produce multiple, differing, and shifting femininities and masculinities. A gendered lens is necessary for seeing how gender combines in complex ways with other structural power relations, such as colonialism, imperialism, racism, and economic and environmental exploitation, to normalize a range of social, political, and economic divisions, inequalities, and injustices.

A gendered lens also resists the reduction of gender to “adding women” as is popular and problematic in policymaking circles. And it alerts us to the work that gender does, especially when deployed in this fashion, to cover up and smooth over what Spike and I termed global and systemic crises of representation, insecurity, and sustainability. An exemplar of how this works, which I address in the postscript of the second edition of [Gender and Global Restructuring](https://www.routledge.com/Gender-and-Global-Restructuring-Sightings-Sites-and-Resistances-2nd/Marchand-Sisson-Runyan/p/book/9780415776806), is in the case of the immediate aftermath of the Great Financial Crisis, when increasing the number of risk-averse women financial managers was briefly trumpeted as a panacea for avoiding such crises in future, relying on biologically determinist constructions of women saviors from testosterone-fueled men. This discursive move (which did not result in any serious material change in the gender make-up of financial services personnel) served to sidestep critical analysis of the systemic nature and costs of gendered financialization.

#### Feminist perspectives in IR are more readily able to create change

Marysia **Zalewski**, 20**18** (Zalewshi, author and professor of International Relations at Cardiff University. “Feminist Approaches to International Relations Theory in the Post-Cold War Period” part of The Age of Perplexity: Rethinking the World We Knew <https://www.bbvaopenmind.com/en/articles/feminist-approaches-to-international-relations-theory-in-the-post-cold-war-period/> /// MF)

OPENING STATEMENT

All these theories yet the bodies keep piling up (Zalewski 1996).

It is quite an undertaking to discuss the range of feminist approaches in relation to international politics over a 30-year period, not least given the vast amount of feminist scholarship that has been done over that time. But this opening statement or ‘pause for thought’, is less about the commonplace challenge of academic distillation and review, but rather specifically connected to the relentless consistency of problematic assumptions made about this provocative body of thought which can rob it of its primary worth. As such, I start with the statement that the work of feminist scholarship on global politics is largely intended to be powerfully destabilising. This remains the case even if destabilisation seems politically and educationally unpalatable. Undeniably, a primary aim of this corpus of feminist scholarship is to create a body of theory and practice with enough agency and traction to make significant structural, epistemological, conceptual and political changes both to the ways international politics is studied, as well as fundamentally alter the violent ways in which much of global politics continues to manifest itself. It might be considered that this scholarly aim of feminist work sounds provocative and overly ambitious, not least given the consistently assumed goal of feminism is typically understood to be simply about including women into the varied realms of high politics. An accompanying assumption is that this inclusion is merely in the service of supporting the theoretical and political agendas of conventional international politics. My claim is that this branch of feminist scholarship has a exceedingly far-reaching aim, and indeed very similar to the one that the discipline of international politics itself was founded upon (and has manifestly failed to achieve), namely to impose a significant halt to the egregious and relentless violence that continues to blight the contemporary global political landscape. Furthermore, the claim of feminist scholarship is that it has much greater potential than the discipline of International Relations to bring about this kind of change. I open with this somewhat provocative statement as the serious intention and work of feminism can so readily evaporate. I hope to seize reader’s attention in this important volume right from the start; the stakes are far too high to not take the destabilizing work of feminism seriously.

#### Only a gendered lens solves – takes into account the existence of other power dynamics and helps resolve the divisions that occur as a result

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Introduction, pgs 10-11 /// MF)

The power of gender produces a common sense of privileging the masculine and devaluing the feminine that is culturally and collectively internalized to such an extent that we are all variously complicit in its reproduction. It is also implicitly and explicitly manipulated to reproduce inequalities as if they were natural and inevitable, thus undercutting critique and resistance. In these ways, devalorizing through feminizing produces even as it obscures vast inequalities of power, authority, and resource distribution.

Examples of how the power of gender, as an ordering system that valorizes or privileges what is deemed masculine and devalorizes or subordinates what is deemed feminine in order to naturalize inequalities and power relations, extends beyond hierarchically dividing women and men to hierarchically dividing peoples, places, cultures, practices, institutions, and even ideas and concepts in the global system can be seen in Table 1.1 . The processes of masculin-ization as valorization and feminization as devalorization powerfully organize our thinking as to what is valued and thus prioritized and what is not valued and thus denigrated in the study (explored more in Chapter 2 ) and practice (explored more in Chapters 3 , 4 , and 5 ) of global politics. To better see how gender as a power relation combines in complex ways with other structural power relations, such as colonialism, imperialism, militarism, racism, and economic and environmental exploitation, to normalize social, political, and economic divisions, inequalities, and injustices, a gendered lens is necessary. The term “gendered” is used in this text, unless otherwise specifi ed, as a shorthand to signal the application of an intersectional analysis to examine interlocking relations of inequality in global politics. The next section provides an overview of how hierarchical gender divisions that foreground the normative masculine–feminine dynamic are intertwined with gender ed hierarchical divi-sions that foreground how gender is never separate from and powerfully informs hierarchical divisions based on race, ethnicity, class, sexuality, nationality, age, ability, and so on. Adopting a gendered lens also more fully reveals how these divisions are productive of and reproduced by global crises, also introduced in the following section.

#### Feminist scholarship demands attention

Marysia **Zalewski**, 20**18** (Zalewshi, author and professor of International Relations at Cardiff University. “Feminist Approaches to International Relations Theory in the Post-Cold War Period” part of The Age of Perplexity: Rethinking the World We Knew <https://www.bbvaopenmind.com/en/articles/feminist-approaches-to-international-relations-theory-in-the-post-cold-war-period/> /// MF)

I opened with a somewhat provocative statement about the intent of feminist scholarship. It might be perceived that I ‘overstate’ the case to draw attention. Yet I maintain that the feminist critique of the underlying knowledge structures on which studies of international politics relies, and which are drawn from long standing philosophical, political and even mythical foundations, poses a very significant challenge. Beginning with the recognition that women and the traditionally ‘feminine’ have been rendered absent or irrelevant in the realm of international politics, it appears that the remedy is not simply to ‘add women in’ -as if they were men. The challenge to the study and practice of international politics demands much more rigorous and effective work in both theory and practice. There have been some notable changes on the global political landscape since 1989, but just a cursory glance will confirm hardly a dent in the realm of global violence, perhaps an increase. Of course, feminist scholarship cannot resolve all these violences, but the vast corpus of knowledge produced since 1989, knowledge which stems for questions drawn from the submerged work and activities of more than half the world’s population, bears much more serious and sustained attention.

#### The “top down” approach fails – a gendered lens is key to examining the powers outside of the state level

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Introduction, pgs 12-13 /// MF)

Gender divisions of power, which equate being political, acting in the public realm of reason, and exercising power-over with normative masculinity and being apolitical, power-less, and sequestered in the private realm of emotion and necessity with femininity, in combination with gendered divisions of power, which feminize or devalorize colonized, racialized, classed, and sexualized peoples in today’s global politics, are refl ective of and instrumental in producing a crisis of representation . This entails still gross inequalities in political representation, not only in formal power structures such as states and intergovern-mental organizations (IGOs), but also in nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and social movements. While problematic in terms of constraining the political agency and voice of large swaths of people, even in “democracies,” without a range of perspectives from varying social locations, solutions proposed by the few (and most privileged) more often benefi t them while causing harm to those un- or under-represented. “Democracy” is strategically promoted while its radical promise is undermined by fraudulent elections, political machinations, imperial impositions, and gendered rule. As addressed in greater detail in Chapter 3 , “global governance” sounds good and is presumably desirable in some form, but its current form obscures the predominantly nondemocratic and unaccountable forms of international rule.

In these senses, analyzing gendered divisions of power requires greater attention to politi-cal, economic, and sociocultural forces below and above the level of the state, thereby revealing the greater complexity of global politics, which cannot be reduced to the actions of state elites and their international organizations or the top-down “problem-solving” orientation they advocate. Such a lens reveals inequalities as a source of confl ict in global politics and illuminates divisions within groups—as well as linkages among groups—not only along national lines but also along gender, race, class, sexuality, and culture lines. The corollary of this, addressed in the fi nal chapter, is that many people are resisting global-politics-as-usual by fi nding common cause with each other across national boundaries and “identity politics” and thus creating a diff erent kind of international relations from that of elite policymakers.

#### A gendered lens incorporates other perspectives and prevents quick fix band-aid solutions

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Introduction, pg 24/// MF)

The gender(ed), or intersectional feminist, lenses that arise from feminist in combination with other critical perspectives on global politics are applied to the traditional categories of global politics inquiry: global governance ( Chapter 3 ), global security ( Chapter 4 ), and global political economy ( Chapter 5 ). It is within these chapters that historical and contemporary gender(ed) divisions of power, violence, and labor and resources and the global crises of representation, insecurity, and sustainability they spawn are fl eshed out empirically and ana-lytically. The employment of multiple feminist perspectives and the empirical research they are generating foregrounds the substantial body of work that now exists in feminist IR, 6which is contributing to, as well as based on, data now being produced by IGOs and NGOs on the gender(ed) eff ects of global political priorities, processes, and institutions and attempts to ameliorate them. The diversity of feminist IR thought and research also aff ords more com-plex and sometimes confl icting gender or gendered analyses of global politics. The benefi ts of this diversity are that it militates against resorts to “quick fi xes” that can do more harm than good and ensures no single or hegemonic analysis that forecloses debate and further investigation within feminist inquiry. At the same time, weaknesses in feminist inquiry and appropriations of gender analysis in policymaking are raised when they fail to address the gendered power relations among women and among men that forestall more comprehensive critiques and resistances to processes that widen and deepen global and local inequalities.

#### The current system of a gender lens reinforces gender binaries and the idea of essentialism – only a gendered lens solves and overcomes these ideas

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Gender(ed) Lenses on Global Politics, pgs 38-40/// MF)

On the other hand, feminists, queer, and trans critics of heteronormativity and gender normativity have exposed the assumption of binary sex diff erence as stunted (reducing “sex” to paired opposites, precluding alternatives and commonalities), static (neglecting historical shifts in how “sex” is “seen” and responded to), simplistic (obscuring the complexity of “sex” and its relationship to gender), and politically problematic (unrefl ectively essentializing what is historically situated and socially constructed). Feminist research has additionally docu-mented the deeply sedimented normalization of dichotomized gender (generated by essen-tializing sex as a binary) as a governing code valorizing what is privileged as masculine at the expense of what is stigmatized as feminine. Gendered socialization and social control mechanisms amplify individual and collective internalization of, and investments in, repro-ducing gendered orderings. Here it is argued that more adequate analyses of power require attending to and integrating the critical insights particularly of poststructuralist, postcolonial, feminist, queer, and trans lenses. In particular, to comprehend the resilience of hierarchical thinking and its reproduction of divisions and inequalities requires making sense of the power of gender as a hegemonic and pernicious but typically unacknowledged worldview.

Stated simply and based on the discussion of the power of gender in Chapter 1 , the “naturalness” of sex difference becomes indistinguishable from the “naturalness” of dichotomized and hierarchical gender differentiation that we reproduce, consciously and unconsciously, as we act out gender in all areas of social life. Because of this interaction, gendered stereotypes have political significance far beyond their role in male–female relations. First, gender normalizes dichotomized thought as a deeply embedded practice reproduced throughout social orders. Second, the gender dichotomy is so taken as given that it lends authority to the binary logic that “naturally” divides terms and identity groups into polarized opposites. The naturalness of dichotomized gender then becomes indistinguishable from—and lends credibility and authority to—the naturalness of dichotomized thinking. Third, the normaliza-tion of dichotomized thinking reproduces not only gender hierarchy but also other relations of inequality as dichotomies are taken for granted and eff ectively legitimate hierarchical ordering.

At the same time and as argued earlier, the binary logic of positivist orientations normal-izes and privileges thinking in dichotomies. The elevated status of this logic lends credibility and authority to the practice of essentializing categories as paired opposites, valuing one over the “other” term, and normalizing domination of whatever and whoever is “othered.” In this sense, the normalization of dichotomies in modernist thought lends credibility and authority to the binary of sex and dichotomy of gender. Insofar as other familiar dichotomies have gen-dered connotations (culture–nature, reason–emotion, autonomy–dependency, public–private), when they are deployed in modernist thought, they buttress the stereotypes of masculine and feminine.

This is what is meant by mutually reinforcing: the dichotomy of gender gains its natural-ness by being grounded in the assumption of essentialized sex diff erence; gendered orderings are normalized by being reproduced throughout social life; dichotomies gain their taken-for-granted and even desirable status by being privileged in modernist thought and acquiring credibility through the “reality” of pervasive gendered diff erentiation. The mutually reinforcing interplay of essentializing sex, dichotomizing gender, and the binary logic of positivism generates the constellation of dimensions of the meta-lens of the power of gender. Recog-nizing the power of these coding and fi ltering devices is crucial for improving our ability to see beyond essentialized identities and oppositional “wholes.” Thus, feminists argue that dichotomized thinking cannot be adequately understood, critiqued, or eff ectively transformed without addressing how sex-diff erentiated gender grounds, naturalizes, and reproduces binary thinking.

These points are crucial to the arguments of this text because the perpetuation of dichotomized thinking and its gendered normalizations reproduces hierarchical divisions and, hence, antagonistic relations between groups. But the power of gender also operates to obscure intersectionality, and, thus, the gendered power relations and divisions discussed in Chapter 1 . When the power of gender focuses attention on essentialized notions of gender—masculinity and femininity—we fail to see these as constructed and crosscutting dimensions operating within any particular group and across groups. This is among the problems with the way in which gender has been taken up by international policymakers, not as a matter of equality and social justice, but rather instrumentalizing women’s empowerment to try to “fi x” serial crises without addressing deeper ones that arise from not only gender but also gendered divisions. Similarly, when essentialized notions of group identities erase the diff erentiations within them, we fail to see the complexity of social orders and how inequalities are often sustained by pitting subordinated groups against each other. We are seeing this now in the rise of illiberal democracies resulting from the cultivation of ethno-nationalist and masculin-ist political backlash, associated with some (typically white, global North, working-class, and heterosexual) men falling down the economic ladder and “strong man” political rhetoric that places the blame for this on groups also in increasing and often greater precarity. Such blaming defl ects attention from the global crises that are producing and are the result of vast and intersecting inequalities, while undermining the equality struggles of all subordinated groups. This militates against the potential for coalitions and more comprehensive resistances to unjust social and global political orders. Deploying intersectional analysis facilitates a more comprehensive notion of gender equality that is indivisible from racial, class, and sex-ual equality and equality among nations. It encourages contemporary feminist IR scholars to ask not just “Where are the women?” but also “Which women?” and “Where are the men and which men?”

### Fem lens – general

#### Feminist perspectives are needed in IR to reveal the issues in how power is viewed in traditional IR

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Introduction, pgs 11-12 /// MF)

In IR, as in political science generally, power is usually defi ned as “power over,” specifi -cally, the ability to get someone to do what you want. It is usually measured by control of resources, especially those supporting physical coercion. The appropriate analogy might be power understood as tools: if you have them, you can use them to get certain things done if and when you choose, and some have more of these tools than others. This defi nition assumes measurable capacities, privileges instrumental rationality, and emphasizes separation and competition: those who have power use it (or its threat) to keep others from securing enough to threaten them. The emphasis on material resources and coercive ability defl ects attention from the fact that power reckoning is embedded in dominant conceptual orders, value systems, disciplinary practices, and institutional dynamics.

In IR, the concept of “political actor”—the legitimate wielder of society’s power—is derived from classical political theory. Common to constructions of “political man”—from Plato and Aristotle to Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau—is the privileging of “man’s” capacity for reason. Rationality ostensibly distinguishes man from other animals and explains his pursuit of freedom—from nature and “necessity” as well as from tyranny. Feminist scholarship has exposed how models of human nature presupposed in constructions of political man are not in fact gender-neutral but are androcentric , based on exclusively male (especially elite male) experience and perspective. With reference to gender divisions of power, “woman” is excluded conceptually from political power by denying her the rationality that marks “man” as the highest animal. Substantively, women have historically been excluded from political power by states’ limiting citizenship to those who perform military duty and/or are property owners. Under these conditions, most women are structurally excluded from formal politics, even though individual women in exceptional circumstances have wielded considerable political power. Women worldwide have largely won the battle for the vote, though defi ni-tions of citizenship continue to limit women’s access to public power and women’s political power is circumscribed by a variety of indirect means (discussed more in Chapter 3 ). Most obvious are the continued eff ects of the dichotomy of public–private that privileges men’s productive and “political” activities over women’s reproductive and “personal/familial” activities. For example, sovereign man and sovereign states are defi ned not by connection or relationships but by (masculinist) autonomy in decision-making and putative freedom from interdependence and collective responsibilities. Although Aristotle acknowledged that the public sphere depends upon the (re)production of life’s necessities in the private sphere, he denied the interdependence that this implies in articulating political theory.

#### The idea of power within traditional IR is based on historical ideas of “men” and colonization – feminist perspectives are key to taking all aspects into consideration

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Introduction, pgs 11-12 /// MF)

In IR, as in political science generally, power is usually defi ned as “power over,” specifi -cally, the ability to get someone to do what you want. It is usually measured by control of resources, especially those supporting physical coercion. The appropriate analogy might be power understood as tools: if you have them, you can use them to get certain things done if and when you choose, and some have more of these tools than others. This defi nition assumes measurable capacities, privileges instrumental rationality, and emphasizes separation and competition: those who have power use it (or its threat) to keep others from securing enough to threaten them. The emphasis on material resources and coercive ability defl ects attention from the fact that power reckoning is embedded in dominant conceptual orders, value systems, disciplinary practices, and institutional dynamics.

In IR, the concept of “political actor”—the legitimate wielder of society’s power—is derived from classical political theory. Common to constructions of “political man”—from Plato and Aristotle to Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau—is the privileging of “man’s” capacity for reason. Rationality ostensibly distinguishes man from other animals and explains his pursuit of freedom—from nature and “necessity” as well as from tyranny. Feminist scholarship has exposed how models of human nature presupposed in constructions of political man are not in fact gender-neutral but are androcentric , based on exclusively male (especially elite male) experience and perspective. With reference to gender divisions of power, “woman” is excluded conceptually from political power by denying her the rationality that marks “man” as the highest animal. Substantively, women have historically been excluded from political power by states’ limiting citizenship to those who perform military duty and/or are property owners. Under these conditions, most women are structurally excluded from formal politics, even though individual women in exceptional circumstances have wielded considerable political power. Women worldwide have largely won the battle for the vote, though defi ni-tions of citizenship continue to limit women’s access to public power and women’s political power is circumscribed by a variety of indirect means (discussed more in Chapter 3 ). Most obvious are the continued eff ects of the dichotomy of public–private that privileges men’s productive and “political” activities over women’s reproductive and “personal/familial” activities. For example, sovereign man and sovereign states are defi ned not by connection or relationships but by (masculinist) autonomy in decision-making and putative freedom from interdependence and collective responsibilities. Although Aristotle acknowledged that the public sphere depends upon the (re)production of life’s necessities in the private sphere, he denied the interdependence that this implies in articulating political theory.

With reference to gender ed divisions of power, “political man” also presupposed “civiliza-tional” status: early Greek texts excluded “barbarians” and Persians; premodern European texts excluded “primitives” and racialized “others” within Europe and outside it as coloniza-tion proceeded. Indeed, racialization is historically inextricable from the expansionary and colonizing practices of European elites who deployed Enlightenment ideas (“reason,” “science”) and new technologies (gunpowder, steam engine) to enhance their power over foreign populations, thus enabling the extraction of resources and labor to fuel European “modernization” and geopolitical dominance. “Eurocentrism” is an ideology of European superiority that arose from this conquest and is often used interchangeably with “Western-centrism” in more recent times. “Orientalism” (Said 1979) is one eff ect of Eurocentrism (or “Occidentalism”), consigning the “non-West” to the status of cultural, political, economic, and technological backwardness. Such backwardness is assumed, in Eurocentric and Orien-talist thinking, to need stimulation from the West to “develop” or “modernize” or “progress.” Thus, men and women of various colonized, racialized, and classed groups have been excluded over time from political power by various means: barred on the basis of property claims, denied leadership in their own lands by colonial domination, displaced to other lands and denied power through slavery and debt bondage, and more generally excluded from citizenship rights based on criteria related to birth location, “appropriate” documentation, or “economic” status. Although after World War II resistance to direct colonial rule was largely successful, more indirect “neocolonial” or “neoimperial” rule (sometimes referred to as “recolonization”), in which former colonial or newer superpowers control or seek to control the polities and economies of formerly colonized nations, has continued. Such labels as “developed” versus “developing” countries or the terms “First” and “Third” Worlds attest to the maintenance colonial logics that construct the West (or the North more broadly) as more advanced politically and economically than the rest. Colonial logics also continue through sexualized as well as racialized divisions of power, justifying the invasion or control of “others” by coding the West as uniquely moral and “respectable,” as well as racially superior.

Today, most people have a “right” to political participation, but the most powerful decision-makers in global politics are those occupying positions of power in national and international governmental institutions and transnational corporations. Occupants of these positions now include elites from both the global North and the global South, terms used in this text to avoid such problematic and inaccurate references as developed vs. developing countries or First vs. Third Worlds. Such elites, regardless of their geographic origin, continue to refl ect privileged statuses, especially of national and economic power, which are derived from being members of the dominant ethnicity/race, class, gender, and sexuality.

[Anne Sisson Runyan.Global Gender Politics]

#### Feminist approaches to IR are key to overcome the resilience and effects of traditional ir

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Gender(ed) Lenses on Global Politics, pg 27 /// MF)

As argued in the introductory chapter, the power of gender is an especially resilient and adaptive fi ltering and organizing mechanism, a meta-lens that produces particular ways of seeing, thinking, and acting in the world. Gender may feature in policymaking, women and men may be repositioned, and ideal forms of masculinity may shift, but as long as the power of gender as a meta-lens continues to operate, it will produce and reproduce inequalities, injustices, and crises of global proportion. Here the central case made is that feminist lenses , and particularly intersectional ones, often in concert with other lenses critical of conventional IR approaches, are necessary to reveal the extent of the power of gender to produce and obscure inequalities and the global crises that ensue from and sustain inequalities.

#### Fem ir accounts for power in a more broad sense thus challenging the assumptions that traditional IR was built upon

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Gender(ed) Lenses on Global Politics, pgs 27-28 /// MF)

Feminist IR scholars, emerging in the discipline by the 1980s, generally do not subscribe to the conventional defi nition of IR as being the power struggles between sovereign states in an anarchic world in which there is no supranational government to control state behaviors through the rule of law. Rather, these scholars favor an alternative defi nition of IR: “the iden-tifi cation and explanation of social stratifi cations and of inequality as structured at the level of global relations” (Brown 1988: 461). In this sense, feminist perspectives on IR understand power in broader and more complex terms than more conventional IR scholars do, and have sought to put the relations of people, as agents and within social structures, back into IR. To do so, these IR scholars have relied on feminist sociopolitical theorizing in other disciplines, including the now well-developed (inter)discipline of women’s, gender, and sexuality studies.

They have also relied on, and contributed to, an array of other IR lenses, arising prior to and after the emergence of feminist IR, that critique conventional IR for such things as assuming reality is given rather than socially constructed, centering the state and state elites as the main actors in world aff airs to the exclusion of actors above and below the state, and failing to see or center how global power structures and relations immiserate the majority of the world’s people and the planet. What connects what are broadly referred to here as critical lenses or perspectives on IR is the view that conventional IR, as a result of its focus on political and economic elites and state power, and its relative blindness to the deleterious eff ects of dominant political, economic, and social arrangements upheld by elites and states, is oriented to serving elites to maintain global power structures. Thus, conventional IR is not value-free. Critical perspectives, which maintain no knowledge is value-free and that scholars should acknowledge their always present values or normative commitments that invariably shape the questions they ask, are, in contrast, oriented to producing more “emancipatory” knowledge, which confronts global power structures and relations and their eff ects on peoples and the planet. Critical perspectives, however, do diff er in terms of which global power struc-tures and relations they highlight, how those structures and relations are understood, and what to do about them. Feminist IR perspectives center gender as a global power relation and structure. But as presented in Chapter 1 and expanded upon in this chapter, feminist intersec-tional analysis in IR goes beyond a gender lens to encompass a gendered lens that highlights the interconnections among global power relations and structures.

This chapter begins with an account of how lenses work and why they matter in a general sense. It then moves to a discussion of IR lenses. Despite the proliferation of such lenses, certain conventional ones still hold sway and take us down very narrow and problematic paths. Why this is the case is particularly explored through a discussion of more privileged positivist knowledge production in conventional IR versus more marginalized postpositivist knowledge production in critical approaches to IR of which feminist IR is a part. Feminist IR, and the multiple perspectives in and approaches to it, is the subject of the rest of the chapter. This discussion includes how feminist IR in particular challenges the power of gender that especially infuses conventional IR lenses and makes them hegemonic or dominant in unques-tioned ways, and produces research that is dedicated to revealing and countering gender and gendered divisions of power, violence, labor, and resources in global politics. Such research informs the empirical fi ndings and analysis presented in Chapters 3 , 4 , and 5 , which examine gender and gendered divisions and their contributions to global crises in the contexts of global governance, security, and political economy.

#### Viewing IR through a new lens transforms how we view our understanding of who fills what roles in IR, instead of merely revealing the inequalities

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Gender(ed) Lenses on Global Politics, pg 33 /// MF)

Gender inquiry in IR began with the question “Where are the women?” in international aff airs, as they appeared absent in typical accounts of the rise of great powers, their leaders, their weaponries, and their wars, as well as in dominant theories about the nature of and interactions among states and their economies. At fi rst glance, activities associated with masculinity (e.g., competitive sports, politics, militaries) appear simply as those in which men are present and women are absent and only the men engaging in these activities need be attended to. Gender analysis, however, reveals how women are in fact important to the picture (enabling men’s activities, such as providing reasons for men to fi ght), even though women and the roles they are expected to play are obscured when we focus only on men. Through a gender lens, we see how constructions of masculinity (agency, control, aggression) are not independent of, but rely upon, contrasting constructions of femininity (dependence, vulner-ability, passivity). In an important sense, the dominant presence of men and the overvaluing of masculinity depend on the absence of women and the devaluing of femininity. Because of this interdependence, using gender analysis in IR does not merely reveal heretofore-unseen conditions and roles of women in global politics, but “transforms” what we know about men and the activities they undertake in international aff airs. Hence, the study of gender alters our understandings of the conventional foci of IR—power politics, war, and economic control—by exposing what more deeply underpins them and why they are given such prominence over other ways of thinking about and acting in the world.

#### A feminist lens takes into other structures of power and inequalities into its evaluation of IR and it proves that simply using gender as a meta-lens has more widespread effects

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Gender(ed) Lenses on Global Politics, pgs 32-33 /// MF)

Feminist IR lenses (see, for example, Tickner and Sjoberg 2011; Tickner 2014; Steans and Tepe-Belfrage 2016) focus on gender and its relation to other inequalities, and the political nature and eff ects of masculinist and other inequality-producing orders. As such, they are highly infl uenced by (neo)Marxist, poststructural, and postcolonial thinking in and outside of IR. More recently, queer and trans theorists in IR (see, for example, Weber 2016; Peterson 2014; Sjoberg 2012), many of whom are feminist, have directed greater attention to the implications of heteronormativity and gender conformity not only for sexual and gender minorities, but also for the further disruption of binaries in IR.

In general, gender analysts in IR operate from feminist perspectives, which, although varied (as discussed later in this chapter), share, minimally, a concern with the problem of gender inequality as a motivation for research. They have found in their examinations that individuals, institutions, and practices associated with masculinity (men, states, war-making, wealth production) remain highly valued (or valorized) in political and world political thought, whereas those individuals, institutions, and practices associated with femininity (women, local or international political formations, peacemaking, poverty reduction) have been more typically devalued (or devalorized) and even dismissed in such thinking until very recently. Again, this is key to what is meant in this text by the power of gender — the perva-siveness of gender as a fi ltering category, or meta-lens, that puts in motion the broad processes of masculinization and feminization. That is, gender-sensitive research does more than docu-ment the pattern of excluding or trivializing women and their experiences while infl ating men’s experiences and power. It documents how gender—characterizations of masculinity and femininity—can infl uence the very categories and frameworks within which scholars work.

#### In practice, lenses become self-fulfilling prophecies that inevitably escalate conflict

Anne **Ruyan**, 20**18** (Ruyan, professor in the School of Public and International Affairs, faculty affiliate of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of Cincinnati and has a PhD in International Relations. “Global Power Politics” Gender(ed) Lenses on Global Politics, pgs 28-29 /// MF)

In simple terms, lenses focus our attention selectively. Selective attention is a necessary feature of making sense of any particular subject, practice, paradox, or social order. Because it is not physically possible for any human to see or comprehend everything at once, we rely on conceptual fi lters—lenses—that enable us to see some things in greater detail, with more accuracy, or in better relation to certain other things. Lenses simplify our thinking by focusing our attention on what seems most relevant. They “order” what we see and provide direction for subsequent actions. In this sense, lenses are like maps: they frame our choices, expectations, and explorations, enabling us to take advantage of knowledge already gained and, presumably, to move more eff ectively toward our objectives. Like maps, lenses enable us to make sense of where we are, what to expect next, and how to proceed. From the conceptual ordering systems available to us, we choose the lens we assume is most appropri-ate for a particular context—a lens that we expect will enable us to make sense of and act appropriately in that context.

Lenses are thus indispensable for ordering what we see and orienting our responses. But their fi ltering function is also problematic. Because we cannot focus on everything, any particular lens directs our attention to some features of a context, which unavoidably renders other features out of focus—fi ltered out—by that lens. In short, lenses both include and exclude, with important and often political implications.

By fi ltering our ways of thinking and ordering experience, the lenses we rely on have concrete eff ects. We observe this readily in the case of self-fulfi lling prophecies: if, for instance, we expect hostility, our own behavior (acting superior, displaying power) may elicit responses (defensive posturing, aggression) that we then interpret as confi rming our expecta-tions. It is in this sense that lenses and “realities” are interactive, interdependent, or mutually constituted. Lenses shape who we are, what we think, and what actions we take, thus shaping the world we live in. At the same time, the world we live in (“reality”) shapes which lenses are available to us, what we see through them, and the likelihood of our using them—or adjusting them—in particular contexts.

#### Current theorizing revealed that politics are defined in gendered ways, especially in international politics
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This was an important insight, but it still did not yield signifi cant change in women’s representation in political offi ce or signifi cantly increase women’s access to and participation in formal politics more generally. Such a focus on “women worthies” also limited feminist interventions to getting relatively few women into relatively few positions of formal power. This led feminist political theorists to question the very defi nition of politics and the standards by which political behavior is judged. 1 That public-sphere, formal politics is only one form of politics was revealed by showing how the private sphere and everyday life are shot through with power relations and negotia-tions (“the personal is political”). This also drew attention to the ways in which women engaged in non-formal political action to turn practices assumed to be natural and unchange-able (such as rape and domestic violence) into “political” (and thus changeable) “issues.” Feminist political theorizing also revealed that formal politics was defi ned, and political behavior judged, on the basis of (hegemonic) male norms that privileged notions of politics as winner-take-all aff airs, eff ectively necessitating individualist and aggressive traits to be successful in such politics. This problem is magnifi ed in the case of international politics, which could be defi ned as hypermasculinist when compared with masculinist domestic politics. Feminists have also shown that domestic politics, as not only national but also local, household, and interpersonal politics, is not separate from international politics, arguing that “the personal is international” (Enloe 1989).

#### Contemporary fem IR reveals and overcomes the mistakes – like exclusion - made by traditional IR
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In the contemporary period, feminist IR is characterized as consisting of two major and interactive areas of inquiry—feminist security studies (FSS) 4 and feminist international (or global) political economy (F(I or G)PE) studies. 5 FSS scholars engage with and critique conventional, state-centric understandings of war, peace, and security that remain at the center of the discipline of IR and challenge the everyday as well as international violence they leave in place. They re-theorize such concepts as states, just war, the democratic peace, and human security through a gender(ed) lens while emphasizing the role of “subjectivities,” human “agency,” and “discourses” (or narratives) as well as bodies and emotions in the production and experience of direct violence, from the intimate to the global (Hudson 2018: 129). F(I or G)PE scholars focus most on “economic insecurities” produced by neo(colonial-ism), (capitalist) economic development, and globalization and the gendered nature of these processes (Hudson 2018: 129). They apply more materialist analyses to reveal how conven-tional accounts of the global political economy and its global governance structures fail to understand how the political economy of gender—from the sex, domestic labor, and beauty trades to the reliance on women’s unpaid reproductive labor to make up for declining wages, public services, and environmental protection standards under global (and fi nancial) capitalism—underpins unjust global economic relations. As a result, they are more focused on structural violence. However, FSS and F(I or G)PE scholarship often intersect, such as in studies on the political economy of peacekeeping in rural societies that disregards women’s economic roles in the gathering of food and fuel far away from homes and refugee camps, making them most vulnerable to attacks, or in studies on the privatization of security forces, either as subcontracted or mercenary labor, which is implicated in greater direct (including sexual) violence being perpetrated on local populations (particularly women) with less accountability than state militaries (Hudson 2018: 135). Although FSS inquiry is highlighted in Chapter 4 and F(I or G)PE inquiry is highlighted in Chapter 5 of this text, as is argued throughout the book, there are strong connections made between direct and structural violence and discursive and material forms of violence in much current feminist IR scholarship. 6

As interrelated FSS and F(I or G)PE research has burgeoned, scholars working in these areas have multiplied the methodologies used in IR inquiry in order to get at the multiple ways in which global politics is gendered. In contrast to conventional positivist IR research, feminist IR scholars (and other transnational feminist scholars who engage with and contribute to feminist IR thought) have often utilized such qualitative approaches as ethnographic fi eldwork to learn about the lives of the non-elite, social action research through participant observation of social movements, and discourse analysis of classic IR texts, world leaders’ pronouncements, (inter)governmental policies and documents, NGO campaigns, and local group articulations of social problems. In doing so, they consider the role of emotion and bodily experience in the production and reproduction of global political actions and reactions. They thus participate in what is referred to as the “aff ective” turn in IR inquiry, which destabilizes rational actor claims in IR and takes seriously how global politics thought and practice are embodied phenomenon. They also plumb cultural sources, such as popular culture images on the airwaves and the Internet and even literature, art, and poetry, to fi nd expressions over time and space of resistance to global politics-as-usual in unusual places (Ackerly, Stern, and True 2006). As a result, feminist scholarship, as well as, increasingly, other critical scholarship, also engages in what has been referred to as the “visual” or “aesthetic” turn in IR inquiry, which examines such things as images, mediascapes, places, and cartographies to better understand how global politics is embedded in, shaped by, productive, and reproductive of cultural construction and processes.

Such practices seek to reveal the underside of global politics, simultaneously exposing the gendered dynamics that underlie and infect the thought, language, structures, and practices of it and privileging dissident and alternative voices about how it might be rethought, reartic-ulated, and rearranged. These practices also require refl exivity about the power relations between the researcher and the researched. In cases of “studying down”—such as working with non-elite actors—feminist IR scholars aim to be cognizant of their privilege and, thus, their responsibility to allow such actors to represent themselves in their own ways so as not to impose Eurocentric/Orientalist, heteronormative, gender normative, or classist interpreta-tions on the motivations, nature, and outcomes of their struggles. When “studying up”—or dealing with elite or more privileged actors—feminist IR scholars aim to be cognizant of how such actors limit access to researchers engaged in critical scholarship and mystify their power through bureaucratic language. Discourse analysis is thus especially productive when studying up because it enables reading between the lines and catching how the powerful con-sistently represent themselves and how they consistently represent “others” to justify their policies and actions. In these ways, feminist IR scholarship itself seeks to counter the crisis of representation both in the fi eld of IR, in which the study of people and especially non-elite people has historically been absent, and in global politics, which has historically operated as if people and especially non-elite people did not matter. Moreover, it has ignored how bodies, embodied experiences, and embodied thought are integral to producing and understanding global political phenomenon

#### Discourse analysis avoids additional stereotyping and counters exclusion in IR and the world globally
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Such practices seek to reveal the underside of global politics, simultaneously exposing the gendered dynamics that underlie and infect the thought, language, structures, and practices of it and privileging dissident and alternative voices about how it might be rethought, reartic-ulated, and rearranged. These practices also require refl exivity about the power relations between the researcher and the researched. In cases of “studying down”—such as working with non-elite actors—feminist IR scholars aim to be cognizant of their privilege and, thus, their responsibility to allow such actors to represent themselves in their own ways so as not to impose Eurocentric/Orientalist, heteronormative, gender normative, or classist interpreta-tions on the motivations, nature, and outcomes of their struggles. When “studying up”—or dealing with elite or more privileged actors—feminist IR scholars aim to be cognizant of how such actors limit access to researchers engaged in critical scholarship and mystify their power through bureaucratic language. Discourse analysis is thus especially productive when studying up because it enables reading between the lines and catching how the powerful con-sistently represent themselves and how they consistently represent “others” to justify their policies and actions. In these ways, feminist IR scholarship itself seeks to counter the crisis of representation both in the fi eld of IR, in which the study of people and especially non-elite people has historically been absent, and in global politics, which has historically operated as if people and especially non-elite people did not matter. Moreover, it has ignored how bodies, embodied experiences, and embodied thought are integral to producing and understanding global political phenomenon

#### Men are not inherently prone to war – its been socially constructed
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Nevertheless, still other contemporary feminists have shown, most recently quantitatively as noted in Chapters 1 and 2, that there is a powerful and direct relationship between inter-national violence and domestic violence, which gives women particular interests in resisting warfare and war preparedness because it produces men who do not visit violence only on the “enemy” but also on their own wives, partners, and children. But men, too, feminists have argued, can develop interests in resisting war because of the harm it does to their bodies and psyches, leading to the destruction of their loved ones and their own selves. What keeps more men—particularly those in subordinate military positions whose bodies are most on the line—from developing such interests is the valorization of war as the penultimate masculine activity through which men can prove they are “real men” (Whitworth 2008). As pointed out in Chapters 1 and 2 , heteronormative masculinity is an elastic construct, but it is also an extraordinarily fragile and unstable one. Men are never suffi ciently masculine simply when they have the appropriate genitalia, and establishing masculinity is never a done deal: males face relentless pressures to demonstrate they are real men by exhibiting unequivocally mas-culine qualities and distancing themselves from what is defi ned as feminine (Kimmel 2008). Thus, masculinity is an identity that leaves men having to prove repeatedly that they have “it.” They are put in constant fear and anxiety that they will be dubbed less than “real men” and, therefore, be demoted down the gender hierarchy and be subject to greater violence by other, higher men.

#### Trying to be the “savior” especially if they believe they are vulnerable – history proves and it ends up foreclosing the possibility of change within the system
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On this point, Susan Faludi’s The Terror Dream (2007) continues to be quite instructive. Not only does this work document the resurgence in the US of a state security discourse proff ered across the airwaves, almost exclusively by military men (to the almost absolute exclusion of female and particularly feminist voices representing alternative views), in the fi rst few years of the post-9/11 period, but it also analyzes the resurgence of older sexist and racist mythologies from America’s past called up to cover up the chink in the sovereign man’s armor. Faludi asks us to consider the lionizing of male rescue workers at “ground zero” (and the attendant silencing of female rescue workers long discriminated against, as well as widows who questioned the US military response, because neither conformed with adulating male protection and security at any cost), the ersatz “rescue” of US soldier Jessica Lynch supposedly from rapacious Iraqi captors (who turned out to be caring medical personnel), or overblown (and in most cases untrue) claims about women opting out of the workplace to return home to raise babies and become “security moms” in support of war. She argues that these convenient “fi ctions” have roots in earlier frontier stories, captivity narratives, and Cold War hysterias. These get trotted out whenever there are fears of “masculine insuffi ciency” because hegemonic masculinity cannot countenance “vulnerability” (Faludi 2007: 280).

When we look more closely at the events behind these earlier narratives, we fi nd that white male frontiersmen (such as Daniel Boone) were, in fact, undistinguished as providers or protectors and more often relied on the provisioning and protective skills of their wives, children, and indigenous peoples to survive, and the majority of white women taken captive by indigenous peoples either preferred to stay with their newfound families into which they were adopted or won their release from their captors on their own (Faludi 2007: 212, 256–262). Nevertheless, Faludi argues, insecure times in patriarchal cultures ratchet up the need for elaborate mythologies that “measure national male strength by female peril,” requiring that “women be saved from more and more gruesome violation to prove their saviors’ valor” (2007: 262). In the US white patriarchal cultural imagination, that peril is limited to con-cerns for white women and symbolized most by racialized men, whether they be indigenous “captors” of old and newer Iraqi ones, the “yellow” and “Hun” hordes of World War II, or the “red” communist threat of the Cold War. In each case, fears of “alien” invasion required the “securing of American domesticity,” which conjured images of (white) women (re)confi ned to the home front, obsessions with “women’s sexual purity” supposedly at risk from racial-ized men, and a summoning of “John Wayne and his avenging brethren” (Faludi 2007: 282–283, 286).

Thus, in each case, we also see a “remasculinization of America” (Jeff ords 1989). A number of periods of this have occurred since the 1980s. Seeking to put behind them the defeat in Vietnam that led to a more chastened view about the value of military confl ict to solve problems and secure geopolitical objectives, Reagan-era neoconservatives—through public discourse and policy and even popular culture—rehabilitated the Rambo-esque masculinist and militarist values of might makes right, unfettered by “feminine” considerations about the costs and usefulness of war. The post-9/11 remasculinization of America under yet another neoconservative government was justifi ed with resort to the necessity of war arising from some inevitable “clash of civilizations” in which one ethnic and religious fundamentalism must combat another (the West/Christianity against the East/Islam), but also with resort, at least for a short time, to the claim that the war in Afghanistan was about civilized men (in the West) saving women from barbaric men (the Taliban). Today, under a far-right regime that claimed the previous more liberal one was “weak” on security (despite a record of massive deportations and drone warfare in the midst of troop drawdowns in Iraq and Afghanistan), has reignited obsessions with “homeland security” now entwined with discourses of “America fi rst” that justify, for example, wall-building on the basis of such specious arguments as keeping Mexican “rapists” out.

In such times, Faludi reminds us that the constant replaying of this “security myth” and the remasculinization of leadership and civil society it entails disables an alternative response. Such a response “involves learning to live with insecurity, fi nding accommodation with—even drawing strength from—an awareness of vulnerability” (2007: 286) in order not to create sacrifi cial altars, but instead to create space for multiple and less vitriolic voices and ways of acting and being.

#### States try to be the “savior” especially if they believe they are vulnerable – history proves
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On this point, Susan Faludi’s The Terror Dream (2007) continues to be quite instructive. Not only does this work document the resurgence in the US of a state security discourse proff ered across the airwaves, almost exclusively by military men (to the almost absolute exclusion of female and particularly feminist voices representing alternative views), in the fi rst few years of the post-9/11 period, but it also analyzes the resurgence of older sexist and racist mythologies from America’s past called up to cover up the chink in the sovereign man’s armor. Faludi asks us to consider the lionizing of male rescue workers at “ground zero” (and the attendant silencing of female rescue workers long discriminated against, as well as widows who questioned the US military response, because neither conformed with adulating male protection and security at any cost), the ersatz “rescue” of US soldier Jessica Lynch supposedly from rapacious Iraqi captors (who turned out to be caring medical personnel), or overblown (and in most cases untrue) claims about women opting out of the workplace to return home to raise babies and become “security moms” in support of war. She argues that these convenient “fi ctions” have roots in earlier frontier stories, captivity narratives, and Cold War hysterias. These get trotted out whenever there are fears of “masculine insuffi ciency” because hegemonic masculinity cannot countenance “vulnerability” (Faludi 2007: 280).

When we look more closely at the events behind these earlier narratives, we fi nd that white male frontiersmen (such as Daniel Boone) were, in fact, undistinguished as providers or protectors and more often relied on the provisioning and protective skills of their wives, children, and indigenous peoples to survive, and the majority of white women taken captive by indigenous peoples either preferred to stay with their newfound families into which they were adopted or won their release from their captors on their own (Faludi 2007: 212, 256–262). Nevertheless, Faludi argues, insecure times in patriarchal cultures ratchet up the need for elaborate mythologies that “measure national male strength by female peril,” requiring that “women be saved from more and more gruesome violation to prove their saviors’ valor” (2007: 262). In the US white patriarchal cultural imagination, that peril is limited to con-cerns for white women and symbolized most by racialized men, whether they be indigenous “captors” of old and newer Iraqi ones, the “yellow” and “Hun” hordes of World War II, or the “red” communist threat of the Cold War. In each case, fears of “alien” invasion required the “securing of American domesticity,” which conjured images of (white) women (re)confi ned to the home front, obsessions with “women’s sexual purity” supposedly at risk from racial-ized men, and a summoning of “John Wayne and his avenging brethren” (Faludi 2007: 282–283, 286).