# Fem IR

### AT Not Intersectional

#### The K’s new view of the world through vulnerability creates a new language to view IR- that’s key to disrupting problematic narratives surrounding the western view of non-white, non-western women.

**Underwood**, Jasmine, "Feminist International Relations and “Epistemic Blank Spots”: Entrenching Hegemony?" (**2016**). Browse all Theses and Dissertations. 1679. [https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/etd\_all/1679 Accessed 7/22/22](https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/etd_all/1679%20Accessed%207/22/22) //ONHS IF

How do these themes/categories and tools of inquiry work together to depict the images of marginalized women and women in the developing world? Putting these together with the seven building tasks,7 we can gather how feminist International Relations literature has constructed and deconstructed the idea of the “third world women” and disrupted stereotypes and preconceived images of women around the world. The basic task of dismantling and decentering the current theoretical paradigms of mainstream IR by challenging its “western” origins served as the foundation to call into question the supposed objectivity of knowledge developed within the boundaries of this discipline (Sign Systems, and Knowledge). This ultimately leads to deconstruction of the masculinities, and consequently, the femininities derived from mainstream IR, which challenges the universalism of its principles. These principles are the basis under which knowledge is disseminated within the field and they dominate the ways in which we think about the world. Thus, to deconstruct and challenge these principles then “problematizes” all of the concepts and practices derived from them. When considering how feminist IR challenged and problematized development, this served as the basis for the building tasks of practices and politics. While international relations and the international system advocate for development as benevolent, in practice, this concept has been enacted (at times) with various self-interested outcomes by those in positions of power. Tickner pointedly referred to development as a “western project” and other theorists critiqued the western frame of development models and practices. Furthermore, if one thinks about the politics of development, this concept is complexly used to withhold social goods such as foreign aid or development assistance. The buildings tasks of relationships, identities, and connections are closely intertwined and dependent upon each other, especially in feminist IR. The literature also challenged, developed, and weaved together the various aspects of identity of women around the world. Challenging the views of women in the developing world also involved challenging how women in the developed world view their own status and position. Take, for example, the concepts of complicity and insider/outsider identities. The feminist IR literature strongly asserted that through actions such as underpaid household labor or unfair labor practices used to produce globally-shipped goods (e.g. buying items produced in sweatshops) women have participated in aspects of patriarchy that disadvantage others. Another example is “femocrats” or women in power who condone—or even advocate—certain policies that are steeped in hegemonic masculinity, such as war. These are women that have upheld certain aspects of patriarchy because it is beneficial to maintaining their own power. Thus, it forces women in the developed world to think about their relationship and connection to their counterparts in developing countries, particularly in ways that do not create them as abstract figures. If these women are oppressed, if they are “third world”; if they are disadvantaged, then, those in the “first world” are not disconnected from their position. This oppression did not—and does not—happen by coincidence. Women in the First World/developed countries/Global North bear some responsibility, whether implicitly or explicitly, in maintaining the disadvantaged social status of those outside the west. Furthermore, an interesting aspect of this analysis of feminist IR literature was not in how these pieces talked about women in developing countries or the “Third World,” but in how these women weren’t spoken about. Not in terms of making them invisible, but in not attempting to describe them; not attempting to speak for them, but straying away from one-dimensional or homogenized views of their lives. It seemed that the goal was simply to “trouble” the existing images and ways in which we think about these women and their lives. The task was not necessarily to describe, but instead, to deconstruct. Perhaps, this was a method to counter existing, problematic narratives, but without co-opting the stories of marginalized women for scholarly purposes. The previously identified themes and categories will be carried forward to the second part of the discourse analysis on policy literature. The purpose of the next chapter is to see if any of these objects in feminist IR literature have influenced and/or appear in the discourse of international women’s development policy. Summary When looking at the overall discourse of feminist IR literature, the not only stresses the idea of adding women to IR, but which women are added and whose voices are heard. This is disruptive to the discipline because of its agendered assumptions. The texts repeatedly and purposefully situate gender and international relations within a western context, to serve as a reminder that the international system has a specific sociocultural frame. This creates situated identities within this frame that may have been imposed upon individuals, particularly women in the “Third World”/ “Developing” world/ “Global South.” By giving examples of women’s agency, particularly in reference to women’s movements and civil society, it serves to uncover and build an image of these women separate from “western” created concepts. Often, images of marginalized individuals are depicted in relation to those in power, highlighting the (hierarchical) differences. Telling a plurality of stories decenters the singular frame in which one can see the world. Despite these attempts at disruption, the use of dichotomies shows the power of language and that one can only exist so far “outside the system” (even when aware of its pitfalls). This “discursive slippage” is a result of unconscious, habitual, and inherited language (Hooper, 2001; Runyan & Peterson, 2010). The continued use of western-imposed, hierarchical dichotomies means that uncovering new ways to view international relations requires new language to speak about international relations. Otherwise, feminist IR will disrupt discourse in one context, while entrenching it in another.

### Alt Ext

#### A feminist security theory is a needed disruption to the status quo. Only after we center feminist action and embrace vulnerability can we unearth and expunge power disparities and the violence of realism.

Talley Diggs, 6-15-22, Women, the State, and War: Considering Feminist Navigation of Security — THE INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS REVIEW, INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS REVIEW, https://www.iar-gwu.org/print-archive/7wok9nnd579m390qfsflq5x3x7p3c7, Accessed: 7-22-2022, //ONHS IF [edited for ableist language]

This paper argues for the utility of a feminist security theory (FST) that is developed from the intersection of feminism and the transnational security agenda. Theoretical lacunae exist in the security field because feminist theory is often granted only peripheral prioritization or no priority at all. FST is necessitated by the IR community’s ~~anemic~~ subpar effort to appropriate academic space to the nexus of security and feminism. These gaps in policy and discourse have begun to shrink, because “FST has subverted, expanded, and enriched notions of security” by questioning “the supposed nonexistence and irrelevance of women in international security politics,” as well as “the extent to which women are secured by state ‘protection’ in times of war and peace.”15 Within the nexus of feminist theory and a transnational security agenda, the dichotomy between traditional state security and newer notions of human security creates an evident aperture in feminist rhetoric and practiced security policy. Heidi Hudson describes her feminist perspective of the politics of security, stating: Today, more than ever, human security coexists uneasily with security. Since the analytical potential of feminist epistemology cannot be divorced from its political and transformative value, a critical feminist perspective on the study of security, and especially human security, is crucial to overcome certain gender silences. Feminist critiques of so-called natural or depoliticized gender dichotomies within state-centric discourse delegitimize discriminatory practices and institutions as socio-historical constructions and ‘repoliticize’ orthodox views of security by challenging the role of the state as provider of security. Gender is intrinsic to the subject matter and politics of security.16 A critical gender lens is imperative in identifying the power disparities that threaten women’s peace and security, which may otherwise go undetected or unchallenged by mainstream IR analysis. In the absence of feminist deconstruction, the gendered natures of war, peace, and security may not be exposed and recognized as products of the inherently gendered societies within which they occur. Without exposing this cycle, peace and security are compromised for all. Blanchard identifies “the functions of feminist scholarship in any disciplinary intervention—the critique of existing theory, the reconceptualization of core concepts, and the expansion of empirical knowledge.”17 It is not until realism’s assumptions about security are countered by feminism’s inclination to question the root of all assumptions that the biases inhibiting inclusive security can be identified and expunged. A disjunction in discourse and policy has emerged as a result of the incongruity between mainstream IR approaches to state security and feminist approaches to human security. I argue that advocacy efforts for human security, such as the security of women in war, are annulled and objectives are misrepresented when conducted in political institutions grounded in state security. This is due to the differences in how insecurities are perceived by proponents of human security and by bodies that are mandated to protect state security and interests. The utility of a security theory that employs a feminist lens rests in its keen dismissal of the status quo. The essence of realism— focusing on “what is” and not “what should be”—implies a dedication to status quo maintenance. Realists accept the international structures in existence under the assumption that what exists is unequivocally normative. Security, as it is interpreted by IR policymakers, suggests the necessary return to the status quo following a deviation from the norm. That which is deemed “insecure” is classified as such by its perceived abnormality—and thus its threat to the status quo. Therefore, the “task of feminist analysis—rendering the familiar strange, in this case by problematizing the naturalness of ‘security’” instigates scrutiny of classifications of security and insecurity.18 If states protect women during war from insecurity (identified as abnormal harms), what does that imply about states’ recognition of the daily harms occurring in times of peace that have been normalized within the contexts of a patriarchal society? I have illustrated the backdrop of realism and security studies to contextualize the framework within which feminist theory strives to broaden traditional security discourse. Through an array of reviewed literature, I have contextualized two theories to war, peace, and security: the mainstream realist approach focused on state security and the peripheral feminist approach interested in human security. By challenging the assumptions of realism, feminists problematize the status quo and question patriarchal structures to demand “where are the women?” Some scholars have argued for the necessary merger of the two theories into a feminist security theory to effectively address and combat the insecurities threatening peace and propagating conflict. Rethinking security with a feminist lens creates new analytical tools to assess existing policies in determining who is intended to receive protection from state-sanctioned security measures? Furthermore, from which insecurities are they protected?

#### Without embracing vulnerability and a new way of thinking about the political, the postwar condition recreates nationalistic violence and hegemonic sovereign power

Väyrynen, Tarja. “Rethinking National Temporal Orders: the Subaltern Presence and Enactment of the Political.” Review of International Studies, vol. 42, no. 4, 2016, pp. 597–612., doi:10.1017/S0260210515000595. Accessed 7/22/22. //ONHS IF

Feminist IR has drawn attention to bodies such as Kaisu’s in the literature where the role of women’s corporeality in symbolising the nation and its honour is studied, particularly in times of violence and war.26 The abject figures of, for example, ‘comfort women’ who have been subjected to nationalistic violence and ‘female terrorists and torturers’ taking part themselves in violence and war have been also brought to the research agenda of feminist IR. 27 Recently, Christine Sylvester’s War as Experience: Contributions from International Relations and Feminist Analysis28 has opened up a new domain for the study of violence and war as a corporeal and a mundane phenomenon. She suggests that war should be studied as an institution whose actual mission is to injure the human body and destroy normal patterns of interaction. Due to the overtly abstract notion of war in IR starting with states, organisations, fundamentalists, security issues and weapons systems, ordinary people and their bodies are overwhelmingly absent in IR and its studies of violence and war, and consequently of postwar peace too.29 Sylvester’s view resonates with Julia Kristeva’s quest for research that seeks concrete instances of ‘women’s time’. This type of research emerges from lived experiences and, thereby, can reveal alternative temporalities not heard in mass media or politics.30 Kaisu is certainly an ordinary person and yet she does more than could be expected from the ‘ordinary’: her performance and temporality disrupt and destabilise, and as such, stand as guarantee for the reconfiguring of the space of the political. Kaisu’s speech act as such does not constitute the political contestation. Rather, the contestation comes forth through an ensemble of performance at a moment when there is an ‘opening’ in the national historiography.31 In short, she exemplifies Sylvester’s point on the importance and unexpectedness of the mundane and corporeal in relation to war and to postwar national identity politics as well as Kristeva’s notion of alternative temporalities that rupture linear ‘normal’ time. To understand the ways Kaisu has symbolically functioned as an abject who has not been ‘taken into account’ 32 and how her narrative brings an anxiety to the core of the imagined unitary postwar Finnish nation, this article derives from the psychoanalytically oriented IR that examines the nexus between war and collective identity, memory, and history.33 In this vein of thought, war and violence are seen to be a constitutive and, at the same time, traumatic event in the nation’s existence as it reveals the instability of the sovereign subject that was thought to provide security. Jenny Edkins argues that sovereign power cannot provide full security for its members. Instead, it sends individuals to their deaths in the name of the survival of the collective self. It is in this sense, that war and violence constitute a trauma in the nation’s existence: they reveal the unstable nature of sovereign power as a security provider. 34 The postwar moment that follows the war and violence is a potential moment of social disintegration, in which the cohesive power of the ideology that has created the nation’s identity as the primary security provider loses its efficiency. In Jenny Edkin’s words, this is ‘trauma time’ when nothing is certain and no decision is assured.35 In a similar vein, Peter Burgess summarises the characteristics of the national subject during this moment by arguing that ‘the subject is, … unstable, exposed, threatened and at risk’. 36 Hence, a new master narrative is needed to stabilise the identity of the sovereign power and to make the war and the collective trauma readable for the national subjects. Postwar memory work is of primary importance when the mastery of the postwar anxiety is created and its collective effects are controlled. Since the nation’s identity is rendered extremely truncated, impossible, mutilated, and antagonistic during the war, collective memory work, and particularly history writing, functions as a tool to cement a closure. National history works to secure for a contingent nation the false unity of the national subject evolving through time. According to Prasenjit Duara, ‘the subject of History is a metaphysical unity devised to address the aporias in the experience of linear time’. 37 Furthermore, as a number of scholars have pointed out, the way in which wars are remembered and war history written is fundamental to the production and reproduction of postwar sovereign political power.38 By 2010, when Kaisu told her story, the Finnish nation had largely sedimented a master narrative of its post-Second World War national history and location in world politics.39 By coincidence, in the same year postwar ‘abject history’ got some official recognition when the Prime Minister’s Office and the National Archives of Finland commissioned a study on the children of foreign soldiers in Finland. It was the first officially initiated attempt to deal with the question of children fathered by foreign soldiers, and consequently the relations between Finnish women and foreign armies. However, Kaisu’s public appearance carried more historical weight than the officially commissioned report40 that was published a year later as her performance exposed her as a living container of residual historical material whose subaltern past made visible the disjuncture with the present view of the national self.

### AT Perm/AT TVA

#### They can’t perm- our poststructuralist feminism rejects the use of the state as a diluting factor to our radical politics.

OR

#### The TVA is illegitimate – it relies on the structures of liberal feminism and state apology. We reject the use of the state – it legitimizes hegemonic masculinity and reframes the state as our “protector”.

Al-Thani, Dana KJ. "Knowledge Production in International Relations: A Poststructural Feminist Critique of Liberal Feminism." Inquiries Journal 14.02 (2022). <http://www.inquiriesjournal.com/a?id=1937> Accessed 7/22/2022 //ONHS IF

Having argued that the core focus and methodology of the liberal feminist study of IR are gendered through a critique from the poststructural feminist lens, this section argues that the means by which liberal feminism studies IR also has consequences for the practice of IR. Thus, in highlighting the consequences of the liberal feminist study of IR on the practice of IR, this essay contends that the practice of IR is also inherently political. Drawing back on the liberal feminist claims analysed in the previous section, it is clear that liberal feminism wrongfully assumes that in utilising a positivist framework to study the subordination of women objective knowledge is produced. However, the knowledge that is produced by the popular liberal feminist analysis of IR does have a significant influence on the practice of IR specifically for the way that equality is defined and achieved. If the liberal feminist methodology of studying gender oppression is by examining their rights under the law then liberal feminism is actively producing individualist knowledge (Baehr, 2013). The liberal understanding of individualism is best described by John Stuart Mill who stated that "over his own body and mind, the individual is sovereign" (Mill, 1859:13). When this definition is applied to feminism it becomes clear that the goals of liberal feminism are that which emphasise the right of the individual such as, equality under the law, personal autonomy, freedom from discrimination from the state on the basis of gender and/or sex, etc. Thus, liberal feminism makes the assumption that the individual exists freely from its social condition. This liberal feminist understanding of the individual is rejected by poststructural feminism, as the poststructural feminist standpoint would argue that there is no such thing as the "fundamental or essential self, but instead, 'we speak ourselves into existence within the terms of available discourses' (Davies, 2000a, p. 55)" (Barrett, 2005:83). Thus, the poststructural feminist understanding of the relationship between the individual and discourse breaks down the liberal feminist notion of agency and autonomy, contending that the individual is a socially constructed phenomenon and every 'self' comes from and is defined by various discourses (Ibid:83). However, poststructural feminism does recognise some level of autonomy in recognising that the individual can control the discourses they are defined by and take up discourses that "disrupt hegemonic cultural narratives" in order to turn against the structures that produced them (Ibid:87). The opposing understanding of the significance of the individual between poststructural and liberal feminism highlights the political nature of knowledge produced by liberal feminism. Liberal feminism attempts to apply the Enlightenment concept of the "autonomous rational individual as a universal model of selfhood and starting point for political action" (Hooper, 2001). However, this concept disregards the fact that the female subject has been defined and constructed in an opposing manner to the male subject, thus the Enlightenment model is one that was constructed for a specific subject. Ultimately it is this disregard that not only defines the liberal feminist practice of achieving equality but the crux of the poststructural feminist critique on liberal feminism, as the liberal feminist commitment to the Enlightenment, manifests in a way that makes the practice blind to the politics of the very institutions it supposes will extend autonomy to deserving individuals. Therefore, in applying the poststructural feminist lens to the liberal feminist understanding of the individual, it becomes clear that liberal feminism has limited its practice to a constructed reality that overlooks the actual political needs of the female subject by wrongfully equating it to the male subject. The State Having investigated the effect of liberal feminist knowledge on the practice of liberal feminism within IR, via its political goals and conception of the individual, this essay now turns to the liberal feminist understanding of the state. Thus, this section argues that by applying the poststructural feminist lens it becomes clear that the liberal feminist understanding of the state is one that is riddled with political and gendered knowledge specifically through the role of the state as a 'protector'. As has been previously shown, the liberal feminist understanding of the state is that its role is to protect its citizens from coercive interference by protecting their rights both domestically and internationally from other states (Baehr, 2013). However, the liberal feminist understanding of the state as a 'protector' is a masculine understanding of international relations that applies gender binaries to the international stage in order to excuse non-cooperative behaviour. In her book, Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security, Judith Tickner analyses the feminist perspective on security arguing that the "security-seeking behaviour of states is described in gendered terms'' that ultimately impacts the practice of IR (1992:49). According to Tickner, states legitimise their security-seeking behaviour by appealing to "masculine hegemony", by which the state takes on the paternal role of 'protector' in order to justify violence (Ibid:49). Furthermore, Tickner highlights that in order to further legitimise security-seeking behaviour states utilise the ideology of the family in order to invoke a sense of community within the state so that there is a perception of national identity and community that needs protecting (Ibid:54). While Tickner takes on the broader feminist critique of popular understandings of security and the role of the state on the international stage, her critique is full of poststructural insights that highlight the cracks in the liberal feminist logic and the politics of its knowledge. Firstly, focusing on Tickner's claim that the state is described as a 'protector', many different things come to light. While liberal feminism is a feminist theory it differs from the majority of other feminist theories by critiquing who is involved in what processes rather than criticising the knowledge produced by popular IR theories. Therefore, liberal feminism follows the same popular logic that the state is a protector. The poststructural feminist understanding of binaries highlights that the protector/protected binary utilised when describing the state is a part of the larger masculine/feminine binary that plagues IR. This description of the state as a 'protector' not only feminises the domestic by describing it as incapable of self-preservation but delegitimises notions of peace by favouring the idea of 'protection' as it insinuates that peace is a naive ideal. Secondly, the process of a national identity drawing upon the ideology of family is one riddled with gender binaries that further delegitimises domestic politics. The state is both feminine and masculine. The home base for a state is the family/the feminine, whereas the state in IR is the action/the masculine. The separation of the state's public and private spheres into masculine and feminine descriptors highlights the power of language within discourses of IR as the liberal feminist description of the state, which it supposes to be neutral, is in fact not only gendered but actively devalues the feminine in order to maintain the current status quo of state behaviour. In all, by applying the poststructural feminist lens to the liberal feminist understanding of the state's role as a 'protector' the argument that knowledge production is always inherently political in the study and conduct of IR is further supported by uncovering the gendered nature of the liberal conception of the state. Conclusion In conclusion, while this essay recognises that poststructural feminism itself has no stance on the politics of knowledge production in the study and conduct of IR, poststructuralism still offers a valuable methodology by which political meaning can be uncovered. Thus, by utilising poststructuralism alongside feminism it becomes clear that the liberal feminist way of producing knowledge in the study and conduct within IR is inherently political as it is both based in and perpetuates a larger gender discourse within IR that has consequences. By adopting the poststructural feminist stance in order to critique liberal feminist notions of knowledge production, this essay analysed the foundations of liberalism and poststructuralism, the role of feminism with each theory respectively and then used the poststructural feminist lens in order to problematise the knowledge that liberal feminism has produced and legitimised on objectivity within IR and the consequences that knowledge has on the knowledge produced around concepts of the individual and the state. This investigation, in turn, revealed the underlying power dynamics within said structures and the way that gender within IR functions as a tool of not only oppression but legitimisation. Therefore, with this in mind, it remains the claim of this essay that the process of knowledge production is always inherently political in the conduct and study of IR

### Gendered Violence Impact ext

#### Hegemonic masculinity and war detract from existing, ongoing gendered violence within a state and outside of it.

Dutta, Ishita. “Feminist Perspective of the War,Peace and Politics in International Relations.” Modern Diplomacy, 14 May 2021, moderndiplomacy.eu/2021/05/15/feminist-perspective-of-the-warpeace-and-politics-in-international-relations. Accessed 7/22/22 //ONHS IF

India is a land where Mahatma Gandhi and his ideas of non-violence were born, but it is also the land where Mahatma Gandhi was assassin by Godse for preaching ‘Feminine’ ‘non-violent’ politics and for making Indian men less ‘manly’ by promoting peace. Masculinity is a social definition given to men and boys in society, it is associated with strong, powerful, brave, and macho characteristics. The understanding of security is limited for many years in international relations (IR) and hence the understanding of a secured state is associated with a leader who has masculine characteristics capable of handling security. Politics across the world is understood in the terms of power and strength of the leader and other masculine characteristics associated with being ‘manly’ enough to control a state. While feminine characteristics are associated with weak, soft, and gentle behavior, even when women are elected as leaders, they are expected to hold strong manly characters to stay in politics. Indira Gandhi, the first female prime minister of India, prefer being addressed herself as ‘sir’ and her policies did not include a gender perspective. In Gender, Justice and the Wars in Iraq (2006), Laura Sjoberg demonstrates that women’s presumed status as innocent civilians make wars harder, not easier, for them, by defining them as protected without regard for their actual safety. On Iraq’s economic sanctions, feminist insights from the study of economic sanctions as the war in international relations are not only valuable for their contribution to IR’s theories of sanctions, but also for their generalizability to IR’s crucial questions, such as what constitutes foreign policy, what counts as war, and how war affects people Feminists see that war and military are often threats to women’s and other vulnerable groups’ security as they are competitors for scarce resources during and after a war on which women may depend more than men, instead of seeing military power as part of a state’s defense against security threats from other states, it should be seen as a product of patriarchy. The large defense spending on soldiers and military weapons rather than creating a safe society for women at home or spending on climate action that could create safer lives for women is an example of a masculine approach to war. The feminist approach in IR demonstrates how the security of individuals is related to national and international politics and how international politics impacts the security of individuals even at the local level. IR feminist theories focus on social relations through gendered lens,rather than power relations or anarchy, they see an international system constituted by socially constructed and gender hierarchies that contribute to gender subordination rather than traditional understanding of security. In 2019 In the Lok Sabha elections of India, Narendra Modi, and his party used his 56-inch chest in the election campaign to associate his capability of handling the security of India with ‘manly’ characteristics. While more than 3 lakhs of children die due to starvation in India every year, the Indian prime minister wins elections by boasting about his 56-inch chest capable of defeating terrorists. Feminists believe that the social construction of masculine characteristics is reflected in politics especially in IR because political theory and practice are both dominated by men. The understanding of war and violence is also associated with men, it praises soldiers, diplomats, and leaders that promote protection from war. Modern Enlightenment science has incorporated a belief system that equates objectivity with masculinity and a set of cultural values that simultaneously elevates what is defined as scientific and what is defined as masculine. The western liberal and realist understanding of masculinity and politics are limited and discriminatory towards women. While the world is facing nationalism wave in politics, leaders like Narendra Modi, Donald Trump and Putin promote a masculine idea of Security in the world to protect their national interest and secure nation through military expansion. The understanding of security, war, and politics are interlinked in creating the foreign policy of a country. In a country like India, the United States, or Russia where leaders promote masculine characters through their election campaigns, where the state controls the reproductive decisions of women, or in a country like India where weapons are worshiped, the foreign policy and politics of the state are influenced by masculine characters and are valued for national security. Rape, domestic violence, harassment against women in their own country is not subjected to war but a traditional understanding of the war in IR as feminists have pointed out is as if women require protection during war and soldiers are fighting to protect the honor of women, in reality, it is often women’s protectors (men) who provide the greatest threat in everyday life. For feminist scholars, a security that is global and multidimensional with political, economic, and ecological facets that are as important as its military dimensions. The security of individuals and their natural environment is considered as much as the security of the state. National security needs to be inclusive of security of all from security threats such as domestic violence, rape, poverty, gender subordination, and ecological destruction as well as war. For example, Sweden has a feminist foreign policy, which means the understanding of security is through a gendered lens, feminist foreign policy not only broadens what security means but also who is guaranteed security in the world. While feminism is a new approach of though in IR, the case study of Sweden explains the importance of feminist foreign policy that believes in gender equality in decision making, promoting peace and does not promote masculine characteristics associated with war and use of force in foreign policy and makes secure, happier nations. While the discourse of security is dominated by masculine characteristics in IR, states can be secured with wider perspective of human security associated with gendered lens.