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A Note from the Editor-in-Chief

The aim of this journal is to disrupt the ‘single-story’ of mainstream foreign policy. Through highlighting both experienced and emerging voices from across the globe, we seek to understand, challenge, and critique foreign policy.

This issue focuses on the theme of post-colonialism and foreign policy, which was chosen by our members and supporters. Through a post-colonial analytical lens, our contributors challenge the unquestioned objectivity of elitist, Western-centric foreign policy, and unpack the complex connections between gender, race, ethnicity, sexuality that are embedded in the everyday actions and politics of people from across the world. Alongside our written contributions, you will find artwork and poetry engaging with this theme. A feminist foreign policy brings all voices to the table, through whichever medium they choose to express themselves, challenging the academic and un-inclusive paradigm it is embedded in.

Thank you for supporting this publication. CFFP is a non-profit volunteer-run organisation and we are proud to lead the way in making foreign policy more feminist, more transparent, and more intersectional. With your support, we’re amplifying a different and more nuanced conversation that can better inform policy decisions and begin to alleviate global inequality.

We hope you enjoy and learn from this journal, but we also encourage you to consider contributing to our next issue. From articles to artwork, we are always looking for new contributors and we are eager to hear (and see) new voices and fresh perspectives.

Katie Washington
Editor-in-Chief
“Stories matter. Many stories matter. Stories have been used to dispossess and to malign, but stories can also be used to empower and to humanise. Stories can break the dignity of a people, but stories can also repair that broken dignity. . . . When we reject the single story, when we realize that there is never a single story about any place, we regain a kind of paradise.”

- Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie, 2014
Mind the Gaps

Rui Zhong

There is a particular silence
That hangs between you and the men
speaking in the forefront of the room:
You suck in the air through the gaps in your teeth
and disguise yourself
as one of “The Good Ones”
The words you leave unsaid build a home in your heart
Lest you prove to be:
Disloyal
Unreasonable
Not-a-team-player
Off-brand

This Town
is too small for the two types of you
The you that lives to please
That pays the loans,
Whose English is So Good,
Who needs to disclose
With immediacy
where you’re really from, anyways

The Other Side of You lives underground
Between eight and nine A.M.
As rail lines of blue and orange
Wind their way through town
like metallic snakes
You mind the gaps as you are devouring through the square plastic tablet
Electric-inked stories of upheavals
of Taking Care of One Another,
Always dreaming
Of that possible Prosperity
If the current feminist paradigm fails to provide a framework that can hold the specific needs and worldviews of all women, a feminist foreign policy is meaningless.

-Rachel Arlene Redeye Porter and Sara Jolena Wolcott
CLOSING THE INDIGENOUS RIGHTS GAP IN FEMINIST FOREIGN POLICY

Rachel Porter and Sara Jolena Wolcott

If the current feminist paradigm fails to provide a framework that can hold the specific needs and worldviews of all women, a feminist foreign policy is meaningless. While Sweden leads in implementing programs and policies that foreground the rights of women and girls globally, the rhetoric surrounding the rights of indigenous peoples is distinctly limited to the Swedish international development space and global indigenous specific forums. When indigenous peoples are mentioned, the specific vulnerabilities of indigenous women and girls are rarely addressed with the voracity that change requires. We can see this in the way Sweden does not integrate their treatment of the Sami people into their international feminist foreign policy. Through looking at Sweden as an example, we make the broader argument that a feminist foreign policy that does not disrupt colonial legacies and seek to reconcile acts of violent land dispossession is ultimately futile in achieving its primary goal of gender equality.

This is a tall order, but it is not too tall for the inherent power currently untapped within decolonised approaches to feminism. The first step in addressing Sweden’s inability to effectively promote the rights of indigenous women and girls in its own country is to re-examine the constructs that define Sweden’s definition of feminism. Achieving equality between women and men requires an intersectional and context specific analysis that recognises that the power structures that oppress women are not universal and that indigenous women face a unique set of vulnerabilities (Herr, 2014).

Moving away from patriarchy is intertwined with moving away from colonial constructs.

Currently in Swedish, and to some extent international, political discourse, the identities of indigenous women are spliced and restricted to competing advocacy realms. Indigenous women are categorised as indigenous or as women and the intersection between these identities is rarely considered. Their role in local culture is too often analysed only through a community lens, which ignores their political agency and the ways in which they are involved in, and affected by, struggles for sovereignty and representation (Picq, 2018). In the case of the Sami, specific needs will always be misunderstood if their indigeneity is ignored because of their location in the Global North. Historical land loss due to European migration patterns pushed the Sami northward, out of their traditional territory. Today, natural resource exploitation continues to threaten livelihoods and devalues the relationship between Sami culture and their land (Trudel, 2016).

United Nations (UN) Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Victoria Tauli-Corpuz (Igorot) spoke about the importance of recognising indigenous land rights at the April 2018 meeting of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. This year’s theme was ‘Indigenous peoples’ collective rights to land, territories and resources’.
It was repeatedly affirmed that indigenous people and, specifically indigenous women, maintain spiritual, cultural and collective identities through their relationship with land and water. When the quality of land and water is destroyed and the wellbeing of the community threatened, rates of violence against women increase and community health deteriorates. (Women's Earth Alliance, 2016). Despite decades of clear calls for action, and a recent UN spotlight, Sweden's feminist foreign policy remains unable to articulate the way land is integrated in an indigenous worldview, no matter if it is about the Sami or other indigenous peoples abroad.

However, this reticence is not due to lack of awareness. In addition to sending a Swedish representative to the 2018 meeting, Norway spoke on behalf of Nordic countries in 2017 about the explicit need to address violence against indigenous women and girls. Marking the ten-year anniversary of the establishment of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, these remarks were timely (Norway in the UN, 2017). Simultaneously, the International Land and Forest Tenure Facility based in Stockholm is an example of an institution dedicated to the protection of indigenous land rights (The Tenure Facility, 2018). While their focus is a conservation agenda, the organisation is still evidence that the discourse around indigenous rights exists in Sweden. Further, there are ongoing battles and consultations between the state and the Sami (Crouch, 2016).

Therefore, it is essential to question why a gap exists between the trendy and progressive feminist rhetoric pedalled by Sweden in some contexts and the glaring omission within one of Sweden’s biggest political brands: feminist foreign policy. Sweden is reluctant to recognise the Sami as a distinct people. Instead, they define Samis legally as a Swedish minority despite the repeated advocacy of the Sami people to be recognised as distinct. Their consultation law is driven by international conventions as opposed to domestic case law, as is the case with First Nations in Canada (Allard, 2018). It is neither reductionist nor alarmist to wonder how Sweden will advocate for the wellbeing of indigenous woman globally if they are unable to fully recognize needs in their own backyard. The establishment of the Nordic Sami Convention is a small step in remedying this. This convention recognises the Sami as the indigenous people of Finland, Norway and Sweden and affirms their right to develop their language, culture, livelihood and society with minimal interference. But, this is not the full story.

This omission of indigenous women and girls from Sweden’s feminist foreign policy rhetoric can be viewed as a repetition and reinforcement of longstanding and well-documented patterns of the marginalisation of subaltern and people of colour by the mainstream feminist movement.

The early feminist movement was grounded in ideologies predominantly aligned with the experiences of White and western women. The 1970s and 1980s were filled with critiques by scholars of colour and post-colonial writers that the feminist movement further subjugated the oppressed and did not meet the needs of indigenous women (Herr, 2014). During this time and into the present moment, feminists cognizant of this disconnect developed theories in ecofeminism, transnational feminism and indigenous feminism to confront these problems. For example, Cheryl Suzack (2010) (Batchewana) draws on both transnational feminism and indigenous feminist theory to assert that indigenous women are forced to make choices when advocating for their rights and to choose one part of their identity over another. She notes that the nation state restricts discussions of sovereignty to issues of political boundaries and court cases.
Daily community struggles are relegated to the realm of “the local” and depoliticised. The result is that the complexity of indigenous women’s identities is rendered invisible and their agency as political agents in the foreign policy space silenced (Picq, 2018). These are the grounds on which Sweden replicates two problematic historical trends: first by ignoring intersectional identity, and second by upholding in word and deed that the personal is not political (Enloe, 2001). Additionally, the government’s failure to look inward and advocate fully for the wellbeing of the Sami people undermines the integrity of their commitment to feminist principles.

The conceptual gap between indigenous rights and feminist rights are based in 500 years of colonial history. As ecofeminist Vandana Shiva (1993) writes, it is critically important for the “North” to go through its own process of decolonising if it has any interest in reducing poverty in the South. Poverty reduction is critical to enable women’s individual and political self-determination. Sovereignty is not separate from self-determination as a means of achieving gender equality. Only with full sovereignty over their bodies, their families and their lands and ecosystems, can women’s ability to realise their potential capacity as creative political, cultural and spiritual agents both locally and internationally significantly increase.

Rachel Porter, M.A.L.D. is a graduate of The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University where she studied indigenous coalition building in the U.S. and Canada. Her current book project examines contemporary indigenous identity politics in the U.S.

Sara Jolena Wolcott, M.Div., is the Director of Sequoia Samanvaya LLC, an EcoTheology company. Her decade-long work in international sustainable development and teaches on the historical intersections of climate change and colonization from an ecofeminist perspective.
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Decolonising the classroom means to disrupt the way learning is conceptualised.

The black body is a central element in the reproduction of inequalities.

- Marielle Franco
Decolonising the classroom means to disrupt the way learning is conceptualised. -Deborah Haffner
LEARNING TO UNLEARN: TOWARDS DECOLONISING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS TEACHING

Deborah Haffner

Since the ‘Rhodes Must Fall’ movement began at the University of Cape Town in South Africa, student-led protests to decolonise education have also erupted across the UK, including #RhodesMustFall at the University of Oxford and the ‘Decolonise our Minds’ initiative at The School of Oriental & African Studies (SOAS). While reading lists and coloniality in physical spaces of universities have been at the forefront of the struggle, this article seeks to accentuate the decolonising move in learning and teaching International Relations (IR). Teaching and classroom experiences matter. The classroom is the space where future policy makers, diplomats, journalists, academics, and voters come together and learn. Hence, the ways they are socialised to think about global politics influences the world. Whether students get to see, and consequently dare to challenge, global power relations, whether they are encouraged to question the objectivity and neutrality of the knowledge that is presented to them and that they engage in producing themselves depends in part on how and what students experience in the classroom.

Within this article, I use feminist post-colonial theories alongside real-world examples to investigate what a decolonised International Relations (IR) classroom could look like. While not the only way to make sense of IR and teaching, investigating in colonial and gendered global power structures is crucial. This article engages with ideas that were developed in resistance to the position of privilege that I speak as a white woman at a Western university. Reflexivity and sharing the platform of this article with numerous voices, for example, other students and faculty of colour are some of the ways that I seek to address this. Furthermore, this article does not offer a vision for a perfectly decolonised way of teaching IR. Rather, it sees decolonising as the continuing process of enhancing non-colonised, non-masculinised ways of understanding and speaking about the world. The concept of coloniality stresses that the colonial is not simply a thing of the past, and that it is, moreover, constitutive of what is often referred to as “modernity” (Quijano, 2007). This article unpacks a small number of notions, perspectives, and challenges pertaining to decolonising the classroom by exploring the intersecting issues of learning, authority, and difference.

What and who is learning for?

Firstly, decolonising the classroom means to disrupt the way learning is conceptualised. Whether we conceive of learning as an accumulative, passive activity, and of knowledge as a consumable product, or whether we see it as a potentially disruptive, discontinuous experience that is best described as a process embedded in context is of paramount importance. The former is about answers and certitude while the latter is about questions and inquiry. While the first conception demands that students receive and accept knowledge, the second expects them to explore and challenge what they are taught. In her vision of decolonised education, Melz Owusu, Education Officer at the University of Leeds, called for a shift...
from learning to thinking (TEDx Talks, 2017). As this article's title suggests, learning also needs to be about unlearning deeply entrenched notions and worldviews. Eurocentrism, the linearity of economic development, and normative, yet exclusionary, conceptions of human rights, are just a few examples of often unchallenged notions in International Relations.

Comparative research on how IR is taught around the world investigates subject areas, schools of thought, and the balance between theory and policy (TRIP, 2012). However, classroom practices are not even part of the inquiry. This points towards a deliberate disinterest in how IR is transmitted to students. Additionally, the lecture plus seminar format, common in IR, leaves little room for more experimental formats (Curtis, 2012). This needs to be placed in the context of the well-researched incentive gap between research and teaching in higher education (see: Colgan, 2016). How academics value teaching, what forms of dissemination they use and think of as possible and how much agency students believe they have shapes the quality and critical thinking in classroom interactions. Thinking of teachers and students as “jointly responsible for a process in which all grow” would help to reposition the teacher-student dichotomy as well as to re-evaluate its purpose (Freire, 1970: 53). The status quo of this relationship is, however, infused with power.

**Where is the power in our classrooms?**

Authority pervades the classroom: it exists between teachers and students, among students themselves and with material, behaviour, and ideas. When it comes to student’s lived classroom experiences, the example of London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) is helpful to draw upon. LSE students who were interviewed by the Students’ Union’s Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) Officer in 2015, held the opinion that there is a hierarchy when it comes to their ability to make arguments in the classroom. This was largely dependent on mainstream authors who are given the most attention in seminars. The naturalisation of knowledges and experiences developed by Westerners, in the West was clear: “the Western perspective isn’t shown as a perspective, it is just shown as what is the truth” (LSESU BME Network, 2015). Students felt uncomfortable in voicing alternative opinions, and worried about their academic record: “I’m legitimately concerned that if I don’t reproduce those thoughts that I’m going to get a bad grade” (ibid.). This is especially apparent in modes of examination that privilege the uncritical reproduction of memorised mainstream ideas.

**While knowledge and power are mutually constitutive and inseparable, feminists have shown IR how not knowing and embarrassment can be fruitful, and curiosity for and from the “margins” thickens our understanding of international politics (Enloe, 2014).**

As James Baldwin reminds us, “education can never be aimless, and it cannot occur in a vacuum” (Baldwin, p. 2). In lieu of a vacuum, there is context, locality and power, that needs to be acknowledged and can also be worked with. The “classroom [can be] a space for radical political action” (hooks, 1986: 126).

**Is the classroom the same for everyone?**

Representation, visibility, and voice are key post-colonial feminist concepts that illuminate educational interactions. In fact, tensions between erasure and hypervisibility are reflected in the classroom. Hypervisibility of some groups can lead to people feeling put “on the spot” in classroom debates, for instance when one is expected to speak up against Islamism as a Muslim. Simultaneously, BME students have expressed frustration at their invisibility in academia: “You cannot deny us and silence and erase us any more when we are physically sat in your
Representation is central for BME students who can see their powerlessness in society which is aggravated by not seeing lecturers that look like them (ibid.). While the lack of people of colour among faculty has been identified as one of the causes for the pervasive BME attainment gap, inclusion also needs to be thought of in terms of safety. Female students and faculty members of colour experience gendered racism, including physical threats within classrooms (Pittman, 2010).

Nevertheless, those very classrooms can be transformed into inclusive spaces for ideas and diverse people, for instance through active reflection on listening and voice, as well as trigger warnings for distressing content. bell hooks stressed that talking about different patterns of speech and expression enabled students to “have a more creative, joyful experience in the class” and ultimately to “feel a sense of community” (hooks, 1986: 135).

Finally, feminist post-colonial scholar Chandra Talpade Mohanty (2003a) argues for a teaching strategy that goes beyond intersectionality, and emphasises ‘mutuality’, ‘co-implication’, and ‘co-responsibility’. This would allow faculty and students to bridge the local and the global and explore “individual and collective experiences of oppression and exploitation and of struggle and resistance” (ibid.) At a time when IR students grapple with the legacies of colonialism, violent borders, and continuing wars, this approach seems to be more relevant than ever.

Isn’t this all “identity politics”?

The counterargument most often invoked is the fear of alleged policing through “political correctness”. But, why is it assumed that decolonising would restrict, rather than open dialogue and various forms of learning? This article has aimed to show that there is a wealth of experiences, knowledges and modes of thinking, learning, and teaching that are suppressed rather than enabled in our classrooms today. Tapping into these could benefit and empower students, teachers, and ultimately universities as societal actors themselves bring about change.

Examining learning, authority, and difference has shown that classrooms play a crucial role in determining the power of arguments, the diversity of worldviews and the potential for transformations.

Feminists and critical pedagogues have long argued for education as liberation, but it obviously depends on what and, as this article has argued, how you learn (Tickner, 2005; Freire, 1970). These conversations are necessary to inform decolonisation of the classroom, that is in turn needed to disrupt the ways in which college-educated actors go on to shape the world.

....

Deborah Haffner is passionate about learning and debating intersectional feminism. Currently finishing her Master’s in International Relations at the LSE, she is interested in how education impacts the world, and in exploring disruptive, inclusive and decolonised alternatives. She’s originally from Germany.
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Ethical stances which pit ‘enlightened’ neo-colonial logics and racial hierarchies that perpetuate, rather than transform, global inequalities.
‘barbaric’ cultures against Western morality are thick with hierarchies that transform, global inequalities.

-Fiona Robinson
‘TAKING AN ETHICAL STAND’: MORAL PRINCIPLES AND COLONIAL LOGICS IN FEMINIST FOREIGN POLICY

Fiona Robinson

In a 2015 speech at the United States Institute of Peace, the Swedish foreign minister Margot Wallström claimed that a feminist foreign policy seeks the same goals as ‘any visionary foreign policy: peace, justice, human rights and human development’ (Wallström, 2015). At a panel discussion following Wallström’s speech, the former deputy administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, Donald Steinberg, said that he has found that men’s eyes “glazed over” when he cited human rights or morality as reasons for preserving women’s rights amid international conflicts (Rupert, 2015). According to Steinberg (in: Rupert, 2015):

“To me, the real arguments are that societies that protect women, that involve women in these processes, that focus on girls’ education, are more stable,” he said. “These are countries that do not traffic in drugs and people and weapons. They don’t send refugees across borders or across oceans. They don’t harbour terrorists or pirates. They don’t transmit pandemic diseases. And, perhaps most importantly in this town, they don’t require American military force or troops on the ground.”

These accounts tell a story of the gendering of ethics, and of foreign policy – where ‘feminist’ (or ‘feminine’) foreign policy is constructed as ethical, principled, or visionary, in contrast with ‘masculine’ foreign policy which is understood as ‘realist’ and focused on national interests and security. Clearly, Steinberg saw the need to masculinise feminist foreign policy by pointing out what he perceives as the real arguments – to make it more ‘palatable’ to men whose eyes ‘glaze over’ at the mention of women’s rights. But either way, the message remains the same: ‘good’ societies ‘protect’ their women, and those that don’t should be disciplined – either through realpolitik or, through ethics.

What is revealed when we unpack the discursive and normative positioning of feminist foreign policy as ‘ethical’? What is at stake when the principles in principled feminist foreign policy are understood as a set of fixed, absolute moral rules based on Western liberal notions of human rights or justice? I argue that according to this narrative, global justice (or ethical feminist foreign policy) is enacted by a series of powerful, Western states to save (or punish) racialised others. Not only is this narrative partial and inadequate, but it serves both to produce and reinforce existing racialised, colonial hierarchies and power relations.

When the requirements of an ‘ethical, feminist’ government are understood in this way, Sweden must pass judgement on the unethical or ‘barbaric’ acts of other states. They must condemn, criticize or rebuke any policy or regime that appears to contradict their own commitment to justice and human rights. This emerged clearly in the 2015 ‘Saudi affair’. On February 11th, Wallström, addressing the Swedish parliament,
criticised Saudi Arabia’s human rights record; specifically, she criticised the public flogging of the blogger Raif Badawi, later describing it as “medieval.” She also referred to Saudi Arabia as a “dictatorship” and commented on the state of women’s rights in the country.

Wallström had been asked to deliver a speech at an Arab League summit in Cairo in late March, but Saudi Arabia intervened, and Wallström was disinvited. On 9th March, Saudi Arabia withdrew its ambassador to Sweden, stating that Wallström had “unacceptably interfered” in the country’s internal affairs (Nordberg, 2015). Wallström told reporters in Cairo that Riyadh had blocked her speech because she was due to “celebrate women’s achievements” and focus on women’s rights and representation (Crouch, 2015). The day after Wallström was supposed to have appeared in Cairo, on March 10th, the Swedish government announced its decision to not renew a bilateral arms agreement with Saudi Arabia.

Unsurprisingly, this move has been lauded and hailed as Wallström’s ‘feminist foreign policy’ in practice. While some might applaud Sweden for taking an ethical stand on this issue, the affair invoked ethics in a way that disregarded the wider socio-economic context and made moral judgements in the absence of a clear historical and contemporary context of the two states. As a result, it demonstrated that a hubris of moral certainty reproduces colonial logics that is, I suggest, counter-productive to long-term feminist goals. To assert the ‘backwardness’ and ‘morally-bankrupt’ nature of Saudi Arabia is to position Sweden as a superior, enlightened culture which treats its women ‘properly’. In addition, this kind of framing contributes to the erasure of Saudi women’s agency. As Heath (2016) argues, it is crucial for Sweden to understand the complicated and nuanced situation of women within the kingdom of Saudi Arabia and recognize the indigenous women’s rights movements and the ‘renegotiations’ of gendered power relations that currently exist. Indeed, Heath points out that women’s rights movements in Saudi Arabia are framed by several contextual factors, including: Islamic religious texts, Saudi national identity, the Saudi state and the importance of promoting an‘indigenous’ (not Western) movement (ibid).

Blindness to this context, and to the agency and diversity of women within Saudi Arabia, reveals both racist logics and a tendency towards culture-blaming that de-politicises social problems, and diverts attention away from the ways in which gendered practices are supported and sustained by wider global economic and geo-political structures of inequality. To imagine culture as an isolated realm of values and practices that are separate from other kinds of social relations, is inevitably to reproduce the dichotomies of ‘us’ and ‘them’. This line of thought is blind to both historical and current relations, and ultimately will hinder our ability to create a foreign policy that helps to create the conditions for long-term transformations in gender relations. Ethical stances which pit ‘barbaric’ cultures against enlightened Western morality are thick with neo-colonial logics and racial hierarchies that perpetuate, rather than transform, global inequalities. As Alison Jaggar argues, topics on the agenda of ‘intercultural dialogue’ about global justice for women (and men) in ‘non-Western countries’ must include questions about the basic structure of the global political economy, as well as the economic policies of Western governments that directly and indirectly affect poor women’s lives (Jaggar, 2004).

My argument here should not be misunderstood as a defence of the Saudi regime. Wallström’s mistake was not the withdrawal from the arms agreement. Rather, it is a critique of the framing of this move within a wider critique of the ‘medieval’ and ‘barbaric’ practices of non-Western, non-liberal societies,
and its attachment to a general appeal to ethics and justice. In so doing, her action, while progressive, is unlikely to be transformative in the direction of long-term feminist goals. For Sweden, a more transformative approach would have been to use the arms trade agreement to highlight the relationships linking the global arms trade, transnational business interests, the permissive conditions for continuing warfare, and the structural causes of women’s oppression across the globe.

Foreign policy can never truly be feminist as long as it is grounded in an understanding of global justice that reproduces, rather than challenges, dominant gender and racial hierarchies. A feminist and post-colonial foreign policy would actively disrupt the binaries – ‘civilized-barbaric’; ‘saviour-victim’; ‘masculine-feminine’ – on which traditional notions of international ethics are based. From a post-colonial feminist perspective, responding morally to global challenges requires a deep reflexivity on the part of powerful states regarding their own historical and contemporary roles in the situations they condemn.

Fiona Robinson is Professor of Political Science at Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada. She received her PhD from the University of Cambridge, and previously taught at the University of Sussex, UK. Her research focuses on ethics and gender in International Relations, especially in the areas of human rights, humanitarianism and human security.
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You

Yumna Ahad

You are the endangered specie going places.
   You are the roaring up growl
   You are the raging sea
   You are the desire to be different
   You are the happening to the unlimited skies
   You are your own grandeur
   You are the ability to stand out wherever you go
   You are the graceful mess in making
   You are the bravery encompassed in fragile bones
   You are the happiness of your own glow
   You are a woman that you ought to be.
Heteronormatisation and in society
racialisation are still present and we must stand up to them.

-Nathalia Corderio
LESBIAN THINKING AND GLOBAL STRUCTURES: THE VOICES OF THE SOUTH SHAKING THE SYSTEM

Nathalia Cordeiro

On the global level, we are seeing the advance and diffusion of feminism. Increased political awareness, resulting from tools such as the internet and social media, has enabled women to question their own reality, and challenge systemic inequality. With the advancement of these discussions and the empowerment of marginalized groups, it has become possible to show that, despite occupying a place of inequality, not all women are affected in the same way by the structures of oppression. In this paper, we will encounter the thinking developed by two lesbian women from the global south – Ochy Curiel and Yuderkis Espinosa-Miñoso – who focus on the relation between coloniality and sexuality, with the aim to bring attention to their transforming potential. In speaking from a lesbian perspective, this paper highlights the need to depart from the binary structures upholding the heterosexual regime that overrules and permeates the whole construction of what we understand as gender. Grounded within Latin American Post-colonial Studies, the theories generated by these dialogues, aim to deconstruct the mechanisms of exploitation and domination suffered in the Americas through the process of colonization (Sartore et al, 2015). In doing so, these racialised lesbian thinkers have constructed feminisms that seek to disrupt the colonial-modern patriarchy.

Gender as a concept has been interpreted in multiple ways since its diffusion during the 1970s. The term is intended to break with biological determinism linked to the concept of sex or sexual difference (Scott, 1995), and instead, refers, in general, to the social construction of the masculine and feminine. Lesbofeminists have expanded on this to highlight that what we understand as gender is a way of naturalising and normalising heterosexuality. The heterosexual system depends on the binary division of the sexes. That is, this form of organisation is based on two strictly opposite sexes, maintaining a supposedly complementary relation (Falquet, 2006). They also emphasise that this complementation is based on the exploitation of women through a rigid and unequal division of labour. In this sense, it is understood that heterosexuality is not a natural mechanism of attraction between two sexes. This is because bio-categorisation is only possible through the domestication of female sexuality, oriented to heterosexuality. Thus, the control of "sexuality [...] is the point of support of gender inequality" (Almeida and Saffioti, 1995, p. 23). Consequently, we can understand that heterosexuality is fundamental to the process of naturalisation of the sexes and sustaining the order of colonial-modern patriarchy.

Lesbianity and its constant erasure in a heteropatriarchal world make it difficult to question deeply the naturalisation of heterosexual relations.

Women who flee the paradigm of patriarchy and refuse to live according to its domination, suffer constant retaliation. However, such a challenge to heteropatriarchy can be seen in the work of Latin American lesbofeminists such
as Ochy Curiel and Yuderkis Espinosa-Miñoso, who discuss throughout their papers how erotic autonomy can disturb heterosexuality (Curiel, 2007; Miñoso, 2008). In addition, they debate how racism, sexism and lesbophobia affects the organisation of society, understanding that they are colonial legacies (Curiel, 2007; Minoso, 2008; Lugones, 2014).

According to Curiel (2007) and Espinosa-Miñoso (2008), sexuality is a relatively recent Western cultural production, and sexual morality, as well as the hierarchies it creates, are state tools trying to present themselves as modern, advanced, and civilized. In Latin America, nations were forged through colonial violence and through the ideology of miscegenation; that is, through the exploitation and rape of black and indigenous women by European white men, guided by the politics of white supremacy. Therefore, several racialised women have debated the patriarchal and capitalist power considering several systems of domination from the postcolonial critique (Curiel, 2007; Minoso, 2008; Lugones, 2014).

In general, throughout Latin America, lesbian autonomy is created in opposition to various patriarchal systems, including the lesbophobia of heterosexual feminists and the sexism of male homosexuals. According to Curiel (2007), the institutionalisation of the lesbian movement, as well as the logic of sexual diversity, has led to a period of regression. The LGBT movement, dominated primarily by male gays, has erased the mobilisation of feminist lesbianism and has engaged in superficial debates around identities and differences without any deeper discussion around systemic inequality. For example, the struggle for marriage equality and the adoption of this issue by the United Nations during the 1980s highlighted the dominant discourse of “diversity and tolerance”, which helped generate a process of bureaucratisation and institutionalisation of the LGBT movement in general. However, according to Curiel (2007) and Miñoso (2008), with the advancement of the political right-wing and conservatism, we must redefine our political positions.

It is necessary to rebuild the foundations of feminism having lesbianism as a political project, questioning the heterosexist, racist and neoliberal world-system.

As Curiel highlights: "It is a transformative proposal that assumes that women do not depend either sexually, emotionally, economically or culturally on men. It means understanding that sexuality is much more than coitus; it entails creating bonds and solidarity between women, without hierarchies and relations of power. It means understanding how patriarchy affects the body of women, historical bodies affected by the globalisation and transnationalisation of capital, racism, poverty, war, but also bodies that have built resistance and opposition to the inequality that produces patriarchy, bodies who have imagined and created other social relations, other paradigms, other worlds" (Curiel, 2007: 7).

In this sense, it is fundamental to address how sexuality embodies gender in society, and forms a central axis in the structural form of social organisation. Together with other determinants, it feeds the logic of poverty, racism and violence. Miñoso (2008) points out that heteronormatisation and racialisation are still present in society and we must stand up to them. Although some lesbofeminists point out advances, others maintain that through the state policies created, the conditions of oppression of lesbian and racialised women are still present. In this sense, these authors affirm the erotic autonomy of women to break with these systems of domination. Heterosexuality cannot be understood only as a sexual preference. Lesbians show that it is an ideology, a form of exploitation of women. As such, the erasure of lesbianity is fundamental for the heterosexual project to continue working. In this way, affection
between women, understood from a racialised debate, is fundamental for us to move towards the horizon of transformation.

Nathalia Corderio is from Brazil. She is currently is completing her Master’s Studies in Gender, Women and Feminism at the University of Bahia (Universidade Federal da Bahia) in Brazil.
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This emphasis on female vulnerability and the resulting victimisation of women can have serious implications on post-conflict reconstruction, hindering - rather than enabling - the principal objective of human rights.

-Michela Magni
THE VICIOUS DICHOTOMIES OF THE WOMEN, PEACE AND SECURITY FRAMEWORK: BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN NORMS AND REALITY, DIGNITY AND FREEDOM

Michela Magni

Lysistrata: Oh surely I am bound to give my best advice to Athens.

What matters that I was born a woman, if I can cure your misfortunes?

Lysistrata, Aristophanes [437]

The notion of women participating in peacekeeping and conflict-resolutions is often conceived as a relatively new phenomenon. Contrary to this social misconception, its origins lay as far back in time as the fourth century BC, an era during which the ancient Greeks depicted the role of women in societies on stage (Fox, 2001). The works of Aristophanes and Sophocles are of interest for providing an important insight into the role played by women in times of war. Through the characters of the heroines Lysistrata and Antigone, these two Greek scholars outlined some of the challenges that women faced and continue facing today during and after conflicts, stressing the intersection between private and public sphere, and local and international realities (Fox, 2001).

The complexity around these dichotomies is reflected in the Women, Peace and Security (WPS) Framework 2010-2011, a set of instruments in international law related to international security aimed at guiding the UN’s implementation of resolutions on women, peace and security. While official peace-security legislations commence in 2000 with Security Council Resolution 1325 (UNSCR-1325), the Framework’s origins can be traced further back. The United Nations’ (UN) commitment to the advancement of women began with the signing of the United Nations Charter in San Francisco in 1945, which declared in its preamble the determination of the UN to reaffirm faith in the equal rights of men and women (Division for the Advancement of Women, 2006). One year later, the Commission on the Status of Women was established and, during its first meeting in February 1946, it formally expressed the international commitment to address women’s role in economic and social development.

The UN’s founding commitments are echoed in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) that articulated the freedoms to which every human being is equally and inalienably entitled (United Nations, 2005). However, despite the increased emphasis on women’s advancement as an important goal, the UDHR, stressing the concepts of dignity and freedom, does not provide a comprehensive understanding of gender roles. Women are still depicted as mere victims, and the complexity that characterises gender violence and women’s active roles in conflicts and resolutions are mostly ignored.
This emphasis on female vulnerability and the resulting victimisation of women can have serious implications on post-conflict reconstruction, hindering - rather than enabling - the principal objective of human rights (Scully, 2009). The very notion of dignity poses some important questions on the human rights discourse. Attention to rhetoric and language is particularly crucial in an international context as these documents are used around the world to shape a wide range of programs. Given the context-specificity of the term and the lack of common understanding of what dignity requires across jurisdictions, this rhetoric creates a case for judicial manipulation, providing a convenient language for the adoption of substantive interpretations of human rights in local contexts (McCrudden, 2008).

In the following century, the adoption of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 (UNSCR-1325) marked a critical shift in the international understanding of the gendered and complex nature of conflicts. So far, it is considered the greatest achievement of the WPS Framework because it created solid normative tools to ensure the institutional capacity required to achieve its four stated goals: i) prevention, ii) protection, iii) participation, iv) relief and recovery. The UNSCR-1325 is revolutionary in the way it incorporates the understanding that women and gender equality are integral to peace, and women are finally depicted as actors, and not as mere victims. However, despite progress made, the Framework is still silent on aspects related to the intersections between the public and private spheres, and war and peace-time. This has the effect of reproducing gender stereotypes and failing to address the root causes of gender-based violence in local realities (Scully, 2009).

The daunting effects of this kind of rhetoric are evident in the context of Papua New Guinea (PNG), where Australia's resolution to promote women, peace and security failed in fostering change at a domestic level. A nation of around 3.5 million people, PNG is a former colony of Australia with a turbulent past of imperial powers dominating its territory, from which it became independent in 1975 (Jessep, 1992). Violence and sexual assault are important issues in PNG and despite a different range of law reforms, both domestic and tribal, violence still constitutes great barriers to national peace (Guthries, 2013). In PNG, Australia is highly criticised for enforcing the victimisation of women, proposing itself as an international protector and supporting the local paternalistic view of women in conflict and post-conflict contexts (Guthrie, 2013). Despite the attempts of the National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security (2012-2018) to draft a document on the language of UNSCR-1325, and its intent to challenge the problematic and simplistic conceptualisations of gender, Australia failed at translating such concepts to the domestic setting of PNG.

The legacies of colonialism and social constructs of PNG's societal fabric have hindered progress towards gender equality. Violence is often exacerbated by complex and evolving social factors, which play differently in urban and rural settings. Violence against women triggers a vicious cycle where gender influences perceptions of crime more than actual discrimination, provoking a general sense of fear and emotional trauma as violence is often perpetuated at the household level and in groups (Guthrie, 2013). Even though men and women are generally reported as similarly vulnerable to violence, the latter tend to experience it in the private sphere, a setting that the local law struggles to oversee (Guthrie, 2013). In such a context, Australia portrayed itself as the "masculine protector – economically developed, capable, professional and required to assist the undeveloped, weak and dishevelled nations to its north" (Lee-Koo, 2014).
In sum, implementation and diffusion of gender equality resolutions in local settings must be understood in their entire complexity, in context, and must challenge colonial legacies.

It’s an ambitious but imperative goal: discrimination remains pervasive across the implementation of various programs, as discussed in the context of PNG. In this way, the longer the legislation is in place, the more there will be opportunities to bridge the gap between norms and reality, legislations and implementation practices, that allows for meaningful progress towards gender equality.

Michela Magni is an International Development graduate from Monash University in Melbourne and the Paris School of Political Affairs (PSIA SciencesPO) with professional experience in project management, M&E and CSR in various developing contexts. Currently she works at Philanthropy Advisors, helping private actors and individuals achieve their philanthropic aspirations.
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Globally, 1 in 5 girls are estimated to be married before they turn 18.
Calling attention to body politics aims to decolonise the body, to reclaim the histories that have been erased from the popular development narrative and reclaim the spaces that have been denied to rationalised bodies and knowledges.

-Garima Shrivastava
BODY POLITICS IN DEVELOPMENT

Garima Shrivastava

This paper explores the role that body politics has played in the making of development through drawing upon and tracing the historicity of population control and reproductive health debates. I further elucidate these points by drawing on specific cases from India that highlight how control of female bodies has been central to the capitalistic development agenda of the state and the maintenance of patriarchy. I conclude by stressing the importance of the notion of ‘embodied consciousness’ (Icaza & Vazquez, 2016) as a critical approach to analyse and ‘do’ development.

What is Body Politics?

As a concept, body politics describes how bodies are central and yet invisible in development theory and practice (Harcourt, 2009). The conceptual shift from Women in Development (WID), which focused on improving women’s participation in existing economic structures, to Gender and Development (GAD), which focuses more specifically on the unequal power structures that shape men and women’s existences, led to an understanding of gender as non-natural, denying its fixity as a social construct. It questioned the dominant heterosexual order and its erasure of the diversity of sexual and gender identities (Icaza & Vazquez, 2016).

Specifically, women’s bodies have been made invisible from the development debates and seen primarily through their reproductive capacities.

This view obscures women’s agency as agents and obfuscates the multiple levels of oppression and discrimination. For example, such a view de-politicises issues of violence against women and issues pertaining to policies of population control and reproductive health and rights. An embodied view of resistance calls for looking at bodies as politicised spaces that have been at the centre of development praxis. “Body politics in the development process charts narratives that call for reproductive rights, sexuality and embodiment to be acknowledged in the development agenda in the debates around women’s agency, gender equality, health, population and environment” (Harcourt, 2017: 191).

Body Politics and Development

Through body politics, the embodied experience of the female body becomes an entry point for political engagement and understanding. According to Harcourt (2009: 24), “In calling attention to bodies as political subjects, feminists recognise that ‘we are bodies’. The political self is not distinct from the body”. Calling attention to body politics aims to decolonise the body, to reclaim the histories that have been erased from the popular development narrative and reclaim the spaces that have been denied to rationalised bodies and knowledges. As an activist working on reproductive rights and women’s access to safe abortion, it has always stunned me how crucial controlling female sexuality and body is to the maintenance of the capitalist world order. Reproductive and sexual freedom of female bodies have shown to be a real threat to the establishment and intrinsically linked to nation building. This understanding can make sense of what makes rape such a powerful tool of war against a nation, why a nation’s honour is tied to its women’s chastity to be defended by men and how the same logic is used to pin different caste, religious groups against one
another. Our bodies are part of the political context that we live in and the development narrative that we are weaved into. According to Desai (2016: 67): “Feminist writings on citizenship and the state has long noted the relevance of women's bodies as reproducers of the nation; it is equally important to think about the uses of the sexed body in a political context.”

In positioning our politics, it is imperative to look at meanings derived through institutions framing how society understands gendered bodies. Indeed, according to Harcourt (2009: 21): “The language and practices of family planning, medicine, public health, population and reproductive rights produce gendered bodies as interesting sets of objects and subjects of study.” The International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD), held in Cairo in 1994, highlighted the importance of a well-articulated transnational feminist movement. The conference initiated a paradigm shift by moving the debate from population control and reducing fertility, to bodily autonomy and reproductive rights. However, this achievement came at the expense of reducing female bodies to reproductive bodies (Harcourt, 2009). The emphasis on maternal health in MDGs further exacerbated this classification as women tied to their wombs making only reproductive bodies worthy of policy attention. Through universalising motherhood, the focus remains only on fertile bodies capable of procreating, and denying agency to the infertile bodies.

**Body Politics in India**

To further illustrate how female bodies have been at the centre of development discourse and yet still rendered invisible, I will draw upon the Indian experience. The case of India illustrates how women's bodies are placed within India's system of caste, kinship, and state domination (Desai, 2016). The imagery of a Hindu nation is articulated in terms of 'Bharat Mata' who is an embodiment of sacred, chaste and sacrificing ‘mother’ by the Hindu right wing in India known as the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS). The violence against minorities and discrimination against Muslims, mainly Muslim men, are enunciated in terms of protecting the honour of our ‘mother’ nation from these men. The same logic gets translated in the politics of violence that is unleashed against Muslims who are trying to dishonour ‘our girls’ and thus, protecting chastity is the foundation on which Hindu masculine men's militant politics is constructed upon. Here, the Female body is at the centre of the vision of the Hindu Rashtra whose honour needs to be protected by masculinized Hindu men. This logic is evident in the 2002 massacre in Gujarat where sexual violence against Muslim women was motivated by Hindu nationalist ideology, and is being reinforced in its most brutal form under the current right-wing government. The ‘make in India’ campaign, cow vigilance and mob lynching are rooted in the same logic of the patriarchal state, which plays itself at multiple levels of caste, class, religion, and gender. This imagery is rooted in a heteronormative world order that denies legitimacy to any other form of social existence as lesser beings and as a threat to the Hindu Rashtra. The culture of rape and violence perpetuated by this politics feeds into the logic of disciplining the 'unruly' bodies and social control: “the evidence of the systemic character of assaults ‘widely tolerated by the state and community’ suggests we need an understanding of the institutional conditions that normalise this violence.” (Desai, 2016: 68).

Moreover, the issue of daughter discrimination and the resulting low female sex ratio is a glaring body politic issue. Targeting reproductive technologies for bringing back ‘balance’ in sex ratio is a superfluous approach that fails to consider the layers of discrimination embedded in the practice. Such an approach puts the burden of achieving that ideal ratio on the women, thus depriving
them of agency and reducing female body to a womb. Further, campaigns which call for saving girls so the society can have wives, mothers, and sisters essentialises women’s identity to one of these roles, denying her any existence beyond them. The focus again here is on the fertile bodies, as ‘daughter’-producing bodies; in order to help achieve the ‘ideal sex ratio’. Thus, it denies agency to other bodies by being controlled through government policies.

There is a similar problem with India’s approach to safe abortion and reproductive health more broadly. In fact, the policy is so deeply embedded in its population control agenda that it fails to consider the embodied socio-political context of the actors involved. Even the rhetoric of ‘choice’ being adopted by feminists falls flat since it remains disconnected to the social political realities. Women’s choice doesn’t exist in a vacuum so, to see where these choices are located, the experiences of the body vis-à-vis its location is important. It helps to understand “how forms of class, kinship and ethnic domination are secured—and what happens when they are disrupted, and how have neoliberalisation and consumerism transformed older practices of sexual coercion and patriarchal norms” (Desai, 2016: 68).

As a framework GAD aims at transforming the current power relations and structures to bring in equality and social justice. Analyses of how gendered bodies are constructed helps to challenge norms and oppressive practices (Harcourt, 2009). Body politics plays a critical role creating the space for conversation around once taboo and depoliticised issues of violence against women, rape, and reproductive health. Yet we see that, despite these issues being increasingly recognised as important, they somehow have lost their transformatory radical essence.

We need to do more than just reflect; as feminists, we need to constantly challenge and devise collective actions to understand the situation changed by neo-liberalism (Harcourt, 2017). I argue for ‘embodied consciousness’ (Icaza & Vazquez, 2016), as central for a critical re-thinking of how we analyse, sense and ‘do’ development. Body politics refocuses attention on the personal experience of women as subjects of development. Politicising the private helps unravel how gender dehumanises bodies and calls for undoing the ‘colonial matrix of power’ – a structure of management that operates by controlling the economy, authority, knowledge, subjectivity, gender, and sexuality (Mignolo, 2007). Thinking, sensing and doing development from the body is the only possibility for destabilising (Icaza & Vazquez, 2016) normalised forms of power relations and paying attention to what has been produced as non-existent.

......

Garima Shrivastava is an Indian feminist working in the field of Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights with a special focus on Gender and Safe Abortion. She is currently a Masters Fellow Gender and Development studies at International Institute of Social Studies (ISS).
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WOMEN 4 PEACE
Contemporary representations of the war routinely omit female agency and participation.

-Laura Coryton
THE ALGERIAN WAR OF INDEPENDENCE:
“A WOMAN’S AFFAIR”

Laura Coryton

Wartime historiographies underpin the formation of national memory. They have functioned as foundational accounts of national pride, endurance, resistance, as well as collective successes and defeats. Yet, a fundamentally worrying depiction of women and the female form rests within this foundational cache. Dominant scholarship often depicts war at large as “une affaire d’hommes” (a man’s affair) (Liauzu, 1999: 1) in which women operate as peripheral, singular suffering entities. Feminist war scholars have been left questioning: “where are the women?” (Sjoberg, 2009: 69).

This article aims to expand the pool of scholarship dedicated to offering an alternative wartime historiographical focus: women. It will argue that war is also a woman’s affair and that women reside firmly at the heart of wartime scholarship, action, sacrifice and recovery alongside their male counterparts. By examining the Algerian War of Independence (1954-62), ultimately this article hopes to contribute to the recent academic shift in the historiography of the Algerian war which pays attention to the “complex, often very divisive, local experiences of the war for Algerian women... to gain a fuller understanding” (Spence, 2018) of the conflict and restore women’s salient position within “the epic narrative of resistance” (Vince, 2015: 212).

As war in Algeria loomed, political activity mounted. Many were enthused by the prospect of independence. This included women. Organisations and publications began to satisfy such enthusiasm by creating small but salient platforms from which women of most political persuasions could varingly discuss their experiences, their intellectual views on the role of women in an independence conflict and more widely, feminist ideas about decolonisation in both Algeria and its neighbouring countries. Such platforms included Party publications. Before it’s amalgamation with the National Liberation Front (FLN), the youth wing of Ferhat Abbas’ Party was perhaps the leading body in this regard. The party weekly, La République, acted as an organisation vehicle for its secular and Westernised feminist members. Feminist discussions were regularly featured in the political publication, alongside interviews of leading Egyptian feminists including Saiza Nabarawi and Mounira Charaoui from the Egyptian Feminist Union. This not only catapulted a female narrative into Algeria’s traditionally androcentric public sphere, but it also allowed the feminist spheres of Egypt to merge with those of Algeria and beyond, empowering women throughout the region, and led to the creation of a new kind of feminism that appealed to traditional Algerian audiences. Not least of all such a commitment to discussion and circulation of feminist material showcased the intricate intellectual efforts made both by and about women from most political persuasions in the wake of war. It not only increased the political attention issues predominantly affecting women gained, but amounted to the overall expansion of feminist thinking across the region as well. Intellectually, women were active as war loomed, but militarily they thrived during the conflict. Such efforts included
the creation and facilitation of “urban networks... as gun and bomb carriers, messengers, fund collectors, nurses, lookouts, cooks and doctors” (MacMaster, 2009: 315). A total of 10,949 (Vince, 2015: 222) women were registered as official militants – a number that rose significantly since the 49 women first reported to fight alongside the initial 1010 Mujahideen [freedom fighters] (Salhi, 2010: 115). A further 2,388 women were active members of fida’iyat: a body dedicated to smuggling arms, money and to support and facilitate the movements of the mujahideen, particularly in urban areas (Salhi, 2010: 115). These women could hide political and strategic messages under their veils, dress as Europeans to gain access European quarters where they deposited explosives, and accommodated mujahideen, for who they washed and knitted clothes, and hid weapons and even personnel. Women’s military actions were important. They not only aided in military advancements throughout the war, but they helped to change the organisation of Algerian society as well. Central to this was the breakdown of gender binaries that assimilated women with secondary, reductive and ultimately oppressive expectations. To adopt masculine traits in the place of those projected onto the female form by penetrating the masculinised military sphere was to challenge the wartime projection of women as incapable, suffering bodies that reacted to the military actions of men, and did not directly engage with them or the military securement of an independent Algeria at large.

Despite the efforts women made to “deconstruct” gendered binaries before and throughout the war, dominant scholarship depicts a post-1962 Algeria as an entirely patriarchal place (Goulimari, 2015: 19). Women were systemically “sent back into the kitchen, forgotten from history” (Vince, 2015: 252), and stripped from opportunities to “decide” their political and personal freedoms (Bourdieu, 2013 [1960]: 361). This is partly an accurate depiction. The first laws enlisted to govern an independent Algeria were particularly restrictive towards its female nationals. Many orbited the Family Code which became law in 1984 and assigned minor status to women in a court of law by recognising them “only in so far as they are daughters, mothers, or wives” (Salhi, 2010: 27). This law has been heavily criticised by feminist scholars for insinuating “a man’s body has meaning by itself” (Mihalache, 2007: 403). It disregards the body of the women, whereas the woman’s body seems devoid of meaning without reference to the male” (Beauvoir, 2015 [1949]: 7). In turn, it permits men to think of themselves as valuable individuals but not women, who must instead think of themselves as valuable only in relation with their connection to men (ibid). The Family Code was an important development. Its value expands from a merely legal phenomenon to an evidential reflectance of the values and expectations that have been projected onto the Algerian female form. However, there was more to women’s post-war experiences than these laws that govern them. Algerian women were also deeply involved in the political changes that dominated the Algerian post-war period. Their everyday activism impacted the ways that women were viewed and how they experienced a newly reborn Algeria. Although discouraged from doing so, many women “exercised a profession, that was activism” (Vince, 2015: 187). In doing so, they fuelled the deconstruction of gendered binaries. As the war ended, it was deemed impossible for “a woman to work like a man” (Bourdieu, 2013 [1960]: 200). For a woman to excel as a professional, she was to adopt “man’s work” and “turn into ‘Man’” (ibid). Women’s experiences of public space also began to change once the war had ended. Up until 1962, women’s living spaces had increasingly become
smaller. Such a reduction was reflected by Bourdieu (1970: 151) who introduces women in his Berber House by describing them as busily "polishing... cow dung" outside of their homes. Towards the end of the war, women were socially discouraged from entering several public areas without a male guardian. Yet, as war came to an end, such spaces began to "widen... she moves around in the European town, goes into department stores, takes the train" (Bourdieu, 2013 [1960]:112). Women enjoyed significantly increased freedoms. In pushing for, achieving, and exercising such freedoms, Algerian women began to break down the gender binaries that held them back throughout the war. Not only this, but Algerian women also lobbied for gender neutralising laws such as "gender-blind citizenship" to minimise the possibilities for legally-binding gender biases (Vince, 2015: 205). It was hoped that such legislative changes would help to secure "greater autonomy" for women and a fundamental break-up of the family bloc, "leading... each member of the group to become aware of his or her individuality", and their unwavering value, independent of gender (Bourdieu, 2013 [1960]: 112).

In doing so, such women could "jump over the gender gap"and set a precedent which, in theory, should have allowed other women to do the same and claim their place as salient actors in "the epic narrative of resistance" (Vince, 2015: 212-253).

Remembering both the sacrifices and achievements of women during the war aids in informing post-war “loyalties, understandings, aspirations, fears and, of course, silences” is important (Vince, 2015: 121). However, contemporary representations of the war routinely omit female agency and participation. This included the Museum of Mujahid in Algiers which, in 2005, dedicated a "corner of the museum with ten or so objects and photographs" to the participation of women during the war (Vince, 2015: 212). It was described as a “shameful” display in the way it possibly reflected a national sense of ownership over the female population and their sacrifices (ibid).

Meanwhile, the contours of the Algerian War of Independence can be seen to extend significantly into ‘peacetime’ as gendered power dynamics continue to disadvantage women and women’s intellectual groups today. In recent decades, the lessons learned by the Algerian women in combat have led to an underground support network used to “mentor Palestinian women in their ongoing struggles”, teaching them lessons reflective of their wartime experiences and aiding with effective female war organisation and tactics (ibid). Their underground storytelling has huge international political implications which can be studied only through the experiences of the women that facilitate them.

......
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This emphasis on female vulnerability and the resulting victimisation of women can have serious implications on post-conflict reconstruction, hindering - rather than enabling - the principal objective of human rights.

-Anwar Mhajne
THE FUTURE OF FEMINIST FOREIGN POLICY: TOWARDS A MORE INCLUSIVE UNDERSTANDING OF WOMEN’S (AND MEN’S) SECURITY

Anwar Mhajne

Feminist foreign policies are strongly informed by the United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) agenda on Women, Peace, and Security (WPS). This agenda provides a normative framework for foreign and security policies. The influence of WPS is evident in various countries’ foreign policy orientations. For instance, Julie Bishop, Australia’s foreign minister, and the first woman in the role, is a strong supporter of WPS issues (Aggestam, 2016). Moreover, during Hillary Clinton’s tenure as U.S. Secretary of State, she framed the status of women as a matter of national security and played a crucial role in garnering unanimous endorsement of UNSCR 1888 (2009) on sexual and gender-based violence in armed conflict (Mason, 2013). The WPS agenda connects women’s issues to national and international security.

A consequence of this agenda is that ending global violence against women could be used to justify militarised interventions, thus “genderwashing” imperialist interventions, and supporting investments in police, military, and peacekeeping to prevent and respond to gendered violence abroad (Mason, 2013). An historical example of such “genderwashing” is U.S. First Lady Laura Bush’s September 2001 announcement in which she justified the invasion of Afghanistan in terms of security and freedom, to liberate Afghan women and facilitate their return to school (Stout, 2001).

Moreover, feminist foreign policy is defined narrowly by the WPS agenda. It merely asks for adding women to the peace process without adequately analysing local, national and international patriarchal power structures or the connection between militarisation, arms trade, and women’s oppression. For instance, the Swedish Foreign Service action plan for feminist foreign policy focuses on improving the situation of women and girls. In 2017, the plan aimed to promote the role of women and girls through conflict prevention (Bjarnegård & Melander, 2017). In 2016, the action plan’s main goal was to promote the participation of women as actors in peace processes and peace support operations (ibid, 2017).

The goals of these action plans are blindly focused on including women, without addressing other patriarchal structures enhanced by militarism and fuelled by access to weapons, which play a strong role in perpetuating the insecurities women face around the world.

Despite advocating a feminist foreign policy, Sweden is one of the world’s top ten arms exporters, allowing exports to repressive authoritarian regimes that oppress their civilians and strip women of their basic rights (Aggestam, 2016). To address this contradiction, the Swedish Parliament passed a new and stricter set of export control criteria in February 2018 that takes into consideration the receiving state’s democratic status as a major element in evaluating potential arms sales (Perlo-Freeman, 2018). However, this policy would
not involve a complete ban on arms exports to non-democracies. For instance, Sweden can continue selling weapons to the United Arab Emirates (UAE), a country fuelling the conflict in Yemen by backing southern separatists (Perlo-Freeman, 2018). Indeed, the Swedish aerospace and defence company, Saab, opened a development and production centre in the UAE in December 2017 (Perlo-Freeman, 2018).

Similarly, despite Canada’s feminist foreign policy, the country continues selling weapons to Saudi Arabia, thus indirectly exacerbating the conflict in Yemen and its devastating effects on women (Zakaria, 2017). In September 2017, a few months after Canada announced its new global feminist agenda, the U.S. government signed a $593 million arms deal with the Nigerian military (ibid, 2017). The deal includes weapons with Canadian ties such as the A-29 Super Tucano warplanes whose engines are manufactured by Pratt and Whitney Canada (York, 2017). These weapons will be used by a government that has in the past bombed refugee camps and killed dozens of civilians (Al Jazeera, 2017). Another deal made last year with the Canadian-led Streit Group also sold 177 armoured vehicles to the Nigerian military (York, 2017).

As opposed to the aforementioned foreign policies, an effective feminist foreign policy needs to acknowledge existing power structures and analyse the causes and consequences of patriarchy, militarisation, and neoliberalism as the dominant order. Profiting from arms production creates a vested interest in sustaining the systems of war. The manufacture, trade, proliferation, possession, and use of weapons facilitate sexual and gender-based violence, human trafficking, and armed conflicts, which are integrally tied up with violent masculinities. Governments need to reallocate resources spent on the military towards activities that benefit women and humanity in general, such as implementing the Sustainable Development Goals.

As Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) have always argued, bloated military spending raids funds set aside for human security and sustainable development: “If the [1.6 trillion USD] spent on military security in 2015 was directed towards human security, this would provide a substantial portion of the total needed to realise the 2015 Sustainable Development Goals” (WILPF, 2017: 20). Militarism and arms trades are tightly connected. An emphasis on militarism might serve the interests of those profiting from arms production, thus sustaining the systems of war. As various studies produced by WILPF and the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) demonstrate (see: Gaynor, 2015 & WILPF, 2016), women and girls often disproportionately suffer from the use of weapons in conflict due to “forced displacement, sexual violence, trafficking, lack of access to health care (including sexual and reproductive health), and lack of access to victim and survivor assistance” (WILPF, 2016: 6).

Therefore, a more impactful approach to feminist foreign policy should be based on challenging militarism and preventing arms from reaching entities that will utilise them to violate the rights of men and women. A feminist foreign policy should not only focus on addressing women’s needs during conflict, but also focus on preventing conflict itself and reducing its intensity through controlling the influx of weapons and limiting arms trade. It is important to ensure that peace processes are inclusive and gender-sensitive, but this alone is insufficient. Rather, to ensure peace, policymakers need to focus on how militarism and arms trade fuel conflicts and increase civilian casualties for men and women alike. A feminist foreign policy should enable effective conflict prevention through disarmament, women’s meaningful participation, and providing effective
conditions for women’s empowerment.

Anwar Mhajne, a Palestinian citizen of Israel, recently received her Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Cincinnati in the US. Her current research focuses on gender, politics, and religion.
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Righteously

Yumna Ahad

Feminism is the acceptance of being treated righteously.
if not me, who?
if not now, when?