A Critique of the "Myth of Protection" of Women in UNSC Resolution 1325

Iker Zirion Landaluze
International Public Law, University of the Basque Country, Leioa, Spain
iker.zirion@ehu.eus

Abstract: This text makes a critical analysis of the "myth of protection", that is, the widespread belief that men protect and women are mainly victims in contexts of armed conflict and post-conflict. Indeed, in the case of women, both the analysis of their participation in contexts of conflict and the international regulations applicable in armed conflicts have generally focused on highlighting their role as innocent and passive victims. In order to question this view this text first examines the traditional symbolic construction of the "woman-victim", created on the basis of International Humanitarian Law, and highlights its reductionist character facing a much more complex and heterogeneous reality of women in armed conflicts. Furthermore, it focuses on Resolution 1325 of the UNSC on women and peace and security, especially on its content and limitations for overcoming the traditional view that identifies women with victims in armed conflicts. Finally, using the concrete case of sexual violence against women in armed conflict the text analyses the extent to which this and subsequent resolutions on this topic (specially Resolutions 1820, 1888, 1960 and 2106), far from overcoming that traditional view, have helped to reproduce it.

Keywords: armed conflict, gender, "woman-victim", UNSCR 1325, sexual violence

1. Introduction

This text aims to critically analyse the paradigm of the "myth of protection", that is, the widespread belief that men protect and women are the principal victims in contexts of armed conflict and post-conflict. This paradigm, which has been constructed and reproduced by the international regulations applicable in armed conflicts (especially International Humanitarian Law) and by the current gender agenda in peacebuilding, has also become hegemonic in the mainstream literature on this topic and in the social imaginary as well.

Casualties amongst the civilian population, previously considered to be a collateral or unsought after effect of war, have now become a principle objective in the military tactics of the conflicting sides, whether these are non-state armed groups or national forces. Moreover, sexual violence, forced enlistment, sexual slavery, forced displacement or ethnic cleansing are tactics that are frequently carried out with special account taken of the victims' gender, because in fact it is precisely gender construction that is being attacked (Mazurana 2005: 33).

In this sense, the cost of war has become greater for women (Zeleza, 2008: 21) to an extent that some authors even argue that actually women probably confront more violence in armed conflicts than men do (Cramer, 2007: 293). But to identify women exclusively – principally – with victims is reductionist and departs from the truth. In these situations women participate in multiple ways that can include confronting and resisting these types of violence, supporting peace and also exercising violence.

This text first examines the traditional symbolic construction of the "woman-victim", created on the basis of International Humanitarian Law, and highlights its reductionist character facing a much more complex and heterogeneous reality. Furthermore, it focuses on Resolution 1325 of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC): on one side, on its content and subsequent development, and on the other, on some of its limitations for overcoming the traditional view that identifies women with victims in armed conflicts. Finally, using the concrete case of sexual violence against women the text analyses the extent to which this resolution and later ones, far from overcoming that traditional view, have helped to reproduce it.

2. Going beyond the traditional "woman-victim" paradigm in contexts of conflict and post-conflict

In the field of peace and security, there are very widely held gender dichotomies based on the reductionist assumption that men are trouble-makers and women are pacific; that is, the association – which has an essentialist character – of men as persons more prone to aggressiveness and violence, and of women linked to their maternal role, with a natural inclination towards peace and, at the same time, more prone to suffering from the violence derived from armed conflicts. However, as different feminist perspectives point out, the characteristics and behaviours assigned to men (male roles and identities) and to women (female roles and

identities) are not natural attributes due to biological differences between the two sexes. They are constructed socially and culturally and can therefore be altered.

Furthermore, these dichotomous, essentialist differences have a particular origin and usefulness. Their construction and reproduction are not a chance occurrence, but instead serve to naturalise other forms of power and domination. Laura Sjoberg (2013: 144; 2006: 895) observes that war is an institution that depends for its reproduction on genderised images of both combatants and civilians. Jean Bethke Elshtain (1995) is even clearer in her critique of the ideal and complementary figures of the "just warrior", the man entrusted with protecting civilians and defending just causes, on the one hand, and the "beautiful soul", the woman needing care and protection, on the other.

Based on this widespread view, the acritical and a priori assumption has arisen that in contexts of conflict all men are combatants and all women are victims. Moreover, this construction is frequently expressed in the singular (the "woman-victim"), as if the experiences and needs of women during and after armed conflicts were homogeneous and lacked distinctive features.

However, going beyond excessively simplistic or stereotyped beliefs about the roles of women and men, and essentialist views on the nature of women and men, the fact is that their experiences in armed conflicts are very heterogeneous. On the one hand, the experiences of men and women are very different, since both experience conflict and post-conflict in different ways (Cockburn 2010: 108). They shape and are shaped by violence in these periods in very distinct ways, while at the same time the patterns of men's sexist domination and oppression of women are maintained (or increased). On the other hand, there is also a heterogeneity of experiences in and between women, just as there is in and between men.

In the case of women, analysis of their participation in contexts of conflict has generally focused on highlighting their role as innocent and passive victims. Nonetheless, women do not speak with a single voice in relation to peace and security; instead, like men, they are divided by different political identities and loyalties and act in very diverse ways in contexts of conflict and post-conflict (El-Bushra 2008: 130). They are not only victims, but are also agents of peace and reconciliation and, of course, they contribute to violence and insecurity.

The dominant literature frequently presents manichean and simplistic analyses of the impact of war on women in which everything is a case of winning or losing for them. However there are great contrasts in women's experiences, deriving from the intersection of their differences of age, class, race, national or ethnic origin, religion, etc. (Pankhurst 2004: 15). Many women suffer disproportionately during an armed conflict while others benefit from it (Hudson 2010: 260). In fact, conflict can have contradictory consequences for women. Indeed, even the same woman, depending on circumstances and the moment in time, might have acted as an agent of peace or of violence; she might have suffered and, at the same time, have benefitted from the conflict.

Armed conflict frequently exacerbates inequalities of power and access to pre-existing resources in a given society (El-Bushra 2008: 131; Abeysekera, 2011: 51) and, although this might seem paradoxical, at the same time women can assume new roles and come into contact with new ideas. In a certain sense, armed conflict makes it possible to transform gender roles and there can also be a certain margin for redefining gender relations, although this redefinition does not affect all members of the society equally. Experience shows that many women find their preceding roles are altered in such a context. In addition to carrying out "traditional" tasks of care, food provision and social reproduction (Pankhurst 2004: 14), they also do jobs that were previously considered unsuitable for them. For example, they take up roles such as armed struggle, they increase their levels of organisation, administration and social mobilisation, and actively participate in decision-making; that is, they set in motion strategies of empowerment and social leadership. All of which enables them to be agents in multiple ways.

However, this empowerment is often related to the fact that they are permitted to adopt roles that are generally performed by men, such as combat. In these cases, conflict is understood as an interval in time during which women are allowed to have greater power and responsibility than in contexts of "normality". From the perspective of this argument, the experience of armed conflicts, far from freeing women, could demonstrate the extent to which the women's lives are controlled by the male elite (Enloe 1993: 63). For that reason conflict should not be idealised as a period of liberation for women. Gender hierarchies are extremely resilient and tend to perpetuate themselves, which is why it is likely that women's involvement in the outbreak of war and their

influence on its development and results continue to be marginal in comparison with that of their male companions (Zeleza 2008: 21).

3. Development and difficulties of Resolution 1325 in transforming the "woman-victim" paradigm

United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325, adopted in the year 2000, is a brief resolution – with barely 18 clauses – and is entirely dedicated to developing the gender perspective in the fields of peace and security. Its goal is, on the one hand, to encourage the participation and representation of women in these fields and, on the other, to prevent and protect women from violence. It has had a clear impact both in and beyond this international organisation, and the incorporation of the gender perspective that it contains has become a reference for all actors who deal with issues related to gender, conflicts and peace.

Inside the UN, the adoption of Resolution 1325 has been followed by many other resolutions that evaluate, strengthen and/or develop its content, namely Resolutions 1820 (2008); 1888 and 1889 (2009); 1960 (2010); 2106 and 2122 (2013); and 2242 (2015). Some of these – Resolutions 1889, 2122 and 2242 – develop the general content of Resolution 1325 and, above all, are aimed at boosting its implementation both within the United Nations and amongst the member states. Others, including Resolutions 1820, 1888, 1960 and 2106, specifically concentrate on the question of sexual violence in contexts of conflict and post-conflict. Resolution 1820 is particularly important in relation to this issue, since for the first time it identifies systematic and generalised sexual violence against women as a threat to international peace and security.

This resolution was also considered to be a pioneering instrument because the Security Council, an androcentric and undemocratic body, largely indifferent to this issue until then, introduced women and gender onto the international peace and security agenda (Cohn 2004: 130). On the one hand, this meant the securitisation of gender and, on the other, a certain improvement on the classic security model. Another novelty was the image it presented of women in armed conflicts. With the goal of promoting their participation and representation in the negotiation and implementation of peace and security, it seemed to have overcome the historic consideration of women as victims, as a vulnerable group or as passive subjects, and to present them as active participants in processes related to peace and security.

However, its subsequent development has been ambiguous and full of lights and shadows. In fact, the majority of peace activists recognise Resolution 1325's usefulness as a starting point, but its development and implementation have been heavily criticised, even by the peace, human rights and/or feminist organisations that originally pressed for its adoption (El-Bushra 2008: 128; Wright 2015).

One of the main criticisms concerns the evident fracture between discourse and practice. Gender mainstreaming has great potential for promoting equality, but along the way it has lost its transformative character. It has become a technical, ahistorical and depoliticised instrument that does not question the unequal power relations existing between men and women. This has in part been made possible because, in spite of its being a UNSC resolution and therefore entailing compulsory fulfilment by member states, this document has a clearly declaratory character, without clearly defined goals (Steinberg, 2011: 118). It does not incorporate specific control and monitoring mechanisms that could guarantee its effectiveness, nor any sanctions for nonfulfillment.

Similarly, its ethnocentric character has also been criticised because, in spite of the supposedly universal character of its proposals, underlying its spirit there is a particular western view of women, peace and security that – not by chance – largely coincides with the view of western liberal feminism on gender equality (Shepherd 2008: 170). This view is based on the idea that men and women are potentially equal subjects of the same rights and its activity is focused on giving visibility to women and promoting their participation in the public sphere in equal conditions with men, on the understanding that such egalitarian participation is a priority for advancing the position of women. It therefore does not include other, deeper feminist criticisms and proposals (Wright, 2015), such as including approaches to security that are less militarised and less masculinised, as against the present dominant perspectives on peace (negative) and security (state-centred and androcentric).

Finally, another criticism has been directed at the instrumental character given to gender questions and the human rights of women in the international scenario. In fact, the arguments on the "protection of women" and/or "defence of women's rights" have been used in an interested way in some conflict contexts – while not

in others – to legitimise the political goals of states (Tronto, 2008: 189; Steans 2013: 124), international organisations, belligerent parties or humanitarian actors (Carpenter 2006: 22-23) with the aim of intervening in other countries, receiving international support in their struggles or obtaining funding for their activities.

4. UNSC resolutions reproduce "the myth of protection" in sexual violence

In the framework of its goal of protecting women, Resolution 1325 has become the starting point for the UN's efforts in relation to violence against women in contexts of armed conflict and post-conflict. However, this protection from violence has been reduced almost exclusively to the prevention of, and protection from sexual violence (Sivakumaran 2010: 271), as can be deduced from the content of Resolution 1325 itself and, above all, from the subsequent Resolutions 1820, 1888, 1960 and 2106.

These resolutions take up the principle of immunity that is recognised in the rules that regulate International Law applicable during war, i.e., International Humanitarian Law. This law has constructed and reproduced a historical distinction between combatants and non-combatants based on a discourse that naturalises differences of sex and gender and that in war identifies men with combatants and women with victims (Kinsella 2005: 250-251; Barrow 2010: 233).

I noted above that the idea of men fighting in wars to protect "vulnerable persons" – usually identified with women, girls and boys – is a very widespread myth (Tickner 2001: 49). This "myth of protection" has frequently been constructed and reproduced by International Humanitarian Law (as in the Geneva Conventions of 1949), an old, conservative and not very flexible area of International Public Law. In this discipline many regulations have an androcentric character – created for men on the basis of men's experiences – and are not based on the consideration that women are subjects of law (Gardam and Charlesworth 2000: 166).

This paradigm of men as perpetrators and women as victims (Barrow, 2010: 233) is not neutral, but instead performs a legitimating function. War is a social construction that needs "victims" to "protect" (Tickner 2001: 51). As I shall now show, Resolution 1325 and the subsequent Resolutions 1820, 1888, 1960 and 2106 – focusing on the question of sexual violence against women and girls – have strengthened this paradigm and, at the same time, have given rise to a deep tension between the goals of representing and protecting women in the liberal strategy of gender mainstreaming in peacebuilding (Hudson 2012).

In line with Laura Shepherd (2008: 9), my intention here is not to discuss the need to address the issue of sexual violence in armed conflicts; instead, I do critically analyse the discourse that lies behind this international juridical regulation and that reproduces gender roles and identities, generating negative consequences that finally damage the effectiveness of Resolution 1325 itself and subsequent resolutions. On the one hand, the weight given to women's role as peace agents in these resolutions is overwhelming in comparison to references to their role as agents of violence, thus ignoring other important roles and aspects of women's experience in armed conflicts that have been referred to above.

On the other hand, there is also a disproportionate emphasis on violence and most especially on sexual violence against women in these resolutions. This, in the first place, reduces women to their bodies and to their reproductive and sexual functions and does not enquire into the structural character of the unequal gender relations that motivate violence against women (Steans 2013: 124). In the second place, it deepens a sexualised view of the violence that women face in contexts of armed conflict and post-conflict. In this way many other specific forms of discrimination and violence are relegated into the background: such as displacement and refuge, in which women make up the majority of the population; the impact on their physical and mental health; economic and social violence; or unequal access to justice in defence of their rights.

It thus ignores the *continuum* of violence (Cockburn 2004: 43) faced by women, that is, the consideration of violence as a complex, constant and integral process in which women confront different types of violence (physical, psychological, structural, symbolic), in different fields (political, social, economic), contexts (in zones of armed conflict but also outside these) and moments (before, during and after conflicts). Thus, for women armed conflicts do not always mean a context so different from the rest. And, in the third and last place, it concentrates the efforts of women and/or the feminist movement on sexual violence in armed conflicts (a military tactic) and thus diverts their energy and resolve from more ambitious goals. In this sense, as Hicks

Stiehm (2010: 23) notes, the aim should not be to make war more human (by eliminating sexual violence against women) but to put an end to war itself.

Finally, the essentialist views of men and women contained in these resolutions reproduce harmful gender stereotypes (Carpenter 2005: 295) as women appear explicitly reflected as victims and pacifists while, conversely, men are implicitly (because there are barely any references to them in Resolution 1325 and later resolutions) shown as aggressors and/or protectors, that is, as those responsible for both the violence and the protection of women. Assigning the label of victims to women, re-victimises them (Hudson 2012: 443) and weakens their capacity and agency as actors in armed conflicts (El-Bushra 2008: 131; Barrow, 2010: 222; Puechguirbal 2010: 162). As a result of all the above, in this area there is a thin red line between giving visibility to women victims and reproducing their victimisation.

In the same sense, Charli Carpenter (2005: 295) criticises, on the one hand, the identification of women with boys, girls and "other vulnerable groups" and, on the other, the effects that this identification has on the reproduction of a particular view of women (as victims) in contexts of conflict. Nonetheless, she also recognises the usefulness of this identification for promoting the protection of civilians in contexts of conflict, insofar as this is a term that is recognised and accepted – independently of whether or not it is respected – by the opposing sides, the mass media and international actors.

As Judith Butler (2011: 27) observes, the category "women and children" constructs an identification of women with innocence that is intended to make violence committed against them even more unacceptable. In this way, in keeping with the dominant discourse, women have a central role as victims in war, but a marginal one as agents. In fact, the principle of immunity that identifies women with victims and that underlies Resolution1325 and subsequent resolutions, has not served to protect women, but has reproduced gender stereotypes that have a negative effect on the subordination of women beyond war situations, by strengthening pre-existing gender inequalities in general.

This means to say, on the one hand, that these resolutions do not achieve their goal of protection, since sexual violence and subsequent impunity persist in both scale and seriousness in contexts of conflict and post-conflict (Steinberg, 2011: 117). And, on the other, it deepens ideas – especially the "woman-victim" paradigm – that not only discriminate against women (Gardam and Charlesworth 2000: 152) but also help to reproduce that discrimination. Resolution 1820 and the rest of the resolutions on sexual violence construct and reproduce certain concrete conceptions about gender violence and international security in place of other possible conceptions (Shepherd 2008: 9-10). They do not succeed in advancing beyond that specific construction of women and thus dilute the efforts, prior and subsequent to Resolution1325, that seek to empower women through their participation and representation in equal conditions with men in the fields of peace and security (Barrow 2010: 234).

5. Final comments

Historically, peace and security studies have helped to construct an essentialist view that identifies different – and unequal – roles and activities with men or with women by virtue of their biological differences. This reality is reflected in the dichotomous, paradigmatic construction "man as protector/ woman as victim", which is very deeply rooted in the dominant imaginary and literature. Against this view, the majority of feminist perspectives consider that male and female roles and identities are socially and culturally constructed and can therefore be altered. Furthermore, they denounce the fact that these essentialist distinctions are not neutral, but have a particular origin and usefulness, since they serve to naturalise sexist forms of power and domination in world politics.

In practice, the experience of men and women in armed conflicts is very heterogeneous. Men and women shape and are shaped by violence in different ways and, at the same time, they have different security needs. Similarly, in contexts of armed conflict, gender barriers are transformed in a certain way, which makes it possible to redefine gender roles. This redefinition, however, does not affect all the members of the society equally and, in general, maintains (or exacerbates) the domination and oppression of women by men.

At the same time, and in relation to their participation during armed conflicts, women are not only victims. They also act as agents of peace and, of course, they contribute to violence and insecurity. Nonetheless, the priority

given to analyses of sexual violence in armed conflicts has strengthened the traditional view of the woman-victim.

It seemed that this situation was going to change with UNSC Resolution 1325, which had a great international impact and, in general terms, a certain degree of success in incorporating the gender perspective into international peacebuilding policies. In fact, this resolution was considered a pioneering instrument because it introduced women and gender into the international peace and security agenda. Its subsequent development, however, has been ambiguous and full of lights and shadows. The majority of peace activists recognise the usefulness of Resolution 1325 as a starting point, but its development and implantation have been subjected to different criticisms.

One of the main ones is the evident fracture between the resolution's discourse and reality, as well as its having abandoned its transformative character to become a technical and depoliticised instrument that does not question the unequal power relations existing between men and women. Likewise, its ethnocentric character has been subjected to criticism, because in spite of the supposed universality of its proposals, there is a determinate (liberal) view of women, peace and security underlying its spirit, while other views that are more critical of the dominant perspectives on peace and security are omitted.

Resolution 1325 and the subsequent Resolutions 1820 (2008), 1888 (2009), 1960 (2010) and 2106 (2013) that complement it, deepen the traditional view of the "woman-victim" already present in the regulations of International Humanitarian Law, like the Geneva Conventions of 1949, according to which women in armed conflicts are especially identified with victims of violence. In fact, their emphasis on sexual violence provides a "sexualised" and reductionist view of the violence that women face in contexts of conflict and post-conflict and of the nature of violence in such scenarios. This has negative consequences for women as it implies, on the one hand, re-victimising them; on the other, it weakens their power and agency as actors by ignoring the plurality of roles that they develop in armed conflicts; and, finally, it dilutes the goal of empowerment – boosting women's participation and representation – that was present in Resolution 1325 and in its subsequent development.

References

Abeysekera, S. (2011) "Gender Equality and Women's Human Rights in Conflict Situations: Evolving Perspectives", Oré Aguilar, G. and Gómez Isa, F. (eds.) *Rethinking Transitions. Equality and Social Justice in Societies Emerging from Conflict*, Intersentia, Cambridge, pp 47-66.

Barrow, A. (2010) "UN Security Council Resolutions 1325 and 1820: constructing gender in armed conflict and international humanitarian law", *International Review of the Red Cross*, Vol 92, No. 877, pp 221-234.

Butler, J. (2011) *Violencia de estado, Guerra, resistencia. Por una nueva política de la izquierda*, Katz Editores, Buenos Aires.

Carpenter, C. R. (2006) *Innocent Women and Children Gender, Norms and the Protection of Civilians*, Ashgate, Aldershot.

Carpenter, C. R. (2005) "'Women, Children and Other Vulnerable Groups': Gender, Strategic Frames and the Protection of Civilians as a Transnational Issue", *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol 49, pp 295-334.

Cockburn, C. (2004) "The Continuum of Violence. A Gender Perspective on War and Peace", Giles, W. and Hyndman, J. (eds.) *Sites of Violence. Gender and Conflict Zones*, University of California Press, Berkeley, pp 24-44.

Cockburn, C. (2010) "Militarism and War", Shepherd, L. J. (ed.) *Gender Matters in Global Politics. A Feminist Introduction to International Relations* (1ª ed.), Routledge, New York, pp 105-126.

Cramer, C. (2007) "El análisis de la violencia y la guerra en África", Oya, C. and Santamaría, A. (eds.) *Economía política del desarrollo en África*, Akal, Madrid, pp 287-306.

Cohn, C. (2004) "Women, Peace and Security Council Resolution 1325", *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Vol 6, No. 1, pp 130-140.

El-Bushra, J. (2008) "Feminism, Gender, and Women's Peace Activism", Cornwall, A., Harrison E. and Whitehead A. (eds.) *Gender Myths and Feminist Fables: The Struggle for Interpretative Power in Gender and Development*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, pp 127-143.

Elshtain, J. B. (1995) *Women and War*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Enloe, C. (1993) *The Morning After: Sexual Politics after the Cold War*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Gardam, J. G. and Charlesworth, H. (2000) "Protection of Women in Armed Conflict", *Human Rights Quarterly*, Vol 22, pp 148-166.

Hicks Stiehm, J. (2010) "Theses on the military, security, war and women", Sjoberg, L. (ed.) *Gender and International Relations*. Feminist Perspectives, Routledge, Abingdon, pp 17-23.

Hudson, H. (2012) "A Double-edged Sword of Peace? Reflections on the Tension between Representation and Protection in Gendering Liberal Peacebuilding", *International Peacekeeping*, Vol 19, No. 4, pp 443-460.

Hudson, H. (2010) "Peace building through a gender lens and the challenges of implementation in Rwanda and Côte d'Ivoire", SJOBERG, L. (ed.) *Gender and International Relations*. Feminist Perspectives, Routledge, Abingdon, pp 256-279.

Kinsella, H. (2005) "Securing the Civilian. Sex and Gender in the Laws of War", Barnett, M. and Duvall, R. (eds.) *Power in Global Governance*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 249-272.

Pankhurst, D. (2004) "'The sex war' and other wars. Towards a feminist approach to peacebuilding", Afshar, H. and Eade, D. (eds.) *Development, Women and War. Feminist Perspectives*, Oxfam International, Oxford, pp 8-42.

Puechguirbal, N. (2010) "Peacekeeping, Peacebuilding and Post-conflict Reconstruction", Shepherd L. J. (ed.), *Gender Matters in Global Politics. A Feminist Introduction to International Relations*, Routledge, New York, pp 161-175.

Sivakumaran, S. (2010) "Lost in translation. UN responses to sexual violence against men in conflict", *International review of the Red Cross*, Vol 92, No. 877, pp 259-277.

Shepherd, L. (2008) *Gender, violence and security. Discourse as practice*, Zed Books, London.

Sjoberg, L. (2013) *Gendering Global Conflict. Towards a Feminist Theory of War*, Columbia University Press, New York.

Sjoberg, L. (2006) "The Gendered Realities of the Immunity Principle: Why Gender Analysis Needs Feminism", *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 50, pp 889-910.

Steans, J. (2013) *Gender and International Relations. Theory, Practice and Policy*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Steinberg, D. (2011) "Women ad War: An Agenda for Action", Kuehnast, K., Oudraat, C. and Hernes, H. (eds.) *Women and war: power and protection in the 21st century*, United States Institute of Peace Press, Washington D.C., pp 115-130.

Tickner, A. (2001) *Gendering World Politics. Issues and approaches in the post-Cold War era*, Columbia University Press, New York.

Tronto, J. (2008) "Is Peacekeeping Care Work? A Feminist Reflection on 'the Responsibility to Protect'", Whisnant, R. and Desautels P. (eds.) *Global Feminist Ethics. Feminist Ethics and Social Theory*, Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham, pp 179-200.

Wright, H. (2015) "La 1325: ¿una herramienta útil para las activistas?", *Por la paz*, Vol 25.

Zeleza, P. T. (2008) "Introduction. The Causes & Costs of War in Africa. From Liberation Struggles to the 'War on Terror'", Nhema, A. and Zeleza, P. T. (eds.) *The Roots of African Conflicts. The Causes & Costs*, James Currey, Oxford, pp 1-35.