

[DOI: 10.20472/IAC.2016.024.003](https://doi.org/10.20472/IAC.2016.024.003)

DENIZ ALCA

Karabuk University, Turkey

SECURITY OF OPPRESSED AT MEN'S WAR

Abstract:

By the course of time to address human societies the term "men" has been used so manhood became the decisive constituent of "humanity". Security issues of any given society were and always have been the major justification instrument for this approach. Beyond humanities attachment to masculinity, war and eo ipso peace are Men's decision to make.

So rationel of men becomes the only logical explanation of the public realm. This understanding of common good comprehends war, peace and their contents limited to states, armies, soldiers and land, then the rest is just collateral damage who are mostly women as the use of rape, murder and 'scorched earth' policies become conventional for current conflicts especially at North African region. But what if this collateral damage (not only at war but also at peace) is the main problematic issue for the humanitarian society?

From this standing point, our study aims to criticize the main stream security approach from three angles. Firstly the gender blindness of traditional security approach will be criticized. Alternatively, gender consciousness or engendered security approach will be analyzed in a different perspective for peacebuilding process.

Than secondly top-down comprehension of security and its implications will be compared with bottom-to-top understanding of security. Top-down comprehension of securities' peremptory tone and uncompromising nature's disadvantages at a multi-dimensional conflict will be brought face to face by opportunities of bottom-to-top understanding of security for conflict resolution.

Thirdly the perception of total security approach will be analyzed and perception of security of the oppressed will be discussed as a solution to the ongoing civil wars and conflicts by bringing a fresh look to the power politics.

The desired output from this study is to unveil the illusional nature of traditional security approach and reveal the advantages of alternative approaches for peacebuilding process, conflict resolution and power politics.

Keywords:

gender blind, gender consciousness, engendered security, Men's War, traditional security, top-down security, bottom-to-top security, conflict resolution, peace building, power politics.

JEL Classification: F51, F50, F53

In the course of time, to address human societies the term “man” has been used so manhood became the decisive constituent of “humanity”. Security issues of any given society were and always have been the major justification instrument for this approach. Beyond humanity’s attachment to masculinity, war and *eo ipso* peace are men’s decision to make.

So *rational* of men becomes the only logical explanation of the public realm. This understanding of common good presumes war, peace and their contents as limited to states, armies, soldiers and land. Then the rest is just collateral damage who are mostly women as the use of rape, murder and 'scorched earth' policies become *conventional* for current conflicts especially at North African Arab Peninsula region. But what if this collateral damage (not only at war but also at peace) is the main issue for the humane civilization?

The desired output from this study is to unveil the illusional nature of traditional security approach and reveal the advantages of alternative approaches for peace building processes, conflict resolution and power politics.

Before analyzing engendered security as the main constituent of feminist International Relations (IR), feminist IR theory itself has to be determined. But it is a challenge to do so as feminist IR theory itself doesn’t have a mutual perspective about security and gender issues. For example:

“Feminist work from a realist perspective is interested in the role of gender in strategy and power politics between states. Liberal feminist work calls attention to the subordinate position of women in global politics and argues that gender oppression can be remedied by including women in the existing structures of global politics. Critical feminism explores the ideational and material manifestations of gendered identity and gendered power in world politics. Feminist constructivism focuses on the ways that ideas about gender shape and are shaped by global politics. Feminist poststructuralism focuses on how gendered linguistic manifestations of meaning, particularly strong/weak, rational/emotional, and public/private dichotomies, serve to empower the masculine, marginalize the feminine, and constitute global politics. Postcolonial feminists, while sharing many of the epistemological assumptions of poststructural feminists, focus on the ways that colonial relations of domination and subordination established under imperialism are reflected in gender relations, and even relations between feminists, in global politics and academic work. Ecological feminism, or “ecofeminism,” identifies connections between the treatment of women and minorities on one hand and the nonhuman environment on the other.”¹

So the “Feminist security theory (FST) emerged from a cross-ideological, trans-epistemological, multivoiced conversational debate

¹Laura Sjoberg (2009), “Introduction to Security Studies: Feminist Contributions”, Security Studies, 18:2, pp:183-213, DOI: 10.1080/09636410902900129, p:188-189.

among multiple feminisms, including liberal, empiricist, modified standpoint, and qualified postmodern perspectives, among others.”²

However, we may say that, feminist security theory differs from main stream security approaches in three standing points:

Firstly, the gender blindness of traditional security approach has been criticized by feminist security theory. Alternatively, gender awareness or engendered security approaches are being suggested for peace building processes.

Then top-down comprehension of security and its implications are opposed by feminist security approach (FSA) and bottom-up understanding of security is being argued. The disadvantages of the peremptory tone and the uncompromising nature of top-down comprehension of security at a multi-dimensional conflict has been criticized by FSA.

Lastly, the gender-hierarchical system of IR has been criticized commonly by FSA.

We shall begin by defining the engendered security approach which is the key concept of FSA.

Even though the history of feminist IR theories is not a new one, the impact of feminist theory on this field has recently increased. The concentrated efforts of feminist theory researchers on security issues have played a significant role in this proliferation.

Despite the fact that until recent history there has not been a special field in the framework of feminist theory about security issues and a consolidated and/or integrated usable study relating to the method of feminist IR theory, these theories have considerably progressed since the cold war.

The term *engendered* which is used to define the feminist security approach relating to feminist IR theory has only recently come to mean gender based or to endow with gender. The term comes from Latin and originally meant; to beget, procreate, to cause to exist, or to develop, it was initially used in 1992 in a critical essay in the meaning as used throughout this paper. The author Anne Cranny-Francis defines engendered as “how they articulate particular sex or gender role”³ after using the term in this sense for the first time in her book “*Engendered Fictions*”. This new meaning assigned to the word by Anne Cranny-Francis who herself is a feminist, has been widely accepted and was instrumental to fill an important terminological gap.

Gender based security approach is directly related to gender roles. “Gender is not the equivalent of membership in biological sex classes. Instead, gender is a system of symbolic meaning that creates social hierarchies based on perceived associations with masculine and feminine characteristics. (...) This is not to say that all people, or

² Eric M. Blanchard, “Gender, International Relations, and the Development of Feminist Security Theory”, Source: *Signs*, Vol. 28, No. 4 (Summer 2003), pp. 1289-1312, The University of Chicago Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/368328>, Accessed: 10-05-2016 10:42 UTC, p: 1295.

³ Anne Cranny-Francis, “*Engendered Fiction: Analysing Gender in the Production and Reception of Texts*”, NSWU Press, 1992, s: 2.

even all women, experience gender in the same ways. While genders are lived by people throughout the world, each person lives gender in a different culture, body, language, and identity.”⁴

Top-down security approach emphasizes “structural matters such as sovereignty, economics and militaries.(...) (W)hereas bottom-up approaches recognize that vulnerability for civilians does not end with the cessation of violence.”⁵ “However, the FST critique is not limited to strategies for getting more women to access the corridors of power; feminists also direct our attention to the gendered structure of IR theory. As the title of a classic IR text indicates, the study of international politics has been concerned first and foremost with *Man, the State, and War*”.⁶

Gender hierarchical approach caused many deficiencies such as assuming women and poor, as low minded creatures who even could not protect themselves or their rights thus must not take part in deciding a nations wellbeing or as seen by realist IR “dominated by elite, white, male practitioners, is a patriarchal discourse that renders women invisible from the high politics of IR even as it depends on women’s subjugation as a ‘domesticated’ figure whose ‘feminine’ sensibilities are both at odds with and inconsequential to the harsh ‘realities’ of the public world of men and states”⁷

*“In other words, while traditional referent objects are referenced by their relative power vis à vis other states, a feminist approach challenges the statecentric and recognizes that power is a) not only material in nature b) gender is one lens with which to identify the socially constructed roots of power c) power is structural, defined by the consistent lines of relationship between oppressor and the oppressed.”*⁸

In methodological basis feminist theory also differs from main stream approaches. “The distinctiveness of feminist methodologies inside and outside IR lies in their reflexivity.”⁹ Another characteristic of feminist methodologies is to be said that they are being epistemologies in action.¹⁰ Not only at IR discipline but also in many branches of social sciences, researchers claim that for providing and protecting the objectivity of scientific research, scientists must define a distance between themselves and

⁴ Laura Sjoberg , “Introduction”, **Gender and International Security Feminist Perspectives**, (Ed) Laura Sjoberg, Routledge Critical Security Studies Series, Routledge, p:3.

⁵Anita Singh, “Women, Conflict And Darfur: A Case Study Critical Concepts In International Security” Journal of Military and Strategic Studies, Summer 2007, Vol. 9, Issue 4, p:5-6.

⁶ Eric M. Blanchard, “Gender, International Relations, and the Development of Feminist Security Theory”, Source:Signs, Vol. 28, No. 4 (Summer 2003), pp. 1289-1312, The University of Chicago Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/368328>, Accessed: 10-05-2016 10:42 UTC, p: 1292.

⁷ Ibid, p: 1292

⁸ Anita Singh, “Women, Conflict and Darfur: A Case Study Critical Concepts In International Security” Journal of Military and Strategic Studies, Summer 2007, Vol. 9, Issue 4, s6-7.

⁹Brooke A. Ackerly, Maria Stern, Jacqui True, “Feminist Methodologies for International Relations”, (ed) Brooke A. Ackerly, Maria Stern, Jacqui True (in) **Feminist Methodologies for International Relations**, Cambridge University Press, 2006, p:4.

¹⁰Ibid, p:8.

subject matter. But contrary to that approach “ most feminist researchers insists that the inquirer be placed on the same critical plane with subject matter.”¹¹ Because feminist approach talks about “knowledge creation as a dialogic process that requires a context of equality and involvement of the researcher in the lives of people she studies.”¹²

Another approach even though is not feminist but critical to main stream security approaches is human security approach. Human security is a new and a very important concept for the security of oppressed. “In the 1994 United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Human Development Report, which launched human security on the international stage, it was defined as `freedom from fear and freedom from want` encompassing seven categories of security: economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community, and political.”¹³ UN Development Programme has made major contributions to the concept of human security. Considering people feeling insecure in their daily lives the following issues were raised:¹⁴ “Do people and their families have access to adequate food supply? Do they have work security? Can streets be protected from murder? Will they be subjected to gender based discrimination or harassment? Will they be exposed to attacks based on their ethnicity or creed?”¹⁵

This new approach to the security issue by adding “human security” * beyond “national security” helps reaching a broader security understanding.¹⁶

As part of the transformed world, war and conflict order; women`s rise to stations that have gravity in the security field and the efforts of feminist scholars` and national, international and supranational women`s organizations in conflict areas have been playing a major role.

¹¹Ibid, p:27.

¹²Ibid, p:27

¹³Laura Sjoberg “Introduction to Security Studies: Feminist Contributions”, Security Studies, (2009), 18:2, 183-213, DOI: 10.1080/09636410902900129, p:205-206.

¹⁴ ¹⁴ Nihal Ergül, “Yeni Güvenlik Anlayışı Kapsamında Birleşmiş Milletler’in Rolü Ve Uygulamaları”, Teoriler Işığında Güvenlik, Savaş, Barış Ve Çatışma Çözümleri, Editör Atilla Sandikli, Bilgesam Yayınları, İstanbul 2012, Ss:165-208, p:292.

¹⁵ Ibid, p:292.

* 1. The objective of human security is to protect the vital core of all human lives. (instead of protect: shield, guarantee, defend, maintain, uphold, preserve, secure, safeguard, ensure that...are shielded)

2. The objective of human security is to protect the vital core of all human lives from critical pervasive threats in a way that is consistent with long-term human fulfillment. (*initial definition was this*)

3. The objective of human security is to guarantee a set of vital rights and freedoms to all people, without unduly compromising their ability to pursue other goals.

4. The objective of human security is to create political, economic, social, cultural, and environmental conditions in which people live knowing that their vital rights and freedoms are secure.

5. The objective of human security is to keep critical pervasive threats from invading the vital core of human lives. (Sabina Alkire, “A Conceptual Framework for Human Security”, WORKING PAPER 2, Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity, CRISE Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford, 2003, p:2)

¹⁶Summer Nicole Forester, **Reconceptualizing Human Security: A Feminist Perspective**, Submitted to the Graduate School Appalachian State University In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, 2012, p: 2-11.

“In 2000, the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security that set forth a commitment on the part of the UN, states and NGOs to promote women’s security in peacebuilding.”¹⁷ This resolution, gives a responsibility and a right to UN, states and NGO’s for doing necessary regulations about woman’s security. “The first time the situation was formally brought to the attention of member states was most likely in December 2003 when, during an open debate of the Security Council on the protection of civilians in armed conflict, Jan Egeland, the UN’s humanitarian chief, mentioned the 600,000 displaced people in Darfur and his serious concerns about a growing humanitarian disaster there. However, it would be several months and many victims later before the Security Council agreed that Darfur was an issue which could no longer be ignored. Other UN bodies behaved even less laudably.”¹⁸

Security of oppressed is rarely the main concern of states or international and supranational organizations. The principal aim of engendered security and human security approaches and the main goal of researchers and inquirers who are trying to improve these approaches theoretically and practically are to change this unfortunate paradigm.

Feminist approach claims that state security is mostly based on its most vulnerable citizens insecurity.¹⁹

“Countries that have included engendered security in peace agreements include: Angola, the DRC, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Sudan (SPLM/A) and Darfur, Nepal, Kenya, Somalia, Uganda, Zimbabwe. Countries not including engendered security are the Central African Republic, Senegal, and Indonesia. By all indications, the proportion of conflicts with engendered security versus without has increased in the last nine years, as illustrated in Table 5.1 Christine Bell and Catherine O’Rourke, who also looked for references to women and 1325 in peace agreements saw an increase, quantitatively, in the mentions of women from 11% between 1990 and 2000 to 27% after 2010. Also, the quality of the engendered security seems to have increased, as most of those with provisions for women include multiple properties, and Sudan-Darfur and Uganda contain all the categories.”²⁰

Despite all the recent developments in alternative approaches to security issues and all the well-intentioned efforts of international and supranational organizations for involvement of women in peace making processes, these issues still persist.

¹⁷Kara Ellerby, “The Tale of Two Sudans: Engendered Security and Peace Processes”, Entry to the Case Studies in Peacebuilding Competition 2012, United States Institute of Peace, p:1.

¹⁸ Joanna Weschler, “The Gap Between Narratives And Practices / Darfur: The Responses From The Arab World”, 5. Un Response To The Darfur Crisis, March 2010. www.fride.org. p:4.

¹⁹ Brooke A. Ackerly, Maria Stern, Jacqui True, “Feminist Methodologies for International Relations”, (ed) Brooke A. Ackerly, Maria Stern, Jacqui True (in) **Feminist Methodologies for International Relations**, Cambridge University Press, 2006, s:31-32.

²⁰Kara L. Ellerby, **Engendered Security: Norms, Gender and Peace Agreements**, A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of The school of Government And Public Policy In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, (erişim)24-May-2016 09:15:20 p:190

“Problematically, there is much less awareness/systematic study on how women are included in formal processes and what may account for their inclusion/exclusion.”²¹

The exclusion of women from current security issues stems from the nature of modern state. “Feminists have pointed out, at the time of the foundation of the modern Western state, and coincidentally with the beginnings of capitalism, women were not included as citizens but consigned to the private space of the household; thus, they were removed both from the public sphere of politics and the economic sphere of production.”²² This inclination of the modern state to exclude women as citizens hence from humanity lingers even to this day.

This exclusion of women from humanity is so deeply buried in the fundamentals of human society that, acts, resolutions or national and international law not yet able to solve the problem. They often function as illusional images for modern state. Most recent example of this phenomena was from the presidential candidate of a Party in USA, during a Fox News' interview. In the program "Fox and Friends" when he had been asked about “how to fight ISIS” he answered:

"The other thing with the terrorists is you have to take out their families, when you get these terrorists, you have to take out their families. They care about their lives, don't kid yourself. When they say they don't care about their lives, you have to take out their families,”²³. This is the essence of the problem. Men's war is still being the men's war and the oppressed who are mostly women and girls are still collateral damage not just for barbarian terrorists but also for those who claim to be the champions of democracy.

REFERENCES

Ackerly Brooke A., Maria Stern, Jacqui True, “Feminist Methodologies for International Relations”, (ed) Brooke A. Ackerly, Maria Stern, Jacqui True (in) **Feminist Methodologies for International Relations**, Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Alkire Sabina, “A Conceptual Framework for Human Security”, WORKING PAPER 2, Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity, CRISE Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford, 2003.

Blanchard Eric M., “Gender, International Relations, and the Development of Feminist Security Theory”, Source: Signs, Vol. 28, No. 4 (Summer 2003), pp. 1289-1312, The University of Chicago Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/368328>, Accessed: 10-05-2016 10:42 UTC.

Cranny-Francis Anne, “*Engendered Fiction: Analysing Gender in the Production and Reception of Texts*”, NSWU Press, 1992.

²¹ Kara Ellerby, “The Tale of Two Sudans: Engendered Security and Peace Processes”, Entry to the Case Studies in Peacebuilding Competition 2012, United States Institute of Peace, p:1.

²² Brooke A. Ackerly, Maria Stern, Jacqui True, “Feminist Methodologies for International Relations”, (ed) Brooke A. Ackerly, Maria Stern, Jacqui True (in) **Feminist Methodologies for International Relations**, Cambridge University Press, 2006, p:38

²³ <http://edition.cnn.com/2015/12/02/politics/donald-trump-terrorists-families/>

Ellerby Kara L., **Engendered Security: Norms, Gender and Peace Agreements**, A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of The school of Government And Public Policy In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, (erişim)24-May-2016 09:15:20.

Ellerby Kara, "The Tale of Two Sudans: Engendered Security and Peace Processes", Entry to the Case Studies in Peacebuilding Competition 2012, United States Institute of Peace.

Ergül Nihal, "Yeni Güvenlik Anlayışı Kapsamında Birleşmiş Milletler'in Rolü Ve Uygulamaları", Teoriler Işığında Güvenlik, Savaş, Barış Ve Çatışma Çözümleri, Editör Atilla Sandikli, Bilgesam Yayınları, İstanbul 2012, pp:165-208.

Forester Summer Nicole, **Reconceptualizing Human Security: A Feminist Perspective**, Submitted to the Graduate School Appalachian State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, 2012.

<http://edition.cnn.com/2015/12/02/politics/donald-trump-terrorists-families>.

Singh Anita, "Women, Conflict and Darfur: A Case Study Critical Concepts In International Security" Journal of Military and Strategic Studies, Summer 2007, Vol. 9, Issue 4.

Sjoberg Laura (2009), "Introduction to Security Studies: Feminist Contributions", Security Studies, 18:2, pp:183-213, DOI: 10.1080/09636410902900129.

Sjoberg Laura, "Introduction", **Gender and International Security Feminist Perspectives**, (Ed) Laura Sjoberg, Routledge Critical Security Studies Series, Routledge.

Weschler Joanna, The Gap Between Narratives And Practices / Darfur: The Responses From The Arab World", 5. Un Response To The Darfur Crisis, March 2010. www.fride.org.