

***Gender and Peace Processes –
an Impossible Match?***

The views expressed in the papers
in this publication
represent the views of the authors
and do not necessarily reflect the views
of the author's organisation
nor of the Collegium for Development Studies.

Published by
Collegium for Development Studies
Övre Slottsgatan 1
SE-753 10 Uppsala, Sweden
www.kus.uu.se

Editor: Louise Olsson
Production editor: Mia Melin
Graphic design: Fröjdlund Grafisk Form AB
Printed by Elanders Graphic Systems AB

ISSN 1403 – 1264
ISBN 91 – 973683 – 9 – 3

Contents

Introduction	1
<i>Anna T. Höglund: Gender Aspects of the Legitimisation of Military Force – a Post-September 11 Perspective</i>	7
<i>Jennifer F. Klot: Women and Peace Processes – an Impossible Match?</i>	17
<i>Kari H. Karamé: Gender, Peace-Building and Foreign Personnel</i>	25
<i>Ulla Andrén: Guinea-Bissau 1998-99: Observations by a Mediator</i>	31
General Discussion	37
<i>Appendix 1: Slutdeklaration / Declaracion Final Colombia Conference</i>	43
<i>Appendix 2: Security Council Resolution 1325</i>	47
<i>Appendix 3: Windhoek Declaration</i>	51
List of Participants	57

Authors

Louise Olsson,

Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University (editor)

Gunilla Lindestam,

Collegium for Development Studies, Uppsala University (conference organiser)

Anna T. Höglund,

Researcher in Ethics, Uppsala University

Jennifer F. Klot,

Social Science Research Council, New York

Kari H. Karamé,

Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, NUPI

Ulla Andrén,

Former Chargée d'Affaires for Sweden in Guinea Bissau

Introduction

Louise Olsson and Gunilla Lindestam

This report is a follow-up to the seminar *Gender and Peace Processes – an impossible match?*, held on December 5, 2002, in Uppsala. The seminar was organised by the Collegium for Development Studies and with active involvement by Louise Olsson at the Department for Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University. It brought together researchers, policy-makers and practitioners from universities, research institutions, NGOs, ministries, the Swedish Rescue Services Agency, the Swedish Armed Forces and the Swedish Police Peace Support Operations. The seminar was funded by Sida.

Background

In September 2001, the Collegium for Development Studies, in collaboration with Sida, hosted a conference where women from Colombia met to discuss their role in the peace process in Colombia. The Colombian participants were women from different social sectors in society, as well as observers from the conflict parties. The conference resulted in a common declaration with recommendations to the parties involved in the peace process on the role of women and how to focus their needs in order to reach peace and social justice (*see Appendix 1 for a Swedish and Spanish version of the final declaration*). After the conference, the women continued to work in Colombia through the women's initiative *Iniciativa de Mujeres Colombianas por la Paz*. A number of activities have been organised, such as big manifestations in order to stop the conflict and continue the peace negotiations. Moreover, Swedish participants were interested to find out how Swedish organisations and researchers could contribute in order to enhance the role of gender in conflict resolution.

As a next step, the Collegium arranged a seminar in December 2001, with the title *Women's Participation in Peace Processes*, the purpose of which was to discuss how the participation of women in peace processes could be placed higher on the Swedish development agenda. Both the conference and the seminar clearly showed the need to follow up this issue in new seminars, through networking or by creating a website. The seminar on gender and peace processes, held in December 2002, was one response.

Seminar contributions and contents of the report

Both seminars focused on the current lack of gender awareness in conflict resolution and peace processes. They primarily debated the apparent difficulty when it comes to including a gender perspective in these areas and what Swedish organisations can do to promote gender issues of peace and security.

It is a fact that both women and men are actors and victims in contemporary armed conflicts. In spite of this, one group – the women – is hardly ever represented at peace negotiations. The notion that this constitutes a problem has, however, reached the international agenda and is currently being debated both in international organisations, states and NGOs.

The issue of gender in peace processes can be divided into two parts: gender balancing – i.e. assuring female representation – and gender mainstreaming. Mainstreaming a gender perspective entails, as defined by the UN's Economic and Social Council (Resolution 1997/2):

... the process of assessing the implications for men and women of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in any area and at all levels. It is a strategy for making women's as well as men's concerns and experiences an integral dimension in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres so that women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal is to achieve gender equality.

Gender should thus be a part of all UN work, including peace and security. This gender mainstreaming policy has also begun to influence the policies of many individual states.

Although the issues are on the agenda, the progress of integrating gender in international work for peace has been slow, especially considering that the debate began in international forums more than 20 years ago¹. Therefore, the Uppsala seminars sought to gather ideas, experiences and suggestions on how to advance gender awareness in peace processes. Both seminars drew upon previous

work conducted by the UN, such as the Resolution 1325 (2000)², the follow up reports by the Secretary General³, and the independent UNIFEM report⁴, as well as the work of Swedish state organisations and NGOs.

One basic seminar approach was the focus on practical experience of working with gender. Before the seminar *Gender and peace processes – an impossible match?*, participants were asked to reflect on how their organisations work with gender issues, whether a resolution such as 1325 could be of help to their everyday work, and what knowledge or resources were lacking in their organisations for them to be able to work more efficiently with the issues. These questions were then discussed in group discussions. The seminar concluded with a general discussion, with the lecturers.

Contributions by lecturers

Anna Höglund, holding a Ph.D. in theology, wrote her dissertation on ethical aspects of war and gender. She was one of the lecturers in the December 2001 seminar, and her contribution in this report, *Gender Aspects of the Legitimisation of Military Force - a Post-September 11 Perspective*, is based on a lecture in which she discusses ethical aspects of armed conflict and the limitations of this traditional research on war, primarily regarding gender aspects. She problematises the established assumptions about men's and women's roles in armed conflict and claims that despite cultural images of women as peaceful by nature, they are not invited to peace negotiations and summits. Höglund also requests that gender aspects become a natural part in the consideration of ethical aspects of contemporary warfare, with increased terrorist activity. It is of vital importance, as this development has serious implications for the entire population.

Jennifer Klot, Kari Karamé and Ulla Andrén all contributed to the seminar *Gender and peace processes – an impossible match?*, focussing their presentations on different gender aspects of the conflict resolution process.

Jennifer Klot is a former Senior Adviser on Governance, Peace and Security at UNIFEM and is one of the initiators behind the UNIFEM project "Women, War and Peace: The Independent Expert's Assessment on the Impact of Armed Conflict on Women and Women's Role in Peace-building" conducted by Elisabeth Rehn and Ellen Johnson Sirleaf. Klot gives her personal observations from a policy perspective regarding current international developments and obstacles to gender mainstreaming and balancing. She identifies strengths and weaknesses with the Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000) and the possible conflicts of interest between increased protections of women's human rights and increasing women's security. Like other contributors, Klot seeks to put the

situation of women in a gender context, and underlines the need to consider that in the group “women”, as in the group “men”, there are both victims and actors. Klot believes that the weakening of multilateralism and the strengthening of globalization can have serious consequences for women and equality work. However, gender mainstreaming, Klot states, is only a tool, not a “panacea”, to come to terms with these consequences, and they need to be put in a context.

Kari Karamé, a researcher at NUPI (Norsk Utenrikspolitisk Institutt), is somewhat more optimistic in her presentation. Karamé’s research is focused on the Middle East, particularly on the Lebanon, Syria and Jordan. Her research interests include the development in these countries and relations with the peace process, gender and conflict, relations between the peace forces and the local residents, development assistance and peace building. In her contribution, Karamé discusses the need to include gender aspects in the rebuilding of societies, and the problematic fact that there is a current lack of women active in peace processes. She states that one remedy to the situation would be for gender to be recognised as a quality-improving tool in peace-building processes, both by the local and the international community. Karamé also shares her insights regarding the UN operation in Lebanon, underlining the importance of gender considerations.

In a personal contribution, Ulla Andrén presents her experiences as a mediator in Guinea-Bissau. She was working as the Chargée d’Affairs in Guinea-Bissau when the war broke out, decided to stay and so became involved in the peace negotiations. Her presentation focuses on the Guinea-Bissau conflict and its gender aspects as well as on how she perceived her role as a mediator. In line with the conclusions made by Höglund, Andrén observes that even if women in Guinea-Bissau were seriously affected by the conflict, they were almost absent from peace negotiations.

A summary of the general discussion at the end of the 2002 seminar is also found in this volume. The declaration from the first Colombia conference is found in Appendix 1, Resolution 1325 (2000), an important basis for the seminars, is found in Appendix 2, and the Windhoek Declaration can be read in Appendix 3.

Purpose of report and acknowledgments

This volume has been compiled at the urgent request of the participants of the seminars, in order to forward the debate on gender and peace processes and to reach a wider audience than the one actually participating.

We want to thank the authors for contributing to the volume. The observations formulated are important opinions and observations of the authors, and we are much indebted to them for taking the time to write out their presentations. We also wish to extend our thanks to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, particularly to Gerd Johnson-Latham who participated at both seminars and arranged for the translation of Höglund's article.

Notes

¹ For a more thorough discussion on the development of these issues in the UN context, see *United Nations and the Advancement of Women, 1946-1996* (1996) United Nations Blue Book Series, Volume VI, revised edition. New York: United Nations.

² See Appendix 2.

³ *Women, Peace and Security*. Study submitted by the Secretary-General pursuant to Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) (2002), New York, United Nations.

⁴ Rehn, Elisabeth and Johnson Sirleaf, Ellen (2002) *Women, War and Peace: The Independent Expert's Assessment on the Impact of Armed Conflict on Women and Women's Role in Peace-building*. New York: UNIFEM.

Gender Aspects of the Legitimisation of Military Force – a Post-September 11 Perspective

Anna T. Höglund

Ever since the 11 September, 2001, terror attacks in the USA shocked the world, the conditions for debate about the political use of violence have radically altered. Global political development after this date has both ethical and gender-related implications. Questions about war, gender and morality continue to be a burning problem in our world. In the 1980s, the issue that dominated the debate about the moral justification of military force was the arms race between the superpowers and nuclear weapons development. In the 1990s, the issue focused on the circumstances, under which so-called humanitarian intervention (military operations by a third party, aimed at protecting human rights in a conflict area) could be regarded as legitimate. This question came to the fore because of the war in the Balkans and the NATO bombings that were claimed to have been undertaken in order to stop ethnic cleansing in the region. Today, at the beginning of the 21st century, the crucial question is how the various forms of illegal violence should be dealt with, violence that, for example, takes the form of terrorist attacks and violence that is not contained by the state.

War and gender

During recent decades, the issue of how war and gender may be related to each other has been debated intensively in feminist research. However, the relation between gender and violence is seldom discussed within the mainstream of political theory and philosophy. Statistics for various conflicts show, however, that the gender aspect is highly relevant to any study of military force. At the

end of the 20th century, one can see a tendency towards an increasing number of women taking part in war as active combatants. Despite this, statistics for a number of different conflicts indicate that women still take part in wars primarily as victims.

The proportion of civilian victims in military conflicts has grown increasingly after World War II. The majority of these civilian victims are women and children. On the other hand the proportion of combatants killed and wounded (which still mainly comprises men) has declined in recent decades. Furthermore, women and children account for most of the refugee streams in the wake of military conflicts. Domestic violence against women increases in connection with civil conflicts and wars between states, as though a direct consequence of them. Rape, sexual abuse and coerced prostitution are, and appear to have always been, systematic, albeit not officially recognised weapons in war.¹

The predominant picture in the Western world is that war is one of the most gender-segregated activities that we know – second only to biological reproduction, according to some researchers.² Cultural gender norms give a complementary image of manliness and womanliness. According to this, women are assumed to be peaceful by nature and to repudiate every type of violence. Men, in contrast, are assumed to be capable of and prepared under certain circumstances to resort to violence, primarily to protect women, children and their native countries.

However, these cultural perceptions have not had any major effect as regards women's being invited to participate in peace negotiations, peace processes or summits. Although women have made up the majority of the membership of the world's peace movements, "real" peace negotiations are still almost exclusively a male activity. In this context, instead of women's love of peace as one would expect, it is another aspect of their natures that comes to the fore in views on womanliness, namely that women and womanliness belong to the private sphere. In matters pertaining to war and foreign policy, women are still considered to be among the outsiders.

This outside position could very well have inspired women in their commitment to peace-work. In a famous passage from *Three Guineas*, Virginia Woolf says that the things soldiers are said to have fought for, such as democratic freedom and civil rights, women have very seldom partaken of:

"Therefore if you insist upon fighting to protect me, or 'our' country, let it be understood soberly and rationally between us, that you are fighting to gratify a sex instinct which I cannot share; to procure benefits which I have not shared and probably will not share; but not to gratify my instincts, or to protect either myself

or my country. For...in fact, as a woman, I have no country. As a woman I want no country. As a woman, my country is the whole world."³

Although Woolf's observations might be correct regarding women's motives for repudiating the use of force, the picture of women excluded from war is in other respects a myth. Throughout the 20th century, we saw a development in which the proportion of civilian victims in wars steadily increased, while the proportion of wounded and injured combatants declined. The backdrop to this is, on the one hand, rapid developments in arms technology, including the production of weapons of mass destruction, which make it no longer possible to exclude the civilian population from, for example, massive bombing, and, on the other, the development from inter-state to civil conflicts. According to UNICEF data, in the wars fought since World War II 90 percent of all victims are found in the civilian population. A large share of them are women and children.⁴ However, this does not mean that women are only victims in wars. Today, women are increasingly participating as active combatants, while civilian women are playing a major role in trying to keep daily life going, even during armed conflicts.

Despite the very different picture of armed conflict today, the change in the relation between war and gender does not seem to have made any impact on our consciousness. The gender-based image of war is still very strong, rooted as they are in strong and deeply embedded gender norms. Gender norms may be described as beliefs at the core of a culture on what is male and what is female. Based on these norms, we are constantly active in consolidating ourselves as women and men, in constructing our gender. Gender construction may be described as a continuous ongoing process of gender creation, taking place wherever people interact with each other and in all arenas, both private and public. War is thus not excluded from this. Even war and the exercise of military force constitute an arena for gender construction, confirming or conflicting with cultural gender norms.⁵

Gender construction in war naturally depends on gender construction in peacetime. Included in the norms for masculinity and femininity are norms both for violence and non-violence. Several men's studies researchers have shown that masculinity is not something static, but a phenomenon that is multifaceted and culturally constructed. In the same context, several types of masculinity can exist simultaneously, but often hierarchically organised in relation to each other. The most desirable type of masculinity in the Western context is

hegemonic, superior masculinity. It is within this form of masculinity that we find that masculinity embodies a preparedness to resort to occasional violence, for example, to protect women and children.⁶

History research has shown that the myth of man as a warrior, already established in Homer's writings, is still very much alive. Accordingly, the construction of masculinity may be likened to the construction of the man as a warrior. This can be seen particularly clearly in military training, where certain desirable qualities classified as manly (such as courage and duty) are encouraged and rewarded, while other, undesirable "female" qualities must be quashed (such as cowardice, gentleness and weakness). This is not just a question of producing the behaviour that is desired in combat, but the creation of identity at a deeper level.⁷

That the use of violence in war can be one way of creating hegemonic masculinity has had devastating consequences for women. The incidence of rape and sexual abuse in war seems almost always to have been part of warfare. The war crime of rape may have political purposes, aimed at breaking down a society's infrastructure or to be part of an ethnic cleansing policy and the terror directed against the civilian population. However, rape is also a means of establishing male dominance. Rape sends signals, both to women and men. To women, that they are weak and threatened by certain men and therefore dependent on the protection of other men; to men, that they have failed in their role as protectors, and therefore in their masculinity. Thus rape in war becomes a means of creating subordinate womanliness for the victim, superior masculinity for the perpetrator and diminished masculinity for the men of the enemy side.⁸

The justification of military force

The predominant approach to military force in political ethics and philosophy is that under certain circumstances it may be justified, an approach traditionally called the theory of the just war. This tradition deals partly with the issue of *when* it may be permissible to start a war, partly with *how* it should be waged, should war break out, i.e., the means and methods that are permitted in war. The theory is largely codified in international legislation on warfare, so-called humanitarian law. Both in the debate about the USA's retaliatory attacks on Afghanistan (in the autumn of 2001) and in the arguments on the legitimacy of a possible attack on Iraq (autumn 2002) – in other words, in what is generally termed "the war against terrorism" – this traditional ethical line of reasoning has once again been brought to the fore.

Self-defence is put forward as the most legitimate cause for resorting to military force. The right to war in self-defence is regulated in the Charter of the United Nations, Article 51. This condition was often cited in the debate on the US bombing of Afghanistan. By describing the attacks as part of a war of defence, they could be justified and claimed to be in accordance with the UN Charter. The assumption behind this was that the terrorist attacks were regarded – as expressed by President Bush – as “acts of war” and not as “acts of terror”.

Similarly the US attack on Iraq (spring 2003) has sometimes been depicted as a war of defence. What is referred to in this case is, however, defence for preventive purposes, justified by the threat said to be represented by Iraq's weapons development. What is problematic with this development, of course, is that the view of what constitutes a war of defence is being extended, so that even pre-emptive strikes are included in the concept. Pre-emptive attacks in self-defence were previously regulated in international law and were prohibited acts.

Another central requirement with regard to justification of military force – closely linked to the demand for a just cause – is the demand for a legitimate authority behind such force. This means that a legitimate regime must order the force for it to be regarded as just. However, the only use of force that can be called for by a legitimate leadership of a state – or union of states – is the force of self-defence, and this is the reason for the close link between the need for a just cause (self-defence) and that of a legitimate authority (the nation-state). Only the UN Security Council is entitled to call for military force for reasons other than self-defence, namely when there is a threat to international peace and security.

Applied to the debate on the US attack on Iraq, these requirements mean that a war on Iraq must either be legitimised through a decision by the UN Security Council, or – if called for by the USA on its own – be defined as a war of defence to meet ethical and legal demands for legitimacy. As mentioned above, however, the inclusion of pre-emptive military attacks within the concept of self-defence is problematic.

But a just cause and legitimate authority do not automatically legitimate military force; it must also be undertaken in a legitimate manner. With regard to the means and methods of warfare, both ethical theories and international law emphasise the need, above all, for what they term the principle of proportionality. This means that the force used should be in proportion to the anticipated advantage of an act of war, for it to be regarded as just in moral terms. This

requirement too has been referred to in the debate on the war against terrorism. Basing their arguments on this perspective, advocates of a military solution to the problem can claim that it is possible to use force that is in proportion to the important goal of eliminating terrorism. This argument was put forward in connection with the war between the USA and Afghanistan. Several critical voices were raised, however, maintaining that the limits for what constituted proportional force were being breached.

Last, but not least, in some cases, theories that justify military force stress the requirement for immunity on the part of civilians. Military attacks may only be directed at military targets to be regarded as just. War must be a fight between combatants, and civilians should, as far as possible, be kept outside the fighting. In the fight against terrorism, this requirement is considerably complicated by the fact that terrorists cannot automatically be regarded as “soldiers”. However, as mentioned above, large terrorist attacks are sometimes interpreted as “acts of war”. Moreover, the requirement has primarily been cited by those who are critical of the war against terrorism being fought with military means. Modern wars affect civilian populations to such an extent that the central requirement for civilian immunity often cannot be met. Because of this, the use of force is not just, despite its advocates' claims of a just cause and a positive goal (eliminating terrorism).

In addition, what distinguished the argument for justifying military operations in Afghanistan was the fact that women's situation under the Taliban regime was used as a form of war propaganda. This is not unusual in war. Rape of one's countrywomen, for example, has often been similarly used to raise fighting spirit and spur soldiers to seek revenge. However, in the case of the Afghanistan bombings, as in many other conflicts, interest in the actual situation of women seems to be irrelevant to the attacks. Nevertheless, pictures of veiled women were made to function as a further means of legitimising the bombings.

Gender aspects of modern and post-modern violence

Regulations on just warfare were drawn up at a time when the nation-state was the natural political unit and it was assumed that wars would be waged as interstate wars, in which the armies of nation-states fought against each other. Today we see a new development with an increasing number of civil wars, and a growing threat of terrorism, while at the same time supranational bodies, such as the UN, the EU and NATO, become increasingly important international actors. From a gender perspective, this development reflects the complexity of the relation between war and gender.

On the one hand, the events of recent years show that “war” is the same as it has always been. It was men who carried out the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center, and it was male political and military leaders who took the decisions and voiced an opinion on retribution. In a speech to the nation that President Bush held shortly before the start of the bombing of Afghanistan, he directed his comments specifically to the US army with rhetoric full of allusions to hegemonic masculinity and the image of the male as a warrior. “Be ready”, he said, “You will make us proud”, words that caused hundreds of young American men to stream to recruitment offices to enlist as volunteers in the war.

In Sweden, there were initially very few women who were given space in the media to comment on what was occurring. When they were finally allowed to do so, they usually dissociated themselves both from the terrorist attacks and the bombings. A clear gender difference also emerged in opinion polls on views of the US bombings, made in Sweden during the autumn of 2001. Women were more likely than men to be critical of the attacks of retribution. All these examples confirm the traditional, cultural image of the connection between gender and violence.

On the other hand, ongoing developments are also breaking down cultural images, both of war and of gender. War has evidently ceased to be a question of the armies of nation-states fighting each other according to the rules of international law. After the terrorist attacks, the USA had to fight an enemy that was invisible as it were, that had no defined territory to fight against, and that definitely did not follow international laws on war – civilians, for example, were used both as means and objectives in the terrorist attacks. To meet this unregulated violence, however, it was decided to resort to a traditional form of regulated force, which could be justified using established laws and theories of war.

The concepts of war and gender in the Western context are very closely linked. This means that if the image of what war represents becomes less clear, our views on gender will also be affected and vice versa. There is much to indicate that today's warfare can no longer be described in terms of previously well-defined categories, such as war and peace, home and front, civilian and military, with their strong associations with gender, masculinity and femininity. What distinguishes war in today's world is partly new weapons technologies that make this impossible, and partly the fact that the majority of conflicts are now wars within states and not between them, as assumed by traditional laws of war.

After 11 September, 2001, yet another type of warfare threatens to proliferate – the war on terrorism. Terrorism may be seen as a response to the existing power balance in the world. When a small number of superpowers acquire access to increasingly sophisticated weapons, they seem to be impossible to defeat with conventional combat methods. This spurs on the acquisition of other combat methods that are not regulated in international agreements and laws of war. The budget adopted by the US Congress in autumn 2002 allocated more money to the military than since the Cold War in the 1980s. This may perhaps be further evidence of the way in which we hold on to a traditional image of war as the armies of nation-states fighting each other. Today's conflicts look different, however. They are rooted in deeply unjust global conditions, and they will not be defeated by more armaments and greater defence allocations.

It is obviously no longer possible to see war as a purely masculine phenomenon. In today's war, there is no clear boundary between the home and the front, and no clear boundary between civilian and military. What distinguishes today's wars – described by many researchers as “post-modern” conflicts – is their *fluidity*, which dissolves traditional perceptions both of war and gender. Where is the front in today's war? Who is civilian and who is military? How is one to exclude civilians from today's fighting? As one researcher wrote in connection with the war in former Yugoslavia in the 1990s: “[In this war] where there is no 'front' and death finds you in the bread lines, water lines and markets, gender roles are being radically redefined.”⁹ Fetching water or buying bread, traditionally women's tasks linked to the home and civilian life, are suddenly associated with masculine values, such as risk-taking, heroism and courage.

Conclusion

A continual ethical reflection on whether the use of force for political ends can ever be justified is necessary. In this article, I have tried to show how traditional parameters for justifying military force have been transformed by the development of increasing terrorism and reactions to it. Perhaps today we should find new ways of preventing escalation of this violence. Maybe it is time to give up our search for just attacks and just defence, and turn our attention instead to striving for a change in global relations that could prevent the causes of, and popular support for, terrorism and reduce the unfortunate polarisation into north-south and West-Islam that now dominates the world.

In addition to this, I believe that we should continually reflect on the relation between gender and violence. How can we put an end to the cultural link between masculinity and violence? How do we strengthen the alternatives to

hegemonic masculinity? How can we discard gender-tainted metaphors such as “security is built on strength”, “autonomy” and “boundaries *vis-à-vis* others”? All these concepts have been shown by feminist researchers to be linked with masculinity, in contrast to culturally feminine concepts, such as “relations”, “dependence”, “mutual respect” and “care for each other”. Can we make use of the post-modern thinking, where our perceptions both of violence and gender are being dissolved? Or does a post-modern view of violence primarily mean that it becomes limitless, impossible to contain and to regulate? Would an acceptance of a definition of the violence of today as post-modern legitimise, for example, terrorist acts? Is it possible to formulate new ethical and judicial rules that would be applicable to today's post-modern war, or should we, on the contrary, stick with modern concepts of humanism, human rights and solidarity?

A synthesis of modern and post-modern thinking on these issues is perhaps as yet an untried possibility. To term today's armed conflicts as post-modern may assist us in the descriptive work of understanding the nature of these conflicts and why laws of war are no longer observed. But in the normative work, where the ethical requirement for respect for human dignity and human rights should be in focus, moral values such as humanism, justice and peace are once again coming to the fore. In practical policy terms, this means that our efforts for finding alternatives to military solutions to international conflicts and problems must be intensified. To shed light on the relation between cultural gender norms and the justification of violence could be an important step in this process.

Notes

¹ Seifert, Ruth, 1994, “War and Rape: A Preliminary Analysis” in Stiglmeier, Alexandra (ed.), *Mass Rape. The War Against Women in Bosnia-Herzegovina*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln & London, p. 63.

Ferris, Elisabeth, 1993, *Women, War and Peace*, Research Report 14, Life & Peace Institute, Uppsala, p. 22, 144-145.

Höglund, Anna T., 2001, *Krig och kön. Feministisk etik och den moraliska bedömningen av militärt våld. (War and Gender. Feminist Ethics and the Moral Judgement of Military Violence. Written in Swedish with an English summary)*, Uppsala Studies in Social Ethics 26, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, p. 20.

² Cooke, Miriam & Woollacott, Angela (eds.), 1993, *Gendering War Talk*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, p. ix.

³ Woolf, Virginia, (1938) 1977, *Three Guineas*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth. Swedish translation 1984 by Margareta Ekström: *Tre guineas*, Författarförlaget, Malmö, p. 137.

⁴ Seifert, Ruth, 1994, op. cit., p. 63.

Gabriel, Richard, 1990, *The Culture of War: Invention and Early Development*, New York, p. 14.

Nordstrom, Carolyn, 1991, "Women and War: Observations from the Field", *Minerva: Quarterly Report on Women and the Military*, 9, no 1, p. 191.

⁵ With regard to gender norms, see e.g. Lundgren, Eva, 1993, *Det får da være grenser for kjønn*, Universitetsforlaget, Oslo, and Höglund, Anna T., 2001, op.cit., pp. 53-57.

⁶ Connel, Robert W., 1987, *Gender and Power. Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*, Polity Press, Cambridge, and 1998, "Masculinities and Globalization" in *Men and Masculinities*, Vol. 1, No.1, Sage Publications Inc.

⁷ Resic, Sanimir, 1999, *American Warriors in Vietnam, Warrior Values and the Myth of the War Experience During the Vietnam War, 1965-1973*, Academic dissertation, Dept. of History, Lund University, Team Offset & Media, Malmö.

⁸ Höglund, Anna T., 2001, op.cit., pp. 230-234.

⁹ Allen, Beverly, 1996, *Rape Warfare. The Hidden Genocide in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, London, p. 26.

Translation: Felicity Roos, Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Women and Peace Processes: An Impossible Match?

Jennifer F. Klot

It took the United Nation's Security Council more than fifty years to recognize the relevance of women and gender issues to the maintenance of international peace and security.

The Council's adoption of its first resolution on Women and Peace and Security (Resolution 1325) in October 2000 was an historical moment resulting from a confluence of factors. The most significant perhaps was the alliance formed among women activists in conflict-affected countries, from national, regional and international non-governmental organizations, facilitators of peace processes, and supporters based in government and intergovernmental bodies. A new kind of 'brokering' between and among women activists – from the grass roots to the multilateral arena – gave new energy, content, constituency and strategy for making women's issues central to the international political agenda.

The embodiment of this new commitment, resolution 1325 reflected a new understanding of and gave unprecedented political legitimacy to years of feminist activism. Coming on the heels of a significant review process within the UN of international peacekeeping (reflected in the Brahimi Report and Plan of Action), Security Council Resolution 1325 was seen in significant measure as a diplomatic rejoinder. It addressed the gender issues that, for the most part, the Brahimi Report neglected. However, Brahimi's comprehensive review of peacekeeping pushed the boundaries of more traditional notions of peacekeeping – to include concepts of prevention, post-conflict reconstruction, the rule of law, humanitarian and human rights concerns, and created an opportunity to consider gender issues more systematically within this framework.

Taken collectively, the Security Council's recent actions over the past five years on children, the protection of civilians, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, conflicts in Africa, peacekeeping and women, gave new meaning to the concept of human security. Humanitarian and human rights issues were finally seen as relevant to rather than compromising of the political agenda. Threats to women were finally seen as threats to international peace and security.

1325 – what it is and what it is not

But understanding the potential of 1325 and its relevance to women's security is as important as understanding its limitations. After all, 1325 is simply a resolution – yet another piece of paper to which the world community (as represented by the Security Council) pledged its allegiance. Although violations of 1325 can, in principle, justify enforcement action under the UN Charter, they are certainly not likely to. Although crucially important as a normative framework, the application of 1325 will, in practice, continue to be voluntary.

Because the Security Council is the most important political body in the United Nations, resolution 1325 is often heralded as both a normative and organizing framework. It is neither. Although 1325 represents the broadest political interpretation of gender issues ever reflected within the peace and security agenda as defined by the United Nations (by including, *inter alia*, references to HIV/AIDS, to gender-based violence, to constitutional, legislative and constitutional reform) it does not, by any stretch of the imagination, refer to the entire agenda of issues relating to women, peace and security – certainly not according to issues experienced by women affected by conflict nor by the assessments of policy makers, academics, NGOs or even governments. 1325 is as specific and narrow as is the Security Council's mandate.

Flowing from the UN Charter, 1325 reflects gender issues as they pertain to the limited (political and military) actions that members of the UN Security Council have determined to be within their mandate. And while this has evolved and broadened significantly over time, it is still extremely narrow. Security Council actions are directed to UN member states (and sometimes other parties to a conflict), to the UN Secretary General and sometimes to regional organizations and other funds, programs and UN bodies. The UN Security Council does *not* have authority to address most aspects relating to the development, humanitarian, reconstruction and human rights arenas. Although thematic discussions have featured increasingly on the Security Council's agenda, its actions focus mainly on conflict situations and of these, only a limited

number of countries make it onto the agenda: (i.e. not countries such as Nigeria, Zimbabwe, Algeria, Colombia or Guatemala).

Moreover, Resolution 1325 is not an organizing framework. Although many NGOs and women's organizations embrace 1325 as an holistic agenda, in reality, it represents a hugely significant, though very narrow and restricted part of a political and military agenda. Certainly, civil society should always work to hold governments accountable to their international commitments – but perhaps in this instance, pressure should first be placed on the UN system itself to ensure the effective functioning of its own machinery.

Political compromise – opportunities lost

No independent expert assessment

Most political achievements result from political compromises. Negotiating 1325 and its subsequent follow-up were no exceptions. One of the most important achievements of 1325 was its call for a study on key aspects relating to women, peace and security. Following the model of Graca Machel's Independent Expert Assessment on the Impact of Armed Conflict on Children, it had been hoped that the Security Council would appoint an Independent Expert on Women, Peace and Security to carry out a comprehensive study on all aspects relating to women, peace and security. An independent expert was considered essential, because so many aspects of this agenda are deeply intertwined with the very functioning of the UN system.

Perhaps for these very reasons, this recommendation was lost during the negotiations and the Security Council requested instead that the study be carried out by the system itself. In an attempt to regain some of the lost political ground, and to complement the Secretary General's (S-G) study, the United Nations Development Fund for Women appointed two independent experts, Ellen Johnson Sirleaf and Elisabeth Rehn, to carry out a comprehensive study on women, peace and security. In the end, both reports went through extensive processes of consultation and, inevitably, took heed of external (and sometimes internal) concerns.

No regular report schedule

Another limitation of 1325 is that it requires no regular schedule for reporting on actions taken and obstacles encountered in its implementation. Most Security Council resolutions request annual reporting – 1325 however gave no time frame for such reporting or for receiving the S-G's study.

Even upon receiving the S-G's study and the Independent Expert Report – both which contained many new action areas for follow up by member states and the UN system, the Security Council chose not to adopt another follow up resolution. Instead, unlike other thematic resolutions – on children and on the protection of civilians – it issued what is known as a Presidential Statement – a document with less political authority. The Statement was much more circumspect and did not include new normative or operational issues. In other words, the Council did not want to set any new standards for increasing women's protection in conflict situations or for promoting their participation in peace processes.

No framework for implementation

Although far reaching in some respects, the Security Council's follow up of 1325 did not respond to a number of important insights and recommendations emerging from the S-G's report and the UNIFEM Independent Expert Assessment. Most significantly, the Council did not put in place a process or framework for implementing these recommendations as had been done with the Brahimi Report.

Indeed, one of the greatest obstacles to improving women's protection and supporting their role in peace-building is the absence of mechanisms to ensure that all of the Council's actions – and therefore the work of the UN secretariat, namely DPKO and DPA and OCHA – are informed by information on women and gender issues. The Council also did not take the opportunity to address the work of the regional organizations and to galvanize the S-G and UN Funds and programs to give priority to this agenda.

No increase in information flow

Another opportunity lost in the political negotiations was to put in place a process to increase information flow and integration between the operational and normative sides of the UN – to ensure that work on the ground in support of women in conflict situations both informs and is informed by the political actions of the SC and the UN.

In some ways, too, the Council's actions on women and gender went to the heart of the struggle over Security Council reform. New divisions and creative tensions emerged between Security Council members and the General Assembly. Women's issues had never before been discussed by the Council – and despite the relevance of gender issues to the work of every single aspect of the UN, some

political groups thought that ‘their issue’ was being hijacked by a body in which only a few participants could engage.

While the consideration by the Council brought about more cohesion within the UN than division, fear was still apparent within some parts of the system that an examination of gender issues would weaken rather than strengthen UN peacekeeping. In the end, it became clear that by exposing failures within the system to adhere to the standards it was founded to protect, a more effective UN would prevail.

Are we giving up human rights for security?

Over the past decade, the international women’s movement has distinguished itself by developing normative, organizational and operational actions to protect women’s human rights. But what human rights was to the nineties, governance and security is to the present decade. The present political climate – and discourse – made it essential to approach gender issues from a security perspective. This shift comes with a heavy cost and reflects the increasing fragility – at the international level – of the human rights system more generally. More specifically, it also reflects the power of individual countries with conservative political agendas to frame debates about gender equality.

Although a human rights framework is being used with increasing effect at the national level in the developing world, leverage within the international system is decreasing. The chance therefore to bring gender issues into the discourse of politically more powerful bodies, like the Security Council, becomes not only an important strategy, but also a necessity. This is particularly so when issues traditionally considered within the human rights discourse are being placed firmly within the security sector – as is the case in Afghanistan and Iraq with judicial and constitutional reform and the rule of law.

So what happens when women’s rights are violated with impunity and on such a massive scale as is being documented in conflict situations around the world? By reframing violations against women as threats to security, the international community and governments themselves may sidestep their obligations under law to ensure the protection of women’s rights. Without monitoring and reporting the egregious violations against women, justice will never be served. As much as women are heroic leaders and survivors and peace-builders, so too are they victims of injustice. Both sides of this reality must be addressed by international law, and by the organizations and resources dedicated for protection and humanitarian assistance and for reconstruction.

By relinquishing the human rights framework, the concept of universality is also undermined. Under the guise of cultural relativism, a collusion of many different fundamentalisms attempt to justify discriminatory practices rather than encourage compliance with universal values and standards recognizing that women's rights transcend culture, caste, creed and geography. Overall, we are witnessing an assault on women's activism and the international coalitions that have been working effectively over the past decade to strengthen both the normative framework of human rights and its application.

Women and leadership

Supporting women's leadership in peace-building must go beyond a focus on numbers. There is no question that quotas guaranteeing women's representation in political processes are necessary; a critical mass of women – said to be around 30% – is necessary for a 'gender' perspective to emerge. But all too often, women do not have that support – either within or outside of the political system; they are often the 'lone' votes for peace – the sole member of a political system voting against an incursion or deployment of armed forces. And without a critical mass of women participating in peace processes, it is unlikely that an agenda responsive to women's concerns will emerge.

But the one should not be dependent on the other! Women's participation in public life is a substantive issue – so too are the legislative and policy reforms necessary to improve women's lives. And another question must be asked: do the institutions in which women's leadership is being promoted have the power to make decisions affecting women's lives? As the private sector plays an increasingly important role in decision making – in the media, the military establishment, and with respect to the provision of services like water, housing and sanitation, how effective can women's leadership in the public sector be?

Women and peace processes: an impossible match?

In very real terms, we may be witnessing the death of multilateralism. The UN is neither able to play the role it was envisaged to, nor fulfill the new expectations being placed on it. The UN was not set up to eradicate poverty; to end the scourge of HIV/AIDS; or to regulate capital flows. Neither can we look to mechanisms like the WTO to defend interests other than those they are supported by.

What does this mean for women? How will the shifting balance of power within and across states affect women's lives? How do women engage in the struggle for gender equality and peace within the seemingly contradictory

forces of globalization and decentralization; universality and cultural relativism; multilateralism and many different unilateralisms? Does fostering women's leadership mean supporting women's entry into bankrupt structures? Should micro-level weapons collection programs be supported while arms production, sales and exports continue to proliferate? Can micro-credit make a meaningful difference in highly indebted countries? Will installing water pumps in rural villages make water accessible when it becomes a major export commodity?

In our collective effort to ensure progress for the world's women – in situations of so-called peace or conflict, it is clear that resources are urgently needed. More space must be created for women to meet and develop agendas of common concern. In the Democratic Republic of Congo, Burundi and Afghanistan, women's 'peace tables' gave space for women to establish a common agenda and a strategy to pursue it. Supporting women's organizations and organizing – at and across all levels, national, regional and international – is a fundamental step towards that end.

Gender training and gender mainstreaming are essential policy tools (though not a panacea). To be meaningful, each require far more political commitment, policies of enforcement and accountability; funds for implementation and processes to monitor and report on their implementation.

As we move forward, a number of possible directions emerge: strengthening women's organizing, joining together with other global movements, and changing the theory and practice of existing institutions. These are all important challenges for the women's movement in its struggle for peace and justice for all.

(This article is a summary of a presentation made at the conference on Gender and Peace Processes referred to in the introduction.)

Gender, Peace-Building and Foreign Personnel

Kari H. Karamé

The title “Gender and peace processes – an impossible match?”, is a rather pessimistically formulated question – and I think I understand why. For more than 20 years now, there have been demands on the United Nations – responsible for about half of the peace operations around the world – to be gender aware¹ and gender mainstreamed² in all phases and at all levels. Regional organisations, such as NATO, OSCE and ECOWAS, responsible for the other half of all peace operations, have followed the same path. But still we read and hear about gender-based violence and abuses against women and young children, both from foreign and local personnel, and we continue to see well-known rules and ways to improve the security and rights of women neglected.

I would argue that one remedy to this sad situation is that gender be recognized as a quality-improving tool in peace-building processes, both by the local and the international community. And, the UN and other organisations should respect their goals of gender awareness and gender mainstreaming in such processes. But this is of course much easier to say than to do.

This article focuses on gender aspects of peace-building in societies in a post-conflict situation. Peace-building is here seen as a meeting between the local war-thorn community and the foreign peace personnel. The purpose of this meeting is to lay the foundations for a sustainable peace. As such, it is a gathering of people with different experiences and expectations and with different cultural backgrounds. In addition, the members of a peace-building force usually come from different parts of the world, and therefore carry with them different cultural values. Because of this, local inhabitants and members of the peace mission may react in different ways to one and the same situation. Gender issues represent a field where cultural norms and values are central dimensions. These can be identified as a gender ideology.

All human societies have its ‘gender ideology’ as defined by the distinguished American scholar Anne Tickner, during a seminar arranged by the Department of Peace and Conflict Research in Uppsala in June 1999:

- It is “a set of expectations about the differing roles of men and women in society”.
- These are socially constructed and variable across societies and cultures, and they generally work to legitimise the subordination of women.
- In many cases, what we expect to see men and women doing, comes to be seen as natural or “just the way things are”.

Reactions to eventual violations of peacekeepers against these norms are often highly emotionally loaded.

The concept of gender – from ‘women’ to ‘both women and men’

The gender issue has been on the UN agenda from the beginning of the history of the organisation – but as a marginalised problem. Over the years, it has developed from seeing women as an isolated category and target group with special needs, to recognising women’s lives as integrated in social relations, as members of social groups with shared ambitions, dreams and fears with their male counterparts. After the UN Decade for women, 1975–1985, demands were made to make gender a factor in the development assistance performed by the organisation; and after the Beijing conference in 1995, requests have been made to mainstream gender into all the UN activities.

This has proved a slow process, though. The expert panel on United Nations Peace Operations released, in August 2000, the so-called Brahimi Report. The mandate of the panel was to present “a clear set of recommendations on how to do better in the future in the whole range of United Nations activities in the area of peace and security”. Still, it hardly mentions women or gender³, even if this panel in fact worked in parallel with the preparations of the UNSC Resolution 1325 on ‘Women, Peace and Security’.

Peace-building, modern wars and gender

The terminology in the field of peace operations embraces a broad range of definitions: ‘peace-making’, ‘peace-keeping’ and ‘peace-building’ are among the most commonly used. Usually they have designated different kinds of missions, or different stages, but they appear to be converging. Peace-keeping can no

longer be seen in isolation, but must be understood as a variety of ‘closely interrelated tasks’ ranging from conflict prevention to conflict resolution and post-conflict peace-building.⁴ In a statement made by the President of the Security Council on February 20, 2001, peace-building was defined as “a means of preventing the outbreak, recurrence or continuation of armed conflict and therefore encompasses a wide range of political, developmental, humanitarian and human rights mechanisms.⁵ This kind of mission will therefore include both military and civilian components, in fact the majority of today’s peace operations are civilian.

Without specific attention to and understanding of gender relations and inequalities, women may be excluded from peace-building initiatives, as will their capacities and knowledge.⁶ The inclusion of women in all functions and at all levels of the peace-building force is seen as one of many tools to achieve a higher degree of participation of local women in the process. Men and women experience warfare in different ways – both as actors and as victims – and they will bring these experiences with them into the post conflict phase when – hopefully – the process of peace-building and normalisation can take place.

One of the main characteristics of most modern wars is that the civilian population has become target of warfare: it is estimated that 80 to 85 percent of the victims are civilians.

Sexual violence against women and young girls is used as a strategy of war, with the purpose of traumatising a whole population and destroying the social structure of the human group.

Also – women, children and elderly make up the majority of the refugees and the internally displaced persons of the world today.

But women may also be actors – soldiers, politicians, activists and pacifists.

However, the absence or at least lack of adult and young men, often even young boys, in civil society during conflicts is often striking. Many have joined the fighting forces, others have fled the area to avoid forced recruitment. The majority of the prisoners of war and missing persons are men.

This results in societies with a female-dominated population, and it places an extra heavy burden on the women’s shoulders, as they struggle to maintain daily life in the midst of war. To face the situation is a challenge to their capacities, and it often leads to the empowerment of women. In fact, women’s roles expand in number, while their traditional roles within the household become more appreciated. Men’s roles, on the other hand, tend to be narrowed, due to displacement, unemployment, and war traumas, which in turn often cause great

frustration among them. Men and women will therefore enter the post-conflict phase with different experiences and expectations. This gendered gap often results in domestic violence.

Benefits of gender mainstreaming peace-building

Different conflicts have different dynamics and characteristics. Awareness of women's needs in conflict, *and* in the often very troubled post-conflict phase, demands that we give attention to the complexities of social relations in local societies. Women – because of their 'gendered' experience of war – are keys to local knowledge, and local women should therefore be recognised as a resource in reconstruction and peace-building of the society, and should be integrated in this process.

The contributing countries, on their side, should – in the interest of the success of their mission – work to ensure a greater representation of women in all stages and at all levels of peace support operations, from the formulation of the mandate to its implementation.

Research and experience indicate that the presence of women among the peace personnel is recommended for several reasons:

- Women tend to be more sensitive to the needs and aspirations of local women, and local women find it easier to communicate with other women.
- Women and girls who have been victims of sexual violence may find it easier to report such incidents to other women.
- Women soldiers seem to be more successful in attempts to convince rather than to confront.
- Women soldiers can search local women. This is necessary for security reasons.
- The presence of women within peace forces has been shown to have a positive impact on negative sides of "military or macho culture" – read: sexual exploitation of local women and children has occurred less often.

Still, it is not enough to include women personnel in peace support operations. Both women and men should be trained in *gender sensitivity* – that is, paying attention to local women's needs, roles, capacities and aspirations for the future, not seeing them only as victims. Local women should be employed on a broader basis and in more functions than what has been the case until now.

In addition to these women's right to work, and the recognised need for their capacities, it may be a way to prevent that women are sexually exploited to obtain their food rations, papers and other things they are entitled to. Cases are reported, for instance from Africa, where women have been exploited by local male employees.

In addition to gender sensitivity there is also a need for *cultural sensitivity*. Peace operations take place in countries where the cultural norms and values differ from those of the peacekeepers. For the success of a mission it is important to avoid cultural conflicts with the host society, and one of the main causes of such conflicts is contact between international personnel and local women. Training and awareness might prevent undesirable behaviour that could undermine the whole purpose of the mission.

It is an additional problem in this context that the personnel of a peace mission usually comes from different parts of the world, and therefore has different cultural backgrounds. Internationally recognised codes of conduct concerning contact with the local civilian population could prevent misconduct. Further, the presence of women among the peace operators will contribute to confidence building between them and the host society.

The example of NORBATT/UNIFIL

For some twenty years, from 1978 to 1998, Norway participated in the United Nation's Interim Forces in Lebanon (UNIFIL). From 1984 on, the Norwegian area of responsibility fell within the Israeli occupied zone where both local militias and the Israeli armed forces were active. UNIFIL was planned and designed as a military mission, with an additional mandate from 1984: to provide security and humanitarian assistance to the civil population. The Norwegian contingent – NORBATT – consisted of 600–900 persons. On an average, there were thirty women in each contingent, representing from 3.3 to 6 percent of the troops. During the first years, women served in the medical corps, logistics and staff units. After full equal rights were introduced in the Norwegian armed forces in 1984, women also served in military positions.

On duty, the NORBATT women filled the same functions as men of same rank and capabilities; they could patrol during the night or be posted at one of the many check-points in this troubled area. Local women often supported and co-operated with the militias, some also with the Israeli army. In addition to intelligence, transportation of arms, ammunition and explosives could be the task of Lebanese women. However, they were rarely searched because of lack

of women NORBATT personnel at the checkpoints. Only women soldiers could perform body search. NORBATT women's presence at the checkpoints therefore most probably added to the security in the area.

Off duty the women of NORBATT, whether military or not, often paid visits to local women, and this broadened the contact between the battalion and the host society, and gave them a better idea of these people's lives, needs and preoccupations. This is an essential part of confidence-building, resulting in an improved chance of success for the mission.⁷

Conclusions

Even if peace-building and gender currently are receiving much needed attention in discussions, more research should be carried out in the field of gender and peace-building with the purpose of increasing the prospects for successful missions and laying the ground for a sustainable peace. A major problem in this connection is that funds from national research councils usually are tied up to long-term programmes in which the relation gender/women-security-peace-building seldom is on the agenda. Funding from other public resources – for instance different ministries – depend on political priorities and may therefore suffer from lack of continuity.

Notes

¹ Gender awareness will in this text be defined as drawing the attention to the importance of looking at both women's and men's activities and roles before, during and after a conflict and to recognise women's agencies as enmeshed in social relations and divisions in both a local and a global context.

² Gender mainstreaming is generally understood as the process of bringing an awareness of the status of women into the public arena. Because of the lack and even absence of women at almost every level of public decision-making in many conflict areas, gender mainstreaming will still mainly concern women.

³ See among other Olsson, Louise and Tryggestad, Torunn L., eds., *Women and International Peacekeeping*, Frank Cass Publishers, London, 2001, pp.2-3.

⁴ *Gendering Human Security. From Marginalisation to the Integration of Women in Peace-Building*, Fafo-report 352 / NUPI-report no.261, Oslo 2001.

⁵ *Women, Peace and Security*, Study submitted to the Secretary-General pursuant to Security Council resolution 1325 (2000), United Nations, 2002, p.65.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Karamé, Kari H., "Military Women in Peace Operations: Experiences of the Norwegian Battalion in UNIFIL, 1978-98", in Olsson and Tryggestad, eds., see note 3, pp. 85-97.

Guinea-Bissau 1998–99: Observations by a Mediator

Ulla Andrén

Guinea-Bissau is a small country (36.125 sq km) in West Africa with some 1.2 million inhabitants. It is one of the poorest countries in Africa, and its human development index (167 out of 173 in 2002) is extremely low. There are few natural resources and the country's income is mainly from cashew nut export and the selling of fishing licences to EU countries.

Guinea-Bissau is not seen as having strategic importance. It is a former Portuguese colony in the middle of francophone Africa. The liberation army, PAIGC (Partido Africano da Independencia da Guiné e Cabo Verde), fought hard against the Portuguese colonial regime. On Independence in 1974, PAIGC became the state-bearing party. The first multi-party elections in Guinea-Bissau took place in 1994. On the 7th of June 1998 an armed conflict erupted.

Conflict causes and setting

The immediate cause of the armed conflict was that Supreme Commander Mané was dismissed by President Vieira on false charges that he had been involved in illegal arms trafficking, providing the independence movement in Casamance, Senegal, with weapons.

The conflict in Casamance has during some 20 years been a source of instability in the region – Guinea-Bissau and The Gambia included – and it has attracted arms dealers and mercenaries to the region. Senegal accuses Guinea-Bissau for letting the Casamance independence movement use northern Guinea-Bissau as a base for attacks into Senegal, and Guinea-Bissau complains of Senegalese cross-border incursions, so peaceful co-existence between the two countries has not always been easy.

However, a major cause of the armed conflict was the discontent amongst the military in Guinea-Bissau. It had increased over many years and included

complaints on miserable conditions in the barracks, irregular payment of meagre salaries, arbitrary promotions and political interference in the running of the defence forces etc.

There were also deeper underlying causes, including human rights abuse, corruption and enrichment by the ruling elite and a popular claim for justice and participation in social and economic development.

With the intervention of foreign troops only two days after the conflict broke out, the situation aggravated. Ninety percent of the regular Guinea-Bissau defence forces, and a large number of retired freedom fighters, immediately answered the call by the self-proclaimed Military Junta for Peace, Democracy and Justice to defend their country.

The Military Junta was unusual, as it never claimed political power and was consistent in its dialogue policy to settle the conflict in a peaceful way. From the beginning to the end, the Junta said they would return to the barracks once a new civilian government had been appointed, and so they did, formally, on the 7th of June 1999, one year after the conflict erupted.

Conflict resolution and peace agreement

At the outbreak of the armed conflict in Guinea-Bissau on the 7th of June 1998, there was international condemnation of the use of arms against a democratically elected regime. But as soon as the foreign community in Guinea-Bissau, including UN staff, had been evacuated ten days later, there were no more headlines about the conflict. The seven initial weeks of war, when there was military intervention from the neighbouring countries Senegal and Guinea-Conakry, and when some 350.000 persons were forced to become refugees, did not inspire the UN system to take forceful action, not even its humanitarian aid agencies.

The Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries, CPLP, and the Economic Community of West African States, ECOWAS, brokered a truce on the 26th of July, which was transformed into a cease-fire accord a month later. However, the monitoring of the agreed upon cease-fire was not realised, and war broke out again, twice, in October 1998. The National Goodwill Commission, including parliamentarians and representatives from civil society, worked together with representatives of France, Portugal and Sweden (represented by myself) – the only local diplomats present – to persuade the conflicting parties to go to the negotiating table.

Finally, a peace accord was signed in Abuja on November 1, 1998, under the auspices of the ECOWAS summit. The agreement provided for continued cease-fire, deployment of the Economic Community Monitoring Group,

ECOMOG, peacekeeping forces and withdrawal of the troops from Senegal and Guinea-Conakry, the installation of a government of national unity and for elections to be held.

The implementation of the Abuja peace accord was slow, and by the end of January 1999 less than 100 peacekeeping soldiers had arrived. When fighting broke out again in the end of January that year, there were intensive diplomatic activities to restore the cease-fire, which was signed again by the parties on February 3, 1999. Consequently, an addition of 500 ECOMOG soldiers arrived in Bissau. The government of national unity was finally sworn in on February 20, 1999, and the troops from Senegal and Guinea-Conakry were withdrawn by the end of March 1999.

The end of the armed conflict

President Vieira continued to obstruct the peace process, and the Military Junta finally took control of the capital in May 1999. The troops loyal to President Vieira surrendered within a few hours, and he himself found asylum at the Portuguese Embassy in Bissau. Consequently, the speaker of the Parliament was sworn in as an interim president in accordance with the constitution, and the government of national unity continued its work.

The UN Security Council played a very limited role with regard to restoring peace in Guinea-Bissau. In March 1999, the Council approved the Secretary-General's proposal to establish a Peace-Building Support Office in Guinea-Bissau. The Representative of the Secretary-General arrived in Bissau as late as July 1999. However, he became an important actor in the latter part of the peace process, including the organisation of elections in November 1999.

Typical African conflict

All armed conflicts are of course unique, but the conflict in Guinea-Bissau may serve as a good example of a rather typical conflict in Africa. The causes and driving forces were complex, and there were regional and international interests at stake. The gender dimension was apparent in that men were actively participating, whereas women had no choice other than to cope with the consequences of the conflict.

Lots of weapons were available, which made the armed conflict possible. Men, young and old, enhanced their status by participating in the armed struggle. Particularly young men were keen to prove themselves great warriors.

The humanitarian consequences of the armed conflict were disastrous, as people did not have the margins or the resources to cope with the crises. Women

and children were the most affected. The provision of food, water and fuel, usually female tasks, became more onerous. Women and girls were also more exposed to violence and sexual abuse in the conflict situation.

Finally, the peace-process was long and cumbersome, whereas expectations for quick results were great. Communication efforts by the government of national unity, mainly through meetings and radio, providing information and giving hope to the affected population, possibly made a difference for the process to come to a successful end.

In the Guinea-Bissau conflict, international resolutions – including the Security Council resolutions – were often given low, if any, priority. However, I would argue that local conflict mediation most of the time is taken seriously and that mediators can remind the conflicting parties of international law and resolutions. Combined with international political pressure and humanitarian assistance it might prove a successful recipe for conflict resolution.

Gender aspects of the conflict

I would argue that during the Guinea Bissau conflict and peace process, gender roles were reinforced. Political and, in particular, security and military issues were the men's world. Most of the time the security issues, dealt with by the militaries, were overriding political concerns.

The gender aspects of the conflict can be analysed at different levels. At a political-societal level, it can be claimed that women were neither involved nor heard in the decisions that led to the armed conflict. However, a women's protest march against the war, organised at a relatively late stage in the armed conflict, gathered many women in the capital and made an impression on the leaders of the conflicting parties. According to African tradition, a man must respect his mother or he risks turning the evil spirits against himself. The women represented "mothers", so the President and the Supreme Commander alike had to listen to their voices.

Generally speaking, it can be said that women were more affected than men, although it was men that actively participated in the actual warfare. Each time war broke out, women had to run away, with negative effects on both their physical and mental health. The problems of finding food, water, and energy for cooking, medical assistance for the children, caring for the elderly etc were more or less entirely left to women.

The "housing conditions" for women fleeing the war zones did not provide protection, and consequently women became more exposed to violence, sexual

abuse and exploitation. Some women were also forced, for economic or other reasons, to assist militaries with cooking, washing and other “services”.

At an individual level, some women were torn between their own political and religious convictions and those of the family, i.e. the male head, as there was pressure to take stands in the conflict and to support one of the conflicting parties.

Gender aspects of mediation

The most striking gender aspect of the mediation effort was the absence of women. Only three women were involved in the local mediation, and none in the international.

The local women active in mediation were two parliamentarians, Ms Gomes, from the ruling party (PAIGC) and Ms Vaz Turpin from the opposition (Movimento Bafata). I participated as the Swedish Chargée d’Affaires in Guinea-Bissau. Although we were few, the importance of the contribution of the women to the mediation efforts was recognised by the conflicting parties as well as by the diplomats involved.

The local mediation efforts included shuttle diplomacy to set up meetings and resolving practical problems, such as transport and security issues to enable meetings to take place. In addition, organising food, pep-talking to make dialogue and meetings constructive, finding new alternatives and angles of approach to problems when discussions reached a deadlock were important aspects of the local mediation efforts.

Another extremely important aspect of the mediation was the provision of information in order to prevent speculation about the peace process. As the only residing “independent” diplomat, I was interviewed by the much listened to foreign radio channels on several occasions. These provided much needed “neutral” information in contrast to the two local radio channels, broadcasting highly biased information and propaganda in favour of the respective conflicting parties.

Gender and sustainability of conflict resolution

I would argue that for conflict resolution to be sustained, there must be institutional (political, judicial, civil and military) mechanisms conducive to the implementation of the peace agreement. They might include the promotion of democratic elections, dealing with human rights abuse and investigating allegations of human rights violations.

But they also must take women's interest into account and have female representation. There might be a need for involving both male and female community leaders, prominent individuals, religious groups and NGOs in dialogue for promoting the peace process and using non-violent means for conflict resolution.

Broad participation in political discussions is helpful in removing the obstacles that caused the conflict. One important aspect would thus be the promotion of independent and transparent media that can inform about the peace process without too much gender bias.

Women are a major target group for humanitarian and reconstructive support. Therefore, they must participate in the planning, implementation and evaluation of this support. Likewise, planning of support to social and economic recovery in the aftermath of the conflict should include gender analysis.

In traditionally male areas, such as education within the armed forces to clarify the role of the military in a democratic state, women might have an important role to play. Their outside views put discussions on demobilised soldiers' rights to pensions etc into perspective of their actual work contribution, by relating it to that of the women, upholding society while the men were away. In de-mining programmes, women's voices are often needed to make certain that information about mines and about care for persons injured by mines are considered, not merely the technical aspect of de-mining.

Enhancing gender in future peace processes

As long as peace processes remain a men's world, information and training of military personnel in the content of Security Council resolution 1325 and in gender analysis will be a key to enhance gender perspectives.

Gender advisers coming from the outside to work with women and women's networks can make a difference in a peace process. There is also a need for earmarked support to women; if it is mainstreamed, it might be appropriated for other purposes.

Women working with peace processes have to be prepared to work in adverse conditions, most of the time on men's terms. But their contributions may be respected and appreciated, encouraging other women to become involved, thus further enhancing the gender perspective in the peace process.

General discussion

Chair: Kari Karamé

Question/Karen Hostens: I have done research on codes of conduct and looked at whether they exist and if they are implemented. Norwegian police sent to peace-keeping operations (both UN and non-UN) follow a two-weeks UN course. The main component is basically human rights, but a gender aspect is missing. How can we get the gender agenda into the course? This could be a starting point since awareness in the field is very important.

Jennifer Klot: Although training is seen as a panacea, we have to go into the discussion knowing it is not. Training courses are not integrated fully and do not reflect gender issues adequately. Not enough trainers exist. Those of us working at policy and program levels are called in to carry out training as though it were instinctive; but training is in itself a profession. If there is to be a regular demand for gender training, institutions need to develop training capacity. Then there are the questions of who is going to pay for it, and what the context and policies on which the training is based will be. Are there universally agreed policies that can be used to train peace-keepers? In addition to training, codes of conduct and disciplinary mechanisms, military policies at the national level need to be assessed. I was really surprised to learn that Sweden does not have a military policy, but that national policy regulates the conducts of forces, whereas in many other countries, military policies are distinct from national policy and are regulated by military courts, military tribunals, military disciplinary mechanisms.

Kari Karamé: In Norway, each soldier is obliged to follow the codes of conduct and if they violate them, they are in principle sent home. There are examples of soldiers sent home in the middle of a mission. Even if the public does not know this, it has had big effects within the army.

Question/Gerd Johnson-Latham: Concerning the twenty recommendations made by Elisabeth Rehn and Ellen Johnson Sirleaf (see Introduction, note 4. Ed.'s comment), I would like to know what areas that would be most appropriate to focus on. Personally, I find the truth- and reconciliation commission on violence against women important, as it is for me a new way of thinking. Also, point number four that concerns support of reproductive health is so far a quite sensitive area. Point number twelve is also interesting: to assess the gaps in international and national laws and standards pertaining to the protection of women. Another interesting issue is budget analysis. What happens to the often quite enormous amounts of money provided for both conflict and assistance in the last phase of a conflict and in the post conflict reconstruction phase?

Jennifer Klot: The truth- and reconciliation commission is a response to how overwhelmed the experts were by the enormous scale of violence that they had seen against women, and the impossibility of redressing it through local courts, the informal justice processes and international criminal courts and so on. Building on the experiences that women have had in these tribunals, we were thinking about a tribunal where women at least would get a chance to put on the record what happened. It would be a large and visible way to provoke an international response and to give women an opportunity to get heard. It would need enormous support for it to happen. I think it would lay the groundwork for taking cases to national and international justice mechanisms; cases must be documented systematically. This will also contribute to building a legal infrastructure at local and national levels.

On convening a panel of experts: many resist the idea of creating another international instrument to protect women though the fact remains that the highest standards for women's protection have not yet been put in place. Three ideas for increasing these standards are being discussed:

1. A commentary or additional protocol to the Geneva Convention setting out specifically violations against women.
2. A new international instrument
3. Guiding principles on the protection of women in armed conflict and supporting their role in peace-building. Following the model of the Guiding Principles for IDPs (introduced by Francis Deng, the special representative on internally displaced persons), guiding principles do not have any legal status but were adopted by the General Assembly and are being adopted by many countries into national law.

In order to assess the viability of each option, the Experts called for the establishment of a panel of experts. Again, this is a very important piece of work – but as normative work usually is, also hugely unpopular.

Standby arrangements or assessment teams is a way for member countries to contribute immediately and visibly to increasing women's protection in conflict situations and supporting their role in peace-building. They can offer to send experts who are ready to be deployed whenever there is an assessment mission.

The question of peace-keeping mandates is equally important; again it is the Security Council that has to be more demanding of the Secretariat to identify the needs of women in conflict situations. We need champions within the Security Council to consistently ask the tough questions, whenever a peacekeeping mandate is being formulated.

Reproductive health: HIV/aids is one way to focus on reproductive health. Another way is to support United Nations Population Fund, UNFPA. There was a huge debate among the experts about the United Nations Development Fund for Women, UNIFEM, itself. The problem is – and you may all experience it in your own institutions – that UNIFEM is not fully operational. UNIFEM operates at 2 % of the budget of the United Nations Children's Fund, UNICEF, or the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, UNHCR. It does not have a presence in countries and cannot deliver regular services to women. The fact is, if you do not have an agency dedicated to doing that, it simply will not happen. In principle, women deserve a fund and women deserve to have an operational presence. In the meantime UNFPA has been doing a really brilliant job on political issues and excellent work on reproductive health and HIV/aids. UNFPA may well be appropriate to take on this agenda.

Gender budget analysis: I think the donors should be really rigorous with the World Bank and with the programme funds to assess how resources are getting to women.

Question/David Friberg: The Swedish Rescue Services Agency is really more on the humanitarian than the peace-keeping side, but we all end up in conflict situations today. We work together with UN OCHA, the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, which is increasingly recognised as a coordinator and information provider of the UN system. In our work with OCHA, we could raise these issues, we could read the resolution together and say: look at what is in it for you. How do you read this resolution and how could

you report on the efficiency of the resolution? I would like to have your opinion on whether this would be a valid approach.

There is a new institution in Sweden since the first of September, 2002: the Folke Bernadotte Academy, which is there in order to gather all actors in training before we go into the field. “All actors” means military and civilian actors, Swedish and international. This Academy now has to respond to how the resolution will be part of their job. We all need to go together to convince them that gender is something important. We also have a message to bring to the UN as a member state, trying to bring other member states along. This is also an issue of great concern for Europe today, as we have started to upgrade EU resources in conflicts to be able to go to conflicts even outside Europe. I do not know if a gender approach is on the agenda. So, whenever we hear about the EU preparing for an upgraded presence in conflicts, we all have to consider what the EU approach is.

Jennifer Klot: Everything you said is right on the money. A gender budget analysis of a UN funding appeal found that approximately 0.2 percent of the appeal went specifically to women’s projects, and they were identified as beneficiaries in approximately 20–30 percent of funds dedicated to larger projects dealing with water or sanitation. Gender analysis needs more information and data – funding requests must specify recipient populations by gender and propose specific strategies for reaching them. The EU is a very important arena for political work. Everything we can do to support your work, we will certainly do.

Finally, something that we do not often talk about is the crucial role played by supportive men – achievements in the cases of Burundi, Congo and even Security Council Resolution 1325 would not have happened without doors being opened by powerful and supportive men. For whatever the reason, they lent their power and their weight and created crucial access. We must celebrate, recognise, foster and appreciate this kind of collaboration and solidarity.

Question/Louise Olsson: As a teacher I can see that the issue of gender is really growing. I had a seminar a week ago and was very surprised about the students’ knowledge and recognition of this issue as very important. I was ready to defend the topic, but I rather had to calm them down. In general, what is really lacking is data. Whatever research topic students come up with for their papers, there is no data. What we all need to do, and what organisations perhaps could do, is to at least ensure that the data gathered is divided according to gender. That would be a very important step. Also, Sweden and Norway could have a leading role in

setting up a database on these issues. This could be a first step forward. How do you see the debate between policy and researchers in this field?

Ulla Andrén: It is obvious that if you are doing research you must have gender disaggregated statistics. In the bilateral agreement with Guinea-Bissau, there was a specific agreement to disaggregate data.

Jennifer Klot: Agencies are not sex-disaggregating data systematically. In statistics on refugee flows across borders, we rarely know the gender breakdown – which could be extremely helpful in understanding the nature of the conflict itself and what supplies and services that will be necessary. I do not know why agencies are not reporting on these questions. In the child soldier literature, finally, you are getting some distinctions between girls and boys, but it is probably the only area in which we are seeing segregation of data.

Kari Karamé: UNDP is really making efforts but their data is usually coming late, usually in reports after things have happened. We need it when things are happening! The only way to get them is in fact to ask for them. We will need a database for the success of every mission.

Appendix 1:

Slutdeklaration/Declaracion Final

Kvinnorna och freden i Colombia 17–18 september 2001

Ett mycket kritiskt läge har uppstått i världen till följd av terroristattacken i Förenta Staterna den 11 september och de av USA:s regering framförda hoten om vedergällning vilka kan komma att leda till förödande skador för vissa folk och kulturer. Mot denna bakgrund kräver vi – som deltagare i ett flertal fredsinitiativ och medvetna om vad detta historiska ögonblick kan innebära för Colombia – att vår regering och övriga aktörer i den väpnade konflikten intar en hållning som möjliggör dialog i medborgerlig och demokratisk anda för att lösa de ekonomiska, sociala och politiska motsättningarna i Colombia och i världen.

Detta innebär ett åtagande att vidmakthålla de utrymmen och mekanismer för dialog som hittills utverkats, att utvidga dessa och skapa de övriga utrymmen som erfordras för att föra fredsförhandlingarna framåt och få till stånd ett eldupphör från alla väpnade aktörer. Detta är nödvändigt med tanke på den pågående upptrappningen av konflikten.

Det är absolut nödvändigt att samtliga stridande parter anammar den internationella folkrättens bestämmelser, bland vilka vi särskilt vill framhålla sådana som syftar till att värna kvinnors liv, integritet och värdighet. Ingen armé äger legitimitet så länge den genomför skrämselektioner av sexuellt slag mot kvinnor för att skapa skräck och förödmjuka såväl dessa som sina motståndare.

I denna strävan att åstadkomma fred med social rättvisa är vi övertygade om att en breddning och fördjupning av demokratin är omöjlig utan vår närvaro

och vårt deltagande. Våra ständiga insatser, vårt engagemang och våra visioner måste erkännas och inkluderas i den fortsatta utveckling av samtalen och förhandlingarna för att åstadkomma fred.

Vi för vår egen talan och kräver att få delta på lika villkor. Vi vill göra oss hörda som den mångfald kvinnor vi är, med verklig möjlighet att påverka och fatta beslut på alla områden där enighet nås om ett nytt socialt, politiskt och kulturellt fördrag, så att våra förslag får genomslag i detta.

Vårt ständiga engagemang för vårt land, såväl i fredstider som under den pågående väpnade konflikten, ger oss rätt att engagera oss i det fortsatta mödosamma arbetet med att utforma vår dagordning för fred med social rättvisa för alla och att utarbeta strategier för dess genomförande så att de grundläggande rättigheterna för alla colombianska män och kvinnor förverkligas.

Dessa föresatser måste åtföljas av processer, förfaranden och mekanismer för kontroll och uppföljning av vad som överenskommits. Vi vädjar därför om solidariskt stöd från det internationella samfundet. Särskilt från kvinnoorganisationer som i likhet med oss tillkännagett sitt beslut att bidra till skapandet en ny politisk och social världsordning som motsvarar de mänskliga behoven hos nuvarande och framtida generationer, i harmoni med vår jord.

En fred som byggs med deltagande av kvinnorna i beslutsprocessen, kommer att skapa rättvisa, demokratiska och hållbara utvecklingsprocesser i Colombia.

Declaracion final **Las mujeres y la paz en Colombia**

En el contexto de agudización de la crisis mundial generada tanto por el atentado terrorista del 11 de septiembre en los Estados Unidos, como por las amenazas de respuestas violentas por parte del gobierno estadounidense que pueden involucrar daños irreparables a pueblos y culturas; Nosotras, participantes en diversas *Iniciativas de paz*, concientes del momento histórico y de lo que él significa para Colombia, demandamos del gobierno nacional y demás actores de la confrontación armada, una postura dialógica como manera civilista y democrática, para resolver la confrontación económica, social y política en Colombia y en el mundo.

Esto significa el compromiso de mantener los espacios de diálogo logrados hasta el momento; ampliar y construir los otros que sean necesarios para avanzar en la negociación y el cese al fuego por parte de todos los actores armados, porque la degradación del conflicto así lo amerita.

Es imperativo que todos los combatientes acojan las reglas del Derecho Internacional Humanitario, entre las cuales destacamos las encaminadas a proteger la vida, integridad y dignidad de nosotras las mujeres,- ningùn ejercito podrà legitimarse mientras utilice pràcticas intimidatorias de tipo sexual contra las mujeres para causar terror y humillarlas a ellas y a sus contrarios.

En este esfuerzo por hacer realidad la paz con justicia social, nosotras estamos convencidas de que sin nuestra presencia y aportes la ampliación y profundización de la democracia no será posible. Nuestros permanentes aportes, compromiso y nuestras visiones deben ser reconocidos e incluidos en el desarrollo de los diálogos y la negociación para la construcción de la paz.

No delegamos nuestra representación, requerimos participar de manera equitativa y expresadas en nuestra diversidad, con opción real de incidir y decidir en todos los espacios donde se defina el nuevo acuerdo social, político y cultural, para que en él se expresen nuestras propuestas.

Legitimadas por nuestro permanente compromiso con el país, tanto en las épocas de paz como en el actual conflicto armado, nos comprometemos en el esfuerzo de seguir avanzando en la construcción de nuestra agenda de paz con justicia social y no discriminatoria y, en el diseño de las estrategias para hacerla efectiva mediante la materialización de los derechos fundamentales de todas las colombianas y los colombianos.

Ese propósito irá acompañado de procesos y mecanismos de verificación y seguimiento de lo pactado para lo cual solicitamos el compromiso solidario de la comunidad internacional y especialmente el de las organizaciones de mujeres que a la par con nosotras, hacen pública su decisión de construir un nuevo orden político y social mundial que responda a los intereses humanistas de las actuales y de las futuras generaciones en una relación armónica con el planeta.

La paz edificada con la participación decisoria de las mujeres generará para Colombia procesos justos, democraticos y sostenibles.

Undertecknat av / Suscriben

1. Organización de mujeres afrocolombianas
2. ANMUCIC, Asociación Nacional de Mujeres Campesinas Negras e Indígenas de Colombia
3. ANUC – UR, Asociación Nacional de Usuarios Campesinos Unidad y Reconstrucción
4. Asamblea permanente de la sociedad civil por la paz
5. ASFAMIPAZ, Asociación de Familias de policías y soldados retenidos por grupos guerrilleros

6. Asociación de cabildos indígenas del Cauca
7. Colectivo mujeres libres
8. Concejala apartado
9. Corporación colombiana de teatro
10. Central unitaria de trabajadores - departamento de la mujer
11. Ruta pacífica de las mujeres
12. Organización de desplazadas – fundación Cléber
13. Iniciativa juvenil – CUT
14. Mesa de concertación nacional de mujeres
15. Mujeres autoras, actrices de paz
16. Red de mujeres de la región Caribe
17. Madres comunitarias -Sintracihobi
18. Universidad nacional de Colombia – Programa de estudios de género mujer y desarrollo
19. Dirección de solución de conflictos y derechos humanos de la G.A.
20. Red nacional de mujeres de Medellín
21. Asociación de mujeres del Quibdó

Appendix 2: Security Council Resolution 1325

Adopted by the Security Council at its 4213th meeting,
on 31 October 2000

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions 1261 (1999) of 25 August 1999, 1265 (1999) of 17 September 1999, 1296 (2000) of 19 April 2000 and 1314 (2000) of 11 August 2000, as well as relevant statements of its President, and *recalling also* the statement of its President to the press on the occasion of the United Nations Day for Women's Rights and International Peace (International Women's Day) of 8 March 2000 (SC/6816),

Recalling also the commitments of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action (A/52/231) as well as those contained in the outcome document of the twenty-third Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly entitled "Women 2000: Gender Equality, Development and Peace for the Twenty-First Century" (A/S-23/10/Rev.1), in particular those concerning women and armed conflict,

Bearing in mind the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the primary responsibility of the Security Council under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security,

Expressing concern that civilians, particularly women and children, account for the vast majority of those adversely affected by armed conflict, including as refugees and internally displaced persons, and increasingly are targeted by combatants and armed elements, and *recognizing* the consequent impact this has on durable peace and reconciliation,

Reaffirming the important role of women in the prevention and resolution of conflicts and in peace-building, and *stressing* the importance of their equal participation and full involvement in all efforts for the maintenance and promotion of peace and security, and the need to increase their role in decision-making with regard to conflict prevention and resolution,

Reaffirming also the need to implement fully international humanitarian and human rights law that protects the rights of women and girls during and after conflicts,

Emphasizing the need for all parties to ensure that mine clearance and mine awareness programmes take into account the special needs of women and girls,

Recognizing the urgent need to mainstream a gender perspective into peacekeeping operations, and in this regard *noting* the Windhoek Declaration and the Namibia Plan of Action on Mainstreaming a Gender Perspective in Multidimensional Peace Support Operations (S/2000/693),

Recognizing also the importance of the recommendation contained in the statement of its President to the press of 8 March 2000 for specialized training for all peacekeeping personnel on the protection, special needs and human rights of women and children in conflict situations,

Recognizing that an understanding of the impact of armed conflict on women and girls, effective institutional arrangements to guarantee their protection and full participation in the peace process can significantly contribute to the maintenance and promotion of international peace and security,

Noting the need to consolidate data on the impact of armed conflict on women and girls,

1. *Urges* Member States to ensure increased representation of women at all decision-making levels in national, regional and international institutions and mechanisms for the prevention, management, and resolution of conflict;
2. *Encourages* the Secretary-General to implement his strategic plan of action (A/49/587) calling for an increase in the participation of women at decision-making levels in conflict resolution and peace processes;
3. *Urges* the Secretary-General to appoint more women as special representatives and envoys to pursue good offices on his behalf, and in this regard *calls on* Member States to provide candidates to the Secretary-General, for inclusion in a regularly updated centralized roster;
4. *Further urges* the Secretary-General to seek to expand the role and contribution of women in United Nations field-based operations, and

especially among military observers, civilian police, human rights and humanitarian personnel;

5. *Expresses* its willingness to incorporate a gender perspective into peacekeeping operations, and *urges* the Secretary-General to ensure that, where appropriate, field operations include a gender component;

6. *Requests* the Secretary-General to provide to Member States training guidelines and materials on the protection, rights and the particular needs of women, as well as on the importance of involving women in all peacekeeping and peace-building measures, *invites* Member States to incorporate these elements as well as HIV/AIDS awareness training into their national training programmes for military and civilian police personnel in preparation for deployment, and *further requests* the Secretary-General to ensure that civilian personnel of peacekeeping operations receive similar training;

7. *Urges* Member States to increase their voluntary financial, technical and logistical support for gender-sensitive training efforts, including those undertaken by relevant funds and programmes, inter alia, the United Nations Fund for Women and United Nations Children's Fund, and by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and other relevant bodies;

8. *Calls on* all actors involved, when negotiating and implementing peace agreements, to adopt a gender perspective, including, inter alia:

- (a) The special needs of women and girls during repatriation and resettlement and for rehabilitation, reintegration and post-conflict reconstruction;
- (b) Measures that support local women's peace initiatives and indigenous processes for conflict resolution, and that involve women in all of the implementation mechanisms of the peace agreements;
- (c) Measures that ensure the protection of and respect for human rights of women and girls, particularly as they relate to the constitution, the electoral system, the police and the judiciary;

9. *Calls upon* all parties to armed conflict to respect fully international law applicable to the rights and protection of women and girls, especially as civilians, in particular the obligations applicable to them under the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and the Additional Protocols thereto of 1977, the Refugee Convention of 1951 and the Protocol thereto of 1967, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women of 1979 and the Optional Protocol thereto of 1999 and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child of 1989 and the two Optional

Protocols thereto of 25 May 2000, and to bear in mind the relevant provisions of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court;

10. *Calls on* all parties to armed conflict to take special measures to protect women and girls from gender-based violence, particularly rape and other forms of sexual abuse, and all other forms of violence in situations of armed conflict;

11. *Emphasizes* the responsibility of all States to put an end to impunity and to prosecute those responsible for genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes including those relating to sexual and other violence against women and girls, and in this regard *stresses* the need to exclude these crimes, where feasible from amnesty provisions;

12. *Calls upon* all parties to armed conflict to respect the civilian and humanitarian character of refugee camps and settlements, and to take into account the particular needs of women and girls, including in their design, and recalls its resolutions 1208 (1998) of 19 November 1998 and 1296 (2000) of 19 April 2000;

13. *Encourages* all those involved in the planning for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration to consider the different needs of female and male ex-combatants and to take into account the needs of their dependants;

14. *Reaffirms* its readiness, whenever measures are adopted under Article 41 of the Charter of the United Nations, to give consideration to their potential impact on the civilian population, bearing in mind the special needs of women and girls, in order to consider appropriate humanitarian exemptions;

15. *Expresses* its willingness to ensure that Security Council missions take into account gender considerations and the rights of women, including through consultation with local and international women's groups;

16. *Invites* the Secretary-General to carry out a study on the impact of armed conflict on women and girls, the role of women in peace-building and the gender dimensions of peace processes and conflict resolution, and *further invites* him to submit a report to the Security Council on the results of this study and to make this available to all Member States of the United Nations;

17. *Requests* the Secretary-General, where appropriate, to include in his reporting to the Security Council progress on gender mainstreaming throughout peacekeeping missions and all other aspects relating to women and girls;

18. *Decides* to remain actively seized of the matter.

Appendix 3: Windhoek Declaration

The Namibia Plan of Action on ‘Mainstreaming a Gender Perspective in Multidimensional Peace Support Operations’

*On the 10th Anniversary of the United Nations
Transitional Assistance Group (UNTAG)*

Windhoek, Namibia, 31 May 2000

In a world riven by war, women and men yearn for peace and are everywhere striving to resolve conflict and bring about peace, reconciliation and stability in their communities, their countries and through the United Nations and regional organizations.

United Nations peace operations have evolved from peacekeeping, in its traditional sense, towards multidimensional peace support operations. So far, women have been denied their full role in these efforts, both nationally and internationally, and the gender dimension in peace processes has not been adequately addressed.

In order to ensure the effectiveness of peace support operations, the principles of gender equality must permeate the entire mission, at all levels, thus ensuring the participation of women and men as equal partners and beneficiaries in all aspects of the peace process -- from peacekeeping, reconciliation and peace-building, towards a situation of political stability in which women and

men play an equal part in the political, economic and social development of their country.

Having considered these matters in Windhoek, Namibia, at a seminar on *'Mainstreaming a Gender Perspective in Multidimensional Peace Support Operations'* organized by the Lessons Learned Unit of the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations and hosted by the Government of Namibia from 29 to 31 May 2000, participants looked at practical ways in which the UN system and Member States can bring the aims set out above closer to realization. In that regard, the Seminar recommends *'The Namibia Plan of Action'* and urges the Secretary-General to ensure that appropriate follow-up measures are taken to implement it, in consultation with Member States, and that periodic progress reviews are undertaken.

Plan of Action

1. Negotiations in Furtherance of a Ceasefire and/or Peace Agreements
 - Equal access and participation by women and men should be ensured in the area of conflict at all levels and stages of the peace process.
 - In negotiations for a ceasefire and/or peace agreements, women should be an integral part of the negotiating team and process. The negotiating team and/or facilitators should ensure that gender issues are placed on the agenda and that those issues are addressed fully in the agreement.

2. Mandate
 - The initial assessment mission for any peace support operation should include a senior adviser on gender mainstreaming.
 - The Secretary-General's initial report to the Security Council, based on the assessment mission, should include the issue of gender mainstreaming, and should propose adequate budgetary provisions.
 - Security Council resolutions setting up and extending peace support operations should incorporate a specific mandate on gender mainstreaming.
 - All mandates for peace support operations should refer to the provisions of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, as well as other relevant international legal instruments.

- Follow-on mechanisms should be established within the mission's mandate to carry over tasks to implement fully gender mainstreaming in the post-conflict reconstruction period.

3. Leadership

- In accordance with the Secretary-General's target of 50 per cent women in managerial and decision-making positions, more determined efforts must be made to select and appoint female Special Representatives of the Secretary-General and senior field staff for peace support operations.
- A comprehensive database with information specifically on female candidates with their qualifications, both military and civilian, should be maintained.
- An Advisory Board should be set up within the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), preferably with qualified external participation, to ensure that this database and existing lists of female candidates are given due consideration.
- Special Representatives of the Secretary-General and senior mission personnel should receive an in-depth briefing on gender mainstreaming issues prior to deployment.

4. Planning, Structure and Resources of Missions

- A gender affairs unit is crucial for effective gender mainstreaming and should be a standard component of all missions. It should be adequately funded and staffed at appropriate levels and should have direct access to senior decision-makers.
- The DPKO-led operational planning teams at United Nations Headquarters must include gender specialists and representatives of other United Nations agencies and organizations dealing with gender issues.
- All DPKO and Department of Political Affairs briefings to the Security Council, as well as formal and informal briefings to the General Assembly legislative bodies, Member States and other relevant bodies, should integrate gender issues related to that particular mission.
- There is a need for the financial authorities of the United Nations, particularly the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, to give priority to the funding of gender mainstreaming.

- Lessons learned from current and prior missions on gender should be incorporated at the planning stage of a new mission. To this end, the compilation of good practices on gender mainstreaming should be constantly updated.

5. Recruitment

- The United Nations must set an example by rapidly increasing the number of senior female civilian personnel in peace support operations in all relevant Headquarters departments, including DPKO, and in the field.
- Member States should be asked to increase the number of women in their military and civilian police forces who are qualified to serve in peace support operations at all levels, including the most senior. To this end, a stronger mechanism than the current *note verbale* to troop-contributing nations should be developed. Requests to troop-contributing nations could be tailor-made to nations that are known to have suitable female staff, while other potential troop-contributing nations could be encouraged to develop longer-term strategies to increase the number and rank of female personnel in their respective forces.
- The terms of reference, including eligibility requirements, for all heads of mission components and their personnel should be reviewed and modified to facilitate the increased participation of women, and, depending on the outcome of that review, special measures should be taken to secure this goal.
- All agreements and individual contracts governing the assignment of personnel, including arrangements for United Nations Volunteers, should reflect the gender-related obligations and responsibilities of those personnel. In particular, the code of conduct should be addressed in all of these documents.

6. Training

- Troop-contributing nations, which are training military, police and civilian personnel specifically for their participation in peace support operations, should involve a higher percentage of women in that training.
- Gender issues should be mainstreamed throughout all regional and national training curricula and courses for peace support operations, particularly those sponsored directly by the Training Unit of DPKO.

- In order to meet United Nations standards for behaviour, DPKO should provide gender awareness guidelines and materials so that Member States can incorporate these elements into their national training programmes for military and civilian police personnel in preparation for deployment. Such training should be enhanced by United Nations Training Assistance Teams and train-the-trainers programmes.
- Obligatory induction training with regard to gender issues held upon arrival at mission areas should include the following:
 - Code of Conduct;
 - Culture, history and social norms of the host country;
 - Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women; and
 - Sexual harassment and sexual assault.

7. Procedures

- DPKO should consider the gender mainstreaming mechanisms currently used by United Nations agencies and adopt an appropriate version for their field operations. DPKO directives should be amended to include gender mainstreaming.
- The reporting mechanisms between the field and Headquarters on gender mainstreaming need to be clarified.
- A post for a Senior Gender Adviser in DPKO, to serve as gender focal point for field missions, should be funded under the regular budget or the peacekeeping support account and filled as a matter of urgency.
- The terms of reference of the Senior Gender Adviser should ensure a proper interchange of information and experience between gender units in individual missions.
- The functions and roles of mission gender units/advisers should be announced to all personnel.
- Standard Operating Procedures applying to all components of missions should be developed on the issues of sexual assault and sexual harassment.

8. Monitoring, Evaluation and Accountability

- Accountability for all issues relating to gender mainstreaming at the field level should be vested at the highest level, in the Secretary-General's Special Representative, who should be assigned the responsibility of

ensuring that gender mainstreaming is implemented in all areas and components of the mission.

- The Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and other concerned legislative bodies should submit recommendations to the General Assembly promoting gender mainstreaming in peace operations.
- Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to assess the implementation of the United Nations gender mainstreaming objectives should be established at United Nations Headquarters and at peacekeeping missions, in consultation with the Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women.
- The current format of reporting, particularly with regard to situation reports and periodic reports of the Secretary-General, should include progress on gender mainstreaming throughout peacekeeping missions.
- There should be periodic and end-of-mission evaluations, led by an independent external team, of the degree to which the United Nations gender mainstreaming approach and objectives have been integrated into all policies and activities of each peace support operation. The first studies should be on East Timor and Kosovo.
- Reporting mechanisms should be established to monitor the effects of the implementation of the peace agreement on the host country population from a gender perspective.
- Research should be encouraged on the short- and long-term effects of the gender dimension of peace support operations on the host country population. Such research should be designed to strengthen host country research capacity, in particular that of women researchers.

9. Public Awareness

- All possible means should be employed to increase public awareness of the importance of gender mainstreaming in peace support operations. In this connection, the media should play a significant and positive role.

List of participants

1. Andrén, Ulla / ulla.andren@sgds.se
2. Berglund, Ing-Marie / Save the Children / ing-marie.berglund@rb.se
3. Burgess, J. Peter / International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO) / peter@prio.no
4. Friberg, David / The Swedish Rescue Services Agency / david.friberg@srv.se
5. Hostens, Karen / International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO) / Karen@prio.no
6. Isaksson, Charlotte / Swedish Armed Forces / charlotte.isaksson@hkv.mil.se
7. Ivarsson, Sophia / Swedish National Defence College / sophia.ivarsson@fhs.mil.se
8. Johnsson-Latham, Gerd / Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs / gerd.johnsson-latham@foreign.ministry.se
9. Karamé, Kari / Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI) / KK@nupi.no
10. Klot, Jennifer / Social Science Research Council, USA /
klot@ssrc.org
11. Larsson, Katarina / Consultant / Katarina.larsson@swipnet.se
12. Lif, Susanna / Olof Palme International Center / susanna.lif@palmecenter.se
13. Lindén, Eva / Swedish Police Peace Support Operations / civpol@rkp.police.se
14. Lindestam, Gunilla / Collegium for Development Studies, Uppsala University /
gunilla.lindestam@kus.uu.se
15. Mason, Joanne / Manchester Metropolitan University, UK / joannemason78@hotmail.com
16. Meiton, Birgitta / Ministry of Defense / birgitta.meiton@defence.ministry.se
17. Melin, Mia / Collegium for Development Studies, Uppsala University /
mia.melin@kus.uu.se
18. Nilsson, Per-Ulf / OmVärlden / per-ulf@context.nu
19. Nittmar, Annika / Dept of Teacher Training, Uppsala university / annika.nittmar@ilu.uu.se

20. Olsson, Louise / Dept. for Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University /
louise.olsson@pcr.uu.se
21. Peuschel, Minja / Student / minjapeuschel@hotmail.com
22. Ramboll, Unni / Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway / unni.ramboll@mfa.no
23. Rang Schmidt, Jessika / Women's Forum / jesra@kvinnoforum.se
24. Törnengren, Gull / Department of Theology, Högskolan Dalarna / gto@du.se
25. Törnengren, Camilla / Journalist/Member of Amnesty International /
camillatoerngren@hotmail.com
26. Tötterman, Petra / Women's International League for Peace and Freedom /
P.Totterman@lse.ac.uk, wilpfsweden@ikff.se
27. Wadstein, Susanne / The Swedish Rescue Services Agency/ susanne.wadstein@srv.se
28. Zillén, Eva / Kvinna till Kvinna / Eva.zillen@iktk.se