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1NC

The affirmative’s drive for military security upholds institutions of hegemonic masculinity that perpetuate gender stereotypes and women’s exclusion

Kronsell 6, Feminist Methodologies or International Relations, Annica Kronsell: Assisnt Professor of Political Science at the University of Lund, edited by Brooke A. Ackerly: Assistnat Professor in the Department of Political Science at Vanderbilt University, Maria Stern: Lecturer and Researcher at the Department of Peace and Development Research, Goteborg University, and Jacqui True: Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Studies at the Univeristy of Auskland, New Zealand, 2006, Cambridge University Press

p.111-2 military…possible masculinities

Military, defense, and security related institutions have historically been “owned” by men and occupied by men’s bodies. This has influenced these institutions’ agendas, politics, and policies. In using the concept “institutions of hegemonic masculinity,” we denote a particular interest in the norms associated with the institutions. However, there appears to be a strong material dimension to such norms, since, it is argued, they are often associated with male bodies. Robert Connell (1998: 5) says: “Men’s bodies do not determine the patterns of masculinity, but they are still of great importance in masculinity.” Hegemonic masculinity cannot, therefore, be completely disentangled from male bodies. In some instances the hegemonic masculinity of these institutions directly corresponds to male bodies, as women are completely excluded through legislative acts from the military and defense institutions in a majority of countries. As we shall discuss in some depth later on, women’s bodies present a very tangible challenge to institutions of hegemonic masculinity, against this normality of male bodies. The continuity of the domination of hegemonic masculinity, I argue, depends on the maintenance of separate spaces for men’s bodies, and hence, women are a clear threat to this order. The hegemonic masculinity associated with military and defense institutions does not necessarily mean that it should reflect the most common form of masculinity in society (Connell 1998: 5). As a matter of fact, Joshua Goldstein’s research (2001) shows that in comparison to other institutions in society, defense and military institutions have been associated with specific gender stereotypes, consistent across both cultures and time, which do not always correspond with norms of masculinity expressed in society at large. Furthermore, hegemonic masculinity does not preclude the fact that diverse masculinities can be expressed. In the contrary, some studies point to the necessity of diverse masculinities for the hierarchical structure of the institution to function (Miller 2001; Hearn and Parkin 2001). Although I am

interested in exploring this in future research, here I shall not differentiate between possible masculinities.

1NC

Feminist resistance to militarism is essential for sustained peace – without the alternative, the patriarchal drive for war ensures a spiraling continuum of armed conflict

Cockburn 10, Cynthia Department of Sociology, The City University London, UK b Centre for the Study of Women and

Gender, University of Warwick, UK (2010) 'Gender Relations as Causal in Militarization and War', International Feminist Journal of Politics, 12: 2, 139 — 157

To summarize the argument made above – looking closely at war with a sociologist’s or anthropologist’s eye reveals cultures, the detail of what is done and said. You see job advertisements for the military, you see training, you see discipline and indiscipline, killing, rape and torture. If, as well, you have a feminist’s engaged standpoint, derived from women’s lives and deaths in this maelstrom, you see the gender in it. And you turn again to evaluate so-called peacetime. You see that the disposition in societies such as those we live in, characterized by a patriarchal gender regime, is towards an association of masculinity with authority, coercion and violence. It is a masculinity (and a complementary femininity) that not only serves militarism very well indeed, but seeks and needs militarization and war for its fulfilment. Of course, the violence of war is in turn productive. It produces re-burnished ethnic identities, sharpened by memories of wrong and a desire for revenge. It produces particular gender identities – armed masculinities, demoralized and angry men, victimized femininities, types of momentarily empowered women. But these war-honed gender relations, ‘after war’ (which may always equally be ‘before war’), again tend to feed back perennially into the spiralling continuum of armed conflict, for ever predisposing a society to violence, forever disturbing the peace. Why is it important to pay attention to the perceptions of a feminist stand- point on war, to address the possibility that gender-as-we-know-it plays a part in perpetuating armed conflict? Because there are practical implications in this for our worldwide, mixed-sex movements for demilitarization, disarmament and peace. After all, we are ready to recognize that a sustainably peaceful society must differ from today’s war-torn societies. At the very least, its economic relations must be more just and equal. Additionally, its national and ethnic relations must become more respectful and inclusive. Women committed to organizing as women against war add a dimension to this transformative change. They ask the antiwar movement to recognize that, to be sustainably peaceful, a society will also have to be one in which we live gender very differently from the way it is lived today. R. W. Connell has persistently analysed what cultural studies tell us about masculinity. In 2002 he wrote ‘men predominate across the spectrum of violence. A strategy for demilitarization and peace must concern itself with this fact, with the reasons for it, and with its implications for work to reduce violence’ (Connell 2002: 34). And he went on to say, Gender dynamics are by no means the whole story. Yet given the concentration of weapons and the practices of violence among men, gender patterns appear to be strategic. Masculinities are the forms in which many dynamics of violence take shape . . . Evidently, then, a strategy for demilitarization and peace must include a strategy of change in masculinities. (2002: 38, emphasis added) Connell has also been important for showing us the multiplicity and variation in masculinity, pointing to its subversive as well as hegemonic forms (Connell 1995). In countries such as Serbia and Turkey where military service for men is still obligatory, some homosexual men have been among the most politicized and challenging ‘conscientious objectors’, because of the way they have simultaneously refused militarism and conformity to patriarchal norms of manhood (Cinar and Usterci 2009). So the message coming from feminist antiwar, antimilitarist and peace organizations of the kind I studied is that our many internationally linked coalitions against militarism and war as a whole need to challenge patriarchy as well as capitalism and nationalism. ‘We can’t do this alone’, women say. Sandra Harding (2004b: 135) has pointed out that: everything that feminist thought must know must also inform the thought of every other liberatory movement, and vice versa. It is not just the women in those other movements who must know the world from the perspective of women’s lives. Everyone must do so if the movements are to succeed at their own goals. But the message emanating from a feminist standpoint on war has not so far been welcomed onto the mainstream agenda. The major antiwar coalitions, mainly led by left tendencies, contain many women activists. An unknown number, individually, may share in a feminist analysis of war, but their presence has not yet been allowed to shape the movements’ activism. If antimilitarist and antiwar organizing is to be strong, effective and to the point, women must oppose war not only as people but as women. And men too must oppose it in their own gender identity – as men – explicitly resisting the exploitation of masculinity for war.

1NC

We can’t merely add women to the affirmative’s theoretical framework- feminist scholarship requires reframing our theory of international relations

Ackerly and True 6, Feminist Methodologies or International Relations, edited by Brooke A. Ackerly: Assistnat Professor in the Department of Political Science at Vanderbilt University, Maria Stern: Lecturer and Researcher at the Department of Peace and Development Research, Goteborg University, and Jacqui True: Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Studies at the Univeristy of Auskland, New Zealand, 2006, Cambridge University Press p.245-6 in the same epistemological…international relations

In the same epistemological vein, feminist scholarship can be seen as a collective effort to make theories of IR better able to wrestle with questions of global justice. IR feminists recognize that the reification of disciplinary and political boundaries limits the possibilities for a truly critical IR theory (see e.g., Zalewski, this volume). Specifically, but not exclusively, they address the gender-based oppression and injustice suffered by women and men within and across states. Although it is possible to include women within existing IR frameworks, such as constructivism, while leaving these frameworks theoretically intact and empirically strengthened, in their attention to women’s experience feminist scholars do not seek to **merely add women** to theoretical frameworks derived from men’s experiences in the world (cf. Keck and Sikkink 1998; Carpenter 2002). Rather, knowledge about the diversity of women’s experiences and contexts leads to appreciate the interrelated character of social hierarchies and their influence on oppression and the gendered ontology of the discipline that professes to study global justice (Brown 1988; Elshtain 1981; 1985;1987; 1998). Consequently, feminists seek to break down not only the exclusionary boundaries of gender, but also those of race, class, sex, sexuality, ethnicity, caste, religion, country of origin, national identity, aboriginal status, immigration status, regional geography, language, cultural practices, forms of dress, beliefs, ability, health status, family history, age, and education. By focusing on *intersections* rather than boundaries as loci of power and oppression, feminist scholars reenvision the way we conceptualize international relations (Crenshaw 1989; 2000).

Link- Military

The military and state defense organizations are institutions of hegemonic masculinity; when these institutions open up to “others” change is possible

Kronsell 6, Feminist Methodologies or International Relations, Annica Kronsell: Assisnt Professor of Political Science at the University of Lund, edited by Brooke A. Ackerly: Assistnat Professor in the Department of Political Science at Vanderbilt University, Maria Stern: Lecturer and Researcher at the Department of Peace and Development Research, Goteborg University, and Jacqui True: Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Studies at the Univeristy of Auskland, New Zealand, 2006, Cambridge University Press p. 108-9 institutions…other contexts

Institutions such as the military and state defense organization are central to the field of international relations. Simultaneously, they represent and reify specific gender relations. This chapter centers on methodological issues for feminist researchers interested in these institutions. They are institutions of hegemonic masculinity because male bodies dominate in them, and have done so historically, and a particular form of masculinity has become the norm (Connell 1995: 77). Although many institutions of importance to international relations can be categorized as institutions of hegemonic masculinity, the defense and mili- tary organizations have a particularly strong standing. The basis for my methodological reflections is a research puzzle aimed at mapping out and making sense of the gendered practices of the Swedish military and defense organization. Examples are given throughout from the study of military and defense institutions in Sweden. My approach starts from post-structural, feminism and gives weight to structural components of gender relations, reproduced when individuals perform within institutions. It follows that I see institutions in general as important for understanding gender relations, but I have a particular interest in institutions of hegemonic masculinity. Apart from feminist IR work I have found much help in organizational studies dealing with gender and sexuality (Hearn and Parkin 2001; Wahl et al. 2001; Alvesson and Billing 1997; Hearn et al. 1989). Here I suggest that gender dynamics of these institutions be studied through analysis of documents, places and narratives. One way, then, is through the deconstruction of the texts and discourses emerging from these institutions, sometimes "reading" what is not written, or what is "between the lines," or what is expressed as symbols and in procedures. Institutions both organize and materialize gender discourses in historically dynamic ways, while simultaneously enabling and restricting the individual involved in institutional activities. Institutions have a part in forming subjects. At the same time, institutions are actively reproduced as well as changed through practice. Hence, change is not a simple or straightforward process. However, I argue that when institutions of hegemonic masculinity open up to “others" and, for example, no longer rely on strict gender segregation, there is a particular potential for institutional change and development, and hence also of changing gender relations. A method suggested here is listening to the stories of women engaged in such institutions. Through their experience they generate important knowledge that can help ex- plore institutional silences on gender. Interviewing is an obvious method, yet not problem-free as Stern, D’Costa, and jacoby (in this volume) also point out. I suggest a method for how to work around the problems interviews pose, by also considering narratives formulated in other contexts (such as "internal" newsletters).

Link- Military

The American military is entrenched in gender ideologies

Jones 9, Adam Jones, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of British Columbia Okanagan, 2009. [Gender Inclusive: Essays on violence, men, and feminist international relations: Humiliation and the masculine crisis, Masculine crisis and the US.]

As for the pathological machismo displayed by some of the occupying troops, it is to be expected- though never condoned- and it is secondary, both chronologically and logically, to its political counterpart. That the military lives and breathes this gender ideology hardly needs emphasizing, after two generations of diligent feminist criticism on this count. Likewise, under conditions of protracted occupation of an alien population whose public face ranges from the sullen to the murderously hostile, the stress and isolation have increased, while discipline and self-esteem have declined; and so it is that once- or sometimes-stable masculinities have tilted toward abuse and atrocity.

Link- Post-colonialism

Empires are masculinist; post-colonialism sidelines gender issues

Nolan 66 “Postcolonial Literary Studies, Nationalism, and Feminist Critique in Contemporary Ireland”, Nolan, Emer, 1966- Volume 42: 1&2, Earrach/Samhradh/Spring/Summer 2007, pp. 336-361 (Article), Published by Irish-American Cultural Institute, p.336-7

The cultural analysis of empire has often been heavily masculinist, focusing overwhelmingly on the activities of administrators, civil servants, soldiers and settlers, explorers and travelers, and on the involvements of male political leaders, intellectuals, and writers in the shaping of imperial and anti-imperial cultures. However, there is now a growing body of feminist scholarship that attends both to the role of women as agents of empire and as participants in anti-imperial struggles of various kinds.1 In addition, historians and cultural critics have begun to examine the ways that racial and sexual politics intersected in the elaboration of colonial administrations.2 In Ireland, the study of imperialism in the disciplines of literary and cultural studies has been mediated primarily through the development of what is now commonly referred to as “Irish postcolonial studies.” For a variety of reasons, the reception of post- colonial studies in Ireland has often been quite hostile.3 The most obvious lines of critique have stemmed from historical revisionists, who have usually dismissed postcolonial studies as simply a recoding of a cultural nationalism that revisionists believed they had largely discredited. From a different angle, Irish feminists, too, have been generally wary of postcolonial studies. Most of the leading figures associated with the area are male, and several were prominently involved with The Field Day Anthology of Irish Writing (1991), Volumes I–III. Feminists were angered by this anthology, on the basis that it did not give due recognition to women writers and feminist scholarship. Other women critics have accused postcolonial studies of reinstating “the national question”—and thus sidelining issues of gender—at the very moment in the 1990s when feminist campaigns were finally beginning to make significant progress.4

Link- PMC

PMC link

Abrahamsen, Rita and Williams, 8 Michael C. (2008) 'Selling security: Assessing the impact of military privatization', Review of International Political Economy, 15: 1, 131 — 146, p.140

The role of PMCs in weak states raises important issues relating to the theoretical usefulness and empirical accuracy of the public/private dichotomy. It is sometimes implied that security privatization in developing countries takes the form of ‘resource enclaves’ where powerful multinational resource corporations backed by heavily armed private security forces pillage the natural resources of a country with little connection to or regard for the state’s interests. Indeed, Singer even quotes the UN Special Rapporteur on the question of mercenaries as worrying about the emergence of a form of ‘multinational neo-colonialism of the twenty-first century’ (188). As Singer points out, the private companies (both resource and military) will often respond that they have been invited into the country by the legitimate government, but he pertinently notes that this ‘misses the parallel to 19th century imperialism, which also usually began when a weak ruler requested the original intervention’. However, an ‘ideal type’ multinational resource enclaves entirely cut off from the economic and political structures outside are actually quite difficult to come by, and most enclave, both armed and unarmed, exist in a complex relationship with the host state and its security forces. Here, the tendency to focus on security privatization as the private military is misleading, if not incorrect. In Angola, Sierra Leone and Nigeria, all frequently discussed as ‘enclave’ economies, private security forces worked (and still work) alongside and in cooperation with public security forces. In other words, it is not so much the case that private capital and force work against the interest of some ‘public’ interest, but rather that the interests of the government in power is intimately bound up, and even dependent on, the extraction of resources by private/foreign capital. For example, analysing the ongoing conflict in the oil-rich Niger Delta in terms of private security forces protecting multinational interests provides at best a partial story, as the protection of oil installations and operations is provided by a complex network of public and private, global and local security actors and serves domestic as well as foreign interests. For all their strengths, the reliance on a public/private distinction is a common shortcoming of much of the literature on security privatization in international relations (IR). While analogies to nineteenth century imperialism, or even to the emergence of a ‘new medievalism’, may be useful in vividly conveying the challenges which security privatization presents to theories mired in visions of total state sovereignty, they risk obscuring some of the most important issues and the links to broader social and economic processes. As such it is crucial to focus not on military privatization as an isolated process, linked primarily to the end of the ColdWar and military institutions and dynamics, but to locate the re-emergence of private security as part of larger social, economic and political transformations in global and local governance. When approached as such, the implications and significance of security privatization for our understanding of the state and of sovereignty in contemporary politics can be brought more clearly into focus.

Link- Silence on Gender

Issues devoid of gender are a clear indicator of hegemonic masculinity; this has created a situation where masculine is the norm. Feminist end this by questioning world politics

Kronsell 6, Feminist Methodologies or International Relations, Annica Kronsell: Assisnt Professor of Political Science at the University of Lund, edited by Brooke A. Ackerly: Assistnat Professor in the Department of Political Science at Vanderbilt University, Maria Stern: Lecturer and Researcher at the Department of Peace and Development Research, Goteborg University, and Jacqui True: Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Studies at the Univeristy of Auskland, New Zealand, 2006, Cambridge University Pre

p. 109 I became…silence on gender

I became interested in what Hearn and Parker (2001: xii) call “the silent unspoken, not necessarily easily observable, but fundamentally material reality" of institutions. Silence on gender is a determining characteristic of institutions of hegemonic masculinity and this is a key point. It indicates a normality and simply "how things are." men are the standards of normality, equated with what it is to be human, while this is not spelled out (Connell 1995: 212). Hegemonic masculinity "naturalizes the everyday practices of gendered identities" (Peterson and True 1998: 21). This has led to the rather perplexing situation in which "men are persons and there is no gender but the feminine” (Butler 1990: 19). Hence, masculinity is not a gender; it is the norm. It should be noted that in the Swedish context, this masculinity norm derives from a standard associated with white, heterosexual, male bodies. What I focus on is the normality, reproduced within organizations and how that can be approached methodologically. The goal is to problematize masculinities and the hegemony of men (cf. Zalgwski 1998a: 1). This is a risky enterprise because masculine norms, when hegemonic, are never really a topic of discussion. They remain hidden - silenced — yet continue to be affirmed in the daily practice of the institutions. Kathy Ferguson (1993: 8), for one, suggests we challenge that which is widely acceptable, unified, and natural, and instead perceive it as being in need of explanation. Breaking the silence is to question what seems self-explanatory and turn it into a research puzzle, in a sense, by making the familiar strange. It means giving the self-explanatory a history and a context. Cynthia Enloe (2004; 1993) encourages feminists to use curiosity to ask challenging questions about what appear as normal, everyday banalities in order to try to understand and make visible, for example, as she does, the gender of` international relations (IR) both as theory and as practice. The first step is to question even the most banal or taken-as—given of everyday practices of world politics. In her study on women’s collective political organizing in Sweden, Maud Eduards (2002: 157) writes that “the most forbidden act" in terms of gender relations is to name men as a political category, which transfers men from a universal nothing to a specific something. If this is so, how can we actually study such silences? What are the methods by which we can transcend this silence on gender?

Link- Iraq

America’s failing occupation in the Middle East injures America’s masculine pride.

Jones 9, Adam Jones, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of British Columbia Okanagan, 2009. [Gender Inclusive: Essays on violence, men, and feminist international relations: Humiliation and the masculine crisis, Masculine crisis and the US.]

There was humiliation, too, in the sophisticated and widespread insurgency against the US occupiers that left the US occupation reeling in April 2004. “In the space of two weeks,” notes The Washington Post, the insurgency “isolated the US-appointed civilian government and stopped the American-financed reconstruction effort… pressured US forces to vastly expand their area of operations within Iraq, while triggering a partial collapse of the new Iraqi security services… {and} stirred support for the insurgents across both Sunni and Shiite communities.” This massive blow paralyzed the US authorities on the ground and shocked their masters in Washington, along with those trying to ensure George W. Bush’s reelection. The contrast between the macho “mission accomplished” rhetoric of the immediate post-conquest period and the collapsing occupation structure at present could hardly be more stark. Such contradictions injure a specifically masculine pride; they are the politico-military equivalent of a kick to the cojones.

Link-Iraq

Death count rhetoric is flawed in that it is more of a question of who matters. It allows the state to justify deaths that were necessary.

Jennifer Hyndman Associate Professor Simon Fraser University February 2007 Feminist Geopolitics Revisited: Body Counts in Iraq\*

The antiwar argument and its attendant liberal politics are implicit in work of Iraq Body Count (2006; hereafter IBC), a nonprofit initiative to verify reported deaths in Iraq due to the violence of the occupation and to keep a record of Iraqi deaths. IBC relies on secondary sources from reputable media whouse mortuary stats, health ministry numbers, and police Feminist Geopolitics Revisited: Body Counts in Iraq 39 reports; it is run by twenty volunteers from the United States and Britain. The site cites General Tommy Franks of the U.S. Central Command who says, ‘‘We don’t do body counts,’’ and so IBC does. It asks visitors to add webcounters to their personal computers so that they too can count the daily deaths in Iraq. The IBC site points out that in ‘‘the current occupation phase this database includes all deaths which the Occupying Authority has a binding responsibility to prevent under the Geneva Conventions and Hague Regulations. This includes civiliandeaths resulting from the breakdown in law and order, and deaths due to inadequate health care or sanitation’’ (IBC 2006).4 IBC maintains that ‘‘Civilian casualties are the most unacceptable consequence of all wars. Each civilian death is a tragedy and should never be regarded as the ‘cost’ of achieving our countries’ war aims, because it is not we who are paying this price’’ (IBC 2006).5 Like the liberal logic of intervention in Afghanistan, IBC enlists international law and a UN approach to human security to justify its actions. It openly states that its audience is the American and British publics and governments (BBC 2005). Methods of counting bodies have never meant so much. I digress briefly to discuss the recent spat about how body counts have been conducted in Iraq. Mortality statistics, methods, and academic activism were widely covered in the media when with the British medical journal, The Lancet, published a pre-U.S.-election study that suggested the number of Iraqis who have died since the U.S. invasion is likely about 98,000, with more than 60,000 directly attributable to violence in Iraq (Roberts et al. 2004; The Economist 2004a).6 The study found that the relative risk of death from any cause was 2.5 times higher for Iraqi civilians after the 2003 invasion than in the preceding fifteen months, a risk that drops to 1.5 times higher if data from the city of Fallujah are removed. These figures are exponentially greater than reports by the IBC and others. The release of this paper on 29 October 2004, earlier than the journal’s normal publication date, suggests that ‘‘academic activism’’ was operating at two levels: among editors and authors. The ‘‘respectability’’ of The Lancet made a difference in how these alarming numbers were consumed. A spokesman for Tony Blair argued that the study appeared to be based on an extrapolation technique rather than a detailed body count; the mainstream British press noted that the count was cautious: ‘‘While doubts have been cast over some of the report’s findings. . . . If anything, researchers appear to have erred on the side of caution, opting to omit all data from Fallujah, where the mortality rates were significantly higher’’ (Lister 2004). British Foreign Secretary Jack Straw said on BBC radio, ‘‘This is a very high estimate, indeed. Because it’s The Lancet, it is obviously something we have to look at in a very serious way’’ (Straw 2004). The Lancet produces knowledge of a different valence. By the end of October 2004, civilian death toll estimates included the following: 14,000 to 16,000 (IBC 2006); 10,000 to 27,000 (Brookings Institution, a Washington-based think tank); 10,000 (the U.K. foreign secretary; Straw 2004); 37,000 ( People’s Kifah); 100,000 (The Lancet). Throughout 2005, new monthly death toll records were set. By mid-June more than 1,000 Iraqis had been killed in the previous two months by 160 suicide bombers. July 2005 was the bloodiest month in Baghdad’s modern history according to mortuary statistics kept by the city (Fisk 2005). During a single weekend, 15– 18 July, at least fifteen suicide bombers killed 156 people, mostly civilians. During the week of 18–24 July, 74 civilians were killed, considerably more than were killed in the London Underground bombings that same month, though less than the number of Indian commuters killed by bombings in Mumbai in July 2006. By July 2006, civilian deaths in Iraq ranged from 39,070 to 43,520 according to the IBC. These fatality metrics provide disparate grids of civilian deaths, but the political and social meaning of these lost lives is effaced by the numbers. Comparative counting misses the point. I argue then for a more relational accounting that draws on feminist practice, one that protests the silent, nameless death counts in Iraq and the United States. On 15 October 2005, The New York Times (2005) reported that 1,929 U.S. soldiers had been killed in Iraq, confirming the death of Cpl. John Stalvey the day before. This (regular) report was interesting precisely because of the newspaper’s front page story: that most of the Louisiana victims of Hurricane Katrina had yet to be named weeks after the disaster occurred. ‘‘The lack of information has robbed the death toll . . . of a human face’’ (Dewan 2005, A20). U.S. Government 40 Volume 59, Number 1, February 2007 interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan, or lack thereof in the case of New Orleans, represent different missions, objectives, and disasters, but a chain of equivalence can be forged in terms of accounting for death: just as the mostly poor, people of color killed by Hurricane Katrina deserve to be named and remembered, so too do those in Iraq and Afghanistan, whether they are soldiers or civilians. Fatality metrics efface fatality meanings. When President Bush stood in front of a banner proclaiming ‘‘mission accomplished’’ in May 2003 only 7 percent of the 5 October 2005 number had been killed. In 1993, it took the death of just eighteen U.S. Rangers in Somalia during an intense gunfight to precipitate the withdrawal of U.S. peacekeepers from that multilateral humanitarian mission; hasten the signing of Presidential Directive No. 25 stating that the United States will not send troops overseas to locations that do not present a direct threat to its national security; and prevent U.S. intervention in Rwanda in 1994 during the genocide that led to death for almost one million. The multiple sites hosting meticulous records, biographies, photos, and circumstances of death for U.S. and coalition soldiers are not of central concern to my argument, except to note their authors’ assiduous efforts to include all possible details and stories of individuals killed.7 Geopolitically, the question of who is counted is related to the questions of ‘‘who counts?’’ and ‘‘who cares?’’ The fatality metrics of body counts is clearly lopsided in the context of Iraq: victimhood is commodified and patriotism publicized for soldiers making ‘‘the ultimate sacrifice,’’ while Iraqi deaths are framed as ‘‘the price that must be paid’’ for introducing ‘‘freedom and justice.’’

Link- Afghanistan

The affirmatives justification of the war as a saving of women only further engenders masculine stereotypes. This rhetoric further ingrains the idea that colonialist white men have the duty to save women from the “savages”

Mary Jo Klinker teachers assistant in the department of womens studies at washington state university 2008 “Book Reviews Feminism and War: Confronting US Imperialism” pdf page 59

The book is most powerful when examining systemic oppression in U.S. society and its connection to the larger geopolitical context of U.S. imperialism. Angela Davis argues that we must “place state violence, war, prison violence, torture, [and] capital punishment on a spectrum of violence” (25) in order to understand the complexity of U.S. militarism. Nellie Hester Bailey connects the systemic inequality of gentrification and the feminization of poverty as unrecognized forms of war. She explains that “gentrification is class warfare waged against poor and working-class people of color. This catastrophe is directly linked to U.S. imperialist war, and is happening not only in Harlem but throughout the country” (236). While much of the text specifically analyzes the brute force of militarism utilized to uphold U.S. hegemony, Breta Joubert-Ceci theorizes that neoliberalist policies of privatization and deregulation are also a war front. She argues that the U.S. dominated institutions of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank have proliferated capitalism to violently exploit Latin America’s resources and labor, as well as the global South. The authors attempt to reclaim the importance of feminism to anti-war movements after the Bush administration co-opted feminist rhetoric to excuse the imperialist endeavor in Afghanistan. Jennifer Fluri argues that the Afghanistan war had nothing to do with confronting Islamic patriarchy. In reality these efforts entail the imposition of U.S. governmental discourses on human rights, proliferated through the systemic destruction of people in order to ensure military superiority and impose a “free” market structure (Fluri 155). Similarly, Elizabeth Philipose states “Muslims and Muslim states are held as the example par excellence of misogyny in the Western imagination, an imagination that provokes the colonialist narrative that white men, in their enlightened masculinity, have the duty to save brown women from brown men” (113).

Gendered geopolitics assigns value to some lives

Jennifer Hyndman Associate Professor Simon Fraser University February 2007 Feminist Geopolitics Revisited: Body Counts in Iraq\* “http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2&hid=119&sid=d02929fe-0ccf-423f-bcaa-c336eca5f5a3%40sessionmgr114”

In my earlier work on body counts during the ‘‘war on terror’’ in Afghanistan, I argued that the visibility, or lack thereof, of civilian deaths contributes to a gendered geopolitics that values (masculinized) U.S. lives over ( feminized) Afghan ones. I illustrated how, after 9/11, short biographies of hundreds of the people killed in the World Trade Center and elsewhere appeared in The New York Times. The human face of these horrific acts of violence in the United States was everywhere apparent. A long time passed, however, before the same paper began to publish photos of civilians who had lost family members to the bombings in Afghanistan, and to cover controversial statistics about how many civilians had been killed in that country by U.S. military planes equipped with smart and not-so-smart bombs. Silence around the equally preposterous deaths of a people already ravaged by war and starvation was, I argued, (geo)politically problematic. Public silence about the death or suffering of innocents in war is a form of political appropriation. The death ledgers, if one can call them that, were highly gendered lists of us and them, named and not, Americans and Afghans, soldiers and civilians. The tragedies at both of ends of this violence were very similar in terms of lives lost, but the patriotic values placed on them and their geopolitical value were highly disparate.

Link- Afghanistan/Iraq

The deaths of Iraqis and Afghans do not matter, they are simply fatality metrics. Feminist geopolitics embodies political subjects to reframe war.

Jennifer Hyndman Associate Professor Simon Fraser University February 2007 Feminist Geopolitics Revisited: Body Counts in Iraq

ConcludingWords on Concluding War In both Iraq and Afghanistan our deaths appear to matter much more than their deaths.8 The stakes are representational and political. ‘‘The world’s most powerful military today is led by a cabal of restless nationalists immersed in an anti-intellectual culture of affect and aggressive militarism’’ (O ´ Tuathail 2003, 857).O ´ Tuathail outlines William Connelly’s argument that human thought is not merely representational but also ‘‘enactive,’’ that it is made possible by a level constituted through encounters and negotiations with the world: ‘‘The affective tsunami unleashed by the terrorist attacks of 2001 is a broad and deep one that has set down a powerful somatic marker for most Americans’’ (O ´ Tuathail 2003, 859). Another tsunami of dead U.S. soldiers appears to be enacting greater wariness of the war in Iraq, a war Americans now believe has little to do with the attacks of 9/11. When our losses are mourned and broadcast, the deaths are more fully registered and the violence of the war questioned. These named bodies in the context of Iraq are generally not civilians but soldiers. Californian Maria Ruzicka (2005), in her last dispatch from Iraq, wrote that Recently, I obtained statistics on civilian casualties from a high-ranking U.S. military officer. counts is the Iraqi Assistance Center in Baghdad and the General Information Centers set up by the U.S. military across Iraq. Iraqis who have been harmed by Americans have the right to file claims for compensation at these locations. . . . These statistics demonstrate that the U.S. military does track civilian casualties. Ruzicka was a tireless activist who helped push the bill for the US$17.5 million compensation package through the U.S. Congress for Afghan and Iraqi victims of the war (MacKinnon 2005). She and her driver were killed in April 2005, driving to Baghdad airport. Did her body counts have an impact on the war itself? Certainly she paid a high price for her convictions, though she lived long enough to see some compensation for the families of civilians killed in Afghanistan and Iraq. Her efforts to narrate the stories of families as embodied political subjects, even victims, established the ‘‘moral proximity’’ O’Kane produced, and moved the United States to ‘‘do something.’’ Ruzicka’s efforts were an expression of feminist geopolitics to the extent that they destabilized dominant geopolitical discourse by peopling it and by mobilizing the United States that invaded Iraq in the name of national security to provide some material security for the injured civilians and the families of those killed in that very invasion. Like Margaret Hassan, who was both like us and like them, and Maggie O’Kane who rendered ‘‘their’’ pain and suffering our own during another war, Maria Ruzicka attempted to invoke proximity and familiarity. She did so by documenting the stories and losses of those affected by the war in Iraq to lobby the U.S. government and inform the North American public. Critical race commentators such as Stuart Hall remind us that ‘‘concrete political engagement does not translate into an anti-theoretical stance,’’ but rather widens the notion of what constitutes theory. If you ask me what is the object of my work, the object of the work is to always reproduce the concrete in thought—not to generate another good theory, but to give a better-theorized account of concrete historical reality. This is not an anti-theoretical stance. I need theory in order to do this. But the goal is to understand the situation you started out with better than before. —(Stuart Hall, quoted in Nagar 2002, 184) Part of this project to bridge feminist and political geography, then, is to challenge the concepts, tools, and theories of political geographyin ways that ‘‘democratize knowledge production through recognition of the importance of situated knowledge and through critical engagement between scholarship and the world in which we live and work’’ (Staeheli and Kofman 2004, 5). Feminist geopolitics challenges state centric dominant geopolitical narratives that reduce dead bodies to fatality metrics by establishing moral proximity between those killed and those watching, and grounding disembodied epistemologies in the suffering and survival of players in the war, making them political subjects alongside states and armies. This article has revisited the strategic feminist geopolitics and normative liberal political position invoked in my earlier work on the war in Afghanistan in light of the war in Iraq. In the earlier piece, I discuss Michael Shapiro’s (1997) distinction between strategic and ethnographic perspectives of mapping cultures of war. Strategic perspectives deepen identity attachments and formal boundaries by treating them as real, whereas ethnographic approaches aim to unsettle such taken-for-granted attachments by questioning the boundary-making narratives through which they are shaped. In trying to invoke political change according to the logic of its makers rather than critically engaging the terms of its struggle, I took a calculated risk that the former would be politically more effective than the latter. From strategic to ethnographic, my position has shifted. This article illustrates that embodied epistemologies provide alternative ways to frame war. The question of who is counted and who counts as subjects in this landscape of political violence points to a feminist geopolitics that may be more successful at disrupting the dominant geopolitical script of the war on terror in Iraq and elsewhere. Feminist geopolitics builds on the strengths of critical geopolitics, and in so doing recasts political possibilities by identifying fissures in dominant geopolitical scripts. But it goes further: it resuscitates the narratives of those affected by violent conflict, and recasts the subject of geopolitics as the fate of people, not simply as a struggle between states over oil and weapons of mass destruction. In very different ways Margaret Hassan and Maria Ruzicka embodied hope and prospects for change in Iraq. They defied simplistic binaries of us and them, here and there, but they also paid for such struggles with their lives. Their work destabilizes dominant geopolitical scripts and generates more epistemologically embodied ways of seeing.’

Link- Body counts

The rhetoric of the affirmative only fuels the fire, trying to convey the lose associated with war in mere numbers. Only through using feminist geopolitics can we speak out for the silenced other, the “necessary casualties”.

Jennifer Hyndman Associate Professor Simon Fraser University February 2007 Feminist Geopolitics Revisited: Body Counts in Iraq\* “http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2&hid=119&sid=d02929fe-0ccf-423f-bcaa-c336eca5f5a3%40sessionmgr114”

The Two Wars: From Afghanistan to Iraq A number is important not only to quantify the cost of war, but as a reminder of those whose dreams will never be realized in a free and democratic Iraq. —(Ruzicka 2005) The dead of Iraq—as they have from the beginning of our illegal invasion—were simply written out of the script. Officially they do not exist. —(Fisk 2005) The ‘‘fatality metrics’’ of war, the body counts of soldiers and civilians killed in violent conflict, represent a geopolitics of war in themselves. The quotations above capture, in the first case, the efforts of an American activist who tried to insert the body count into the geopolitical script of a ‘‘free and democratic Iraq,’’ and in the second, the observations of a British journalist critical of the invasion of Iraq, lamenting the invisible, mounting deaths of Iraqis that peaked in July 2005. The deaths of militarized soldiers are officially counted, described, and remembered by the armies that send them in to fight and the families they leave behind; the deaths of civilians are not. Casualties might be thought of as masculinized (soldier) and feminized (civilian) sides of the body count ledger amassed by both official and unofficial sources. Although counting is an important device for remembering, it also flawed in the way it transforms unnamed dead people into abstract figures that obfuscate the political meanings of the violence and its social and political consequences. Counting bodies does not sufficiently account for the remarkable destruction of lives and livelihoods occurring in Iraq. No metric or measure of trauma and violence should dominate the meanings of suffering and loss. Global media do provide us with overwhelming information about the scope and number of atrocities occurring across the world, making their meaning and scope difficult to grasp. ‘‘There is too much to see, and there appears to be too much to do anything about. Thus, our epoch’s dominating sense that complex problems can be neither understood nor fixed works with the massive globalization of images of suffering to produce moral fatigue, exhaustion or empathy, and political despair’’ (Kleinman and Kleinman 1997, 9). Nonetheless, what we see or read is partial in two senses: it is a selective and always incomplete representation of the crisis at hand, and it has been fashioned in particular ways that are at once institutionalized and convey dominant kinds of meaning (Shapiro 1997). ‘‘Vision is always a question of the power to see—and perhaps of the violence implicit in our visualizing practices,’’ so ‘‘an optics is a politics of position’’ (Haraway 1991, 192, 193). These partial representations shape our responses, or not, to the geopolitics of war and the suffering at hand. ‘‘Much of routinized misery is invisible; much that is made visible is not ordinary or routine’’ (Kleinman, Das, and Lock 1997, xiii). How violent conflict and death is represented in the context of war is at least as important as how much destruction and death wreaks havoc on a society. The more difficult question is how to produce responsible relational representations of war that convey meanings of loss, pain, and destruction without further fuelling conflict. How does one represent the futility and tragedy of civilian death without promoting vengeance? More important, which impressions and understandings 38 Volume 59, Number 1, February 2007 of war actually shape public opinion and government actions, so that struggles to end such violence may be successful? In revisiting feminist geopolitics in relation to body counts, I argue for analyses that contextualize the effects of violence by connecting the lives and deaths of victims counted during war to those of the audience that consumes that information. Accountability, I contend now as then, is predicated on embodied epistemologies and visibility, but fatality metrics fail to embody the casualties of war. Feminist geopolitics is about putting together the quiet, even silenced, narratives of violence and loss that do the work of taking apart dominant geopolitical scripts of ‘‘us’’ and ‘‘them.’’ Although the deconstruction of such scripts is vital, feminist geopolitics aims to recover stories and voices that potentially recast the terms of war on new ground.

Link- Taliban

The Talibans' practices towards women breaks multiple international human rights laws

U.S. Department of State November 17, 20**0**1Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor Report on the Taliban's War Against Women “The Taliban's War Against Women” http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/6185.htm

The assault on the status of women began immediately after the Taliban took power in Kabul. The Taliban closed the women's university and forced nearly all women to quit their jobs, closing down an important source of talent and expertise for the country. It restricted access to medical care for women, brutally enforced a restrictive dress code, and limited the ability of women to move about the city. The Taliban perpetrated egregious acts of violence against women, including rape, abduction, and forced marriage. Some families resorted to sending their daughters to Pakistan or Iran to protect them. Afghan women living under the Taliban virtually had the world of work closed to them. Forced to quit their jobs as teachers, doctors, nurses, and clerical workers when the Taliban took over, women could work only in very limited circumstances. A tremendous asset was lost to a society that desperately needed trained professionals. As many as 50,000 women, who had lost husbands and other male relatives during Afghanistan's long civil war, had no source of income. Many were reduced to selling all of their possessions and begging in the streets, or worse, to feed their families. Denied Education and Health Care Restricting women's access to work is an attack on women today. Eliminating women's access to education is an assault on women tomorrow. The Taliban ended, for all practical purposes, education for girls. Since 1998, girls over the age of eight have been prohibited from attending school. Home schooling, while sometimes tolerated, was more often repressed. Last year, the Taliban jailed and then deported a female foreign aid worker who had promoted home-based work for women and home schools for girls. The Taliban prohibited women from studying at Kabul University. "The Taliban has clamped down on knowledge and ignorance is ruling instead."-- Sadriqa, a 22-year-old woman in KabulAs a result of these measures, the Taliban was ensuring that women would continue to sink deeper into poverty and deprivation, thereby guaranteeing that tomorrow's women would have none of the skills needed to function in a modern society. Under Taliban rule, women were given only the most rudimentary access to health care and medical care, thereby endangering the health of women, and in turn, their families. In most hospitals, male physicians could only examine a female patient if she were fully clothed, ruling out the possibility of meaningful diagnosis and treatment. These Taliban regulations led to a lack of adequate medical care for women and contributed to increased suffering and higher mortality rates. Afghanistan has the world's second worst rate of maternal death during childbirth. About 16 out of every 100 women die giving birth. Inadequate medical care for women also meant poor medical care and a high mortality rate for Afghan children. Afghanistan has one of the world's highest rates of infant and child mortality. According to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF), 165 of every 1000 babies die before their first birthday. Further hampering health, the Taliban destroyed public education posters and other health information. This left many women, in a society already plagued by massive illiteracy, without basic health care information. In May 2001, the Taliban raided and temporarily closed a foreign-funded hospital in Kabul because male and female staff allegedly mixed in the dining room and operating wards. It is significant to note that approximately 70% of health services had been provided by international relief organizations -- further highlighting the Taliban's general disregard for the welfare of the Afghan people."The life of Afghan women is so bad.  We are locked at home and cannot see the sun."-- Nageeba, a 35-year-old widow in Kabul The Taliban also required that windows of houses be painted over to prevent outsiders from possibly seeing women inside homes, further isolating women who once led productive lives and contributing to a rise in mental health problems. Physicians for Human Rights reports high rates of depression and suicide among Afghan women. One European physician reported many cases of burns in the esophagus as the result of women swallowing battery acid or household cleaners--a cheap, if painful, method of suicide. Fettered by Restrictions on Movement In urban areas, the Taliban brutally enforced a dress code that required women to be covered under a burqa -- a voluminous, tent-like full-body outer garment that covers them from head to toe. One Anglo-Afghan journalist reported that the burqa's veil is so thick that the wearer finds it difficult to breathe; the small mesh panel permitted for seeing allows such limited vision that even crossing the street safely is difficult. While the burqa existed prior to the Taliban, its use was not required. As elsewhere in the Muslim world and the United States, women chose to use the burqa as a matter of individual religious or personal preference. In Afghanistan, however, the Taliban enforced the wearing of the burqa with threats, fines, and on-the-spot beatings. Even the accidental showing of the feet or ankles was severely punished. No exceptions were allowed. One woman who became violently carsick was not permitted to take off the garment. When paying for food in the market, a woman's hand could not show when handing over money or receiving the purchase. Even girls as young as eight or nine years old were expected to wear the burqa. The fate of women in Afghanistan is infamous and intolerable. The burqa that imprisons them is a cloth prison, but it is above all a moral prison. The torture imposed on little girls who dare to show their ankles or their polished nails is appalling. It is unacceptable and insupportable. -- King Mohammed VI of Morocco The burqa is not only a physical and psychological burden on some Afghan women, it is a significant economic burden as well. Many women cannot afford the cost of one. In some cases, whole neighborhoods share a single garment, and women must wait days for their turn to go out. For disabled women who need a prosthesis or other aid to walk, the required wearing of the burqa makes them virtually homebound if they cannot get the burqa over the prosthesis or other aid, or use the device effectively when wearing the burqa. Restrictions on clothing are matched with other limitations on personal adornment. Makeup and nail polish were prohibited. White socks were also prohibited, as were shoes that make noise as it had been deemed that women should walk silently. Even when dressed according to the Taliban rules, women were severely restricted in their movement. Women were permitted to go out only when accompanied by male relatives or risk Taliban beatings. Women could not use public taxis without accompanying male relatives, and taxi drivers risked losing their licenses or beatings if they took unescorted female passengers. Women could only use special buses set aside for their use, and these buses had their windows draped with thick curtains so that no one on the street could see the women passengers. One woman who was caught with an unrelated man in the street was publicly flogged with 100 lashes, in a stadium full of people. She was lucky. If she had been married, and found with an unrelated male, the punishment would have been death by stoning. Such is the Taliban's perversion of justice, which also includes swift summary trials, public amputations and executions. Violation of Basic Rights The Taliban claimed it was trying to ensure a society in which women had a safe and dignified role. But the facts show the opposite. Women were stripped of their dignity under the Taliban. They were made unable to support their families. Girls were deprived of basic health care and of any semblance of schooling. They were even deprived of their childhood under a regime that took away their songs, their dolls, and their stuffed animals -- all banned by the Taliban. The Amman Declaration (1996) of the World Health Organization cites strong authority within Islamic law and traditions that support the right to education for both girls and boys as well as the right to earn a living and participate in public life. Indeed, the Taliban's discriminatory policies violate many of the basic principles of international human rights law. These rights include the right to freedom of expression, association and assembly, the right to work, the right to education, freedom of movement, and the right to health care. What is more, as Human Rights Watch has noted, the discrimination [that Afghan women face] is cumulative and so overwhelming that it is literally life threatening for many Afghan women.  This assault on the role of women has not been dictated by the history and social mores of Afghanistan as the Taliban claim. Nor are the Taliban's restrictions on women in line with the reality in other Muslim countries. Women are serving as President of Indonesia and Prime Minister of Bangladesh. There are women government ministers in Arab countries and in other Muslim countries. Women have the right to vote in Muslim countries such as Qatar, Iran, and Bahrain. Throughout the Muslim world, women fill countless positions as doctors, teachers, journalists, judges, business people, diplomats, and other professionals.

Link- Taliban

Taliban rule enforces dress code, prevents women from receiving medical care, education, and going outside unaccompanied

Feminist Majority Foundation 2009'Campaign for Afghan Women & Girls“ http://feminist.org/afghan/taliban\_women.asp

The Taliban & Afghan Women The Taliban, an extremist militia, seized control first of Herat (1994) and then Kabul, the capital of Afghanistan, on September 27, 1996 and violently plunged Afghanistan into a brutal state of totalitarian dictatorship and gender apartheid in which women and girls were stripped of their basic human rights. The Elimination of Women's Rights Upon seizing power, the Taliban regime instituted a system of gender apartheid effectively thrusting the women of Afghanistan into a state of virtual house arrest. Under Taliban rule women were stripped of all human rights - their work, visibility, opportunity for education, voice, healthcare, and mobility. When they took control in 1996, the Taliban initially imposed strict edicts that: Banished women from the work force Closed schools to girls and women and expelled women from universities Prohibited women from leaving their homes unless accompanied by a close male relative Ordered the publicly visible windows of women's houses painted black and forced women to wear the burqa (or chadari) - which completely shrouds the body, leaving only a small mesh-covered opening through which to see Prohibited women and girls from being examined by male physicians while at the same time prohibited female doctors and nurses from working Women were brutally beaten, publicly flogged, and killed for violating Taliban decrees. Even after international condemnation, the Taliban made only slight changes. Some say it was progress when the Taliban allowed a few women doctors and nurses to work, even while hospitals still had segregated wards for women. In Kabul and other cities, a few home schools for girls operated in secret. In addition, women who conducted home schools were risking their lives or a severe beating. Taliban Reality for Women and Girls A woman who defied Taliban orders by running a home school for girls was killed in front of her family and friends. A woman caught trying to flee Afghanistan with a man not related to her was stoned to death for adultery. An elderly woman was brutally beaten with a metal cable until her leg was broken because her ankle was accidentally showing from underneath her burqa. Women and girls died of curable ailments because male doctors were not allowed to treat them. Two women accused of prostitution were publicly hung.Taliban Law Is In Opposition To Islam Women in Afghanistan were educated and employed prior to the Taliban control, especially in the capital city Kabul. For example, 50% of the students and 60% of the teachers at Kabul University were women. In addition 70% of school teachers, 50% of civilian government workers, and 40% of doctors in Kabul were women. The Taliban claimed to follow a pure, fundamentalist Islamic ideology, yet the oppression they perpetrated against women had no basis in Islam. Within Islam, women are allowed to earn and control their own money, and to participate in public life. The 55-member Organization of Islamic Conference refused to recognize the Taliban as Afghanistan's official government. The Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, regarded by many as an ultraconservative organization, denounced the Taliban's decrees.

Alt solves

The method by which feminists formulate knowledge does not adhere to a particular standard, rather it is flexible and ongoing- this framework for analysis is critical to comprehend and change the gender and power hierarchies that oppress people

Tickner 6, Feminist Methodologies or International Relations, J. Ann Ticker: Professor, School of IR at USC, edited by Brooke A. Ackerly: Assistnat Professor in the Department of Political Science at Vanderbilt University, Maria Stern: Lecturer and Researcher at the Department of Peace and Development Research, Goteborg University, and Jacqui True: Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Studies at the Univeristy of Auskland, New Zealand, 2006, Cambridge University Press p. 21-22 feminists cliam…changing them

Feminists claim no single standard of method of correctness or “feminist way” to do research (Reinharz 1992: 243); nor do they see it as desirable to construct one. Many describe their research as a journey, or an archeological dig, that draws on different methods or tools appropriate to the goals of the task at hand, or the questions asked, rather than on any prior thodo1ogical commitment more typical of IR social science (Rcinharz 1992: 211; CharleS’4’°’ 1994: 6; Jayaratfle and Stewart 1991: 102; Sylvester 2002). Feminist knowledge building is an ongoing process tentative and emergent, feminists frequently describe knowledge-building as emerging rough conversation with texts, research subjects, or data (Rcinharz 1992: 230)b Many feminist scholars prefer to use the term “epistemological perspective” rather than “methodology” to indicate the research goals and orientation of an ongoing projects the aim of which is to challenge and rethink what is claimed to be “knowledge,” from the perspective of women’s lives (Reinhart 1992: 241). Feminist scholars emphasize the challenge to and estrangement from conventional knowledge-building caused by the tension of being inside and outside one’s discipline at the same time. Given that feminist knowledge has emerged from a deep skepticism about know1edge which claims to be universal and objective but which is, in reality, knowledge based on men’s lives, such knowledge is constructed simultaneously out of disciplinary frameworks and feminist criticisms of these disciplines.7 Its goal is nothing less than to transform these disciplinary frameworks and the knowledge to which they contribute. Feminist inquiry is a dialectical process - listening to women and understanding how the subjective meanings they attach to their lived experiences are so often at variance with meanings internalized from society at large (Nielsen 1990: 26). Much of feminist scholarship is both transdisiplinary and avowedly political; it has explored and sought to understand the unequal gender Hierarchies as well as other hierarchies of power, which exist in all societies, and their effects on the subordination of women and other disempowered people with the goal of changing them.8 I shall now elaborate on four methodological perspectives which guide much of feminist research: a deep concern with which research questions get asked and why; the goal of designing research that is useful to women (and also to men) and is both less biased and more universal than conventional research; the centrality of questions of reflexivity and the subjectivity of the researcher; and a commitment ot knowledge as emancipation.

Questions about gender relations can be used to address many problems

Riley, Mohanty, and Pratt 8, “FEMINISM AND WAR: Confronting US Imperialism”, Robin L. Riley, Chandra Talpade Mohanty and Minnie Bruce Pratt editors, Zed Books. 2008

The inextricable connections between the domestic and international impact of US gendered, sexualized, radicalized wars point to important sites for feminist, anti imperialist critique and organizing. These include scrutiny of the militarized US state at the administrative, legislative, judicial, and military levels; corporate globalization and economies producing unequal power relations of radicalized gender and sexuality; questions about discourses of 'freedom' and 'liberation' when raised by an imperial, neoliberal state, by embedded media, and by complicit feminists; and the lessons of cross border struggles and the politics of feminist resistance on individual, community, national, and international levels.

Alt solves

The feminist methodology advances our understanding of IR and is objectively better than other approaches

Kronsell 6, Feminist Methodologies or International Relations, Annica Kronsell: Assisnt Professor of Political Science at the University of Lund, edited by Brooke A. Ackerly: Assistnat Professor in the Department of Political Science at Vanderbilt University, Maria Stern: Lecturer and Researcher at the Department of Peace and Development Research, Goteborg University, and Jacqui True: Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Studies at the Univeristy of Auskland, New Zealand, 2006, Cambridge University Press

In this chapter I have suggested that feminist theorizing about methodology should include a more worked-out account of what scholarly collectives should look like. This approach provides the conceptual basis on which to argue that mainstream scholarship should, for methodo- logical reasons, attend to and take account of feminist, postcolonial, and other situated standpoints. Taking account of feminist work in international relations will advance our collective understanding of international relations, and will make mainstream work more objective and less distorted. Theorizing what the structure of a scholarly feminist collective should look like highlights how the organization and procedural norms of the discipline pose obstacles to advancing our understanding of international Relations. Current feminist epistemology in International Relations emphasizes the situatedness of individual researchers, but the approach advanced here suggests that individual decisions are only part of the story; our disciplinary structure cannot be neutral in terms of epistemology. Some feminist epistemological approaches tend to emphasize the benefit of cultivating multiple perspectives, moving away from stand- point epistemology’s original emphasis on the superiority of the subju- gated standpoint. But this approach provides no political leverage for those who wish to argue that mainstream scholars must attend to femi- nist work. The "live and let live" approach poses little obligation on mainstream scholars, and does nothing to break down scholarly segregation. In failing to emphasize that some approaches are better than others, it obscures the weaknesses of mainstream approaches and permits main- stream scholars to dismiss feminist work. (Of course, this is not the fault of these feminist epistemologies.) To the extent that arguments make any diference, it is important to have grounds for demanding that mainstream scholars attend to feminist work and take it seriously, as opposed to ignoring it. In this chapter I develop the basis for saying that they must do so, not only because ignoring this work is unfair or sexist, but also because doing so blocks them, and the broader discipline, from a better, fuller understanding of politics. Attending to feminist perspectives (and the perspectives of other marginalized groups) should force a transformation of dominant paradigms and give us all a better under- standing of international relations. This is an epistemological argument, then, grounded in feminism and pragmatism, for adopting a methodology of inclusion; for ensuring that feminist voices are articulated and heard in scholarly discussions of international relations.

Feminist theory has the propensity to inform IR theory but critical theorists aren’t acknowledging it

Ackerly and True 6, Feminist Methodologies or International Relations, edited by Brooke A. Ackerly: Assistnat Professor in the Department of Political Science at Vanderbilt University, Maria Stern: Lecturer and Researcher at the Department of Peace and Development Research, Goteborg University, and Jacqui True: Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Studies at the Univeristy of Auskland, New Zealand, 2006, Cambridge University Press p.260 last two paragraphs

By drawing on a range of existing frameworks and setting out new ones, feminists offer rich contributions to the study of global politics. Yet sympathetic colleagues often find it difficult to engage with and incorp- orate feminist analyses (see Keohane 1998). Even critical theorists, whose epistemological starting points and explicit normative concerns with global social justice would make them obvious partners of feminists, have not engaged with feminist scholarship. Their non-engagement persists, even though they find questions relating to gender intriguing and occasionally refer to women’s movements, “feminism," and some feminist scholars (Cox 1999a; Linklater 1998). The practices of skeptical scrutiny, inclusionary inquiry, explicitly choosing a deliberative moment, and conceptualizing the field as a collective define and constitute our ferninist theoretical method. Of course, decontextualized, these practices may seem to us the professional tools of all good scholars, and not merely the tools of IR feminists. Here we have identified them through examples from feminist IR scholarship for the benefit of both feminist scholars and the IR field at large. By articulating a feminist critical method, we offer to critical IR theorists a way to practice their own methodology. In addition, we offer to feminist IR scholars a methodological framework for situating their work as contributing to both international relations and feminist scholarship. And we invite all IR scholars, should they wish to address the challenges of global injustice, to employ this feminist theoretical method.

Alt solves

Feminist perspectives can solve militarization

Mary Jo Klinker teachers assistant in the department of womens studies at washington state university 2008 “Book Reviews Feminism and War: Confronting US Imperialism” pdf pages 59-60

The final section speaks to the radical potentialities of feminists organizing against war. As Leslie Cagan points out, war is the antithesis of feminist principles because, “all of the values of feminism are contradicted—if not rendered impossible to achieve—by the realities of war and the machinery of war-making” (252). Cynthia Enloe echoes this by arguing that militarization cannot be sustained without women’s consent; therefore, a feminist revelation which explores the intersections of race, class, gender, and sexuality is necessary for activists to mobilize women against war. This revelation will not occur through the essentialist notion of women as peacemakers, but necessitates the direct action of speaking truth to power. Judy Rohrer dismantles the activist/scholar binary by arguing that feminists alike must recognize the many tools that grow out of action and theory, citing Code Pink, Women in Black, and Raging Grannies as feminist mobilizations that have successfully contributed to ways of thinking about social justice to confront U.S. imperialism.

Alt solves- demilitarization

Considering gender relations and incorporating women can be part of the transformative change in IR to procure real peace

Cockburn 10, Cynthia Department of Sociology, The City University London, UK b Centre for the Study of Women and

Gender, University of Warwick, UK (2010) 'Gender Relations as Causal in Militarization and War', International Feminist Journal of Politics, 12: 2, 139 — 157

To summarize the argument made above – looking closely at war with a sociologist’s or anthropologist’s eye reveals cultures, the detail of what is done and said. You see job advertisements for the military, you see training, you see discipline and indiscipline, killing, rape and torture. If, as well, you have a feminist’s engaged standpoint, derived from women’s lives and deaths in this maelstrom, you see the gender in it. And you turn again to evaluate so-called peacetime. You see that the disposition in societies such as those we live in, characterized by a patriarchal gender regime, is towards an association of masculinity with authority, coercion and violence. It is a masculinity (and a complementary femininity) that not only serves militarism very well indeed, but seeks and needs militarization and war for its fulfilment. Of course, the violence of war is in turn productive. It produces re-burnished ethnic identities, sharpened by memories of wrong and a desire for revenge. It produces particular gender identities – armed masculinities, demoralized and angry men, victimized femininities, types of momentarily empowered women. But these war-honed gender relations, ‘after war’ (which may always equally be ‘before war’), again tend to feed back perennially into the spiralling continuum of armed conflict, for ever predisposing a society to violence, forever disturbing the peace. Why is it important to pay attention to the perceptions of a feminist stand- point on war, to address the possibility that gender-as-we-know-it plays a part in perpetuating armed conflict? Because there are practical implications in this for our worldwide, mixed-sex movements for demilitarization, disarmament and peace. After all, we are ready to recognize that a sustainably peaceful society must differ from today’s war-torn societies. At the very least, its economic relations must be more just and equal. Additionally, its national and ethnic relations must become more respectful and inclusive. Women committed to organizing as women against war add a dimension to this transformative change. They ask the antiwar movement to recognize that, to be sustainably peaceful, a society will also have to be one in which we live gender very differently from the way it is lived today. R. W. Connell has persistently analysed what cultural studies tell us about masculinity. In 2002 he wrote ‘men predominate across the spectrum of violence. A strategy for demilitarization and peace must concern itself with this fact, with the reasons for it, and with its implications for work to reduce violence’ (Connell 2002: 34). And he went on to say, Gender dynamics are by no means the whole story. Yet given the concentration of weapons and the practices of violence among men, gender patterns appear to be strategic. Masculinities are the forms in which many dynamics of violence take shape . . . Evidently, then, a strategy for demilitarization and peace must include a strategy of change in masculinities. (2002: 38, emphasis added) Connell has also been important for showing us the multiplicity and variation in masculinity, pointing to its subversive as well as hegemonic forms (Connell 1995). In countries such as Serbia and Turkey where military service for men is still obligatory, some homosexual men have been among the most politicized and challenging ‘conscientious objectors’, because of the way they have simultaneously refused militarism and conformity to patriarchal norms of manhood (Cinar and Usterci 2009). So the message coming from feminist antiwar, antimilitarist and peace organizations of the kind I studied is that our many internationally linked coalitions against militarism and war as a whole need to challenge patriarchy as well as capitalism and nationalism. ‘We can’t do this alone’, women say. Sandra Harding (2004b: 135) has pointed out that: everything that feminist thought must know must also inform the thought of every other liberatory movement, and vice versa. It is not just the women in those other movements who must know the world from the perspective of women’s lives. Everyone must do so if the movements are to succeed at their own goals. But the message emanating from a feminist standpoint on war has not so far been welcomed onto the mainstream agenda. The major antiwar coalitions, mainly led by left tendencies, contain many women activists. An unknown number, individually, may share in a feminist analysis of war, but their presence has not yet been allowed to shape the movements’ activism. If antimilitarist and antiwar organizing is to be strong, effective and to the point, women must oppose war not only as people but as women. And men too must oppose it in their own gender identity – as men – explicitly resisting the exploitation of masculinity for war.

Alt solves- statesmen too removed

A woman’s perception of war is better than the traditional analysis done by statesmen and military men which always simplifies conflicts

Cockburn 10, Cynthia Department of Sociology, The City University London, UK b Centre for the Study of Women and

Gender, University of Warwick, UK (2010) 'Gender Relations as Causal in Militarization and War', International Feminist Journal of Politics, 12: 2, 139 — 157

What I have learned in listening to feminist antiwar activists is that a particular perception of war comes from a combination of a certain location and a certain positionality. Being located close to war, in the flesh or in the imagination, combines with the experience of being a woman in patriarchy to foster an understanding of the significance of gender. Women’s reflections on war are closer to those of the culturally attuned sociologist or anthropologist than those of the international relations discipline which, despite the recent intervention of feminists (Grant and Newland 1991; Peterson 1992; Tickner 1992), tends to speak for and from the abstract masculinity of statesmen, diplomats and military. The conventional view of war in this maintream discourse stresses its political, institutional, calculated and organized nature. It tends to downplay the messy cultural detail of armed conflict. For example, Colin Creighton and Martin Shaw (1987: 3) in the introduction to their classic collection of articles The Sociology of War and Peace sum up this understanding in the words: ‘Aggression isn’t force, force isn’t violence, violence isn’t killing, killing isn’t war.’

Alt solves- democratic systems

To make democratic systems more inclusive a spirit of openness needs to be perused, inequalities addressed, and decision rules made

Weldon 6, Feminist Methodologies or International Relations, S. Laurel Weldon: Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Purdue, edited by Brooke A. Ackerly: Assistnat Professor in the Department of Political Science at Vanderbilt University, Maria Stern: Lecturer and Researcher at the Department of Peace and Development Research, Goteborg University, and Jacqui True: Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Studies at the Univeristy of Auskland, New Zealand, 2006, Cambridge University Press p. 73 democratic and…scholarly practice

Democratic and feminist political theorists suggest a number of measures for making democratic systems more inclusive of such groups. Inclusive political communication requires a spirit of openness, where all parties both genuinely listen to others and genuinely seek to advance others’ understanding of their positions and perspectives. Inequalities in distribution of resources needed for effective participation must be redressed. In addition, non-distributive measures such as descriptive representation, self-organization of marginalized groups, and decision rules that provide greater influence for minority groups are three major mechanisms for countering exclusion of marginalized groups. Decision rules that empower minority groups include rules that set high thresholds for agreement (for example, supermajorities or unanimous con- sent), while also institutionalizing dissent. I explain these ideas a bit more below, and suggest examples of how they might be instantiated in scholarly practice.

Alt solves- root cause

Feminist perspectives are better able to understand the gendered politics of war and everyday life- this exposes the truth that gender inequalities are the building blocks upon which international relations are built

Tickner 6, Feminist Methodologies or International Relations, J. Ann Ticker: Professor, School of IR at USC, edited by Brooke A. Ackerly: Assistnat Professor in the Department of Political Science at Vanderbilt University, Maria Stern: Lecturer and Researcher at the Department of Peace and Development Research, Goteborg University, and Jacqui True: Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Studies at the Univeristy of Auskland, New Zealand, 2006, Cambridge University Press p. 24 feminist questions are challenging…varying degrees

Feminist questions are challenging the core assumptions of the discipline and deconstructing its central concepts. Feminists have sought to better understand a neglected but constitutive feature of war- why it has been primarily a male activity , and what the causal and constitutive implications of this are for women's political roles, given that they have been constructed as a "protected' category. They have investigated the continuing legitimation of war itself though appeals to traditional notions of masculinity and femininity. Working from the discovery of the gendered biases in state-centric security thinking, they have redefined the meaning of (in)security to include the effects of structural inequalities of race, class, and gender. Similarly, on the bases of theoretical critiques of the gendered political uses of the public/private distinction, they have rearticulated the meaning of democracy to include the participation of individuals in all the political and economic processes that affect their daily lives (Ackerly 2000: 178- 203). While not rejecting in principle the use of quantitative date, feminists have recognizes how past behavioral realities have been publics constitutes in state-generated indicators in biased, gendered ways, using data that do not adequately reflect the reality of women's lives and the unequal structures of power within which they are situated. For this reason they have relied more on hermeneutic, historical, narrative, and case study methodological orientations rather than on causal analysis of unproblematically defined empirical patterns. Importantly, feminists use gender as a socially constructed and variable category of analysis to investigate theses power dynamics and gender hierarchies. They have suggested that gender inequality, as well as other social relations of domination and subordination, has been among the fundamental building blocks on which, to varying extends, the publically recognized features of states, their security relationships, and the global economy have been constructed and on which they continue to operate to varying degrees.

Alt solves- VAW, inclusion

Women were responsible for a broader conceptualized of violence against women; this resulted in a global movement against VAW and greater understanding of social issues. Proves inclusion key to change.

Weldon 6, Feminist Methodologies or International Relations, S. Laurel Weldon: Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Purdue, edited by Brooke A. Ackerly: Assistnat Professor in the Department of Political Science at Vanderbilt University, Maria Stern: Lecturer and Researcher at the Department of Peace and Development Research, Goteborg University, and Jacqui True: Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Studies at the Univeristy of Auskland, New Zealand, 2006, Cambridge University Press p. 85-6 frustrated with…feminist methodology

Frustrated with their inability to cooperate, activists sought ways to forge a common agenda. Beginning in the early to mid-1980s, activists to work to be more inclusive in their organizational efforts and deliberations. Northern women ceded leadership of key meetings to southern women, and southern women’s presence at movement events considerably. Southern women formed independent organizations that enabled them to magnify their voice within the transnational movement. Southern women were able to discuss issues on own terms and independently identified violence against women as a priority. But southern women conceptualized such violence quite "differently from northern women. As a result of these discussions, south- women began to advance a conceptualization of violence against women that included the "traditional practices" and state violence hitherto conceptualized as different or special problems for Third World women. Female genital mutilation, dowry deaths, state-sponsored violence against women, and the like were framed as part of a continuum of violence against women (Abeyesekera 1995; Tinker 1999; Ferree and Subramaniam 2001; A. S. Fraser 1987). This broader conceptualization of the issue of “gender violence" emerged from more inclusive deliberations among women. The conceptualization was an analytic advance because it highlighted the connections among forms of violence that were not previously seen as related. This understanding of violence against women has informed, not only analyses of these particular forms of violence, but also the relationship between gender and violence more generally. Focusing on the cultural bases for violence highlighted the role of social norms in perpetuating all violence against women regardless of whether it was immediately the result of actions by men, women, or institutions. It rendered more visible the way that all violence against women enhances social control of women’s behavior and maintains hierarchical relations. Colonial discourse obscured similarities between violence against Women in the North and such violence in the South. Violence against Women in the South was portrayed as qualitatively different from violence against women in the North. This difference served as evidence of a backward culture or civilization in arguments regarding the civilizing mission of northern powers. In contrast, southern feminists emphasized Sonnections between so-called "harmful traditional practices" (sati, dowry deaths, female genital mutilation) and the types of violence more salient in the North (wife—battering, rape). This analytic move revealed how gender was implicated in colonial relations more generally (Ngara 1985; Kishwar and Vanita 1984; Narayan 1997). These connections Were not as visible or salient before southern women articulated their perspectives and northern women were motivated to listen and work towards agreement. This broader conceptualization of violence against women facilitated cooperation among women and permitted the framing of this issue as an issue of women’s human rights. These factors contributed to the success of the global movement against gender violence. Thus, greater inclusiveness in women’s-movement deliberations advanced understanding of social phenomena and improved the political strength of the movememt. This suggests that inclusiveness can be an important methodological as well as a political concern. Moreover, inclusion is an important aspect of feminist methodology.

Alt solves- Deconstruction/binaries

Feminist used deconstruction to expose binaries in IR

Kronsell 6, Feminist Methodologies or International Relations, Annica Kronsell: Assisnt Professor of Political Science at the University of Lund, edited by Brooke A. Ackerly: Assistnat Professor in the Department of Political Science at Vanderbilt University, Maria Stern: Lecturer and Researcher at the Department of Peace and Development Research, Goteborg University, and Jacqui True: Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Studies at the Univeristy of Auskland, New Zealand, 2006, Cambridge University Press

p.110-1 since the earl…gendered norms

Since the early 1990s, feminist IR researchers have used deconstruction to highlight how mainstream IR literature is laced with gender dichotomies, stereotypes, and practices, while, at the same time, it is completely oblivious to gender. Ann Tickner is one of the first to deconstruct IR theory, with a reformulation of Morgenthau’s principles (1988). She continues along this path in her 1992 book on Gender in International Relczrions by “br·inging to light” what she believes are "the masculine underpinnings of the field" (Tiekner 1992; xi). Deconstruction makes gender relations visible by overturning the oppositional logic that mystifies categories like woman/man, domestic/international and peace/war. It requires a form of double reading that exposes historically derived norms underlying concepts. ]ean Bethke Elshtain’s well-known work Women and War, from 1987, uses deconstruction as a method to locate the binary gendered categories upon which discourses of war and peace are based (see also Molloy 1995; Elshtain 1988). Christine Sylvester (1994a) deconstructed three IR debates and seriously questioned the epistemological and ontological underpinnings of IR theories that have left “women" and "gender" outside or, at best, in the very margins of the discipline. The activities associated with men and masculinity constitute IR’s main story (Peterson and True 1998: 20). Yet, until feminist IR arrived, men, women, and gender were not topics for the discipline. I became inspired by this cleconstruction of IR theory that made visible the academic discip1ine’s gendered norms.

Alt solves-Militarization/gender relations

Militarization and war built upon the patriarchal gender relation itself, not what individuals do or think

Cockburn 10, Cynthia Department of Sociology, The City University London, UK b Centre for the Study of Women and

Gender, University of Warwick, UK (2010) 'Gender Relations as Causal in Militarization and War', International Feminist Journal of Politics, 12: 2, 139 — 157

So, observing the sexual division of war and especially observing its vagaries, it becomes clear that the case for gender as a power relation implicated in the perpetuation of war cannot rest on what individual men and women do. It is not written in stone that the cultures we live in will capture and ‘normalize’ the gender performance of each and every one of us. Some of us escape, some of us do not match up, some of us fail to live our gender ‘properly’, some individuals resist gender norms. There are no certainties, only probabilities. The case rests more firmly on the patriarchal gender relation itself, which is a phallocratic relation between a supreme masculine principle and a secondary feminine one, where masculinity is associated with transcendence (rising above the mundane) and femininity with immanence (immersion in the daily round), where the masculine is a source of authority (de Beauvoir 1953). It is the gender order itself, predicated on coercion and violence, that comes to view as bearing on militarization and war in interesting and significant ways.

Alt solves- intersectionality

Intersectional power relations that influence war and militarization

Cockburn 10, Cynthia Department of Sociology, The City University London, UK b Centre for the Study of Women and

Gender, University of Warwick, UK (2010) 'Gender Relations as Causal in Militarization and War', International Feminist Journal of Politics, 12: 2, 139 — 157

There are many dimensions along which power is distributed in the ‘totality’ of society (Weeks 1998). One is age. Others are skin colour; physical strength and ability; or, say, the urban–rural dimension of advantage. As far as militarization and war are concerned however it is safe to say that three dimensions of power are the most significant and influential. The first is economic power. The second is ethnic or national power embodied in community, religious and state structures. This is often, but not uniquely, white supremacy. The third is gender power. Feminist studies have developed a way of addressing this multiplicity of sources of power from the perspective of the individual, using the concepts of ‘positionality’ and ‘intersectionality’. They are ugly and tedious words, sometimes deployed to the point of fetishization, but they are genuinely useful because they enable us to take account of the way a person’s sense- of-self and ascribed identity are partly defined by her or his positioning in relation to not one but several dimensions of power (Anthias 1998). What has too often been overlooked, I believe, in a ‘post-structuralist’ climate, is that intersectionality also and always works at the macro level. The power structures of economic class based on ownership of the means of production, the racializing power of ethno-nationalism expressed in community authorities and states and the sex/gender hierarchy together shape human social structures, institutions and relational processes. Together they establish positions of relative power, thereby laying down the possibilities and probabilities for individuals and groups that variously inhabit them. No single one of them produces its effects in the absence of the other two. Intersectionality means that it makes little sense to seek to isolate the institutions, the structures, of patriarchal gender power. The family may appear to be the ‘real’ one, the only one. It is not. Few if any institutions do a specialized gender job – or for that matter a specialized economic or other ‘power mobi- lizing’ job. A corporation or a bank may appear to be ‘just’ an economic insti- tution, a church or a mosque may look as if it is simply an ethnic institution, a family may seem to be merely a sex/gender institution. But look inside them and you find each and all sets of relations functioning at one and the same time: they are all economic, ethnic and gender institutions, though differently weighted. In corporations, almost all senior people are men; churches often mobilize considerable wealth and all the monotheistic clerical institutions are bastions of male power; blood-and-earth nationalists have keen interests in the fecundity of the patriarchal family and so on. It is not possible logically to disconnect them, neither the dimensions of power themselves nor the processes that are their vectors. They are distinct, they can be studied and named, but they are intersectional.

Alt solves- everyday problems/social conditions

Individuals have considerable potential to change social conditions.

Brigitte Bargetz, 2009. [Reconciling the Irreconcilable, The Politics of the Everyday: A Feminist Revision of the Public/Private Frame, http://www.iwm.at/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=130&Itemid=125-There]

The everyday as critical concept is not an unchanging and distinct social sphere. Rather, critical conceptualizations of the everyday (e.g. by Michel de Certeau, Antonio Gramsci, Agnes Heller, Henri Lefebvre, Dorothy Smith) situate it in specific historical and political contexts. Perceiving the everyday as “polydimensional”, these theories focus explicitly on the everyday’s ambivalences, in particular on its relations to power structures and its hidden empowering potentials. The everyday then is not only an object of inquiry, but also something to be transformed. “Adherents of the critical approach to the study of everyday life therefore take an explicit ethico-political stance, and place considerable stress on the potential for individual and collective agency to transform existing social conditions, a strategy which is anathema to practitioners of mainstream social science.”

Alt solves- body counts

Feminist geopolitical analyses eschews the militarized practice of counting bodies and instead offers a epistemologically embodied account of war.

Jennifer Hyndman Associate Professor Simon Fraser University February 2007 Feminist Geopolitics Revisited: Body Counts in Iraq\*

An average of nearly 100 Iraqi civilians were killed every day in May and June [2006]. —(CBC 2006) This article has two discrete but closely related objectives. On the one hand, I address the question of what feminist theory and feminist geography, in particular, bring to political geography, arguing that they contribute a distinct approach to the production of geographical knowledge. On the other, I aim to sharpen and deepen one dimension of feminist political geography by revisiting a piece of my own work on feminist geopolitics and body counts in war zones. Drawing on the scholarship of feminists both within and beyond the discipline, I contend that feminist thought challenges existing conceptions of ‘‘the political’’ in political geography; and that feminist subjects ‘‘embody, enact and expose’’ paradoxes ( Joan Scott in Pratt 2002, 198) that eschew disembodied, free-floating epistemologies. Together, these feminist contributions generate grounds for alternative modes of knowledge production in geography that are at once feminist and political. In part one of this article, I explore some of the most salient contributions of feminist thinking and feminist geography in particular to political geography. My focus is geopolitics and specifically the ‘‘war on terror’’ in Afghanistan and Iraq, but includes a brief analysis of recent scholarship that traverses the divide between political geography and feminist geography. The traffic between these different parts of the discipline points to (a) increasing intellectual engagement, but (b) a notable lack of feminist geography on the radar of mainstream political geographers. The authors of one undergraduate textbook in political geography assess the relevance of feminist geography to political geography this way: two relatively new themes have become prominent in publications devoted to or identified as political geography. One is an attempt to relate geography to changes in social theory. Much of this is a continuation of one or another of the many efforts to apply Marxist theory to geography, though with different emphases and interpretations. The other is the introduction of ‘‘gender issues’’ or ‘‘feminist viewpoints’’ into the continuing evolution of our field. It remains to be seen whether either of these trends has enough substance and staying power to survive the inevitable assaults of reality on them. Some of the ideas may survive in other disciplines such as sociology or political theory, but only those based on both politics and geography are likely to be incorporated into future mainstream political geography. —(Glassner and Fahrer 2004, 8–9; emphasis added)Apparently, the case for feminist thought (as well as Marxist theory) in political geography has yet to be made in some academic circles. I intend to fill this gap in a partial way in the remainder of the article. In part two, I revisit an argument that I made about ‘‘feminist geopolitics’’ and the uneven practices of body counts in Afghanistan in 2001 (Hyndman 2003). Written after 11 September 2001 (hereafter ‘‘9/11’’) but before the invasion of Iraq in March 2003, I countenanced a liberal argument that underscored the universal value of human life (and death) because I saw it as politically persuasive to the citizenry and government of a superpower state whose mantra is one of transforming so-called rogue states (see Sidaway 2003) into democratic ones.1 I posited that U.S. citizens would find the death toll of Afghan civilians killed in order to roust the Taliban, a number similar to that of Americans killed during 9/11, unacceptable. Tactically, I proffered that ‘‘their’’ deaths would count to Americans as much as American deaths, if someone were in fact counting Afghan civilian casualties. I fully realized the theoretical critiques and shortcomings of this liberal argument and its problematic assumption that all life is valued equally, but wanted to highlight the [liberal] failure of the U.S. military as an occupying force to take on its [liberal] legal responsibility,as outlined in the Geneva Conventions, to record these fatalities. AsWendy Larner and Richa Nagar in different contexts have asked of their feminist research, ‘‘what kinds of struggles does my analysis make possible for them [research participants]?’’ (Larner 1995; Nagar 2002). I attempted to make possible the struggle for greater U.S. accountability in relation to civilian deaths. Counting bodies in Afghanistan has had some effect; the U.S. Congress was persuaded to pass a US$17.5 million compensation package for victims of the war in Afghanistan and Iraq, but the U.S. military presence and violence in Iraq have only escalated since May 2003 when President Bush stood before a banner that declared ‘‘mission accomplished.’’ Are body counts politically persuasive? And if not, why not? In exploring the politics of body counts, I revisit the concept of feminist geopolitics as an analytical framing of militarized violence and death in Iraq. In an earlier paper, I argued that feminist geopolitics is an approach to international relations that provides more accountable, embodied ways of seeing and understanding the intersection of power and space (Hyndman 2003). I made the case then and still contend that it refers to an analytic that is contingent on context, place, and time, rather than a new theory of geopolitics or a new ordering of space. Feminist geopolitical analyses are more accountable to the safety of bodies, traversing scales from the macrosecurity of states to the microsecurity of people and their homes; from the disembodied space of neorealist geopolitics to a field of live human subjects with names, families, and hometowns. The argument that counting civilian deaths ‘‘over there’’ as a strategy to protest and stop the deadly military approach employed in Afghanistan has proven, however, politically ineffectual. The mounting deaths of U.S. soldiers ‘‘over here’’—now more than 2,500—is a more pressing concern for the U.S. government, affecting domestic support for the war in Iraq. In taking feminist geopolitics to Iraq, where tens of thousands of civilians have perished, I revisit my analysis with a view to reframing my argument and the struggles against violence there. I question whether counting bodies has not become a disembodied, abstract process, the methodology of which has been as contentious as the deaths themselves. I argue that feminist geopolitics offers more epistemologically embodied accounts of war that more effectively convey the loss and suffering of people affected by it. Specifically, feminist geopolitics challenges the state centrism of global politics, the disembodied epistemology of knowledge production, and the masculinist practices of militarizing states. In so doing, feminist geopolitics destabilizes dominant and often disembodied geopolitical discourse. People as much as states are the subjects of geopolitics. Bringing feminist thought to political geography generally and the war in Iraq specifically deepens analysis that links the two.

Alt solves- everyday/ Body count bad

Focus on everyday problems good, body count stuff

Brigitte Bargetz, 2009. [Reconciling the Irreconcilable, The Politics of the Everyday: A Feminist Revision of the Public/Private Frame, http://www.iwm.at/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=130&Itemid=125-There]

Dorothy Smith specifies such a view by conceptualizing “the everyday world” not as phenomenon or object, but rather as problematic: “The concept of a problematic is used in part to bring the sociologist and the sociological inquiry into a different relation to the society by constituting the everyday world as that in which questions originate.” Taking the everyday as problematic is then based upon her feminist critique of androcentric sociology, which not only excludes women as scientific producers, but takes masculinity as taken-for-granted norm and therefore largely excludes experiences, activities and knowledge from everyday life. Drawing on the everyday as a critical concept then implies to ask who and what is being excluded and what forms of exclusions become apparent when using the everyday as an analytical tool.

Alt Solves- Otherizing/Oreintalism

The ongoing wars otherize the civilians killed, silencing them. This is inherently a masculine process, only by rejecting this can we proceed with feminist geopolitics

Jennifer Hyndman Associate Professor Simon Fraser University February 2007 Feminist Geopolitics Revisited: Body Counts in Iraq\*

Feminist Geopolitics Revisited: Body Counts in Iraq 41 people affected by violent conflict. She attempted to invoke political change through these stories and through more obvious political tactics—such as an open letter to John Major, then Prime Minister of Britain—that built on these narratives of everyday people affect by war (O´ Tuathail 1996). Feminist geopolitics in the context of violent conflict narratives renders civilian people as embodied political subjects; it forges a space for the telling of their stories, not just those of states. In so doing, feminist geopolitics destabilizes dominant and often disembodied geopolitical discourse. Bridging Us and Them In the shadow of torture in Abu Ghraib prison, Derek Gregory (2004b, 323) writes that there ‘‘has never been a greater need to untwist the separations between ‘us’ and ‘them’ than the present moment of danger.’’ Also commenting on the treatment of prisoners at Abu Ghraib in Iraq, Jasbir Puar argues that such violence is not an exception or an extension of imperialist occupation. ‘‘Rather, the focus on purported homosexual acts obscures other forms of gendered violence and serves a broader racist and sexist, as well as homophobic, agenda’’ ( Puar 2004, 523). She too is concerned with the Orientalist ‘‘othering’’ processes that are part and parcel of the war on and in Iraq. The representation of deaths, ours and theirs, takes on crucial importance in this volatile context of the war on terror. Gregory’s most recent book, The Colonial Present (2004a), demonstrates a remarkable shift in what it means to be critical in one’s analysis. From social theorist to political storyteller, Gregory’s take on the war on terror since 9/11 in Afghanistan and Iraq is, like O’Kane’s, engaged, outraged, and visceral. Political geography generally and geopolitics specifically stand to benefit from such anti-Orientalist and feminist thought. If political geographers are serious about understanding the twisted confluence of militarized masculinities, femininities, sexual identities, and casualties in these politicized sites of torture and humiliation during war, then more rather than less conversation across the gap between feminist and political geography is needed. Feminist geopolitics, as an attempt to draw on the strengths of both, represents one way forward.

Alt solves-relection

Historically, women and the human costs of hegemonic dominance are often forgotten or seen as invisible; analyzing from the “underside” is part of the feminist approach

Zalewski 6, Feminist Methodologies or International Relations, Marysia Zalewski: Director of the Centre for Gender Studies at the University of Aberdeen, Scotland, edited by Brooke A. Ackerly: Assistnat Professor in the Department of Political Science at Vanderbilt University, Maria Stern: Lecturer and Researcher at the Department of Peace and Development Research, Goteborg University, and Jacqui True: Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Studies at the Univeristy of Auskland, New Zealand, 2006, Cambridge University Press p.53-5 sifting through…different constituencies

Sifting through seemingly rock-solid ideologies of state-securitizing practices in western modernity, Spike Peterson finds invisible but hugely effective practices of "forgetting” the human costs of our unreflective reproduction of categories of domination (1992a: 38). Charlotte Hooper (2001) takes on one such unreflective practice of “forgetting” and performs an archaeological dig through the pages of The Economist magazine, showing how this publication interpellants its readers into identifying with various models of hegemonic masculinity. Employing a gendered textual reading, Hooper expertly shows how what appears on the surface to be largely gender neutral is instead drenched in a wash of hegemonic masculinity. Weaving literature (Margaret Atwood’s The Handmaid's Tale, 1985) and 1nternational Relations together, Christine Sylvester asserts that “the power of the abject zone is the contamination it seeps but rarely announces” (2002: 68). Revisiting John F. Kennedy’s administration in the 1960s, Sylvester circuitously narrates how the largely invisible and seemingly ineffective and irrelevant activities of women in and around the ‘White House machinery “ooze power with, around, or over those they loyally attended” (2002: 56). Singling out a joke made by Kennedy after his electoral triumph in 1959 (when both his wife and the wife of a friend were pregnant, Kennedy quipped “Okay, girls, you can take the pillows out now. We won”), Sylvester demonstrates how adult “girls” become “sex-linked pregnant wives,” indelibly “married” to their husband’s powerful positions. Jokes are often a site trough which the work or presence of the invisible or the silenced appears. My own early reflections on the gendered character of IR include a consideration of a joke told at an international conference in 1994. An American diplomat in Britain was asked what he missed most about home. His answer was, “A good hamburger.” His wife’s answer was, “My job.” Most of the delegates laughed (Zalewski 1996: 347). Yet the joke evidences the powerfully gendered nature of diplomacy and the sacrifices that countless women have made in order to tailor their marriages and lives to fit in with their husbands’ careers and the significant (unpaid and overlooked) contribution that such women’s activities have made to the workings of governments and interstate relationships (see also Cohn, this volume) The insignificant, barely visible markers and traces of gender or sex the “spectral secrets,” describe how “that which appears to be not there is often a seething presence” (A. Gordon, 2001: 8). But this “nothingness” is also resisted because it has effects; it matters. Begona Aretxaga's discussion of the physical and conceptual contamination of women's menstrual blood in Irish republican women’s dirty protest and the embarrassment this caused republican men, demonstrates how (in)significant markers of gender are strictly policed thereby, ironically exposing their force.’° “The interstitial character of women's political practices the fact that they were situated in the margins of social and political space, places dominant gender discourse out of place by introducing slippages of meaning and creating new social fields" (Aretzaga 1997: 78). Consequently, investigating the supposed underside of knowledge- the production and maintenance of "ignorance/forgetting" - is a significant and powerful aspect of feminist research programs and methodologies. As such, feminist methodologizing consists of a constant juxtaposing and layering from different sites, different contexts, and different constituencies (Cohn, this volume).

Impact- War

Patriarchal gender relations is the cause of international conflict, only a feminist programme of gender transformation

Cockburn 10, Cynthia Department of Sociology, The City University London, UK b Centre for the Study of Women and

Gender, University of Warwick, UK (2010) 'Gender Relations as Causal in Militarization and War', International Feminist Journal of Politics, 12: 2, 139 — 157

Based on empirical research among women’s antiwar organizations worldwide, the article derives a feminist oppositional standpoint on militarization and war. From this standpoint, patriarchal gender relations are seen to be intersectional with economic and ethno-national power relations in perpetuating a tendency to armed conflict in human societies. The feminism generated in antiwar activism tends to be holistic, and understands gender in patriarchy as a relation of power underpinned by coercion and violence. The cultural features of militarization and war readily perceived by women positioned in or close to armed conflict, and their sense of war as systemic and as a continuum, make its gendered nature visible. There are implications in this perspective for antiwar movements. If gender relations are one of the root causes of war, a feminist programme of gender transformation is a necessary component of the pursuit of peace.

War has exploited and damaged women, feminism critiques the exclusion of other groups and the operations of power

Cockburn 10, Cynthia Department of Sociology, The City University London, UK b Centre for the Study of Women and

Gender, University of Warwick, UK (2010) 'Gender Relations as Causal in Militarization and War', International Feminist Journal of Politics, 12: 2, 139 — 157

Third, looking through the prism of war has made us acutely conscious of the way women are oppressed and exploited through our bodies, our sexuality and reproductive capacities. War deepens already deep sexual divisions, emphasizing the male as perpetrator of violence, women as victim. In particu- lar, it legitimates male sexual violence, enabling mass rape of women. It magnifies the distance between femininity and masculinity and enhances men’s authority in a quantum leap. So this feminism sees women’s subordination as more than the by-product of political inequality or an exploitative economic system. However, antiwar feminism inevitably has a wider range of con- cerns than this. It cannot fail to have a critique of capitalism, and new forms of imperialism and colonization, class exploitation and the global thrust for markets, since these are visibly implicated among the causes of militarization and war. Further, many wars involve intra-state and inter-state nationalisms, so this feminism is necessarily conscious of and opposed to exclusions on grounds of race, religion or other aspects of ethnicity. Abuses in war give rise to energetic movements for human rights, including women’s rights, and the struggle to obtain UN Security Council resolution 1325 (Cockburn 2007: ch. 5) involved a demand for representation, suggesting that antiwar feminism also has these so-called liberal demands on its complex agenda. Many organizations and networks are concerned to create horizontal structures and prefigurative forms of activism (Cockburn 2007: 178–80), presupposing a feminism that has a critique of the meanings and operation of power.

Impact- War

War needs to be views as relational, systemic, and a continuum

Cockburn 10, Cynthia Department of Sociology, The City University London, UK b Centre for the Study of Women and

Gender, University of Warwick, UK (2010) 'Gender Relations as Causal in Militarization and War', International Feminist Journal of Politics, 12: 2, 139 — 157

So, war as relational, war as systemic – and a third qualifier is important: the idea that wars are only phases in a sequence of conditions linked together as a continuum. It is from women I have met during my research that I have learned to see the continuum effect more clearly (Cockburn 2004). La Ruta Pacifica (2003: 75) for instance write, ‘we Colombian women are tired of so many kinds of violence: sexual violence, intrafamilial, social, economic, pol- itical violence – and armed violence as its maximal expression’. As with ‘war system’, ‘war as continuum’ is a perception that arises from being linked in an international movement, yet variously located in relation to war-fighting as it waxes and wanes. For example, some, like the Women’s Network against Militarism whose focus is the US military bases in the Pacific and Caribbean, are particularly well informed on militarization, the state of preparedness for war. La Ruta is in mid-war. Actoras de Cambio in Guatemala are in a post-war moment, dealing with the terrible residues of massive armed sexual violence. In Sierra Leone, the women of MARWOPNET are organizing women along borders to monitor movements of men, guns and drugs to prevent a renewal of war (Cockburn 2007: chs 1 and 2). So, organizations and networks like this, spanning the globe and linked by electronic communications, tend to see ‘war’ not just as spasms of war-fighting, but as part of a continuum leading from militarism (as a persisting mindset, expressed in philosophy, newspaper editorials, political think tanks), through militarization (processes in economy and society that signify preparation for war), to episodes of ‘hot’ war, and thence to cease fire and stand-off, followed perhaps by an unsteady peace with sustained military beset by sporadic violence that prefigures a further round in the spiral. In fact, authors in mainstream war studies too are increasingly noting a continuum effect. Steve Schofield (1994) has shown how the UK’s war-readiness was not relaxed at the end of the Cold War – rather militarization measured by military expenditure was maintained into the 1990s. Rupert Smith (2006) suggests that with the end of industrial warfare and the advent of the new paradigm of ‘war among the people’ the continuum effect has increased. War ‘is no longer a single massive event of military decision that delivers a conclusive political result’ – rather ‘our conflicts tend to be timeless, since we are seeking a condition, which then must be maintained until an agreement on a definitive outcome, which may take years or decades’ (Smith 2006: 17). Berdal and Malone (2000) have collected a volume of essays that suggest that in contemporary civil wars, defeating the enemy in battle is no longer necessarily the aim. Rather, some participants have a ‘vested interest in continued conflict’ and in the long-term institutionalization of violence (Berdal and Malone 2000: 2).

Impact- War

Gender relations are the root cause of war- examining the war system exposes this

Cockburn 10, Cynthia Department of Sociology, The City University London, UK b Centre for the Study of Women and

Gender, University of Warwick, UK (2010) 'Gender Relations as Causal in Militarization and War', International Feminist Journal of Politics, 12: 2, 139 — 157

By contrast, patriarchal gender relations as a cause of war, I would suggest, most often fall in the ‘root cause’ or ‘favourable conditions’ category, and here we have to pay attention to culture. With the exception of the abduction of the mythical Helen of Troy (and the spurious attempt of George W. and Laura Bush to portray the invasion of Afghanistan in 2001 as a war to save Afghan women from repression by the Taliban) wars are not fought ‘for’ gender issues in the way they are sometimes fought ‘for’ oil resources, or ‘for’ national autonomy. Instead, they foster militarism and militarization. They make war thinkable. They make peace difficult to sustain. As noted above, women close to militarization and war are observant of cultures, cultures as they manifest themselves in societies before, in and after armed conflicts. If we think of the war system as having a cyclical or spiralling life, as a continuum over time, proceeding from the discourse of militarist ideology, through material investment in militarization, aggressive policy-making, outbreaks of war, short firefights, prolonged stalemates, ceasefires, demobilization, periods of provisional peace, anxieties about security, rearmament and so on, and if we look closely at the social relations in which individuals and groups enact these various steps, that is where it is possible to see gender relations at work, pushing the wheel around. The above account of a feminist standpoint, generating an understanding of war that contradicts the hegemonic view, is derived first and foremost from my empirical research among women’s antiwar organizations and networks. But, closely involved with that movement, there is a world of feminist scholars (men as well as women) who have striven over the past three decades to articu late in a growing library of written work the understandings arising among women war survivors and activists. Many collected editions bring together research and reporting from a range of different countries and periods (for instance, Cooke and Woollacott 1993; Lorentzen and Turpin 1998; Moser and Clark 2001; Giles and Hyndman 2004). Research-based monographs show the influence of gender relations at points along the continuum of militarization and war. Robert Dean (2001), for instance, in his study of the Kennedy administration taking the USA to war in Vietnam, shows masculinism at work in preparation for war. Susan Jeffords (1989) in The Remasculinization of America, shows, through an analysis of films and novels, national efforts to salvage masculine pride after such a defeat. Many firsthand accounts show in painful detail how, in military training, patriarchal masculinity lends itself to exploitation for war-fighting, and how violence is eroticized in masculine fantasy (Theweleit 1987). Together such studies articulate the feminist perception that patriarchal gender relations are among the ‘root causes’ of militarism and war.

Impact- War

Traditional IR studies focus on the wrong questions; feminist IR addresses the real source of war, conflict, and inequalities

Tickner 6, Feminist Methodologies or International Relations, J. Ann Ticker: Professor, School of IR at USC, edited by Brooke A. Ackerly: Assistnat Professor in the Department of Political Science at Vanderbilt University, Maria Stern: Lecturer and Researcher at the Department of Peace and Development Research, Goteborg University, and Jacqui True: Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Studies at the Univeristy of Auskland, New Zealand, 2006, Cambridge University Press p. 23-4 the questions….capitalist economy

The questions that IR has asked since the discipline was founded have typically been about the behavior of states, particularly powerful states and their security-seeking behavior, given an anarchical international environment. Much of the scholarship in international political economy and international institutions has also focused on the behavior of the great powers and their potential or lack thereof, for international cooperation. These questions are of particular importance for the foreign policy interests of the most powerful states. Most IR feminists have asked very different questions. ‘While they may to understand state behavior, they do so in the context of asking why, in so many parts of the ‘world, women remain so fundamentally disempowered in matters of foreign and military policy. Rather than speculate on the hypothetical question whether women might be more peaceful than men as foreign policymakers they have concentrated on the more immediate problem of why there are so few women in positions of power.’° On issues of war and peace, feminists have asked why wars have been predominantly fought by men and how gendered structures of masculinity and femininity have legitimated war and militarism for both women and men;” they have also investigated the problematic essentialized association of women with peace, an association which, many believe, disempowers both women and peace (Sylvester 1987; Tickner 2001: 59). Rather than uncritically assume the state as a given unit of analysis, feminists have investigated the constitutive features of “gendered states” and their implications for the militarization of women’s (and men’s) lives (Peterson 1992a; Enloe 2000). But the basic question that has most concerned IR feminists is why, in just about all societies women are disadvantages, politically, socially, and economically, relative to men, and to what extent this is due to international politics and the global economy. Conversely, they have also asked in what ways these hierarchical gendered structures of inequality may actually support the international system of states and contribute to the unevenly distributed wealth and resources of the global capitalist economy.

War has a devastating effect on women, feminist perceptions are required to attain peace

Riley, Mohanty, and Pratt 8, “FEMINISM AND WAR: Confronting US Imperialism”, Robin L. Riley, Chandra Talpade Mohanty and Minnie Bruce Pratt editors, Zed Books. 2008

This is the context in which the essays in this volume examine and challenge US imperial wars crafted as rescue missions in the name of democracy and 'civilization.' These wars, with their disproportionate and annihilating effect on the lives of women, with the ensuing traffic in gendered bodies, with the manipulation of racialized discourses of male supremacy and female helplessness as justification, raise profoundly feminist issues, and require a complex, anti imperialist feminist engagement. In fact, as Angela Davis suggests here, what is required are particular feminist 'habits of perception ... habits of the imagination' that allow us to envision and work toward 'the world without war.' Or, as Micere Githae Mugo writes in her poem 'In praise of Afrika's children': 'What song! shall I sing! in praise of! our children! living in! the mass graves! of apartheid! of capitalism! of imperialism?! What sung! shall I sing?'

Impact-War

Throughout history gender power relations have shaped society and war- only recognizing this in IR can solve

Cockburn 10, Cynthia Department of Sociology, The City University London, UK b Centre for the Study of Women and

Gender, University of Warwick, UK (2010) 'Gender Relations as Causal in Militarization and War', International Feminist Journal of Politics, 12: 2, 139 — 157

What, then, has the view of power as intersected sets of institutions and relations got to do with war? Here I think we need to depart from empirical material and undertake an exegesis, something like this. A class system built on economic surpluses, a racializing hierarchy of cities, then states and empires, and institutionalized patriarchy, emerged together within a definable historical period (at a different moment in different parts of the world). They were predicated on violence. They all involved constituting a self in relation to an inferiorized, exploited other – the rich man’s landless labourer; the citizen’s hated foreigner; the woman as men’s property, commodified in bride price, sale or exchange price, in prostitution and the value of her children. All three processes were necessarily violent. Labourers will not build canal systems unless driven by hunger. Foreigners will not bow to another’s hegemony if it is not backed by coercion. Women will not be subdued without force. It is not surprising therefore that institutionalized warfare, the augmentation and mobilization of what Charles Tilly (1992) terms the means of coercion, was born along with increasing accumulation of wealth, the early state and the establishment of patriarchies – innovations that signified the condition known as ‘civilization’. Gerda Lerner’s (1986) intensively researched book The Creation of Patriarchy shows this happening towards the end of the Neolithic in the emerging societies of the eastern Mediterranean. It has also been noted, several millennia later, in the American hemisphere. William Eckhardt (1992: 4), in a comprehensive study that reviews many other historians on war, evolves a ‘dialectical evolutionary theory’, as he calls it, suggesting that the more ‘civilized’ people became the more warlike they became. Civilization and war: it is a correlation he finds persisting in all regions and phases of history. The suggestion here then is that militarization and war are caused, shaped, achieved and reproduced across millennia through all three dimensions of power. If one is at work, the others will be too. The gender drama is never absent: the male as subject, the female as alien, the alien as effeminate (both the one a man perceives out there, and the one he fears inside himself). This is why a theory of war and its causation is flawed if it lacks a gender dimension. Most theories of war, however, in sociology and in international relations, do indeed lack this necessary element. To those who evolve and deploy them, they seem perfectly complete and satisfying without it. When women, feminists, come along and introduce our insights into discussions of war, when we talk about women and gender, we are often told we are being trivial, we are forgetting ‘the big picture’. Cynthia Enloe (2005: 280) speaks from a feminist standpoint when she boldy interjects ‘but suppose this IS the big picture?’.

Impact- VAW

Women have been severely victimized in the war.

J. Ann Tickner, 2002. [International Studies Perspective: Visions of International Studies: Feminist Perspectives on 9/11, http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118929799/PDFSTART]

Since the war, many women and children who are family members of fleeing or killed foreign Taliban fighters have been stranded inside Afghanistan with nowhere to go to seek safety. And Afghanistan is the world’s largest source of refugees; more than 2.5 million Afghans resided in Iran and Pakistan in refugee camps before the recent war began (Mertus, 2000:53). While all displaced people are vulnerable, displaced women are particularly subject to gender-based violence and abuse (Mertus, 2000:69). Evidence such as this offers a severe challenge to the myth that wars are fought for the protection of women and children.

AT: Essentialism

We function in a methodology of inclusion to optimize our understanding of international relations and avoid essentialism

Weldon 6, Feminist Methodologies or International Relations, S. Laurel Weldon: Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Purdue, edited by Brooke A. Ackerly: Assistnat Professor in the Department of Political Science at Vanderbilt University, Maria Stern: Lecturer and Researcher at the Department of Peace and Development Research, Goteborg University, and Jacqui True: Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Studies at the Univeristy of Auskland, New Zealand, 2006, Cambridge University Press

In this chapter, I aim to show that these concerns are unwarranted. I argue that greater attention to feminist work on the part of mainstream scholars will result in a better, less partial view of international relations. Concrete efforts to take account of the perspectives of marginalized groups further our understanding of international relations, and thus constitute a methodology of inclusion. This is most clear when we reconstitute methodology more broadly to include the collective dimension of research. Indeed, I argue, feminist standpoint theory (to which many feminist IR scholars subscribe) implicitly requires, but does not offer, a collectivist approach to methodology. I propose such a collectivist account of methodology, drawing on a combination of feminist stand- point and pragmatist epistemology. This methodology of inclusion implies that attending to feminist work improves our understanding of international relations while avoiding both essentialism and positivism.

Discussing the “feminist perspective” is not essentialzing; standpoints are constructed by groups and can be adopted by anyone

Weldon 6, Feminist Methodologies or International Relations, S. Laurel Weldon: Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Purdue, edited by Brooke A. Ackerly: Assistnat Professor in the Department of Political Science at Vanderbilt University, Maria Stern: Lecturer and Researcher at the Department of Peace and Development Research, Goteborg University, and Jacqui True: Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Studies at the Univeristy of Auskland, New Zealand, 2006, Cambridge University Press p.65-6 standpoints are not…and the like

Standpoints are not innate in groups but rather arise from a particular political situation, namely a situation of group hierarchy or domination. Standpoints are the perspectives of groups, not of individuals. Standpoint epistemology does not focus on individualized differences in viewpoints, but rather on issues, values, or styles of discourse, that inform a group perspective. "Communities, and not primarily individuals, produce knowledge” (Harding 1993: 65). Asserting that groups share “standpoints” has raised charges of essentialism (Tickner 2001; Sylvester 1996b). Essentialism refers to the analytic mistake of attributing a fundamental, underlying essence to a group that does not, in fact, exist. But asserting that a group shares a standpoint does not suggest that each person in the group has the same opinions or values, or that anything shared derives from some fundamental group essence or nature (cf. Harding 1998). Rather, standpoints are constructed collectively by group members. This means, for example, that feminist standpoints can be adopted by men, but they are developed when women — in all their diversity - interact, discuss, and indeed contest representations of "women,” “women’s interests," and women’s identities. A standpoint, then, is expressed most fully in collective products: feminist publications, newspapers, conferences, and the like (Harding 1998).

AT: Essentialism

Feminist ethics of care leads to discovery of and resolution to “moral binds”; this is not essentializing

Robinson 6, Feminist Methodologies or International Relations, Fiona Robinson: , edited by Brooke A. Ackerly: Assistnat Professor in the Department of Political Science at Vanderbilt University, Maria Stern: Lecturer and Researcher at the Department of Peace and Development Research, Goteborg University, and Jacqui True: Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Studies at the Univeristy of Auskland, New Zealand, 2006, Cambridge University Press p.239-40

The purpose of this chapter has been to explore the nature of feminist ethics in International Relations, and then to ask what this means for Questions of method and methodology within this specific field of re- search. I have argued that feminist ethics should be characterized by a commitment to detailed case studies of the social arrangements — includ- ins the nature of gender relations, the distributions of responsibilities, and the valuing (or devaluing) of certain practices or activities - in particular contexts. In addition, however, a feminist political ethic of care may be used as a normative framework from which to carry out Critical reflection, discursive analysis, and policy critique and formulation. This framework is characterized by "relationality," which is manifested in at least two distinct areas. First, and perhaps most obviously, relationality is central to feminist moral ontology. This relational ontology — which sees human beings as existing, at a fundamental level, in relation to and in relations with others — contrasts sharply with the traditional ethical and social science ontologies which see humans and other objects as essentially autonomous, atomistic, and existing only in disinterested, contractual relations with other individuals. Moreover, this relational ontology is itself the source of the feminist ethical commitment to values such as attentiveness, responsiveness, trust, patience, and responsibility, which emerge naturally from it. **This is not to say,** however, **that feminist ethics must necessarily prescribe these virtues as distinctly "feminine" or morally superior**, rather, the focus on ontology over epistemology in this sense leads, more simply, to the need for feminists to uncover, and highlight, the varied but always essential role of care and other relational moral practices in the everyday lives of all people in all social settings. Feminist ethics in IR must also, I then argued, be characterized by a focus on the relationship between ethics and moral practices on one hand, and politics and power relations on the other. Because of the paramount importance of gender subordination to feminist theorizing in general, and to feminist projects for transformation, feminist normative theory in IR must start with an approach to ethics which regards ethics as always infused with, rather than separate from, politics and power. This perspective is especially evident in theories of the ethics of care; “In our present culture there is a great ideological advantage to gain from keeping care from coming into focus. By not noticing how perva- sive and central care is to human life, those who are in positions of power and privilege can continue to ignore and to degrade the activity of care and those who give care" (Tronto 1993: 1 11). "Critical moral ethnography” and "mapping geographies of responsi- bility" are two methods of feminist normative inquiry for the study of international relations. When these methods are used in conjunction- with an account of morality as relational — as in the feminist ethics of care — the result is socially situated, critical normative inquiry which is sensitive to gender — as well as racial and class - subordination.4 While this method will not result in grand theories of justice or rights, it may just help intricately connected human beings to engage together in a “search for shareable interpretations of their responsibilities and/or bearable resolutions to their moral binds" (M. U. Wallcer 1998: 144).

Their claims to equality are actually a masked move towards feminine superiority.

**Anne** Campbell**, Oxford University Press, March, 20**02**: “Do you know the 10 variations of Feminism? “**

**Afro-American feminists**: Reject the Eurocentric approach to knowledge embodied in individualism and positivism. They maintain that race is the primary oppression and that gender is secondary to this. They are particularly critical of scientific work that under-emphasizes the impact of social and economic inequalities between the races. They deplore the failure of mainstream feminism to address the problems of women of color. Also sometimes referred as "Hip-Hop" Feminism -- a "sassy" brand of African-American form of social, and polirtical view from the black female perspective. Essentialist feminists: argue that women by virtue of their biological and psychological qualities are equal to or superior to men. Although originally rejecting any implication of biological differences as 'a tool for conservatives who wished to keep women in the home,' they have now rethought their position 'with a recognition that biologically based differences between the sexes might imply superiority and power for women in some areas'[Rosser, S.V. (1997) Possible implications of feminist theories for the study of evolution. In P.A. Gowarty (ed.), Feminism and evolutionary biology: boundaries, intersections and frontiers. New York: Chapman & Hall]. **Evolutionary feminists:** based on the evolutionary selection pressure dictating that responsibility of passing genes through birth and nurturing is solely a function of the female of our species. It has its solid foundation on empirical evidence that female mammals do not wage war. Of the 4,000 or so mammal species on the planet, only two form alliances to attack their own species: chimpanzees and humans. The importance of this fact is given even greater strength when we acknowledge the empirical fact that only the males of both species are involved in this social behavior (if you want to call war a "social behavior.") This link to the primates gives rise to this unique view of the evolutionary perspective to feminism. Much of the new insight into of this evolutionary perspective was formed within the emerging science of evolutionary psychology.

AT: Essentialism

War is associated with hegemonic masculinity, so peace is associated with femininity.

J. Ann Tickner, 2002. [International Studies Perspective: Visions of International Studies: Feminist Perspectives on 9/11, http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118929799/PDFSTART]

George Patton’s claim—that war gives purpose to life, evident in post-9/11 political discourse—is one that has been widely shared by both women and men. Whereas wars frequently energize societies and foster a communal and self- sacrificial spirit among women and men alike, war-fighting is an activity that has been undertaken almost exclusively by men. In his book War and Gender, Joshua Goldstein questions why we have not been more curious about this fact. In an exhaustive cross-cultural investigation of wars throughout history, Goldstein finds no biological evidence for why men are almost always the fighters; instead, he attributes it to cultural socialization. “Cultures mold males into warriors by attaching to ‘manhood’ those qualities that make good warriors” (Goldstein, 2001:252)). The toughening up of boys is found across cultures and many cultures use gender to motivate participation in combat (Goldstein, 2001:406). Warriors require intense socialization in order to fight effectively (Goldstein, 2001:252). While Goldstein finds it remarkable that this association between masculinity and war has received so little attention from scholars who write about war, war as a masculine activity has been central to feminist investigations (Stiehm, 1983; Elshtain, 1987; Enloe, 1993, 2000). Generally supporting Goldstein’s claims about militarized masculinity, feminists have suggested that “military manhood,” or a type of heroic masculinity that goes back to ancient Greece, attracts recruits and maintains self-esteem in institutions where obedience is the norm. The term “patriot” is frequently associated with service in military combat. The National Organization for Women’s (NOW) support for women entering the U.S. military was based on the argument that, if women were barred from participation in the armed forces on an equal footing with men, they would remain second-class citizens denied the unique political responsibility of risking one’s life for the state (Jones, 1990). The lack of ability to serve in combat has also acted as a handicap for women running for political office in the United States. The notion that (young) males fight wars to protect vulnerable people, such as women and children who cannot be expected to protect themselves, has also been an important motivator for the recruitment of military forces. “Protection” has been an important myth that has sustained support for war by both men and women. I use the term “myth” because the large number of civilian casualties in recent wars severely strains the credibility of female protection. If war is a phenomenon we associate with men and “hegemonic” masculinity, peace is a term we stereotypically associate[d] with women and some of the devalued feminine characteristics I outlined earlier. As Jean Elshtain (1987:230) has suggested, we are afraid to let go of war because we fear even more the prospects of a sterile peace. Peace is frequently seen as an ideal, and even uninteresting, state with little chance of success in the “real” world. Women have been linked to anti-war sentiment throughout history and most peace movements have been disproportionately populated by women. Indeed, many of these movements have drawn inspiration from maternal imagery to craft their strategies. Yet I believe that the association of women with peace renders both women and peace as idealistic, utopian, and unrealistic; it is profoundly disempowering for both. And as long as peace remains associated with women, this may reinforce militarized masculinity (Goldstein, 2001:413). The association of men with the “realities” of war and women with an “idealistic” notion of peace reinforces the gender hierarchies I outlined earlier. The consequences of this gender hierarchy are real in that it reinforces men’s legitimacy and helps sustain their continued dominance in world politics; it also serves to perpetuate the barriers that women face in gaining legitimacy in foreign and military policymaking, particularly in times of conflict. In most societies, women’s under-representation in international security matters and the military cannot be explained by legal barriers alone. I shall now suggest some consequences of these gender stereotypes for our post-9/11 world.

AT: Essentialism

Their assumptions are flawed, the underlying connotation for women is a white, middle class women. This makes it it impossible to embrace the feminist practices in other countries. By not accepting non western cultures, these feminists are becoming the colonialists that they criticize

Katharine T. Bartlett and Angela Harris Kenneth**:** Pye Professor of Law, served as Dean of Duke Law School Professor of Law; Executive Committee Member, Center for Social Justice Office (1998) “Gender and Law: Theory, Doctrine, Commentary, 1007-1010” http://academic.udayton.edu/gender/01Unit/essent.htm

Essentialism . . . refers to a grab bag of different, sometimes overlapping, problems. Once is the problem of false universalisms, in which over-generalizations or unstated reference points implicitly attribute to all members of a group the characteristics of a dominant subset of that group. Critiques of law . . . often have included the claim that legal standards purporting to be neutral and objective often presuppose a single standard -- the "make need of the law's "special accommodations." "Feminist Theory has a problem of over-generalization".  A common subject for critique is the unstated, sometimes unconscious assumption that for purposes of feminism, "women" are white, middle class, heterosexual, able-bodied, and otherwise privileged. To what extent can we think about "women" as a class and "women's interests" generally without indulging this assumption? A second, and related, problem of universalism often described as "essentialism" has to do with the applicability of Western feminism to other cultures. How should Western feminists respond to practices like clitoridectomy, veiling, or gender-based access to rights when they occur in a non-Western context? When feminists challenge such practices, are they inappropriately importing Western conceptions of gender oppression? When feminists defer to such practices, are they holding non-Western cultures to a lower standard? Which should take precedence when feminism and anti-colonialism seem to be at odds? Is sisterhood truly global?

By viewing gender oppression as the “primary” form of oppression allows other forms of oppression to thrive

Katharine T. Bartlett and Angela Harris Kenneth**:** Pye Professor of Law, served as Dean of Duke Law School Professor of Law; Executive Committee Member, Center for Social Justice Office (1998) “Gender and Law: Theory, Doctrine, Commentary, 1007-1010” http://academic.udayton.edu/gender/01Unit/essent.htm

A third meaning of the term "essentialism" is a form of reductionism by which the world is viewed through a single lens that reduces social relations to those aspects that support one "grand" theory. People who take this view believe that gender oppression is the most "fundamental" or "primary" oppression; all other forms of oppression are less central, or less universal, or dependent upon gender oppression. A frequent criticism of this view is that it wrongly minimizes the significance of oppression based on other factors such as race, sexuality, class, ethnicity, and religion.

AT: Essentialism

Categorization is inevitable – No matter how many fixes are applied, how many critiques are made, how many alternatives are fulfilled, human nature cannot change

Katharine T. Bartlett and Angela Harris Kenneth: Pye Professor of Law, served as Dean of Duke Law School Professor of Law; Executive Committee Member, Center for Social Justice Office (1998) “Gender and Law: Theory, Doctrine, Commentary, 1007-1010” http://academic.udayton.edu/gender/01Unit/essent.htm

A fifth meaning of the term "essentialism" that appears not only in law itself but in some feminist critiques of law might be called the "naturalist" error. Within critical legal perspectives, to commit the naturalist error is to assume the existence of certain inherent or "natural" facts, rather than socially construed ones, on which law is or should be based. This error is replicated by feminists, some say, when they treat "women" as a self-explanatory category, often defined by biology. The example of the transsexual throws into relief some of the difficulties of viewing sexual characteristics as inherent, biological ones. Is a male-to-female transsexual a woman? If so, is she a woman only upon completion of reassignment surgery, or is her inner sense of feminine identity sufficient with or without the proper genitalia? Is a woman born or made? Another naturalist mistake is made when feminists assume that the removal of unnatural, man-made social constructions will make women's basic commonality, or oppression, more apparent and, once removed, allow women's "true-identity" to emerge. In the absence of sex-based oppression, would there still be "women?" Or only individuals who happen to be of different sexes? A sixth meaning of the term "essentialism" points at a deeper problem, located in the process of categorization itself. Humans constantly put one another into mental categories; it seems to be an inescapable part of cognition itself. But every category is inevitably under-inclusive and over-inclusive. Every category is useful for some purposes and not for others. When categories are both assumed to be fixed and treated as extremely important to social life, as "gender" is, what are the consequences for people who don't neatly fit one category or another? Is it possible to escape categories altogether? Would trying to do so make collective action impossible? Is it possible to learn to think of our categories as provisional instead of unalterable, socially created rather than inherent nature? Finally, a seventh connotation of the term "essentialism" points toward the philosophical movement known as "postmodernism." Postmodern theory challenges the notion that there is any objective reality "out there" in the world that can be perceived apart from our expectations and our past experience. It insists, instead, that one's experience of the world is always shaped by one's position in it. Many anti-essentialist commentators argue that feminists should be receptive to postmodernist theory, because both feminists and postmodernists are skeptical of claims about universal truth, which have often been used to justify women's oppression. Other feminists, however, argue that postmodern philosophy is dangerous because it tends to suggest that people can simply "think" themselves free of oppression, and because it implies that any world view or opinion is as good as any other because non can be proven to be universally "true."

AT: Perm

The concept of victims and survivors needs to be contextualized; this demonstrates the role women’s struggles and survival plays as an agent of history

D’Costa 6, Feminist Methodologies or International Relations, Bina D’Costa: John Vincent fellow at the Center for International Relations at the Australia National University, Canberra, edited by Brooke A. Ackerly: Assistnat Professor in the Department of Political Science at Vanderbilt University, Maria Stern: Lecturer and Researcher at the Department of Peace and Development Research, Goteborg University, and Jacqui True: Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Studies at the Univeristy of Auskland, New Zealand, 2006, Cambridge University Press p.140-1 I discussed both of these categories….my research project

I discussed both of these categories, victims and survivors, with my colleagues and friends, and realized that we all have quite different ideas about whom we would consider as a survivor and whom a victim. I asked this question randomly and in an abstract manner. The responses indicated that, more than being defined, these terms need to be contextualized. When I consider these terms, I immediately think of Hiroshima survivors or rape survivors, who have also been victims of particular kinds of violence; whereas for others the contexts might vary and might not be so srraight forwardly interchangeable. For example, one friend thought of someone being lost in desert for a few days and then being rescued. He regarded his hypothetical subject as a survivor but not as a victim. In representing Birangona women, I used both of these terms. A Bimngom is a survivor who has the power to control her destiny, within the limitations of her context, and also a victim of a traumatic event and the limitations of that context. However, neither "victim" nor "survivor” is a simple construct when the women do not think of themselves as survivors and do not see their own agency, but instead; remain within the limitations of their context. While the term "survivor" has an empowering meaning attached to it, a survivor might remain captive to her past. Her past might haunt her and re-victimize her in the present. One example of this is Duljan Nesa,18 who was raped by two Pakistani soldiers in front of her husband. She was asked to provide tes- timony at the I-"eople’s Tribunallg in Dhaka, the capital of Bangladesh, with two other rape survivors in 1992. The tribunal proceedings were not successful, but the three women were photographed for the press and their stories published without their consent (Akhter et al. n.d.: 80-104). The press reports led to cruel consequences for them, and Duljan Nesa and her family were banished from their community. These methodological puzzles placed in high relief the remaining conceptual problem of how to relate a rigorous structural analysis of women’s positions as agents of history through their struggles and survival. Why and where are the political shifts taking place? Merely making women visible (as was implied in my original intention of bring- ing to the fore the silencing of the act of rape) is an insufficient step towards intellectually and politically satisfying explanations of the subordination of women’s interests to the nation-state. Bearing this in mind, the guiding force in my research project was the life stories of women and their survival initiatives. The possibilities for social change can be found in analyses that locate and link the political margin (that is, the voices of the Brmngomz) with the political center in diverse social theories and political practices. Feminist methodology makes such research possible. In light of these insights, I will now return to my story of the unfolding of my research process.

The perm fails: merely adding women to the plan keeps this invisible- only considerable analysis solves

Sylvester ’02 (Christine, Professor of Women, Gender, Development at the Institute of Social Studies, The Hague) Pg. 166

Feminist theories are diverse but generally concur that the invisibility of gender issues within mainstream social theories, and of women in important public domains of human existence, cannot be remedied simply by adding a pinch of woman – to the state, to capitalist processes and to theories. Visibility requires considerable analysis of the points in the international system and in the theories that depict it, where women’s behaviors and contributions are choked off and men’s are taken as the norm.

AT: Realism

Realism is incomplete – failure to consider gender ignores a powerful cause of war

Cockburn 10, Cynthia Department of Sociology, The City University London, UK b Centre for the Study of Women and

Gender, University of Warwick, UK (2010) 'Gender Relations as Causal in Militarization and War', International Feminist Journal of Politics, 12: 2, 139 — 157

What, then, has the view of power as intersected sets of institutions and relations got to do with war? Here I think we need to depart from empirical material and undertake an exegesis, something like this. A class system built on economic surpluses, a racializing hierarchy of cities, then states and empires, and institutionalized patriarchy, emerged together within a definable historical period (at a different moment in different parts of the world). They were predicated on violence. They all involved constituting a self in relation to an inferiorized, exploited other – the rich man’s landless labourer; the citizen’s hated foreigner; the woman as men’s property, commodified in bride price, sale or exchange price, in prostitution and the value of her children. All three processes were necessarily violent. Labourers will not build canal systems unless driven by hunger. Foreigners will not bow to another’s hegemony if it is not backed by coercion. Women will not be subdued without force. It is not surprising therefore that institutionalized warfare, the augmentation and mobilization of what Charles Tilly (1992) terms the means of coercion, was born along with increasing accumulation of wealth, the early state and the establishment of patriarchies – innovations that signified the condition known as ‘civilization’. Gerda Lerner’s (1986) intensively researched book The Creation of Patriarchy shows this happening towards the end of the Neolithic in the emerging societies of the eastern Mediterranean. It has also been noted, several millennia later, in the American hemisphere. William Eckhardt (1992: 4), in a comprehensive study that reviews many other historians on war, evolves a ‘dialectical evolutionary theory’, as he calls it, suggesting that the more ‘civilized’ people became the more warlike they became. Civilization and war: it is a correlation he finds persisting in all regions and phases of history. The suggestion here then is that militarization and war are caused, shaped, achieved and reproduced across millennia through all three dimensions of power. If one is at work, the others will be too. The gender drama is never absent: the male as subject, the female as alien, the alien as effeminate (both the one a man perceives out there, and the one he fears inside himself). This is why a theory of war and its causation is flawed if it lacks a gender dimension. Most theories of war, however, in sociology and in international relations, do indeed lack this necessary element. To those who evolve and deploy them, they seem perfectly complete and satisfying without it. When women, feminists, come along and introduce our insights into discussions of war, when we talk about women and gender, we are often told we are being trivial, we are forgetting ‘the big picture’. Cynthia Enloe (2005: 280) speaks from a feminist standpoint when she boldy interjects ‘but suppose this IS the big picture?’.

AT: util/realism

Utilitarian justifications for advocating a plan only further immunize us from reluctance to go to war, the idea that we net save lives only encourages conflict and war

Jennifer Hyndman Associate Professor Simon Fraser University February 2007 Feminist Geopolitics Revisited: Body Counts in Iraq

One obvious critique of this position is that all lives are not equally valued, as the liberal covenant would suggest. By forging this chain of equivalence I was arguing for an accountability to the very logic and principles that authorized military force in Afghanistan, namely that of the United Nations Charter and its Security Council resolution. Another critique of liberal logic is that it often authorizes violence in the name of national interests that are part and parcel of liberal modernity. AsTalal Asad (1997, 285) points out, ‘‘the modern dedication to eliminating pain and suffering often conflicts with the other commitments and values: the right of individuals to choose and the duty of the state to maintain its interests.’’ Nonetheless, body counts of the invisible, feminized other, namely Afghan civilians, bring some visibility to the loss and suffering in the context of American civilian deaths and an awareness of the damage that that war on terror has wreaked. I do not, however, subscribe to the idea that subjective, specific experiences of death can be objectively compared. A utilitarian calculus of death and loss is precisely what I aim to undermine as the dominant geopolitical discourse. In the context of Iraq and recent debates about the legitimacy of various civilian body counts, the numerical calibration of loss and suffering is making us (North Americans consuming the war through the media) more, rather than less, complicit in the war. Counting practices have even been used to support the invasion of Iraq: Saddam Hussein killed some 280,000 Iraqis during his rule, so the loss of a portion of that number is justified in the eyes of those comparing death tallies in a realist framework (Human RightsWatch cited in The Economist 2004b).3 The public is told that the death of some Iraqis, whether military personnel trained by the occupying forces, or civilians, is inevitable, a military necessity, collateral damage, or the price to be paid for freedom and democracy. Why do newspaper readers and television watchers know the officially documented names and exact number of U.S. and coalition soldiers that have been killed, but not the number of Iraqis—civilians, armed forces, and insurgents—who have died?

AT: public/private dichotomy

Considering the everyday instead of a public/private dichotomy allows the individual to matter in politics.

Brigitte Bargetz, 2009. [Reconciling the Irreconcilable, The Politics of the Everyday: A Feminist Revision of the Public/Private Frame, http://www.iwm.at/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=130&Itemid=125-There]

As Nancy Hirschman and Christine Di Stefano point out, the feminist claim to politicize the private has offered a “radical challenge to the notion of politics itself and has instigated a redefinition of politics to include things that ‘mainstream’ theory considers completely non-political, such as the body and sexuality, the family and interpersonal relationships”. However, drawing on the notion of the private for rethinking a broad notion of the political renders this claim complicit with one problem mentioned above. More precisely, focusing on the private means taking the public/private dichotomy as a foundation and is therefore running the risk of reproducing the very dichotomy it strives to overcome. Instead of bringing into play the concept of the private – which cannot be separated from the public, since the private itself is a political invention – I suggest using the concept of the everyday, which is not confronted with this problem because everyday life includes both public and private issues. Taking the everyday as problematic makes it possible to include spaces, actions, and attitudes that are supposedly private and therefore excluded from main- and malestream concepts of the political without reproducing the public/private dichotomy by concentrating on either of the two spheres.

Using the concept of the everyday rather than public/private allows for less bias and better analysis.

Brigitte Bargetz, 2009. [Reconciling the Irreconcilable, The Politics of the Everyday: A Feminist Revision of the Public/Private Frame, http://www.iwm.at/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=130&Itemid=125-There]

The feminist critique of the public/private dichotomy has been an important contribution to feminist research. Exposing the gendered and sexualized dimensions and the inherent hierarchies, feminists have revealed the public/private distinction as an influential liberal power mechanism of modernity. However, taking seriously the critiques of this concept, I would like to propose a revision from the perspective of the everyday. In particular, in view of some androcentric and Eurocentric biases, I suggest that taking into account the concept of everyday life makes it possible to overcome some of the public/private framework’s analytical shortcomings.

Standpoint epistemology

Examining questions through the eyes of the oppressed is the only way to see the social phenomena not visible from the positions of power

Weldon 6, Feminist Methodologies or International Relations, S. Laurel Weldon: Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Purdue, edited by Brooke A. Ackerly: Assistnat Professor in the Department of Political Science at Vanderbilt University, Maria Stern: Lecturer and Researcher at the Department of Peace and Development Research, Goteborg University, and Jacqui True: Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Studies at the Univeristy of Auskland, New Zealand, 2006, Cambridge University Press p. 64-5 current feminist…current accounts

Current feminist scholarship draws on an epistemological approach that aims to take into account the consequences of` cultural differences, gender differences, and power relationships for the development of knowledge.]The idea of standpoint theory, or situated knowledge, is at the heart of this approach.2 Many scholars argue that what we know is importantly shaped by the context in which we find ourselves. Stand- point theory holds that members of dominant and subordinate groups have systematically different experiences deriving from their different social positions (Hartsock 2003). Standpoint theorists stress the epistemological benefits of examining questions from the perspective of marginalized groups. This theory emphasizes "how positions of political disadvantage can be turned into sites of analytical advantage" (Harding 1998: 91). The position of the subordinate or oppressed groups offers special analytic leverage because some social phenomena are not visible from the position of the powerful group. "In societies stratified by race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality, or some other such politics shaping the very structure and meanings of social relations, the activities or lives . . . of those at the top both organize and set limits on what persons who perform such activities can under- stand about themselves and the world around them” (Harding 1998: 150; see also Hartsock 2003). Viewing social relations from the position of the oppressed does not just add another set of experiences to existing accounts; it forces revision of the dominant accounts, since it reveals them as partial and limited (Hattsoclc 2003; Harding 1998). Recently, feminist theorists have worked to move beyond the dichotomy of "powerful and powerless" implicit in early accounts of standpoint theory to recognize the multiplicity of "oppressed," marginalized, and for feminist standpoints.3 But the core emphasis on the connection between experience and standpoint, and on the role of power in sup- pressing some standpoints, is retained in current accounts (Harding I998; Locher and Prugl 2001; Tickner 1997; 2001).

NO hope to emancipate the oppressed from the eyes of the master

Cockburn 10, Cynthia Department of Sociology, The City University London, UK b Centre for the Study of Women and

Gender, University of Warwick, UK (2010) 'Gender Relations as Causal in Militarization and War', International Feminist Journal of Politics, 12: 2, 139 — 157

A number of feminist theorists in those productive years were questioning the basis of knowledge claims (Jaggar 1983; Rose 1983; Harding 1986; Smith 1987). Donna Haraway, addressing the multiplicity and diversity of feminist subjects and life experiences, developed the plural concept of ‘situated knowledges’. One cannot expect, she affirmed, to generate an understanding useful to subjugated groups from the universalizing standpoint of the master. After all, he is ‘the Man, the One God, whose Eye produces, appropri- ates, and orders all difference’ (Haraway 1988: 593). Diverse views from below, clearly rooted in life experiences, were a better bet for more reliable accounts of the world.

Aff claims flawed

The affirmative’s claims are flawed because the evidence they are based on is not gathered in a participatory or invested way

Tickner 6, Feminist Methodologies or International Relations, J. Ann Ticker: Professor, School of IR at USC, edited by Brooke A. Ackerly: Assistnat Professor in the Department of Political Science at Vanderbilt University, Maria Stern: Lecturer and Researcher at the Department of Peace and Development Research, Goteborg University, and Jacqui True: Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Studies at the Univeristy of Auskland, New Zealand, 2006, Cambridge University Press p. 28 as Sandra…research subjects

As Sandra Harding has claimed, most feminist research insists that the inquirer be placed on the same critical plane as the subject matter. “Only in this way can we hope to produce understandings and explanations which are free of distortion from the unexamined beliefs of social scientists themselves” (Harding 1987: 9). In contrast to conventional social scientific methods, acknowledging the subjective element in one’s analysis, which exists in all social science research, actually increases the objectivity of the research. Similarly, Mary Margaret Cook and Judith Fonow reject the assumption that maintaining a gap between the researcher and the research subject produces more valid knowledge; rather, they advocate a participatory research strategy that emphasizes a dialectic between the researcher and the researched throughout the project (Cook and FonoW [1986 1990: 76). Joyce Nielsen talks about knowledge creation as a dialogic process that requires a context of equality and the involvement of the researcher in the lives of the people she studies (Nielsen 1990: 30). Feminists also struggle with the issue of power differentials between the researcher and her subjects.

Quantitative evidence concerning women bad, leads to value being placed on men’s interactions with the marketplace

Tickner 6, Feminist Methodologies or International Relations, J. Ann Ticker: Professor, School of IR at USC, edited by Brooke A. Ackerly: Assistnat Professor in the Department of Political Science at Vanderbilt University, Maria Stern: Lecturer and Researcher at the Department of Peace and Development Research, Goteborg University, and Jacqui True: Senior Lecturer in the Department of Political Studies at the Univeristy of Auskland, New Zealand, 2006, Cambridge University Press p. 37 these two cases…with the marketplace

These two cases, as with most feminist IR research, have avoided quantitative methods. As my case studies have demonstrated, fitting women and other marginalized people into methodologically conventional quantitative frameworks has been problematic. Many of the experiences of women’s lives have not yet been documented or analyzed, either within social science disciplines or by states. The choices that states make about ‘which data to collect is a political act. Traditional ways in which data are collected and analyzed do not lend themselves to answering many of the questions that feminists raise. The data that are available to scholars and, more importantly, the data that are not, determine which research questions get asked and how they are answered. Marilyn Waring describes how national accounting systems have been shaped and reshaped to help states frame their national security policies — specifically to understand how to pay for wars.22 In national accounting systems no value is attached to the environment, to unpaid work, to the reproduction of human life, or to its maintenance or care, tasks generally undertaken by women (Waring 1988: 3—4). Political decisions are made on the basis of data that policy elites choose to collect (Waring 1988: 302). Waring goes on to assert that, under the guise of value-free science, the economics of accounting has constructed a reality which believes that “value” results only when (predominantly) men interact with the marketplace (Waring 1988: 17— 18).

AFF cards

Gender not root cause/only issue in considering war

Cockburn 10, Cynthia Department of Sociology, The City University London, UK b Centre for the Study of Women and

Gender, University of Warwick, UK (2010) 'Gender Relations as Causal in Militarization and War', International Feminist Journal of Politics, 12: 2, 139 — 157

Second, war-fighting between two armies is only the tip of the iceberg, as it were, of an underlying, less immediate, set of institutions and relationships that can be understood as systemic. The author most often credited for the term ‘war system’ is Betty Reardon. In her text Sexism and the War System she employs the term to refer to society in its entirety, ‘our competitive social order, which is based on authoritarian principles, assumes unequal value among and between human beings, and is held in place by coercive force’ (Reardon 1996: 10) While this accurately describes many modern societies, the women’s organizations I have studied, in so far as I have come to understand their analysis, do not in the main share Betty Reardon’s reduction of this social order to nothing other than a gender order. Few, I believe, would follow her in a belief that ‘patriarchy . . . invented and maintains war to hold in place the social order it spawned’ (Reardon 1996: 12). Looking at war from close quarters these women activists see all too clearly that other forces are at work in addition to gender.

Ethno-nationalist issues a major cause of war

Cockburn 10, Cynthia Department of Sociology, The City University London, UK b Centre for the Study of Women and

Gender, University of Warwick, UK (2010) 'Gender Relations as Causal in Militarization and War', International Feminist Journal of Politics, 12: 2, 139 — 157

Ethno-nationalist issues, foreignness, the expression of the perceived security interests of an ethnic or national self in relation to its others, is a second major cause of war (Horowitz 1985; Gurr and Harff 1994; Hutchinson 2005). It is often an antecedent cause, in Fogarty’s terms, if not an immediate one. Raids against the ones outside the walls of the first city states, the barbarians on the borders of the early empires. Later, the Infidel. Some contemporary wars are fought by an insurgent ethnic group trying to get recognition inside a larger polity, looking for more autonomy or its own state: as Chechen separatists seek to escape from the Russian Federation while the Russian military mobilize to stop them. How can this kind of racializing cause in war be detected? By listening to what the ideologues are saying, the religious leaders. What is the the propaganda, who is putting it out? What names are claimed, what names are being imposed on others?

The public/private concept is essential in analyzing modern transformations.

Brigitte Bargetz, 2009. [Reconciling the Irreconcilable, The Politics of the Everyday: A Feminist Revision of the Public/Private Frame, http://www.iwm.at/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=130&Itemid=125-There]

Meanwhile, the public/private distinction is used – not only in feminist debates – in order to analyze transformations of the social, the economic, and the political. In the 1970s, for instance, Richard Sennett was concerned with the “increasing tyranny of intimacy’”. Currently, public/private is often discussed in the context of neoliberal transformations like the privatization of parts of the state, the ignorance of structural inequalities in public debates, and the economization and individualization of the social. Thus, Janine Brodie argues that “the current moment of restructuring can be viewed as a concerted discursive and political struggle around the very meaning of the public and the private”.

Perm solves: Both the public/private concept and the everyday concept have been important for feminists.

Brigitte Bargetz, 2009. [Reconciling the Irreconcilable, The Politics of the Everyday: A Feminist Revision of the Public/Private Frame, http://www.iwm.at/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=130&Itemid=125-There]

The public/private frame and the concept of the everyday share some common ground when taking into account their critique of androcentric science. Feminists have drawn on both concepts in order to reveal different (disciplinary) exclusions: of women as scientists, of women’s experiences, of questions of sex and gender relations, of patriarchy, etc. Moreover, both concepts are confronted with gendered and sexualized denigrations. Associating women with either the sphere of the private or the sphere of the everyday, they are often regarded as being “naturally” subordinated to the public sphere of male transcendence.