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#### The affirmative’s logic that connects mobility with freedom is masculine dominated and only seeks to control space

**Bauhardt 4** (Christine, Technical University of Berlin Institute of Urban and Regional Planning, Urban Development and Transportation Infrastructures: Insights from the Ruhr Region, http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CFkQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.ifz.tugraz.at%2FMedia%2FDateien%2FDownloads-IFZ%2FSummer-Academy%2FProceedings-2004%2FUrban-Development-and-Transportation-Infrastructures-Insights-from-the-Ruhr-Region&ei=1bjxT4TdK4is8QS1u4X3DA&usg=AFQjCNETXWV2Zg7c7C1sVijFo3CcG7tCkA JGC )

My first thesis is that the acceleration of these tendencies and their equation with economic progress, technological modernization and spatial autonomy are deeply related to the construction of the male Enlightenment subject. This masculine subject is constructed through the dissociation of the intellect from nature and the body, as well as through the idea of its dominance over nature and through the valuing of individual autonomy over social bonds. Both natural processes and social ties are anchored in concrete, particular spaces. Overcoming social, natural and spatial bonds by forward motion is understood to guarantee autonomy and freedom. My second thesis posits that this imagined link between acceleration and technological and economic progress influences actions not only in the area of transportation policy; it has been internalized as a social metaphor in the minds of people and thus influences their transportation behaviour. The promise of freedom through accelerated transportation is, however, an illusion given that this desire for freedom has contributed to the creation of and reinforcement of power relations that no longer allow for freedom of movement: If increasing speed is adopted as a principle in city and transportation planning, then mobility becomes a necessity. Compulsory mobility has high economic and social costs, making it all the more important to seek alternatives in transportation planning that guarantee equality in transportation conditions and thereby also guarantee the free movement of all urban inhabitants.

#### This masculine ideology is the root cause of all proliferation, environmental destruction, domestic violence, and war

**Warren and Cady 94** (Karen J, Duane L, feminists and authors, Hypatia, “Feminism and Peace: Seeing connections,” pg 16-17)

Much of the current "unmanageability" of contemporary life in patriarchal societies, (d), is then viewed as a consequence of a patriarchal preoccupation with activities, events, and experiences that reflect historically male-gender identified beliefs, values, attitudes, and assumptions. Included among these real-life consequences are precisely those concerns with nuclear proliferation, war, environmental destruction, and violence toward women, which many feminists see as the logical outgrowth of patriarchal thinking. In fact, it is often only through observing these dysfunctional behaviors -- the symptoms of dysfunctionality -- that one can truly see that and how patriarchy serves to maintain and perpetuate them. When patriarchy is understood as a dysfunctional system, this "unmanageability" can be seen for what it is -- as a predictable and thus logical consequence of patriarchy. 11The theme that global environmental crises, war, and violence generally are predictable and logical consequences of sexism and patriarchal culture is pervasive in ecofeminist literature (see Russell 1989 , 2). Ecofeminist Charlene Spretnak, for instance, argues that "a militarism and warfare are continual features of a patriarchal society because they reflect and instill patriarchal values and fulfill needs of such a system. Acknowledging the context of patriarchal conceptualizations that feed militarism is a first step toward reducing their impact and preserving life on Earth" ( Spretnak 1989 , 54). Stated in terms of the foregoing model of patriarchy as a dysfunctional social system, the claims by Spretnak and other feminists take on a clearer meaning: Patriarchal conceptual frameworks legitimate impaired thinking (about women, national and regional conflict, the environment) which is manifested in behaviors which, if continued, will make life on earth difficult, if not impossible. It is a stark message, but it is plausible. Its plausibility ties in understanding the conceptual roots of various woman-nature-peace connections in regional, national, and global contexts.

#### Alternative-Reject the affirmative.

#### Framing of Gender can be a powerful cultural and political influence. These methodologies become public discourse and utilized to improve future policies. The alternative is a prior question- without it the 1AC becomes another failure of the system.

**Beland 9** (Daniel, Professor of Public Policy-University of Saskatchewan, “Gender, Ideational Analysis, and Social Policy”, Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society, Volume 16(4), Project Muse) LL

As far as the political stream is concerned (Kingdon 1995), ideas can take the form of cultural and discursive frames that actors use to challenge or justify existing policy arrangements (e.g., Béland 2009; Campbell 1998; Schön and Rein 1994). These frames "appear typically in the public pronouncements of policy makers and their aides, such as sound bites, campaign speeches, press releases, and other very public statements designed to muster public support for policy proposals" (Campbell 1998, 394). Discursive frames are part of most political battles and the competition between these frames and between the actors using them points to what Tasleem Padamsee (2009) refers to as the "multiplicity of discourses" present in a society at any given moment. As suggested by the social movement literature, career politicians are not the only actors who engage in cultural and discursive framing (e.g., Benford and Snow 2000; Oliver and Johnston 2000; [End Page 568] Schneider 1997). The work of Pedriana and Stryker (1997) on the symbolic struggles surrounding civil rights in Philadelphia in the late 1960s perfectly illustrates how social movements can use framing processes to bring about policy change. In their detailed study, these sociologists show how civil rights activists transformed the constraints of the legal discourse prevailing at the time into a valuable political and ideological resource that would ultimately help them reshape the law. Throughout their analysis, they "identify diverse symbolic packages that opponents and supporters used to frame [a civil rights plan], its meaning, and the desirability of its enforcement. [They] identify cultural strategies actors used to try to stabilize or transform law by drawing on equal opportunity values and language that law already incorporated" (Pedriana and Stryker 1997, 637). Their account backs the claim that framing processes can strongly influence political struggles and help bring about policy change. In this special issue, Stryker and Wald (2009) provide even more ground to this claim through an analysis of the central role of cultural framing in contemporary US welfare reform, showing that political struggles over cultural meaning were significant for the 1996 welfare reform. As evidenced in their article, cultural framing can become a powerful factor in the politics of policy change. To further illustrate the role of frames in politics and policy change, let me discuss three ways in which political actors can mobilize them. First, frames can take the form of a public discourse used by specific political actors to convince others that policy change is necessary. This is what political scientist Robert H. Cox (2001) calls "the social construction of the need to reform" and what political philosopher Nancy Fraser (1989) has called the "politics of needs interpretation." From this perspective, discursive frames can help convince political actors and the general public that existing policy legacies are flawed, and that reforms should be enacted to solve perceived social and economic problems. Thus, policy learning can feed framing processes in the sense that experts, officials, and interest groups can publicly voice their negative assessments of existing policies to convince other actors that the time has come to improve or even replace them. But "social learning remains analytically distinct from framing activities in part because learning can occur without the emergence of a public discourse about the need to reform. An autonomous set of evaluative activities, social learning generally predates and, in only some cases, informs framing processes" (Béland 2006, 562). Overall, discursive frames help actors make a case for policy change, and this activity generally involves a public discussion of the meaning and performance of existing policy legacies. [End Page 569] Second, these frames help political actors convince other groups and individuals to form a coalition around a concrete proposal or vision for change. As discussed above, ideational processes participate in the construction of interests and the ranking of policy goals. In this context, particular political actors can use frames and political discourse to influence the way other actors see their interests and identify with shared policy goals. From this perspective, policy debates are largely about the construction of interests, policy goals, and identities, without which political coalitions can hardly survive. Although concrete quid pro quos between key political actors are a major aspect of coalition building (Bonoli 2000), frames can help sell concrete policy alternatives to the public and build a stronger coalition around them. On one hand, politicians can "speak to their base" and argue that the measures they support are consistent with the broad ideological principles that cement their existing coalition. On the other hand, ambiguous policy ideas and proposals can make many different actors believe that they have an interest in supporting a complex policy alternative, which can lead to seemingly paradoxical coalitions (Palier 2005). Third, political actors can mobilize framing processes to counter criticism targeting the policy alternatives they support. Thus, one might expand Weaver's notion of blame avoidance strategies (Weaver 1986) to take on a discursive form. For instance, officials may blame economic cycles for higher unemployment rates to convince the public that their decisions are not at the origin of this negative situation. Policymakers can also frame policy alternatives in a way that diverts attention away from their actual departure from well-accepted political symbols or policy paradigms. For example, since the 1980s, Swedish politicians have referred to enduringly popular idea of "social democracy" to legitimize forms of policy change that are arguably closer to neoliberalism than to traditional social democratic ideals (Cox 2004). Blame avoidance frames such as these have a preventive component because political actors use them to shield the policy alternatives they support from criticism (Béland 2005, 11). Scholars interested in the gender–social policy nexus have long analyzed discursive and framing processes (Tannen 1994), and their potential impact on policy change (Lewis 2002). A good example of this type of scholarship is the research of Hobson and Lindholm (1997) on the mobilization of Swedish women during the 1930s. In order to understand this mobilization, the authors bridge the power resource approach and the sociological scholarship on social movements. Their analysis of women's mobilization emphasizes the role of what they call "discursive resources," a concept that [End Page 570] "acknowledges that social groups engage in struggles over the meanings and the boundaries of political and social citizenship. This includes the cultural narratives and metaphors that social actors exploit in their public representations as well as the contesting ideological stances that they take on dominant themes and issues on the political agenda." (Hobson and Lindholm 1997, 479) For these two scholars, ideational processes clearly serve as powerful framing tools in struggles over gender and social policy change. Once again, this discussion of the gender scholarship points to the relationship between ideational processes and categorical inequalities, a major issue that is frequently overlooked in the general ideational literature on policy and politics. By pointing to this key relationship, students of gender and social policy make a strong and original contribution to this ideational literature. The work of sociologist Myra Marx Ferree on the German and the US abortion debates is another fascinating example of how gendered framing processes can play a central role in policy debates. In her comparison between the feminist arguments for abortion rights in Germany and the United States, Marx Ferree convincingly argues that "Although both privacy and protection are part of the feminist repertoire of discourse available to speakers in both countries, they are selectively advantaged differently in each country. In the United States the discursive opportunity structure privileges individual privacy, and in Germany state protection is institutionally anchored in the discourse." (Ferree 2003, 306) Referring to the "institutionally anchored ways of thinking that provide a gradient of relative political acceptability to specific packages of ideas," the concept of discursive opportunity structure is a significant contribution to the ideational scholarship on policy change, as it suggests that framing processes "do not exist in a vacuum." (Ferree 2003, 308–309) Although national cultures are never ideologically cohesive (Quadagno and Street 2005), frames are culturally resonant—and more effective politically—when they draw on a society's dominant cultural repertoire, which forms the symbolic backdrop of national policy debates (Béland 2009). The issue of cultural resonance (Ferree 2003) points to the above-mentioned role of culture in policy development. Through framing processes, political actors can draw on existing cultural resources to promote—or oppose—policy change.

## \*\*\*Links

### Transportation – Generic

#### Transportation reinforces the dominant masculine structure

**Hamilton 1** (Kerry, Professor of Transport Studies @ University of East London, “Gender and Transport in Developed Countries,” January 10, 2012. http://www.cityshelter.org/13\_mobil/03tend.htm) JGG

There are many examples of the role that transport plays in women's efforts to manage the multiple roles they play. Juggling paid and unpaid work as well as the demands of child care, and perhaps also care of adults, places particular time-constraints on women. This can cause great difficulties where public transport services are infrequent and/or unreliable. Getting to appointments and to work on time can be especially difficult. Transport plays a significant role in either exacerbating or ameliorating the relative disadvantage of women. Transport poverty is very evident in many parts of the developed world and this compounds the many other difficulties associated with living on a low income. Poor transport options limit access to employment and social support networks, and to health, recreational and sports facilities, restricting both quality of life and 'life chances'. Transport or the lack of it can impact directly on women's physical and emotional well-being. There are obvious health risks associated with waiting for long periods in inclement weather, particularly for older women, and respiratory problems triggered by traffic pollution and poor air quality. Some of the problems of travelling by public transport affect women's wellbeing by producing strong, negative emotions. Long waits after a tiring day produce frustration and anger. Overcrowding on public transport involves invasion of personal space which many find distressing, and which renders women vulnerable to sexual abuse. Fear of harassment and attack produces high levels of anxiety. All of these, particularly the last, can act as a strong deterrent to women travelling at all. Thanks to recent advances in, for example, psycho-neuroimmunology, it is now widely recognised that emotions can impact on physical as well as mental health. The stresses of travelling can be considerable and serious consideration needs to be given to ways of minimising these. Conversely, when women are dissuaded from travelling by factors such as these and by poor transport availability, there can also be consequences for health and well-being. The ability to 'get out and about' is important for the maintenance of a positive outlook on life. Social relationships are kept healthy through regular social contact. They are a crucial factor for both the mental health of the individual and the 'social capital' of the community. Choice and options In practice women have few travel options or choices open to them. As a general rule, if car transport is available this will be used, whether as a driver or a passenger, in preference to using public transport. There are very few examples in the available literature of genuine choice over mode of personal travel, and even fewer examples where public transport is used in preference to the car because it is cheaper, quicker or more pleasant. As part of a recent UK study, women were questioned about their attitudes and experience of transport, in particular about what stopped them from using public transport. Their responses revealed that their predominantly negative experiences of public transport do not appear in most cases to prevent them from using it. There does however appear to be a significant reduction in actual as opposed to desired journeys for social and recreational purposes, particularly in the evening and more so among women with caring responsibilities and those in older age groups. Examples of what may be termed 'imperatives to car use', were evident and these were of two kinds: first, strong concerns about personal security, for example; and second, the need to ensure safe travel to school for one's children.28 Costs and inconvenience associated with children's journeys to school were also major concerns, but safety was paramount: Although car ownership and use are on the increase among women, there is still an important market for public transport among women. There are many pressures to get and use a car, but research among women indicates that cars are also perceived to have a range of disadvantages and limitations that other competing modes have either low availability, high costs or low attractiveness for women, and that for the great majority cycling and motorbike cycle use are hardly seen as options at all. For many women, walking is still probably the most viable option for shorter journeys. However, rising rates of crimes against the person does nothing to allay women's concerns about personal security. Additionally, often hazardous pedestrian environments and the encumbered nature of many of women's journeys lessen the attractiveness of walking. There remains a strong need for some form of motorised non-private transport in keeping with transport and sustainability criteria to meet women's travel needs.29. In conclusion, the failure to produce transport policies and provision that meet women's needs has exacerbated social exclusion and environmental pollution. Much more research needs to be undertaken to provide a clearer picture of women's lives, their domestic and family responsibilities and their preferred work and leisure patterns, particularly at the local level. This data could then be employed to promote greater awareness among those responsible for transport provision of the extent of gender inequality and more importantly as material to construct a tool to audit 30 all transport plans. A better transport future for women could then be attained if all policy and plans were audited for gender sensitivity.

#### The ability for the government classify by gender discrimatinates

Currah and Mulqueen 11 (Paisley and Tara, Securitizing Gender: Identity, Biometrics, and Transgender Bodies at the Airport , Social Research, 78(2) p.557-582 JGC)

The notion that one's classification as male or female will not change is such a vwdely held belief that gender classification has been part of state practices of recognition since the earliest days of modem state formations (Noiriel 2001). In addition, gender has been a central Securitizing Gender 559 mechanism for the distribution of rights, obligations, and resources, including voting, registration for the draft, and eligility for pensions. States' powers to classify individuals by gender is essential to much state-sponsored discrimination based on sexual orientation; for bans on same-sex marriage to work, officials need to know the gender of the parties appl5âng for marriage licenses. In the United States, an indi- vidual's gender marker as M or F is included on all state-issued identity documents or in records associated with the document. But for people often grouped under the term "transgender," the gender marker on a piece of state-issued ID can be troublesome; a transgender woman presenting herself as female at the airport, might, unlike other women, have an M on her passport. Conversely, someone who looks like a man might show a driver's license with the gender marker of F. While the heightened intensity of such gender scmtiny is new, the problem itself is not; the lack of a neat correlation between an indi- vidual's body, her gender identity and presentation, and the identity document(s) she carries has long posed an obstacle for those whose gender identity does not correspond to social expectations for the gender assigned to them at birth. As Currah points out elsewhere. Sex changes. When some individuals cross borders, walk into a govemment office to apply for benefits, get a driv- er's license, go to prison, sign up for selective service, try to get married, or have any interaction with any arm of the state, the legal sex of some people can and often does switch from male to female, or female to male. To comph- cate matters even more, almost every state agency—from federal to municipal—has the authority to decide its own mies for sex classification. The lack of a uniform standard for classifying people as male or female means that some state agencies will recognize the new gender of people who wish to change their gender and some will not. For most people, this does not appear to be a problem. For others, it is (Currah forthcoming).

#### The aff leads to the creation of construction projects that deny equal opportunities for women

**Masika and Baden 97**

(Rachel and Sally, Professors of Math, Technology, and Science at The Open University, “Infrastructure and Poverty: A Gender Analysis”, Bridge Development, June 1997, http://www.bridge.ids.ac.uk/reports/re51.pdf JGC)

Explanations for gender biases in construction range from patriarchal culture/attitudes, exclusion from training 8, the nature of construction work, the work environment etc. (Shah 1993;Menendez 1991). The development of formal construction trade training, initially through apprenticeship and later through modern vocational training programmes has usually reinforced the exclusion of women from the direct income benefits that construction work generates (UNCHS 1990). Women’s involvement in the construction industry is further constrained by sexual segmentation in the labour force. Wells (1990) points out that women are more likely to be employed in clerical categories, occupying low positions, while men are concentrated in production-related tasks, and in technical and managerial positions.

#### Transportation policies ignore gender differences by assuming everyone is the same

Duchène 2011

(Chantal, Director ChD Mobilité Transport, “France Gender and Transport”; International Transport Forum; March 2011; <http://www.internationaltransportforum.org/jtrc/DiscussionPapers/DP201111.pdf>)

In developed countries, comparative travel studies of men and women tend to show converging patterns of behaviour, notably with regard to possession of a driver’s licence. However, differences still remain due to the fact that women have far more complex programmes of activity. In both North America and Europe, for example, women make more trips, and in chains that are more complex, than those made by men, notably due to the fact that they undertake more non work-related trips. At the same time, their journey-to-work trips are shorter as their area of access to jobs is often smaller due to time constraints and their lesser degree of access to a private car. Because of the complexity of their travel chains and the fact that they have more trips to make, they are more dependent on the car. However, when they have the time, they make greater use of public transport and walking than men for equivalent trips. There are also significant differences between men and women with regard to the means of transport that they use. In all European countries, fewer women than men own or use a car. In Sweden, 70% of cars on the road are owned by men. In France, 60% of men living outside the Paris region only travel by car. With traditionally men working in transport sector, it is therefore not surprising that transport policies have generally favoured car use over public transport, cycling and walking. Decisions regarding transport policy are generally taken by “mature” men, precisely the age group that mainly travels by car. In Europe, women are more dependent than men on public transport networks, of which they make greater use. In France, for example, men only use public transport for 10% of their trips, and two thirds of passengers on public transport networks are women.

#### The aff’s transportation project fails to restructure cities which perpetuates the marginalization of women form daily transportation patterns

**International Transport Forum 11** ( Chantal Duchene, Director General of GART, french association of Public Transport Local Authorities, Economist and lawyer, “Gender and Transport,” May 3, 2011. <http://www.internationaltransportforum.org/jtrc/DiscussionPapers/DP201111.pdf>, JGC)

11.1 Transport infrastructure

In both developed and developing countries, women walk more than men. The existence of paths alongside roads and sidewalks in cities, as well as safe pedestrian crossings, is therefore very important for both safety and comfort. Crossings over waterways for pedestrians also allow trips on foot to be shortened. Moreover, the routes of paths and crossings must be thought out from the standpoint of those travelling on foot to ensure that they are as short as possible. Bus stops and the paths leading to bus stops must also take account of women’s needs and in particular their safety, the issue of lighting being especially important in this respect. The question of safety also arises with regard to the design of car parks in areas where women have access to a private car. 11.2 Transport facilities- 11.2.1 Public transport- The design of transport facilities is very important. Women often have children with them, either in a pushchair or on their back. They are also often loaded down with packets. Access to buses and underground trains must be facilitated, by providing sufficiently wide doors and by avoiding steps; stairs and turnstiles are often difficult to negotiate for somebody accompanied by children and carrying packages. The issue of women’s safety must also be taken into account by providing for a high level of visibility throughout all underground and train carriages and by ensuring that, wherever possible and particularly in developing countries, men and women can travel separately. In developed countries, failure to take account of women’s safety sometimes prompts the latter to prefer private car use to public transport. 11.2.2 Individual transport- In developing countries, intermediate modes such as bicycles, mopeds, rickshaws, etc., must also take account of the specific constraints on women. 11.3 Transport services- Whereas public transport services (public or private public transport, as well as taxis, etc.) are in most cases designed to travel towards the city centre during rush hours, women also need transport services in their local neighbourhood outside rush hours which will allow them to make short, but linked trips. The decentralised organisation of transport, to move services closer to where they are needed, can often help to improve services and thereby improve women’s access to markets, public facilities (schools, health centres, etc.) and jobs. Fares must be set at a level that allows women to access public transport at an affordable price, notably by taking account of the fact that they make series of trips which in most cases call for the use of several tickets. Furthermore, season tickets are usually designed to meet the needs of full-time workers whereas many women work part-time. To take account of safety problems, women should be allowed greater scope to alight closer to their final destination, outside the normal bus stops, in the evening and at night. Awareness campaigns aimed at both bus drivers and passengers should also be promoted to improve women’s safety.

#### The aff is indicative of a form of transportation planning whose masculine roots drive a hegemonic vision

**Bauhardt 4** (Christine, Technical University of Berlin Institute of Urban and Regional Planning, Urban Development and Transportation Infrastructures: Insights from the Ruhr Region, http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CFkQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.ifz.tugraz.at%2FMedia%2FDateien%2FDownloads-IFZ%2FSummer-Academy%2FProceedings-2004%2FUrban-Development-and-Transportation-Infrastructures-Insights-from-the-Ruhr-Region&ei=1bjxT4TdK4is8QS1u4X3DA&usg=AFQjCNETXWV2Zg7c7C1sVijFo3CcG7tCkA JGC )

Instead of addressing small-scale traffic problems, transportation planners offer complicated yet elegant technological solutions. The construction of highways and rapid transit trains, which takes priority over the infrastructures of slow-moving traffic, does not correspond with the mobility needs of the majority of the population, but is instead a field for technicians and engineers to earn their reputations. As I studied the publications that praised the construction of the transportation infrastructure in the Ruhr region, I was truly surprised by the enthusiasm with which these “daring” and “clever” men – technicians, engineers, and construction workers – were described (see Bauhardt 1995, p. 120 ff.). Technology, in particular complicated but elegant technological solutions, contributes to the reproduction of masculine stereotypes. Yet, what transportation planning really needs in the place of complicated and extremely expensive engineering is intelligent organization. To achieve this, one first needs to understand the gendered organization of time and space in the urban setting. The most important traffic problems emerge in the organization of everyday life. Intelligent solutions are therefore more often found through organizational rather than technological means. A strictly technical understanding tends to accelerate time and overcome space. Time and space are perceived as economic resources: acceleration aims to save time and overcome space, so that mobility becomes “as fast as possible and as far as possible.” The historical development of transportation infrastructure in the Ruhr region clearly demonstrates this. Overcoming long distances with the fastest possible means of transportation has long been and still is understood as an efficient way to organize transportation and as an appropriate means of measuring a population’s mobility. Increasing the distances travelled was an explicit goal of the regional planning: “The future image of transportation in the Ruhr region will be very different from that of today. The new possibilities for transportation, in conjunction with the realization of regional planning goals, will lead to greater mobility for people, greater commuting distances, and ultimately to a new distribution among means of transportation” (SVR 1970, p.55). The new distribution of transportation means brought about an increased use of private passenger cars, while environmentally friendly forms of mobility, in particular the number of pedestrian paths, were reduced. Starting from the premise that mobility is a result of the relationship between distance and acceleration, the political concept of decentralized concentration (Siedlungsschwerpunktekonzept) comes to the following conclusion: “As a result of the considerably increased speed of transportation, the distances that will be travelled in the future will be on average much greater than they are today” (SVR 1970, p.56). In the daily organization of their lives, women combine through time and space the productive and reproductive spheres of life. Their model of mobility can be described as a combination of usually shorter trips or travel sequences. Such an integration of activities in time and space is the basis for a qualitative understanding of mobility, which examines the reasons for the need to be mobile as opposed to the quantitative concept of mobility, which merely calculates the amount of human tonnage that can be moved how far in how much time. A feminist perspective in transportation research and planning perceives time and space less as economic resources than as social categories. This approach raises the issue of re-appropriating time and space as prerequisites for communication and an improvement in the quality of life in the city. In my opinion, these are absolutely essential conditions for a sustainable planning of urban development and transportation systems.

### Transportation – Public Transportation

#### Public Transportation fails to address gender, causes separation

**Hamilton 1**, (Kerry, Professor of Transport Studies, “Gender and Transport in Developed Countries,”January 10, 2012. http://www.cityshelter.org/13\_mobil/03tend.htm, JGC)

We do not believe or assume that all women are the same, or that they feel the same about public transport. This is manifestly not so. However, there are sufficiently significant differences between women's transport demands and experiences, as opposed to those of men-differences in access to private transport, in patterns of commuting and employment, in child-care and elder-care responsibilities, in basic attitudes to private and public transport-to justify treating women separately. Within that group 'women' there are highly important distinctions which depend-for example-upon income, age, household, elder- and child-care responsibilities, ethnicity, employment status, degree of disability, location, class and education The particular balance among these will vary from country to country and area to area, and it is therefore essential for policy makers and transport operators to gather information locally in line with best gender balancing practice in order to understand the characteristics of women. This paper draws on data from Sweden, UK and the USA to demonstrate the widespread nature of inequality of access for women in the developed world and highlight the importance of the role played by transport in women's lives and its potential for ameliorating or exacerbating some of the structural disadvantages associated with women's roles. Demographic profile The world's fifth richest economy, the UK, has a population of 29.9 million women compared with 28.8 million men. Women make up 51% of the population. However, men outnumber women until they reach their mid-forties, when the numbers become more or less equal. For those aged 85 and over, there are 3 women to every man. 56% of women in Britain are married; 5% are cohabiting; 18% are single; 14% are widowed; 6% are divorced and 2% are separated. Over two fifths (43%) of women of working age in the UK have dependent children. One in five (21%) of these women is a lone parent.1 In Sweden, 46% of a total population of over 8 million are women. Figures for 1994, show that 28% of the population were living in single adult households and the majority of the population, some 72%, were cohabiting. Within this group, 39% of the population lived in cohabiting households with children and 33% lived in cohabiting households without children. Of single person households, 6% had children and the majority of these were headed by women. In the US the fastest growing households is amongst single parent families. Between 1974-94 the total number of US families increased over 17% and the number of families headed by a cohabiting married couple fell by more than 10%. Families headed by a lone female parent now account for almost a quarter of all American families. Over the three decades since 1960 the percentage of children living with just one parent tripled. In 1990 around 22% of all children lived in single women households.

### Transportation – Airports

#### Transgender people are discriminated against at airports

Currah and Mulqueen 11(Paisley and Tara, Securitizing Gender: Identity, Biometrics, and Transgender Bodies at the Airport , Social Research, 78(2) p.557-582 JGC)

As it happened. Cross was not directed to walk through the body imaging scanner that day. But when travelers do get whole body scans or undergo intensive pat downs (touching breast and genital areas), in some cases TSA agents are seeing in the image or feeling in the pat down things they do not expect to be there—male genitalia on female travelers, or breasts on male travelers. They are also not seeing or feeling things they do expect to be there: men without penises, women without breasts. These atypically gendered bodies tend to trigger security responses. A letter written to the head of the TSA from three trans- gender advocacy groups describes incidents that have been reported to them. They document one case, for example, in which a "male trans- gender attorney was detained for two hours on his way to an out-of- town court hearing by TSA agents because his intimate anatomy, as indicated by a whole-body image scan and a subsequent pat down, did not conform to agents' expectations of what a man's body should look or feel like." During his detention, he "was subjected to humiliating personal questions and comments" about the history of his body and his identify. But that's not all: a bomb appraisal unit was called in to evaluate him as a potential threat. Eventually, he was allowed to board a later flight. But he was advised to carry "a physician's letter regarding 564 social research his transgender status whenever he flies" so that the situation could be resolved more quickly the next time (Keisling et al. 2010). For transgender individuals, unfortunately, these are not isolated events (see, for example, Kirkup 2009).^ In fact, when Currah mentioned to a friend that he was working on this article, the friend revealed that the same thing had happened to him; after walldng through the body scanner, and then undergoing an "enhanced" pat down, he was taken to a small room where agents announced they had found a "gonadal anomaly" that had to be investigated as a potential threat to the secu- rity of the airplane before he could board. For other transgender people, the fear of gender-based interrogation is so great that they have chosen not to fly. According to Katherine Rachlin, a clinical psychologist and member of the board of directors of the World Professional Association for Transgender Health, The full-body scanners became news long before they were actually used in local airports and were a major topic in therapy. Patients anticipated that they would be publicly outed by screeners who saw that there was a mismatch between a person's documents and presentation and their body parts. . . . Patients had increased anxiety and even panic attacks just contemplating the possibilities. Those prone to depression went deeper into depression as their option to travel was taken away (Rachlin 2011). In describing the anomalies and uncertainties that emerge in the ways that gender has been securitized at the airport, we are not suggest- ing that these particular events, however distressing to the traveler, are comparable to the gross injustices done to some peoples, individuals, and bodies in the name of national security (nor do we mean to imply that there is no overlap between transgender individuals and victims of intensified surveillance and racial profiling) (Queers for Economic Justice 2010). Indeed, the proliferation of sites where individuals can be stopped, searched, and required to verify their identity—as part of Securitizing Gender 565 the "war on terror" or as a consquence of federal and state initiatives to identify, locate, and deport "illegal aliens"—only amplifies the impor- tance of examining the production and policing of legal identify. Nikolas Rose and Mariana Valverde suggest that there is much to be learned from drilling down into the apparently more "minor, mundane . . . meticulous and detailed work of regulatory apparatuses" (Rose and Valverde 1998: 550). We have followed that suggestion in producing this very granular analysis of confiicts over gender classification in the U.S. airpori.

### Transportation – Ports

#### Maritime is inherently masculine, causing discrepancies within the system

**Ransley 5** (Jesse, writer for World Archaeology, “Boats Are for Boys: Queering Maritime Archaeology” World Archaeology, 37(4) p.621-629 JGC)

Not surprisingly then, the practice of maritime archaeology is similarly androcentric. We make interpretations about male objects and our analysis leans heavily if not entirely towards the masculine. There is not so crude a rule as 'women cannot be maritime archaeologists, or sailors or boat builders', but what is evident is that when women undertake such activities they are undertaking male activities. Put simply, boats are for boys. If ever there was a sub-discipline of archaeology blithely and unquestioningly constructing the world, past and present, in terms of contemporary, Western notions of male and female, it is maritime archaeology. The dominant narrative that prescribes the business of boats and the sea as male can be isolated and traced; it can be explored and its component parts laid out. It is obvious in Western maritime art, and it is also highlighted in our discourse of anomalous females. If 'queering' is questioning the dominant narrative, then the narrative of maritime archaeology, drawing on Western, modern constructions of gender, as well as the gendering of maritime activity as male, is ripe for queering. In this paper I show how these constructs are evident in maritime archaeology's interpretations and reconstruction, but also I argue that this dominant narrative is evident in the development of our discipline, in our techniques, in our dominant theoretical frameworks and our prevailing interpretative narratives. In short, it pervades all that we are interested in: what we do, how we do it and how we started doing it. I suggest that a failure to recognize this supposed universal truth about man and woman and the sea as our construct, as our world-view, means we ignore the possibilities of other ways to be male, female, or to be maritime. Consequently, our constructions of past maritime cultures, and also of maritime activities, are limited. We miss the potential of meanings more complex, more diverse and less rigid. It is not simply that we might not be telling the whole story, but more importantly that we are not even looking for other possibilities because we are not aware that these other possibilities exist. I conclude my paper by arguing that, by failing to explore, or even challenge, the masculist character of maritime archaeology, maritime archaeologists are in fact contributing to their own marginalization within the discipline of archaeology. Moreover the marginalization of maritime archaeology is a loss to the archaeological project as a whole, because maritime archaeology represents a vast, largely untapped source of different data about the past.

### Mobility

#### Gender is spatially produced-mobility and place

**Uteng an Cresswell 8** (Tanu Priya, Research Fellow in the Department of Civil and Transport Engineering-Norway, and Tim Cresswell, Professor in the Department of Geography at Royal Holloway-UK, “Gendered Mobilities”, http://books.google.com/books?id=g1mHrOAHHGwC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\_ge\_summary\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false , page 2) LL

There are many ways in which gender is spatially produced. Perhaps the most commented on is the binary of public and private which has been mapped on to masculine and feminine, man and woman, in clearly delineated ways and been brought into question by any number of feminist theories. Here gender is defined at least in part, spatially – through a geographical image. Another key spatial coding for gender, and the one that lies at the heart of this book, is the dialects of fixity and flow — of place and mobility. By mobility we mean not only geographical movement but also the potential for undertaking movements (mobility) as it is lived and experienced—movement and motility plus meaning plus power. Understanding mobility thus means understanding observable physical movement, the meanings that such movements are encoded with, the experience of practicing these movements and the potential for undertaking these movements. Each of these aspects of mobility—movement, meaning, practice and potential—has histories and geographies of gendered difference. Each of these is in some way constructed in a gendered way and each, in turn, contributes to the production, reproduction and contestation of gender itself. How people move (where, how fast, how often etc.) is demonstrably gendered and continues to reproduce gendered power hierarchies. The meanings give to mobility through narrative, discourse and representation have also been clearly differentiated by gender. Similarly, narratives of mobility and immobility play a central role in the constitution of gender as social and cultural construct. Finally, mobilities are experienced and practiced differently. Acquiring mobility is often analogous to a struggle for acquiring new subjectivity. This reality is in a continuous state of flux, leading to the changing of contours in the relationships between gender, mobilities and shifting subjectivity. Consider just a few of the arenas in which gender and mobilities intersect.

### Fem IR

#### International politics is a masculinized world that diminishes peace by emphasizing power and competition

**Tickner 92** (J. Ann., Professor at School of International Relations-USC, “Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security, Engendered Insecurities”, Columbia University Press. Online http://www.ciaonet.org/book/tickner/tickner12.html) LL

As Eleanor Roosevelt and countless others have observed, international politics is a man's world. It is a world inhabited by diplomats, soldiers, and international civil servants most of whom are men. Apart from the occasional head of state, there is little evidence to suggest that women have played much of a role in shaping foreign policy in any country in the twentieth century. In the United States in 1987, women constituted less than 5 percent of the senior Foreign Service ranks, and in the same year, less than 4 percent of the executive positions in the Department of Defense were held by women. [1](http://www.ciaonet.org/book/tickner/tickner12.html#note1)Although it is true that women are underrepresented in all top-level government positions in the United States and elsewhere, they encounter additional difficulties in positions having to do with international politics. The following stories can help us to understand why. Before the superpower summit in Geneva in 1985, Donald Regan, then White House chief of staff, told a Washington Post reporter that women would not understand the issues at stake at that meeting. As reported in the Boston Globe of October 10, 1985, Regan claimed that women are "not... going to understand [missile] throw-weights or what is happening in Afghanistan or what is happening in human rights. ... Some women will, but most women... would rather read the human interest stuff of what happened." Protesting Regan's remarks, feminists cited women's prominent roles in the various peace movements of the twentieth century as evidence of their competency in international affairs. [2](http://www.ciaonet.org/book/tickner/tickner12.html#note2) When Bella Abzug entered the House of Representatives in 1972, she claimed that ending the war in Vietnam was the most important item on the congressional agenda and the one on which she most wanted to work as the representative of the many women and men in her district who opposed the war. With this goal in mind, Abzug requested a seat on the House Armed Services Committee, a committee on which, in 1972, no woman had served in the past twenty-two years. Abzug's request was denied by members of the House leadership, one of whom suggested that the Agriculture Committee would be more appropriate. In her account of this incident, Abzug notes that, of the twelve women in the House of Representatives in 1972, five were assigned to the Education and Labor Committee, evidence that suggests that women in politics are channeled into certain arenas of public policy that are perceived as "women's issues." [3](http://www.ciaonet.org/book/tickner/tickner12.html#note3) Each of these stories reinforces the belief, widely held in the United States and throughout the world by both men and women, that military and foreign policy are arenas of policy-making least appropriate for women. Strength, power, autonomy, independence, and rationality, all typically associated with men and masculinity, are characteristics we most value in those to whom we entrust the conduct of our foreign policy and the defense of our national interest. Those women in the peace movements, whom feminist critics of Donald Regan cited as evidence for women's involvement in international affairs, are frequently branded as naive, weak, and even unpatriotic. When we think about the definition of a patriot, we generally think of a man, often a soldier who defends his homeland, most especially his women and children, from dangerous outsiders. (We sometimes even think of a missile or a football team.) The Schroeder story suggests that even women who have experience in foreign policy issues are perceived as being too emotional and too weak for the tough life-and-death decisions required for the nation's defense. Weakness is always considered a danger when issues of national security are at stake: the president's dual role as commander in chief reinforces our belief that qualities we associate with "manliness" are of utmost importance in the selection of our presidents. The few women who do make it into the foreign policy establishment often suffer from this negative perception: Jeane Kirkpatrick is one such example. Attracted by her authoritative and forceful public style and strong anticommunist rhetoric, Ronald Reagan appointed Kirkpatrick as ambassador to the United Nations in 1981. Yet in spite of the visibility she achieved due to her strong stance against anti-American voices at the United Nations, Kirkpatrick complained of not being taken seriously by her peers both in the United Nations and in the U.S. foreign policy establishment. Although other American ambassadors to the United Nations have also complained that they lack influence over U.S. foreign policy-making, Kirkpatrick specifically attributed this lack of respect to her sex: describing herself to one reporter as a "mouse in a man's world," Kirkpatrick claimed that her views were seldom listened to and that she failed to have any effect whatsoever on the course of American foreign policy. [5](http://www.ciaonet.org/book/tickner/tickner12.html#note5)

#### International law denies women a sense of self-leaders speak for them

**Johnstone 9** (Rachael, Law @ U of Akureyri Iceland, Chicago-Kent Journal of International and Comparative Law, p. 43, http://www.genderandsecurity.umb.edu/Feminist%20Theory%20and%20Gender%20%20Studies%20Archive.pdf ) LL

Hand in hand with the liberalization of the market in the post-intervention economies comes the further reification of the public/private dichotomies long criticized by feminists in Western democracies, as women (and violence against them) are considered non-political. Women are effectively excluded from positions of governance in Afghanistan and Iraq, and similarly have been largely excluded in negotiations between competing factions.207 The (male) self-declared leaders are presumed to speak for all and women’s rights become a matter of relative cultural values.208 This is self-determination of a highly selective “self.” Violence against women qua women is considered a matter of domestic law, and when domestic process fails to take it seriously, no questions are raised by the state’s allies about the legitimacy of the government or its sovereign inviolability.209 Despite changes in the language of state responsibility, little has changed for women since the “liberation” of Kuwait from the oppressive Iraqi invader in 1991, after which Kuwaiti women remained disenfranchised from the electoral process and foreign women found themselves targets of sexual violence by Kuwaiti men, often ostensibly under color of state authority.210

#### The affirmative is rooted in attempts at masculine action – their focus on transportation infrastructure investment ultimately subverts the feminine tendencies in International Relations.

**Duncanson and Eschle 8** (Claire and Catherine, U of Edinburgh and U of Strathclyde, New Political Science 30(4), p. 560) LL

Nonetheless, the British state is, and must be, capable of decisive action. Such capability is central to Realist understandings of the state and shot through with masculine associations in contrast to feminised passivity and succumbing to constraint. Thus active verb constructions and descriptions of decisive action predominate throughout the text. The foreword and executive summary, for example, mention repeatedly that “we believe” and “we have decided.”90 Even when the state is doing nothing, or reducing its stockpile, it is actively choosing to do so: “we decided not to take an option . . . We will reduce . . . we have not conducted . . . we have increased our transparency . . . we have ceased production . . . We continue to make progress.”91 There is also an overt emphasis on avoiding inaction or constraint. “[O]ur capacity to act” must “not be constrained by nuclear blackmail by others,”92 “we must not allow such states to . . . deter us and the international community from taking the action required . . . or fundamentally constrain our policy options.”93 The possibility of a “dormant” nuclear weapons capability cannot be entertained, the capability must be “active” and also “credible.”94 The need for British nuclear weapons capacity to be “credible” is emphasised at several points so even if we do not act, it must be possible that we can, and others must believe that we can.

#### International norms are masculine.

**Tickner 1** (J. Ann, prof at the School of International Relations-USC, “Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post–Cold War Era”, p. 124) JM

World-order and normative IR theorists have challenged us to think about the meaning of democracy beyond its narrow statist form. They have argued that a true “democratic peace” cannot be built on exclusive forms of national democracy but must be conceptualized in global terms. Drawing on feminist literatures in democratic theory and empirical examinations of the experiences of states that have recently undergone democratic transitions, IR feminists have reanalyzed democratization and exposed its gender biases. They have also pointed out that the norms and rules upon which Western democracy has been built and that have been carried up into international organizations are gendered. Universalist claims embodied in such international norms as human rights are based on male definitions of rights. Although not normally included in conventional IR agendas, democratization at all levels, from the local to the global, has been central to IR feminist analyses. In calling for a form of democracy that dismantles oppressive social hierarchies, feminists have begun to build models of democracy that rethink the state and its international security policies.

#### International law continues the subordination of women because it does not require action in the face of abuse

**Chinkin 99** (Christine, Int Law @ U of London, A Critique of the Public/Private Dimension, European Journal of International Law, p. 392) LL

The feminist critique also has particular resonance in international law. Because the state does not incur responsibility for violations committed within the private sector, it can ignore the continued subordination of women in that arena. Thus, domestic violence against women can be designated as a private wrong, an individual matter that is outside international scrutiny. The tradition of viewing sexual conduct as private allows sexual abuse by public officials, such as prison officials or police officers, also to be readily discounted as not coming within their official duties. Failure by a state to investigate and punish such matters is a continuation of the exclusion of family/private life even from domestic legal intervention and thus far from international accountability. Similarly, treatment of domestic foreign maids within foreign states can be factored out from international law. Diplomatic protection of aliens was the historic starting point for the formulation of principles of state responsibility and the basis for the differentiation between ultra vires acts of officials for which there is responsibility because of their apparent authority, and the private acts of individuals for which there is no responsibility. The employment of foreign maids falls within both of these areas: their household work is private and often concealed from domestic legal regulation and their employment, even by government officials, is not in that capacity. Yet their employment abroad is of major economic significance to many sending states and supported by receiving states. Their widespread abuse in many states is not private, but systemic, it is upheld by government policies that fail to enquire about their treatment or to offer protection against known abuses, and as such should engage state responsibility.

### Realism

#### Realism encourages gender binaries and sides with masculinity

**Duncanson and Eschle 8** (Claire and Catherine, U of Edinburgh and U of Strathclyde, “Gender and the Nuclear Weapons State: A Feminist Critique of the British Government’s White Paper on Trident”, page. 6) LL

As this quote indicates, the Realist state is a ‘manly state’ (Hooper, 2000). We can see here the systematic mobilising of gendered dichotomies such as active/passive, independent/(inter)dependent, and rational/irrational, and the assumption that the state fits with the masculine side of the dichotomies. Needless to say, the model of rationality James describes has been critiqued by countless feminist philosophers. Proponents of this model are accused of neglecting social context, both in terms of the domestic labour and relationships that make the processes of rational decision making possible, and in terms of the consequences of the rational decisions made. As Jacqui True points out, ‘[r]ational thinkers such as men and states do not figure in their cost-benefit analyses of foreign policies (military build-up, war mobilisation, economic liberalisation or protection), the social costs that are borne by ‘private’ family-households and communities’ (True, 2001: 249, 255-6). In addition, proponents of this model of rationality are criticised for evacuating emotional and ethical dimensions of thought, historically gendered feminine, as highlighted in our discussion above about the limitations of technonuclear discourse.

#### Realism is destructive because it inherently excludes women’s perspectives and encourages amoral and violent behavior.

**Tickner 92** (J. Ann., Professor at School of International Relations-USC, “Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security, Engendered Insecurities”, Columbia University Press. Online http://www.ciaonet.org/book/tickner/tickner12.html) LL

In the face of what is generally perceived as a dangerous international environment, states have ranked national security high in terms of their policy priorities. According to international relations scholar Kenneth Waltz, the state conducts its affairs in the "brooding shadow of violence," and therefore war could break out at any time. [1](http://www.ciaonet.org/book/tickner/tickner13.html#note1)In the name of national security, states have justified large defense budgets, which take priority over domestic spending, military conscription of their young adult male population, foreign invasions, and the curtailment of civil liberties. The security of the state is perceived as a core value that is generally supported unquestioningly by most citizens, particularly in time of war. While the role of the state in the twentieth century has expanded to include the provision of domestic social programs, national security often takes precedence over the social security of individuals. When we think about the provision of national security we enter into what has been, and continues to be, an almost exclusively male domain. While most women support what they take to be legitimate calls for state action in the interests of international security, the task of defining, defending, and advancing the security interests of the state is a man's affair, a task that, through its association with war, has been especially valorized and rewarded in many cultures throughout history. As Simone de Beauvoir's explanation for male superiority suggests, giving one's life for one's country has been considered the highest form of patriotism, but it is an act from which women have been virtually excluded. While men have been associated with defending the state and advancing its international interests as soldiers and diplomats, women have typically been engaged in the "ordering" and "comforting" roles both in the domestic sphere, as mothers and basic needs providers, and in the caring professions, as teachers, nurses, and social workers. [2](http://www.ciaonet.org/book/tickner/tickner13.html#note2) The role of women with respect to national security has been ambiguous: defined as those whom the state and its men are protecting, women have had little control over the conditions of their protection. I shall begin this chapter by examining the contemporary realist analysis of national security, concentrating on the work of Hans Morgenthau and Kenneth Waltz, two scholars of international relations whom I define in chapter 1 as a classical realist and a neorealist, respectively. [3](http://www.ciaonet.org/book/tickner/tickner13.html#note3) I shall also discuss some of the ideas of Thomas Hobbes and Niccolò Machiavelli, Western political theorists whose writings have had an important influence on contemporary realism. Of all the academic approaches to international relations, political realism is most closely associated with the world view of foreign policy practitioners, particularly national security specialists. Realists have concentrated their investigations on the activities of the great powers: therefore my discussion in this section will be drawn mainly from the experiences of the great powers, particularly the contemporary United States with whose activities realists are centrally concerned. For realists, security is tied to the military security of the state. Given their pessimistic assumptions about the likely behavior of states in an "anarchic" international environment, most realists are skeptical about the possibility of states ever achieving perfect security. In an imperfect world, where many states have national security interests that go beyond self-preservation and where there is no international government to curb their ambitions, realists tell us that war could break out at any time because nothing can prevent it. Consequently, they advise, states must rely on their own power capabilities to achieve security. The best contribution the discipline of international relations can make to national security is to investigate the causes of war and thereby help to design "realistic" policies that can prolong intervals of peace. Realists counsel that morality is usually ineffective in a dangerous world: a "realistic" understanding of amoral and instrumental behavior, characteristic of international politics, is necessary if states are not to fall prey to others' ambitions.

### Nuclear War

#### Weapons Discourse of nuclear weapons supports masculinity

Duncanson and Eschle 8 (Claire and Catherine, U of Edinburgh and U of Strathclyde, “Gender and the Nuclear Weapons State: A Feminist Critique of the British Government’s White Paper on Trident”, page. 3) LL

We begin our examination of feminist arguments about gender and the nuclear weapons state by looking at accounts of the way in which elites talk about nuclear weapons technology. On this point, feminists have long highlighted the way that the political and military power associated with nuclear weapons is linked metaphorically with sexual potency and masculinity. This linkage is neither arbitrary nor trivial: sexual metaphors are a way of mobilising gendered associations in order to create excitement about, support for and identification with both the weapons and the political regime possessing them (Cohn, Hill and Ruddick, 2005). Thus feminist histories of the development of the nuclear arms race in the decades after World War Two demonstrate the extent to which it was a race to prove masculine prowess, fuelled by ‘missile’ envy (Caldicott, 1984; Easlea, 1983), with the nuclear weapons of the Cold War superpowers ‘wheeled out like monumental phalluses’ on parade (Cockburn, 2001). Such imagery has proved seductive to governments across time and space. Thus when India exploded five nuclear devices in May 1998, Hindu nationalist leader Balashaheb Thakeray argued that ‘[w]e have to prove that we are not eunuchs’ and Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee was portrayed in a newspaper cartoon as propping up his coalition with a nuclear bomb, captioned ‘Made with Viagra’ (cited in Cohn, Hill and Ruddick, 2005: 4). Indeed, as Indian novelist Arundhati Roy has commented: Reading the papers, it was often hard to tell when people were referring to Viagra (which was competing for second place on the front pages) and when they were talking about the bomb – ‘We have superior strength and potency.’ (Roy, 1999: 136) Similar language permeates the nuclear discourse of the military and defence industry. In her ground-breaking study of the discourse of American defence intellectuals who formulate nuclear weapon policy, Cohn noted that sexualised metaphors, phallic imagery and the promise of sexual domination thrived (Cohn, 1987: 687-8). Lectures were dominated by discussion of: vertical erector launchers, thrust-to-weight ratios, soft lay downs, deep penetration, and the comparative advantages of protracted versus spasm attacks—or what one military adviser to the National Security Council has called ‘releasing 70 to 80 percent of our megatonnage in one orgasmic whump’.

#### Perception of “unmanly”

Duncanson and Eschle 8 (Claire and Catherine, U of Edinburgh and U of Strathclyde, “Gender and the Nuclear Weapons State: A Feminist Critique of the British Government’s White Paper on Trident”, page. 3) LL

Fear of emasculation, of being made or perceived to be ‘unmanly’, also underpins the tendency of defence intellectuals to talk about nuclear weapons in a highly ‘abstract, euphemistic and acronym-ridden language’ (Cohn, 1989: 156), as evident in such bland descriptors as ‘collateral damage’, ‘damage limitation weapon’ and ‘clean bombs’. This way of talking, which Cohn labels ‘technostrategic’, leaves out ‘the emotional, the concrete, the particular, human bodies and their vulnerability, human lives and their subjectivity—all of which are marked [as] feminine’ (Cohn, Hill and Ruddick, 2005: 5). For a member of the defence community to speak of such things would mean they risk being discredited and disempowered in the male-dominated world in which they operate. Conversely, ignoring such things helps defence intellectuals insulate themselves from the realities and consequences of their work.

#### Gender allow us to form our own ideas of nuclear weapons

Duncanson and Eschle 8 (Claire and Catherine, U of Edinburgh and U of Strathclyde, “Gender and the Nuclear Weapons State: A Feminist Critique of the British Government’s White Paper on Trident”, page. 1) LL

What is gender? Feminists now offer multiple and sometimes conflicting accounts of this key concept (see, e.g., Squires, 1999: ch. 2; Marshall, 2000). Following Carol Cohn, perhaps the most important writer on gender and nuclear weapons, we want to emphasise three dimensions here (Cohn, Hill and Ruddick, 2005: 1-3). Firstly, gender as a category helps us understand the ways in which individual (and collective) identity is socially constructed around and through assumptions about male/female sexual difference, or the categories of masculinity and femininity. Secondly, gender is ‘a way of structuring relations of power’ (Cohn, Hill and Ruddick, 2005: 1), one which most feminists agree ‘shows constancy in assigning greater value to that which is associated with masculinity and lesser value to that associated with femininity … the terms are not independent but form a hierarchical (unequal) relation’ (Peterson and Runyan, 1993: 7). Thirdly, ‘gender also functions as a symbolic system: our ideas about gender permeate and shape our ideas about many other aspects of society beyond male-female relations—including politics, weapons, and warfare’ (Cohn, Hill and Ruddick, 2005: 2). This means that discourses about nuclear weapons, amongst other things, are infused with a series of conceptual dichotomies which flow from and underpin the primary signifiers of masculine/feminine, with the masculine side of the dichotomy favoured over the feminine.

### Security

#### Discourse of security is instigated by ‘hyper-masculinized protectors’

Duncanson and Eschle 8 (Claire and Catherine, U of Edinburgh and U of Strathclyde, “Gender and the Nuclear Weapons State: A Feminist Critique of the British Government’s White Paper on Trident”, page. 5) LL

Moreover, feminists and others have pointed out that security discourse involves an enforced linkage between the protector and protected in the face of an external threat. For Stiehm this functions to mask the fact that the biggest danger to the protected may actually not come from outside the state but from the hyper-masculinised protectors themselves (Stiehm, 1982: 368, 373-4; Tickner, 1997: 627). More recent poststructuralist-influenced work has made this relationship between the state and an external threat in Realist thought, or between state identity and ‘the Other’, central to their analyses. Although ‘the Other’ may seem radically different from ‘us’, for poststructuralists, it is our understanding of the Other which in part constitutes the self (Hansen, 2006). As feminists then point out, the self-other dichotomy frequently has gendered, as well as sexualised and racialised, dimensions. That the Other is frequently feminised, serving to underpin a masculine or hyper-masculine response, can be seen in examples ranging from colonial conceptions of virgin territories populated by compliant, exotic populations, to the treatment of prisoners at Abu Ghraib (Enloe, 2000: 46-51; Goldstein, 2001: 356; Kaufman-Osborn, 2005). Alternatively, ‘the Other’ may be portrayed as having a deficient, gross masculinity in contrast to the rationality and restraint of ‘ourselves’ (Zalewski and Enloe, 1996: 291-293). Thus different kinds of masculinities may be mobilised in security discourses, serving to differentiate a particular state government in the eyes of its population from its enemies and legitimate its protector role.

#### The aff’s discourse imbues international politics with masculine norms- the focus on strategies for ensuring security deny the potential to challenge the patriarchal norms of the Political

Blanchard, 3(Eric M., School of IR-USC, “Gender, International Relations, and the Development of Feminist Security Theory”,) LL

National security discourses are typically part of the elite world of the masculine high politics. Statesmen, diplomats, and the military conduct the business of states, and too often war, imbuing the relations and processes of the society of nation-states with an atmosphere seemingly devoid of women and an interest in issues of concern to women. The academic discipline charged with theorizing this world, international re­lations (IR), has only recently made a place for feminist analysis, and then only grudgingly. Academic feminism and IR are contemporaries, each developing through the war-torn twentieth century and motivated by some of the same international events, although work in IR often over­looks women's contributions, such as the 1919 International Congress of Women, which ran parallel to Versailles (Grant 1992, 86). While in some respects estranged from the mainstream of IR, feminist and gender schol­ars have launched an important critique of the core issues of the discipline: war, peace, and the quest to secure the boundaries of the nation-state. In a rapidly changing, post-9/11 world, feminist voices must be heard if the international system is to achieve a more comprehensive security in the face of terror networks, technowar, and mounting civilian casualties. The term security itself has been wrought with ambiguity and has re­cently taken on the status of an essentially contested concept in the dis­cipline. Within international relations, discussions of international security traditionally revolve around issues of war and peace in an international system of sovereign and self-interested nation-states, with a particular fo­cus on issues of military strategy. In this view, the provision of security is entrusted to the state, with the assumption that states protect and secure the members of the political community from threats emanating from the dangerous, foreign realm outside state boundaries. However, feminists and other critical scholars have started to inquire into the meaning of this concept by asking just who is being secured by security policies? Against the illusion of total security, feminists contest the possibility of a perfectly controlled, coherent security policy that could handle every international contingency. Security for women struggling with everyday patriarchy, as Christine Sylvester observes, "is always partial . . . elusive and mundane" (1994, 183).

### Gendered Language

#### He/man language promotes male imagery at the expense of women.

Spender 91 (Dale, Feminist scholar, Man Made Language) LL

Through the introduction of he/man, males were able to take another step in ensuring that the thought of reality of our society is that the males become foreground while the females become the blurred and often indecipherable background. He/man makes males linguistically visible and females linguistically invisible. It promotes male imagery in everyday life at the expense of female imagery so that it seems reasonable to assume the world is male until proven otherwise. It reinforces the belief of the dominant group, that they, males, are the universal, the central, important category so that even those who are not member of the dominate group learn to accept this reality. It predisposes us to see more male in the world we inhabit, so that we can, for example, project male images on our past and allow females to go unnoticed; we can construct our theories of the past, including evolutionary ones, formulating explanations that are consistent only with the male experience. He/man also makes women outsiders, and are not just metaphorically. Through the use of he/man women cannot take their existence for granted: they must certainly seek self confirmation so that they are included in the human species.

## \*\*\*Impacts

### War

#### Patriarchy makes the impacts of the 1ac inevitable- only the alternative’s divestment from masculine political thought can avert extinction of the human race

**della-Madre 11**(Leslene, psychology degree form the University of California, The Role Patriarchy Plays in Our Contemporary World Situation, No Date, , http://www.midwifingdeath.com/musings/patriarchy\_in\_our\_world.html , JGC)

For the last 5000 years the global rule of men, or patriarchy, has wreaked havoc and destructive chaos on earth and all her children. This grievous fact is hardly noticed by anyone in our species other than those who are victimized by it-women and children. And even then, those who suffer at the hands of male rule are often blamed for that which is inflicted upon them. We very often hear about injustices of racism, oppression, and classism. While these are certainly cultural and social priority issues, we almost never hear of the injustices of sexism, from which all other "isms" spring, and the misogynist foundations of patriarchal structure and hierarchy that create the unspeakably abusive state of dominance, or power-over. The paradigm of power-over affects every aspect of our being-spiritual, mental, emotional, psychic, biological, psychological, environmental and cultural. This [topic](http://www.midwifingdeath.com/musings/patriarchy_in_our_world.html) is immense, and it is beyond the scope of this article to explore all the effects of patriarchy on our contemporary world situation. I will therefore touch on a few salient points to hopefully inspire further inquiry. From this writer's point of view, patriarchy is the root of the world's problems-i.e., war, colonization, rape, sexism, racism, destruction of the environment, so-called "domestic" violence, terrorism, pornography, sexual slavery, kids killing kids, fascism, religious fanaticism, and homophobia, to name a few. I am not afraid to say that while it may sound simplistic that I state patriarchy as the problem, it is simply the problem. According to pioneer authors in feminist spirituality and women's culture, Monica Sjoo and Barbara Mor, patriarchy is disconnection from cosmic oneness. Male rule without the values of female wisdom is completely and unequivocally insane. It can't get much more simple than that. Because women birth all life, it only follows that maternal values would maintain and nurture [the community](http://www.midwifingdeath.com/musings/patriarchy_in_our_world.html), which they did in matrifocaled cultures around the world for millennia, and still do in some existing matriarchates, as in the cultures of the Mosuo in China, the Minangkabau in Sumatra and the Berber in Tunisia. Without this very basic structure for life to thrive, destructive chaos and an ever-growing narcissism reign, which is what we experience in patriarchy in many forms. I have named the cold, isolated and desperate mind-set that has emerged from this condition, the patriarchal mind-set, or "pms." Citing the amazing Devi-Mahatmya, the epic myth depicting awesome female power from 400 CE India, author Ajrit Mookerjee writes, " It is said that Kali sprang forth from the brow of the Great Goddess Durga to annihilate demonic male power." It is indeed time now for demonic male power to be subdued once again. In the myth, the gods alone could not tame the out-of-control asuras or demons, the embodiment of control and domination. The gods had to summon the Goddess, the Great Mother Herself, in the form of Durga, whose name means "Beyond Reach." The asuras were "man-beasts", mighty in their force, multiplying at an electrifying rate, quite like what we see happening in the world today. Our own current government grows more fascist everyday. Author and activist Arundhati Roy speaks of the Nazi-based fascist philosophy sweeping India. Our environment is under constant assault; the connection between the war against women and the war against the environment goes virtually unnoticed by those too entitled to pay attention. Any war currently being waged on the planet is a war against women. The women of Afghanistan, Iraq, Palestine and Israel I have spent time with [agree](http://www.midwifingdeath.com/musings/patriarchy_in_our_world.html). These out-of-control demonic forces are first engendered in a white male elite whose hunger knows no bounds, giving permission for all men to follow. Pms has colonized wherever and whatever, including women's bodies (ever wonder how women got stuck with the label "pms"?), resulting in what I refer to in shamanic terms as the collective soul loss of the sacred female. This myth is medicine for our times. It is clear the Goddess was summoned because she alone had the power to subdue the demons. Mookerjit states, "We have suffered the consequences of unbalanced power for long enough. Our world cannot any longer tolerate the disruption and destruction brought about by demonic force. In the present Kali Age, Kali is the answer, and she will have to annihilate again in order to reveal the truth of things, which is her mission, and to restore to our natures the divine feminine spirituality which we have lost." In shamanic terms I call this restoration "soul retrieval" of the sacred feminine. (Refer to my presentation "Soul Loss of the Sacred Feminine," available on tape from the Institute of Transpersonal Psychology, under the name Leslene McIntyre). I feel this very book is a collective effort in summoning the Goddess, for if we do not, there is little hope for the survival of our species.

#### Patriarchy is the root cause of resource conflicts and war- cultural forms of discrimination against women are part and parcel of the same system that justifies physical violence by nation-states

Hudson et al 8 (Valerie M. Hudson, Professor of Political Science @ Brigham Young University, Mary Caprioli, Professor of Political Science @ the University of Minnesota–Duluth, Bonnie Ballif-Spanvill, Professor of Psychology and Director of the Women’s Research Institute @ Brigham Young University, Rose McDermott, Professor of Political Science @ Brown University, Chad F. Emmett, Professor of Geography @ Brigham Young University, "The Heart of the Matter The Security of Women and the Security of States," <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v033/33.3.hudson.html> JGC)

Human groups formed because of the increased protection they provided against predators. Although we imagine the first predators of concern were large carnivorous animals, the most important threat to males in terms of reproductive fitness were not only out-group males but also in-group males. Evolutionary theorists posit that male dominance hierarchies were naturally selected among humans to maximize protection against out-group males and minimize conflict between in-group males. Dominance hierarchies are a system wherein a subgroup of superordinate (or “alpha”) males dominates subordinate males, and alpha males generally control sexual access to females. In contemporary terms, male dominance hierarchies are the foundation of patriarchy. Wrangham and Peterson write, “**Patriarchy is worldwide and history-wide, and its origins are detectable in the social lives** of chimpanzees. **It serves the reproductive purposes of the men who maintain the system**. Patriarchy comes from biology in the sense that it emerges from men’s temperaments, out of their evolutionarily derived efforts to control women and at the same time have solidarity with fellow men in competition against outsiders. . . . **Patriarchy has its ultimate origins in male violence**.”[19](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v033/33.3.hudson.html#f19) In the first place, **this violence is directed against women**. Unfortunately, given sexual dimorphism in humans, coercion is an effective male mating strategy. **Women accede to dominance hierarchies because of “the one terrible threat that never goes away**”[20](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v033/33.3.hudson.html#f20)—**the need of females to have protection from** [End Page 14] **killer males**, who will injure or kill not only females but also the children that females guard. **The battering that women suffer from the males they live with is the price paid for such protection** and occurs “in species where females have few allies, or where males have bonds with each other.”[21](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v033/33.3.hudson.html#f21) Indeed, among humans, sex differences trump the blood ties associated with natural selection for inclusive fitness. As anthropologist Barbara Miller notes, “**Human gender hierarchies are one of the most persistent, pervasive, and pernicious forms of inequality in the world**. **Gender is used as the basis for systems of discrimination** which can, even within the same household, provide that those designated ‘male’ receive more food and live longer, while those designated ‘female’ receive less food to the point that their survival is drastically impaired.”[22](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v033/33.3.hudson.html#f22) Those with physical power also dominate political power, so that when law developed in human societies, men created legal systems that, generally speaking, favored male reproductive success and interests—with adultery as a crime for women but not for men; with female infanticide, male-on-female domestic violence, and marital rape not recognized as crimes; with polygamy legal but polyandry proscribed; with divorce easy for men and almost impossible for women. The development of male dominance hierarchies may also alter female evolution, and females apparently began to make adaptive choices that serve to perpetuate this system. Primary among these female choices that entrench violent patriarchy are a general preference for the most dominant men (who are able to provide superior protection, though may also offer increased domestic violence and control), and female-female competition for these males, which reduces the opportunity to form countervailing female alliances to offset male violence against women. Male dominance hierarchies also appear to change women emotionally, and as a result, change them endocrinologically. The experience of chronic, intimate oppression, exploitation, and violence shapes women hormonally, molding them into creatures more easily persuaded by coercion to yield and submit—predispositions that Kemper asserts may be inherited by their daughters through placental transfer of specific ratios of hormones in utero.[23](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v033/33.3.hudson.html#f23) **The entrenchment of patriarchy also leads to aggression against out-groups. Males in dominance hierarchies quickly discover that resources may be gained** [End Page 15] **with little cost and risk through coalitional violence; and these resources include women**. The form of exogamy practiced among humans and chimpanzees (where daughters leave the group to mate) means that males of the group are kin. As a result, blood ties provide the necessary trust to engage in such violence as male-bonded gangs. Coercion of out-groups becomes relatively inexpensive in this context, with potentially great payoff. **Dominant males in coalition with male kin are able to adopt a parasitical lifestyle based on physical force: with very little effort, but with a willingness to harm, kill, and enslave others, they can be provided with every resource that natural selection predisposes them to desire:** food, women, territory, resources, status, political power, pride. As Kemper puts it, “The dominant are not dependent for their sense of well-being on the voluntary responses of others. The dominant simply take what they want.”[24](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v033/33.3.hudson.html#f24) **Contemporary human societies do not inhabit the evolutionary landscape of hundreds of thousands of years ago**. We would be remiss, **however,** if we did not note how primal male coalitionary violence and resulting patriarchy are, and what influence these forces still have today. Thayer notes that humans are only about 400 generations removed from that landscape, and only eight generations have passed since the industrial revolution:[25](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v033/33.3.hudson.html#f25) **the past still bears heavily on our behavioral proclivities.** The men among us have certain behavioral tendencies induced by the “strange path” our ancestors took: Wrangham and Peterson argue, “Men have a vastly long history of violence [which] implies that they have been temperamentally shaped to use violence effectively, and that they will therefore find it hard to stop. It is startling, perhaps, to recognize the absurdity of the system: one that works to benefit our genes rather than our conscious selves, and that inadvertently jeopardizes the fate of all our descendants.”[26](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v033/33.3.hudson.html#f26) In other words, the foreign policy of human groups, including modern states, is more dangerous because of the human male evolutionary legacy: “**Unfortunately, there appears something special about foreign policy in the hands of males. Among humans and chimpanzees at least, male coalitionary groups often go beyond defense [typical of monkey matriarchies] to include unprovoked aggression**, which suggests that our own intercommunity conflicts might be less terrible if they were conducted on behalf of women’s rather than men’s interests. Primate communities organized around male [End Page 16]interests naturally tend to follow male strategies and, thanks to sexual selection, tend to seek power with an almost unbounded enthusiasm.”[27](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v033/33.3.hudson.html#f27) Thayer concurs, noting that “**war evolved in humans because it is an effective way to gain and defend resources**.”[28](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v033/33.3.hudson.html#f28) Moreover, because the evolutionary environment produced egoism, domination, and the in-group/out-group distinction, “**these specific traits are sufficient to explain why state leaders will maximize their power over others and their environment, even if they must hurt others or risk injury to themselves**.”[29](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v033/33.3.hudson.html#f29) Indeed, the title of Thayer’s book speaks to the point: Darwin and International Relations. He finds ultimate cause for such observable modern state-level phenomena as offensive realism and ethnic conflict in natural selection.[30](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international_security/v033/33.3.hudson.html#f30)

#### We control the internal link to the aff’s advantages- nuclear weapons are the end result of masculinity- nuclear war is inevitable without the alternative

ASFS ‘87 (Alliance To Stop First Strike, Anti-militarism and Anti-Patriarchy activist organization, “Nonviolent Civil Disobedience Handbook, Activism: Peace: NVCD: Discrimination,” <http://www.activism.net/peace/nvcdh/discrimination.shtml> )

In this action**, our struggle is not only against missiles and bombs, but against the system of power they defend: a system based on domination, on the belief that some people have more value than others, and therefore have the right to control others, to exploit them so that they can lead better lives than those they oppress**. We say that all people have value. No person, no group, has the right to wield power over the decisions and resources of others. The structure of our organizations and the processes we use among ourselves are our best attempt to live our belief in self-determination. **Besides working against discrimination of all kinds among ourselves, we must try to understand how such discrimination supports the system which produces nuclear weapons. For some people who come to this action, the overriding issue is the struggle to prevent nuclear destruction. For others, that struggle is not separate from the struggles against racism, sexism, classism, and the oppression of groups of people because of their sexual orientation, religion, age, physical (dis)ability, appearance, or life history**. Understood this way, it is clear that nuclear weapons are already killing people, forcing them to lead lives of difficulty and struggle. **Nuclear war has already begun, and it claims its victims disproportionately from native peoples, the Third World, women, and those who are economically vulnerable because of the history of oppression**. All oppressions are interlocking. We separate racism, classism, etc. in order to discuss them, not to imply that any form of oppression works in isolation. We know that to work against any one of these is not just to try to stop something negative, but to build a positive vision. Many in the movement call this larger goal feminism. **Calling our process "feminist process" does not mean that women dominate or exclude men; on the contrary, it challenges all systems of domination.** **The term recognizes the historical importance of the feminist movement in insisting that nonviolence begins at home, in the ways we treat each other**. Confronting the issues that divide us is often painful. People may feel guilty, or hurt, or react defensively when we begin to speak of these things, as if they were being personally accused. **But working through this pain together, taking responsibility for our oppressive behavior, is part of our struggle to end the nuclear arms race**. Asking members of oppressed groups to be the catalyst for this change is avoiding our own responsibility for discrimination. Most of us benefit from some form of privilege due to our sex, or class, or skin color, or sexual orientation, but that privilege is limited. **None of us alone has the power to end institutions of discrimination. Only when we struggle together can we hope to do so** -- and when pain and hurt arise in that struggle, we can see it as a measure of the depth to which discrimination hurts us all, keeping us separated and divided in our strength. Racism, Classism, Sexism, Heterosexism and Militarism.

### Root Cause

#### Patriarchy is the root cause of war

Reardon 93(Betty, Director, Peace Education Program, Columbia. Women and Peace. Pg. 30-31)

A clearly visible element in the escalating tensions among militarized nations is the macho posturing and the patriarchal ideal of domination, not parity, which motivates defense ministers and government leaders to “strut their stuff” as we watch with increasing horror. Most men in our patriarchal culture are still acting out old patterns that are radically inappropriate for the nuclear age. To prove dominance and control, to distance one’s character from that of women, to survive the toughest violent initiation, to shed the sacred blood of the hero, to collaborate with death in order to hold it at bay all of these patriarchal pressures on men have traditionally reached resolution in ritual fashion on the battlefield. Butt here is no longer any battlefield. Does anyone seriously believe that if a nuclear power were losing a crucial large-scale conventional war it would refrain from using its nuclear war missiles because of some diplomatic agreement? The military theater of a nuclear exchange today would extend instantly or eventually to all living things, all the air, all the soil, all the water. If we believe that war is a “necessary evil,” that patriarchal assumptions are simply “human nature,” then we are locked into a lie, paralyzed. The ultimate result of unchecked terminal patriarchy will be nuclear holocaust.

### Oppression

#### Male-dominated thought leads to the devaluation of life and the murder of millions

Schott 96 (Robin May, PhD MPhil MA, Philosophy Senior Researcher, “Gender and ‘Postmodern War’” *Hypatia* Autumn 1996, JSTOR) LL

However, Ruddick's list of military "femininities" is drawn from reflection on World War II, as was Virginia Woolf's comment. Therefore, it oversees many of the gender positions made available to women during "postmodern wars." Women during the Lebanese civil war and the Palestinian war have not just acted as nurses, workers, mourners, and patriots. They have also been writers (as they were in earlier wars), creating "the war they had known without reference to an epic model,"6 negotiators, unarmed fighters. The discourse of "postmoder war" is said to create a new imagery and a "counterdiscourse"th at challenges traditionalw ar myths and binaryo ppositions. Nonetheless, this new imagery exists amidst social relations in which gender remains a determinative, and not infinitely malleable category. Cooke's discussion of the intifada illustrates this point. She characterizes the intifada as originallya women'si nsurrection,7a s a form of unarmedf ighting relying on stone throwing and kicking to incapacitate the violence of the other (Cooke 1993, 193). Yet she also acknowledges that this form of fighting was transformed when the movement was recognized and legitimated by men's participation. In other words, the multiplicity of "discursive spaces" stressed by postmodern theorists exists within a social environment that is still pervaded by gender oppositions and differential powers. THE GENDERINGO FW AR DISCOURSE Just as military rituals and practices create distinct masculinities and femininities, the discourse that is dominant amongst military analysts and policy makers is profoundly gendered. Carol Cohn argues convincingly in "Wars, Wimps, and Women: Talking Gender and Thinking War," that military analysts' thinking is greatly shaped by the gendered discourse that permeates their thinking. Although real men and women may not fit these gender ideals, this system of meanings affects them nonetheless. She quotes a story told by a white male physicist: Several colleagues and I were working on modeling counterforce attacks. ... At one point, we remodeled a particular attack . . . and found that instead of there being thirty-six million immediate fatalities, there would only be thirty million. And everybody was sitting around nodding, saying "Oh yeah, that's great, only thirty million," when all of a sudden, I heard 25 Hypatia what we were saying. And I blurted out, "Wait, I've just heard how we're talking-only thirty million! Only thirty million human beings killed instantly?" Silence fell upon the room. Nobody said a word. They didn't even look at me. It was awful. I felt like a woman. (Cohn 1993, 227) The physicist added that afterwards he was careful never to blurt out anything like that again. In this story, concerns and feelings that express an emotional awareness of the human reality behind the sanitized abstractions of death and destruction become marked as feminine, and thus are difficult both to speak and to hear. Voicing concern about the number of casualties and the suffering of the killed and wounded-imagining children with their flesh melting away from their bones, imagining the psychological effects on soldiers and citizens, imagining their deprivation, their helplessness in watching babies die from diarrhea-all of these are not to be spoken. Instead, one must be cool, dispassionate, and distant. Other ways of thinking about weapons and security have been preempted by gender discourse (Cohn 1993, 232). In this context, the accusation that one might be "acting like a wimp," be insufficiently masculine, erases everything else. Accusations that the Soviet "new thinkers" are a "bunch of pussies," that West German politicians concerned about popular opposition to Euromissile deployments are "a bunch of limp-dicked wimps" indicates that manliness is equated not only with an ability to win a war but to threaten and use force (Cohn 1993, 234). To these military analysts, the only thing worse than a man acting like a woman is a woman acting like a woman. Discussions of strategy take on the tone of a sporting match, pitting one single male opponent against another, bypassing the complexity of governmental and military apparatuses , domestic politics, and so on. For example, in personalizing the Iraqi army as Saddam Hussein during the Gulf War, individual human beings in Iraq were abstracted out of existence (Cohn 1993, 240-41). Cohn's analysis of "defense" intellectuals' discourse is based on her view that in Western culture, gender oppositions remain a fundamental component of the system of meanings. Even though individuals may seek to take up positions of resistance vis-a-vis this system, they are not immune to its effects. She confesses that when she was called a "wimp" after a war simulation, she was stung. Even though she thought it was an inane term, even though she did not think of her identity as being wrapped up with not being wimpish, it was impossible in that environment not to feel humiliated (Cohn 1993, 237). Her self-insight is an important reminder that it is not enough to look at the sites of resistance to traditional categories. It remains necessary to look at how political institutions operate, what the conditions for entrance into these institutions are, what codes of thinking and behavior become normative for 26 Robin May Schott the insiders of these institutions. Although Cohn draws her remarkable insights from her renegade position within the world of defense intellectuals, the storys he tells is of the nearly irresistible power of the gendered oppositions of this discourse, that makes resistance so difficult and seldom. I have tried to show that gender is a defining condition of how war affects individuals, what roles and situations it makes available to them, and what categories of thinking and speaking appear legitimate to them. But analyses of gender are of course inadequate to comprehend the way that war shatters the private worlds of everyday life and individual happiness. War may mean, as it did in Sarajevo, that children cannot go out in the sunshine for two years for fear of bombardments, and that they sleep with their arms clutched around their mothers' necks. It may mean that families are separated, that one's sister might have been shot to death when she went out to visit a relative, that one's daughter might have been killed by a shell had she been sitting as usual on the sofa, instead of in an asylum center in Denmark.8

#### The devalutization of human beings because of patriarchy makes racism, classism, and other forms of oppression inevitable, only the alt solves

ASFS ’87 (Alliance To Stop First Strike, Anti-militarism and Anti-Patriarchy activist organization, Nonviolent Civil Disobedience Handbook, Activism: Peace: NVCD: Discrimination, http://www.activism.net/peace/nvcdh/discrimination.shtml) LL

Part of struggling against nuclear weapons involves understanding the ways in which the oppression of particular groups of people supports militarism, makes the institutionalized system of war and violence appear "natural" and "inevitable." For instance, heterosexism, or the assumption that sexual relations are only permissible, desirable, and normal between opposite sexes, justifies a system of rigid sex roles, in which men and women are expected to behave and look in particular ways, and in which qualities attributed to women are devalued. Thus, men who are not willing to be violent are not virile -- they are threatened with the real sanctions placed on homosexuality (physical violence, housing and economic discrimination) unless they behave like "real men." The military relies upon homophobia (the fear of homosexuality) to provide it with willing enlistees, with soldiers who are trained to kill others to prove their masculinity. Sexism, or the systematic devaluation of women, is clearly related to this. Women have traditionally opposed war because women bear the next generation and feel a responsiblity to protect it. But feminists are not content to speak only from traditional roles as mothers and nurturers. Many activists see a feminist analysis as crucial to effectively challenging militarism. The system of patriarchy, under which men benefit from the oppression of women, supports and thrives on war. In a sexist or patriarchal society, women are relegated to limited roles and valued primarily for their sexual and reproductive functions, while men are seen as the central makers of culture, the primary actors in history. Patriarchy is enforced by the language and images of our culture; by keeping women in the lowest paying and lowest status jobs, and by violence against women in the home and on the streets. Women are portrayed by the media as objects to be violated; 50% of women are battered by men in their lives, 75% are sexually assaulted. The sexist splitting of humanity which turns women into others, lesser beings whose purpose is to serve men, is the same split which allows us to see our enemies as non-human, fair game for any means of destruction or cruelty. In war, the victors frequently rape the women of the conquered peoples. Our country's foreign policy often seems directed by teenage boys desparately trying to live up to stereotypes of male toughness, with no regard for the humanity or land of their "enemy." Men are socialized to repress emotions, to ignore their needs to nurture and cherish other people and the earth. Emotions, tender feelings, care for the living, and for those to come are not seen as appropriate concerns of public policy. This makes it possible for policymakers to conceive of nuclear war as "winnable." Similarly, racism, or the institutionalized devaluation of darker peoples, supports both the idea and the practice of the military and the production of nuclear weapons. Racism operates as a system of divide and conquer. It helps to perpetuate a system in which some people consistently are "haves" and others are "have nots." Racism tries to make white people forget that all people need and are entitled to self-determination, good health care, and challenging work. Racism limits our horizons to what presently exists; it makes us suppose that current injustices are "natural," or it makes those injustices invisible. For example, most of the uranium used in making nuclear weapons is mined under incredibly hazardous conditions by people of color: Native Americans and black South Africans. Similarly, most radioactive and hazardous waste dumps are located on lands owned or occupied by people of color. If all those people suffering right now from exposure to nuclear materials were white, would nuclear production remain acceptable to the white-dominated power structure? Racism also underlies the concept of "national security": that the U.S. must protect its "interests" in Third World countries through the exercise of military force and economic manipulation. In this world-view, the darker peoples of the world are incapable of managing their own affairs and do not have the right to self-determination. Their struggles to democratize their countries and become independent of U.S. military and economic institutions are portrayed as "fanatic," "terrorist," or "Communist." The greatest danger of nuclear war today lies in the likelihood of superpower intervention in Third World countries, fueled by government appeals to nationalistic and racist interests. All forms of discrimination are interrelated with economic discrimination, or classism. Classism justifies a system in which competition is the norm, and profit is believed to be a universal motivation. Thus, poor and working class people lack access to education, leisure time and frequently basic things like food and shelter. But a classist society blames them for their poverty, or devalues their particular way of living. Classism values certain kinds of work over others, and sets up a system of unequal rewards. Our society threatens the majority of our members with economic insecurity, forcing us to accept things the way they are for fear of losing the few things we've gained through hard work. Since most poor people are women, children and people of color, classism and other forms of discrimination work together to hide the injustice of our economic system. Poor and working class people feel the effects of the military directly, profoundly, and brutally. Vital social services have been cut to feed the Pentagon. Inflation, aggravated by the military budget, chews away at what is left after disproportionately high taxes are deducted from our pay. Poor people are prime military recruits, with historically little access to draft deferments or information about conscientious objection, forced by unemployment to think of the military as a "career opportunity." Our militarized society does not support cooperative and socially productive work, but counts on unequal competition and economic deprivation to provide workers in defense industries, miners in uranium mines, and soldiers in the armed forces. No human being is born with discriminatory attitudes and beliefs. Physical and cultural attitudes are not the causes of oppression; these differences are used to justify oppression. Racist, classist, sexist, heterosexist, and all other forms of discriminatory attitudes are a mixture of misinformation and ignorance which have to be imposed on young people through a painful process of social conditioning. These processes are left unchallenged partially because people feel powerless to do anything about them. But the situation is not hopeless. People can grow and change. Many successful struggles have taken place against structures of exploitation and discrimination. We are not condemned to repeat the past. Discriminatory condition ning can be analyzed and unlearned. All people come from traditions which have a history of resistance to injustice, and every person has their own individual history of resistance to discriminatory conditioning. This history needs to be recalled and celebrated, and people need to listen to and learn from other people's histories. When people act from a sense of informed pride in themselves and their own traditions, they will be more effective in all struggles for justice and peace.

### Environment

#### Patriarchy destroys the environment

**Hoetzer 10** (Irene Ecofeminism and Environmental Justice, PhD in environmental law at Macquarie University, page 4, http://www.inter-disciplinary.net/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/hoetzerpaper.pdf,) LL

This **anthropocentric view of the world,** which **distinguishes between instrumental and intrinsic values**, **fails to acknowledge** the **intrinsic value of anything that is not human.** 16 Environmental ethicists challenge this view and claim that all of nature has its own, separate intrinsic value. **Ecofeminists** also hold this view but further **argue that** the **culture over nature** dichotomy that **dominates Western thought is representative** **of the** dominance/subordinance **hierarchy that permeates the fabric of patriarchal** capitalist **society and results in women and nature sharing a common inferior position**. For ecofeminists, therefore, **the ecological crisis is more than a question of environmental destruction and human misery**. By **drawing attention to the interconnection of women and nature,** ecofeminists argue that egalitarian, non-hierarchical structures must be created, **in which the inherent value of nature is acknowledged and** the **relationships between humans, non-humans and the natural environment become just and sustainable.** 17

## \*\*\*Alt Solvency

### Alt Solves – General

#### 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.) LL

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.

#### Feminist used deconstruction to expose binaries in IR

Kronsell et al 6 (Annic: Assisnt Professor of Political Science-University of Lund, edited by Brooke A. Ackerly: Assistnat Professor in the Department of Political Science-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, “Feminist Methodologies or International Relations”, Cambridge University Press, p.110-111) LL

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 – Transportation Policy**

#### Transportation is rooted in masculine culture, only the alt can solve

Bauhardt 4 (Christine, Technical University of Berlin Institute of Urban and Regional Planning, Urban Development and Transportation Infrastructures: Insights from the Ruhr Region, http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CFkQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.ifz.tugraz.at%2FMedia%2FDateien%2FDownloads-IFZ%2FSummer-Academy%2FProceedings-2004%2FUrban-Development-and-Transportation-Infrastructures-Insights-from-the-Ruhr-Region&ei=1bjxT4TdK4is8QS1u4X3DA&usg=AFQjCNETXWV2Zg7c7C1sVijFo3CcG7tCkA JGC)

Transportation policy is a policy for society as a whole. In spatial planning, many “entangled” political, economic, social, symbolic and ethical dimensions are tied up in an almost inextricable knot: Politically, transportation policy as a policy of modernization is equated with technological and social modernization. The model used for modernization is the autonomously mobile individual who is freed from spatial reference points and ties to particular places. This individual corresponds to the masculine subject of the Enlightenment. Economically, transportation policy is the prerequisite for economic activity. Infrastructure policy ensures advances for the production of goods and for the mobility of employees. The commonly used model of employees is that of the “normal worker,” who is free of family responsibilities. Correspondingly, the male commuter is the model used for the concept of mobility as defined by the market. In social terms, transportation policy creates and reinforces social inequality. Existing inequalities between those who are “slow” and those who are “fast” are increased by uneven investment in the different transportation infrastructures, and new inequalities are produced. The symbolic dimension takes precedence over rational patterns of usage: Speed is considered a status symbol or a “prosthesis of power.” For men, the equation of speed with power often plays a more important role than practicality, while for most women the symbolic meaning of the means of transportation is less important than practical aspects. In terms of ethics, conflicts arise between individual freedom and mobility and responsibility toward the natural and social environment. If transportation policy is to be centred around social and economical reasoning, it must reverse previous objectives and centre instead on spatial ties as well as social and ecological responsibility and thereby depart from a model of exclusively male-oriented rationality.

### Alt Solves – Energy

#### Without Feminisit Ideology Energy Sectors fail to solve

Clancy et. al. 7(Joy, Fareeha Ummar, Indira Shakya and Govind Kelkar, “Appropriate Gender-Analysis Tools for Unpacking the Gender-Energy-Poverty Nexus” Gender and Development 15(2) p.241-257 JGC)

Gender blindness in the energy sector In what ways does energy policy fail to address gender? The gender dimensions of energy are embedded in the gender division of labour, and energy needs reflect gender roles. So for example, when assessing energy technologies for water pumping, women might look for technologies which match drinking water needs, whereas men might look for technologies which can provide sufficient water for irrigating crops. In addition, access to sources of energy is not only determined by their physical availability, but is also differentiated by power relations vested in a variety of social constructions, including gender. Between men and women, distribution of, and power over, energy services is not equal, but reflects the situation within and between households in respect of available resources. Energy services are the desired and useful products, processes, or services that result from the use of energy. These include lighting, a comfortable indoor climate, refrigerated storage, transportation, and appropriate heat for cooking (Clancy et al. 2003). Approximately 2 billion people in the world still lack access to energy services (World Bank 1996). Energy planners tend to treat this problem as a technical issue, to be solved by increasing the supply of fossil fuels2 and electricity. Energy planning is implemented in a gender-neutral way, in other words it is assumed that energy policies benefit women and men equally. What we find in reality is that energy planning is gender-blind. Policy makers and implementers do not recognise the existence of gender needs in energy services, nor the role gender relations play in controlling access to energy. As a consequence, women's energy needs tend to be marginalised in policy documents (Clancy 2000). Such an assumption of gender-neutrality in planning misses issues that are of relevance to women and inadvertently discriminates, usually against women. In the energy sector, the fact that in many contexts, women rely on two sources of energy - biomass3 and metabolic or human physical energy - for performing most of their daily tasks goes largely unrecognised. While the full consequences of women continuing to rely on their own energy inputs and biomass fuels are not known, it is recognised that the continued exposure to smoke from biomass fires in enclosed spaces is detrimental to women's health (Smith 1999), and the time expended in the collection of biomass and other essential household tasks is not only physically demanding, but also constrains participation in other activities which could lead to their empowerment (ENERGIA 2005).

#### Incorporation feminist theories is important to take down artificial boundary distinctions in domestic policy.

Tickner 92 (J. Ann, Professor at School of International Relations-USC, “Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security”,*CIAO*, http://www.ciaonet.org/book/tickner/tickner12.html ) LL

However, feminist theories must go beyond injecting women's experiences into different disciplines and attempt to challenge the core concepts of the disciplines themselves. Concepts central to international relations theory and practice, such as power, sovereignty, and security, have been framed in terms that we associate with masculinity. Drawing on feminist theories to examine and critique the meaning of these and other concepts fundamental to international politics could help us to reformulate these concepts in ways that might allow us to see new possibilities for solving our current insecurities. Suggesting that the personal is political, feminist scholars have brought to our attention distinctions between public and private in the domestic polity: examining these artificial boundary distinctions in the domestic polity could shed new light on international boundaries, such as those between anarchy and order, which are so fundamental to the conceptual framework of realist discourse.

#### Alt is key to rectifying gender inequality which is essential dismantling the war machine

Cockburn 10 (Cynthia, UK Centre for the Study of Women and Gender-University of Warwick, “Gender Relations as Causal in Militarization and War”, http://www.cynthiacockburn.org/Blogfeministreview.pdf ) LL

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, forever predisposing a society to violence, forever disturbing the peace. Why is it important to pay attention to the perceptions of a feminist standpoint 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. \

#### The alternative is prerequisite to the aff- must include gendered social analysis when planning transportation projects

Bauhardt, 4 (Christine, Technical University of Berlin Institute of Urban and Regional Planning, “Urban Development and Transportation Infrastructures: Insights from the Ruhr Region,” http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CFkQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.ifz.tugraz.at%2FMedia%2FDateien%2FDownloads-IFZ%2FSummer-Academy%2FProceedings-2004%2FUrban-Development-and-Transportation-Infrastructures-Insights-from-the-Ruhr-Region&ei=1bjxT4TdK4is8QS1u4X3DA&usg=AFQjCNETXWV2Zg7c7C1sVijFo3CcG7tCkA ) LL

The androcentric concept of the economy, which only considers one half of reality and ignores the interdependence of production and reproduction, can be deemed unsuitable for society as a whole. Better solutions for urban development therefore need to take far more into account the unremunerated work women do on behalf of the home and familial care. This means that women's patterns of mobility and work must be given more attention in planning than they have in the past, because women integrate, through their very being, both of the work spheres vital to society: they are involved in gainful employment and in the reproductive work of provision and personal care.

#### Alt key to prevent war- vital to solving the root cause of the aff’s impact

Caprioli and Boyer, 2001 (Mary, PhD and MA-University of Connecticut in Political Science and Women’s Studies, Mark A., Boyer is M.A. in International Relations-University of Maryland) LL

Women work for peace, and men wage war-cooperative women, conflictual men. These images pervade conventional wisdom about the efficacy of women in leadership roles and decision-making environments. Imagery, however, is not always grounded in reality. We examine the constructs of feminist international relations literature to understand how domestic gender equality may predict a state's international behavior. Following an illustrative examination of female leaders as decision makers during international crises, we build our analysis on and extend the recent work of Caprioli (2000). That work shows that states with higher levels of domestic gender equality are less likely to use violence during interstate conflict than states with lower levels of domestic gender equality. In addition, this study complements the work of Tessler and Warriner (1997) and Conover and Sapiro (1993), who suggested that women tend to be more peace oriented than men in some Western states. This scholarship draws from a wide array of contemporary international relations literature that asserts that domestic values and political behavior are mirrored in a state's international interactions. We offer a rigorous test of the relation between gender equality and a state's use of vio- lence internationally. We use the International Crisis Behavior (ICB) data set and run a multinomial logistic regression to test the international crisis behavior of states with varying levels of domestic gender equality

#### Alt solves- critical to a cultural transformation of gender norms

[Cosgrove](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/hypatia/v018/18.3cosgrove.html#authbio) 03 (Lisa, College of Education and Human Development-University of Massachusetts Boston, “Feminism, Postmodernism, and Psychological Research”, Hypatia, *Project Muse*) LL

At the same time however, it is possible to call a halt to the performance. By conceptualizing gender as an effect, as that which is neither fully determined nor completely arbitrary, Butler’s theory allows for “the possibilities of agency that are insidiously foreclosed by positions that take identity categories as fi xed or foundational” (Butler 1993, 147). In other words, insofar as agency is dethroned from its transcendental status, it becomes reconceptualized as a “reiterative or re-articulating process . . . a hiatus in the compulsion to install an identity through repetition” (1993, 220). Thus, resistance and transformation are possible and occur when we contest the citing of gendered norms, but they are not easy to achieve nor are they the result of a simple reversal or pure opposition to gender norms. We cannot know for sure what the effect will be when we contest gendered norms, nor can we predict what kind of contestation will be the most emancipatory. Indeed, Foucault’s famous dictum “it’s not that everything is bad it’s that everything is dangerous” (1980a) has an important corollary in Butler’s observation that “gender preformativity will always involve a diffi cult labor of forging a future from resources inevitably impure” (1993, 241). Kristeva (1980, 1981a, 1981b, 1986), like Butler, also maintains that subjectivity is a constituted achievement; identity is established within the sociosymbolic contract; thus, as subjects we are all subjected to the Law. She refers to the development of selfhood as the thetic moment. However, what differentiates Kristeva from other poststructuralist thinkers who offer a postmodern critique of identity, such as Jacques Lacan (for example, see 1977) or Jacques Derrida (for example, see 1982), is that Kristeva sees the symbolic as a position: “We shall distinguish the semiotic (drives and their articulations) from the realm of signifi cation, which is always that of a proposition or judgment, in other words a realm of positions” (Kristeva 1986, 98). For Kristeva, entry into the symbolic does not only (or even primarily) involve pain or violence.6 The thetic moment, the grounding moment of identity, is not entirely repressive or negative, but it is also marked by pleasure (Weir 1996, 164, 165). Entry into this position (that is, into the symbolic) is what allows for refl exivity, judgment, and the development of ethics. As Allison Weir astutely notes, “the thetic break is essential for taking ethical positions” (1996, 162). Neither Kristeva nor Butler accord the feminine transcendental status; just as there is no original femininity for Butler, there is no eternal feminine for Kristeva. According to Kristeva, femininity is a marginalized subject position. She stresses the idea that if we are “[t]o change the system we have to change the speaking subject” (Jardine 1981, 11); if we are to think and speak ourselves into new subject positions then the feminine must be discoursed and symbolized differently—in less reductive, dichotomous, and oppressive ways. Clearly, if we want to increase the emancipatory potential of psychological research, we must bridge the gap between the “individual” and the “social.” One way to bridge this gap, as Kristeva’s theory of identity suggests, is to examine how ideologies of motherhood function to regulate subjectivity. (In a later section of this paper I will demonstrate, by way of example, how a researcher might take into account the discursive construction of mothering. Also see Young 1997 for an insightful social justice perspective on ideologies of motherhood.) Because the thetic moment must be described in terms of pre-Oedipal and Oedipal registers, Kristeva demonstrates that symbolizing femininity in less oppressive ways requires a discourse and symbolization of motherhood that isn’t bound up with repudiation, merging, lack, or fantasies of the omnipotent phallic mother (Moi 1985; Weir 1996). She suggests that the Oedipal drama contains scenes in which the mother is a separate subject whose desires cannot be fully captured by a phallic economy: “. . . [a mother] can indicate to her child that her desire is not limited to responding to her offspring’s request (or simply turning it down)” (Kristeva 1986, 256). “The loving mother, different from the caring and clinging mother, is someone who has an object of desire” (Kristeva 1986, 251). “Nobody knows what the ‘good enough’ mother is. I wouldn’t try to explain what that is, but I would try to suggest that maybe the good enough mother is the mother who has something else to love besides her child, such as her work, her husband, her lovers, etc” (Kristeva 1984, 23). Kristeva offers a theory of self-identity in which the mother serves as a model of a decentered subject who still retains the capacity for agency and refl exivity, and her theory of language allows her to see the Oedipal situation as a multilayered story. The development of self identity via Oedipalization is as much about the possibility for refl exivity and connection as it is about the impossibility of fulfi lling desire. The thetic moment occurs because the symbiotic relationship with the mother is disrupted, but the disruption is the very precondition of a subject capable of an empathic and ethical engagement in the world (Weir 1996): “Dependence on the mother is severed, and transformed into a symbolic relationship to an other, the constitution of the other is indispensable for communicating with an other” (Kristeva 1986, 102; italics added). Kristeva theorizes subjectivity by emphasizing the possibilities created by the symbiotic break: ethics and social change (Moi 1985; Weir 1996). Thus, she underscores an important point that seems to be lost on Lacan and Derrida: the severing of the dependence on the mother is possible because the mother is simultaneously a decentered and unifi ed subject. The mother does not only (or primarily) represent all that is lost or all that can not be. Again, Weir offers an insightful reading of Kristeva: “The mother represents a subject unifi ed in division—divided between her relation to the child and her investment in the world. . . . [T]he child develops a self-identity by sharing in the mother’s desire not for the phallus per se but for a world outside the child. [For Kristeva] the development of identity is not based on repudiation of the mother but on the recognition of and identifi cation with the mother’s investment in the world” (Weir 1996, 183, italics added).

Refusing their patriarchal politics opens the space necessary for dissent and difference

Burke**,** School of Political Science and International Studies, University of Queensland, 2002 Anthony, Alternatives: Global, Local, Political 27.1 page InfoTrac OneFile

It is perhaps easy to become despondent, but as countless struggles for freedom, justice, and social transformation have proved, a sense of seriousness can be tempered with the knowledge that many tools are already available--and where they are not, the effort to create a productive new critical sensibility is well advanced. There is also a crucial political opening within the liberal problematic itself, in the sense that it assumes that power is most effective when it is absorbed as truth, consented to and desired--which creates an important space for refusal. As Colin Gordon argues, Foucault thought that the very possibility of governing was conditional on it being credible to the governed as well as the governing. (60) This throws weight onto the question of how security works as a technology of subjectivity. It is to take up Foucault's challenge, framed as a reversal of the liberal progressive movement of being we have seen in Hegel, not to discover who or what we are so much as to refuse what we are. (61 ) Just as security rules subjectivity as both a totalizing and individualizing blackmail and promise, it is at these levels that we can intervene. We can critique the machinic frameworks of possibility represented by law, policy, economic regulation, and diplomacy, while challenging the way these institutions deploy language to draw individual subjects into their consensual web. This suggests, at least provisionally, a dual strategy. The first asserts the space for agency, both in challenging available possibilities for being and their larger socioeconomic implications. Roland Bleiker formulates an idea of agency that shifts away from the lone (male) hero overthrowing the social order in a decisive act of rebellion to one that understands both the thickness of social power and its "fissures," "fragmentation," and "thinness." We must, he says, "observe how an individual may be able to escape the discursive order and influence its shifting boundaries.... By doing so, discursive terrains of dissent all of a sudden appear where forces of domination previously seemed invincible." (62) Pushing beyond security requires tactics that can work at many levels--that empower individuals to recognize the larger social, cultural, and economic implications of the everyday forms of desire, subjection, and discipline they encounter, to challenge and rewrite them, and that in turn contribute to collective efforts to transform the larger structures of being, exchange, and power that sustain (and have been sustained by) these forms. As Derrida suggests, this is to open up aporetic possibilities that transgress and call into question the boundaries of the self, society, and the international that security seeks to imagine and police. The second seeks new ethical principles based on a critique of the rigid and repressive forms of identity that security has heretofore offered. Thus writers such as Rosalyn Diprose, William Conolly, and Moira Gatens have sought to imagine a new ethical relationship that thinks difference not on the basis of the same but on the basis of a dialogue with the other that might allow space for the unknown and unfamiliar, for a "debate and engagement with the other's law and the other's ethics"--an encounter that involves a transformation of the self rather than the other. (63) Thus while the sweep and power of security must be acknowledged, it must also be **refused**: at the simultaneous levels of individual identity, social order, and macroeconomic possibility, it would entail another kind of work on "ourselves"--a **political refusal** of the One, the imagination of an other that never returns to the same. It would be to ask if there is a world after security, and what its shimmering possibilities might be.

## \*\*\*Framework

### Framework – Policy Making

#### Gender should be included as a focal part of policy debates

Lovenduski 2005(Joni, Professor of Politics at Birkbeck college, University of London, author of Women and European Politics and Feminizing politics, “State Feminism and Political Representation”, p. 7)

**Gender is therefore an important component of the way in which issues are framed in policy debates**. Policy-making can be construed as a set of arguments among policy actors about what problems deserve attention, how those problems are defined and what the solutions are (John 1998; Mazur 2002). In this conflict of ideas only a few issues are taken up for action. The problem for women's advocates therefore is twofold: first, they must gain attention for their issues and the ideas they promote, and second, they must ensure that the problem is defined in terms that are compatible with movement goals. **The public definition of a problem is amongst other things a frame that affects how an issue is considered and treated. Paradoxically gender issues are often framed in gender-blind terms. Historically the gendering of debates about political representation has 'neen 'invisible', built on the unspoken assumption that the political actor** (the voter, the citizen**) is male.** Feminist theorists have unmasked this convention (Pateman 1988; Lister 1997) pointing out not only that women are citizens, voters and activists, but also that women in traditional gender roles have made possible the functioning and dominance of the male political actor. **Historically, when issues of political representation were discussed, traditional gendering went unnoticed until the suffrage movements claimed votes for women.**

### Framing – Transportation Policy

#### Incorporation of gendered perspective in transportation policy possible-Sweden proves

Uteng an Cresswell 8 (Tanu Priya, Research Fellow in the Department of Civil and Transport Engineering-Norway, and Tim Cresswell, Professor in the Department of Geography at Royal Holloway-UK, “Gendered Mobilities”, http://books.google.com/books?id=g1mHrOAHHGwC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\_ge\_summary\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false , page 2) LL

The incorporation of a gender perspective in transportation sector in Sweden began to take shape in 1994, when the Parliament adopted a national directive requiring that all committees and working groups include an analysis of how their proposals affect gender equality (Direktiv. 1994:124). The aim of this directive was to require the active mainstreaming of gender equality in all sectors of Swedish society. Within the transportation sector, this started within the overall process of designing a policy for a sustainable transportation system. In preparation for this, one of the expert groups convened in 1996 dealt specifically with gender equality. The 1997 final background report on transportation policy, *A new course in transportation policy*, included a chapter on gender equality (SOU, 1997:35). This chapter set the stage for gender mainstreaming within the sector by presenting differences in travel patterns between women and men and noting the lack of women in the decision-making process. Ensuing from this, the 1998 governmental proposition, *Transport policy for sustainable development*, resulted in the 1999 appointment of an advisory council charged with collecting information and suggesting measures for attaining gender equality within the transportation sector (Proposition 1997/98:56). This council was called the Gender Equality Council for Transport and IT. The Gender Equality Council presented their final report, *Gender equality—transportation and IT*, in June 2001 (SOU, 2001:144). The Gender Equality Council’s 2001 report is a broad analysis that presents a history of gender equality, a vision for the future, methods for gender mainstreaming, and a summary of the laws and regulations that influence, or could be used to influence, gender equality (ibid). A clear connection is made between the goals of gender equality and sustainable development, especially regarding equal representation and participation in societal decision-making. A great deal of attention is also given to governmental measures that can be used to ensure gender mainstreaming, such as the use of socioeconomic modelling, public bidding, and requiring the companies that receive conracts from the state actively promote gender inequality (ibid).

#### Alternative comes before aff- must integrate feminine analysis into transportation planning is essential to challenging the androcentric economy that drives transportation infrastructure development

Bauhardt 4 (Christine, Technical University of Berlin Institute of Urban and Regional Planning, “Urban Development and Transportation Infrastructures: Insights from the Ruhr Region”, http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CFkQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.ifz.tugraz.at%2FMedia%2FDateien%2FDownloads-IFZ%2FSummer-Academy%2FProceedings-2004%2FUrban-Development-and-Transportation-Infrastructures-Insights-from-the-Ruhr-Region&ei=1bjxT4TdK4is8QS1u4X3DA&usg=AFQjCNETXWV2Zg7c7C1sVijFo3CcG7tCkA ) LL

Analysis of the Ruhr region shows that the norms of urban development are geared exclusively toward the market. The idea of a good standard of living and general well-being in the city is closely linked to economic growth, while other value orientations outside market logic, such as health or concern for other people, are not the explicit goals of successful urban planning or are clearly subordinate to economic ones. Economic growth is identified with the availability of jobs, whereas the sphere of reproduction and the unremunerated work of women do not play a role in establishing economic goals. Patterns of men’s fulltime work were and still are the primary model used in urban and transportation planning. The expansion of rapid transportation both in road construction as well as in public transportation was justified on the basis of economic restructuring and the employment situation in the Ruhr region. The decline of coal and steel industries since the end of the 1950s necessitated a new orientation in the economy. Job losses in coal and steel industries was to be offset by specialization in production and the development of the tertiary sector. Favourable local conditions were to attract trade and services to the area. Attractive transportation access was an essential element in the planning concepts for developing the regional infrastructure. The main objective of the cities and the local government, besides making the area attractive for investors, was to increase the mobility of the working population by expanding rapid transportation infrastructure. After losing their jobs, which were often located close to home, coal and steel workers were to be able to find other work in the newly developed trade branches. The androcentric concept of the economy, which only considers one half of reality and ignores the interdependence of production and reproduction, can be deemed unsuitable for society as a whole. Better solutions for urban development therefore need to take far more into account the unremunerated work women do on behalf of the home and familial care. This means that women's patterns of mobility and work must be given more attention in planning than they have in the past, because women integrate, through their very being, both of the work spheres vital to society: they are involved in gainful employment and in the reproductive work of provision and personal care.

### Framing – Epistemology

#### Their knowledge production is not neutral – the gender and political foundations for their understanding of the world should be rejected because they are epistemologically flawed

Sjoberg 9(Assistant Prof. Poli Sci Virginia, “Laura Security Studies” Informaworld 18.2 JGC)

Feminist scholars have argued that“gender matters in what we study, why we study, and how we study global politics.”55Epistemologically,feminists have long recognized that“whatever knowledge may ostensibly be about, it is always in part about the relationships between the knower and the known.”56 In other words,feminist scholars often see knowing not in terms of the dichotomy between objective knowledge (fact) and subjective knowledge (opinion),but instead relationally—knowledge is necessarily contextual, contingent, and interested.57Instead,objective knowledge is only the subjective knowledge of privileged voices disguised as neutral by culturally assumed objectivity, “where the privileged are licensed to think for everyone, so long as they do so 'objectively.”'58 This understanding of the relationship between the knower and the known in feminist thought means that some feminists “are asking questions that could probably not be asked within the epistemological boundaries of positivist social scientific approaches to the discipline.”59The feminist recognition of a relationship between the knower and the known means that many if not most feminist scholars see (all) knowledge-building as a political enterprise.60 Feminist scholars have argued that all ir scholarship has political commitments, even though most of the discipline hides its politics behind claimed objectivity.61 Feminist scholars, however, emphasize that all knowledge is interested, and express a political commitment to understanding the world from the points of view of marginalized peoples and actors.62

#### Don’t trust their epistemology – their truth claims lack gender analysis which makes them suspect

Sjoberg 9(Assistant Prof. Poli Sci Virginia, “Laura Security Studies” Informaworld 18.2 JGC)

In other words,while gender hierarchy is a normative problem, the failure to recognize it presents an empirical problem for ir scholarship. Failing to recognize gender hierarchy makes ir scholarship less descriptively accurate and predictively powerful for its omission of this major force in global politics.In the study of ir“feminist theories begin with a different perspective and lead to further rethinking.They distinguish 'reality' from the world as men know it.”53Scholars looking through gender lenses“ask what assumptions about gender(and race, class, nationality, and sexuality)are necessary to make particular statements, policies, and actions meaningful.”54 Even though gender representations differ, the patterns of valorizing masculinities over femininities that are reflected and reproduced in genderings in global politics demonstrate the importance of feminist analysis.

#### Lenses determine what is excluded from our perspective on the world – the 1AC has chosen a certain order which masks the violence of patriarchal systems - self fulfilling prophecies

Peterson and Runyan 99(Professor in School of Government and Public Policy, Professor and former Head, V. Spike & Anne Sisson Global Gender Issues, p.1-2 JGC)

Whenever we study a topic, we do so through a lens that necessarily focuses our attention in particular ways.By filtering or "ordering" what we look at, each lens enables us to see some things in greater detail or more accurately or in better relation to certain other things. But this is unavoidably at the expense of seeing other things that are rendered out of focus-filtered out--by each particular lens.According to Paul Viotti and Mark Kauppi,various theoretical perspectives, or "images," of international politics contain certain assumptions and lead us "to ask certain questions, seek certain types of answers, and use certain methodological tools."1 For example, different images act as lenses and shape our assumptions about who the significant actors are (individuals? states? multinational corporations?), what their attributes are (rationality? self-interest? Power?), how social processes are categorized (politics? cooperation? Dependence?), and what outcomes are desirable (peace? national security? global equity?).The images or lenses we use have important consequences because they structure what we look for and are able to "see." In Patrick Morgan's words, "Our conception of [IR acts as a] map for directing our attention and distributing our efforts, and using the wrong map can lead us into a swamp instead of taking us to higher ground." 2What we look for depends a great deal on how we make sense of, or "order," our experience. We learn our ordering systems in a variety of contexts. From infancy on, we are taught to make distinctions enabling us to perform appropriately within a particular culture. As college students, we are taught the distinctions appropriate to particular disciplines (psychology, anthropology, political science) and particular schools of thought within them (realism, behavioralism, liberalism, structuralism). No matter in which context we learned them, the categories and ordering frameworks shape the lenses through which we look at, think about,and make sense of the world around us.At the same time, the lenses we adopt shape our experience of the world itself because they shape what we do and how and why we do it. For example,a political science lens focuses our attention on particular categories and events(the meaning of power, democracy, or elections) in ways that variously influence our behavior(questioning authority, protesting abuse of power, or participating in electoral campaigns).By filtering our ways of thinking about and ordering experience, the categories and images we rely on shape how we behave and thus the world we live in: They have concrete consequences. We observe this readily in the case of self-fulfilling prophecies: If we expect hostility, our own behavior (acting superior, displaying power) may elicit responses (defensive posturing, aggression) that we then interpret as "confirming" our expectations. It is in this sense that we refer to lenses and "realities" as interactive, interdependent, or mutually constituted. Lenses shape who we are, what we think, and what actions we take, thus shaping the world we live in. At the same time, the world we live in ("reality") shapes which lenses are available to us, what we see through them, and the likelihood of our using them in particular contexts.

#### Only feminist Ideology can prevent war, the aff just perpetuates it

Sjoberg 6(Laura, “Gendered Realities of the Immunity Principle: Why Gender Analysis Needs Feminism”, International Studies Quarterly, 50(4) p. 899-910 JGC)

This oppression is visible on a number of levels. First, in the discourse about the immunity principle, it appears that women either are or could be protected from the horrors of war. As we discussed above, however, no one is immune from war- fighting when the battleground is their homeland. While the United States boasts about protecting women and children everywhere (Bush 2002), tens of thousands of Iraqi civilians (mostly women) die from direct fire in wartime. Second, the just war narrative does not even cover most of the wartime causes of women's suffering. While many women civilians die during the fighting, many more suffer from its effects after the fighting is over. These include infrastructural damage that limits their access to food, water, medical care, and transportation; loss of the family's source of income; loss of educational and social opportunities due to political in- stability; and loss of freedoms from martial law-like situations (Vickers 1993). Third, the immunity principle presents this illusion of protection without fundamentally changing any of the rules of war-fighting. Belligerents are permitted to choose where they fight, make strategic plans, and use weapons in the same ways that they would if they did not care who they affected. The difference, with the immunity principle, is not how belligerents conceptualize war, but who they mean to hurt the most when they fight. Women, although given "immunity," become symbolic stand- ins for the morality and justice of war-fighting, which is no less brutal to them because they are immune. The immunity principle legitimates war-making, while failing to provide protection to civilians, gendered male or female.

### Framing – Discourse First

#### Language is politics – everything we write, say, think, and do comes down to language

Bleiker 0 (Roland, Ph.D., Professor of International Relations, Popular Dissent, Human Agency, and Global Politics pg 280) To recognise that language is politics is to acknowledge that form and substance cannot be separated. The manner in which a text is written, a speech is uttered, a thought is thought, is integral to its content. There is no neutral form of representing the world, a form that is somehow detached from the linguistic and social practices in which the speaker or writer is embedded. Science and philosophy, empirical analyses and literature, mathematics and poetry, are all bound by the form through which they convey their ideas. Being built on specific grammatical and rhetorical structures, all of these stories and accounts, Michael Shapiro points out, implicitly advance political arguments. All of them, 'no matter how much their style might protest innocence, contain a mythical level — that is they have a job to do, a perspective to promote, a kind of world to affirm or deny'. 6 This is not to say that every account of social dynamics is equally insightful or valid. But it is to accept that linguistic practices are metaphorical. Some tropes, however, have been so extensively rehearsed and are so deeply entrenched in linguistic and cultural traditions that they appear as authentic representations of the real. Dissent in global politics is the process that interferes with such objectifications.

#### Our discourse comes from our thinking process, not everything is discourse but everything is in discourse

Bleiker 3 (Roland. Co-Director of the University of Queensland’s Rotary Centre for International Studies in Peace and Conflict Resolution. Contemporary Political Theory, Volume 2, Number 1, pg 25-47)

'It is within discourse,' one of Foucault's much rehearsed passages (1976, 133) notes, 'that power and knowledge articulate each other.' The work of the French historian and philosopher epitomizes what is at stake in questions of discourse and agency. For Foucault, discourses are subtle mechanisms that frame our thinking process. They determine the limits of what can be thought, talked and written in a normal and rational way. In every society the production of discourses is controlled, selected, organized and diffused by certain procedures. This process creates systems of exclusion in which one group of discourses is elevated to a hegemonic status, while others are condemned to exile. Discourses give rise to social rules that decide which statements most people recognize as valid, as debatable or as undoubtedly false. They guide the selection process that ascertains which propositions from previous periods or foreign cultures are retained, imported, valued, and which are forgotten or neglected (see Foucault, 1969,1971,1991, 59-60). Not everything is discourse, but everything is in discourse. Things exist independently of discourses, but we can only assess them through the lenses of discourse, through the practices of knowing, perceiving and sensing, which we have acquired over time. Discourses render social practices intelligible and rational -- and by doing so mask the ways in which they have been constituted and framed. Systems of domination gradually become accepted as normal and silently penetrate every aspect of society. They cling to the most remote corners of our mind, for, as Nietzsche (1983, 17) once expressed it, 'all things that live long are gradually so saturated with reason that their emergence out of unreason thereby becomes improbable.' While providing compelling evidence of subtle forms of domination, a preoccupation with discourses may run the risk of leaving us with an image of the world in which the capacity for human agency is all but erased, annihilated by forces that are not only impenetrable, but also elude human comprehension. In his reading of Nietzsche, for instance, Foucault portrays the emergence of things (as the concept of goodness) as taking place in a void between the energy of the strong and the reaction of the weak. Since adversaries do not meet directly in this interstice, so we read, no one is responsible for its outcome. 'Only a single drama is ever staged in this "non-place," the endlessly repeated play of dominations' (Foucault, 1984, 85). If power and domination are so omnipresent, so invincible, how could anything every change? If, as Foucault implicitly suggests, there is no conversation, no common language, not even a visible discursive meeting between the inside and the outside, the centre and the margin, how could one explain all those challenges from below, the moments when people take to the street and shake, successfully or not, the foundations of the established order? These questions prompted many critics to dismiss approaches that revolve around discursive explanations of social dynamics.

#### Discourse is key to solvency

Tickner 1 (J. Ann, Professor of international relations at USC, Gendering World Politics. Pg 144.)

Chin's critical political-economy approach, one used by other feminists, too, differs from rationalistic approaches in that it takes into account both the material and ideational dimensions of social relations. Chin claims that a focus on legislation is not sufficient to account for the repressive policies of the state; one must also examine the ideological hegemony necessary to formulate and legitimate such economic policies." As these empirical studies demonstrate, gender is a system of meaning that comes to be expressed in legitimating discourses that keep prevailing power structures in place. For this reason, feminists have also been attracted to discourse analysis as a methodology.

#### Discourse shapes reality and creates a space for social change

Tickner 1 (J. Ann, professor of international relations at USC, Gendering World Politics. Pg 144-145)

Claiming that discourse analysis is an emerging research program in IR, Jennifer Milliken outlines its three theoretical commitments: First, discourses are systems of signification in which discourse is structured in terms of binary oppositions that establish relations of power. As examples, she supplies terms such as modem/traditional, and West/Third World that are not neutral but establish the first term as superior to the second. 50 Second, discourses define subjects authorized to speak and to act; they also define knowledgeable practices by these subjects, which makes certain practices legitimate and others not. Discourses also produce publics or audiences for these actors; in this way, social space comes to be organized and controlled. This works to restrict experts to certain groups and to endorse a certain meaning of the way things should be done, excluding others. Third, discourse analysis directs us toward studying dominating or hegemonic discourses and the way they are connected to the implementation and legitimation of certain practices. But more fundamentally, discourse produces what we have come to understand in the world as "common sense." Discourse analysis can also help us understand how such language works and when the predominant forms of knowledge embodied in such discourses are unstable; this allows the study of subjugated knowledge or alternative discourses that have been silenced in the process. 52 Focusing on subjugated knowledges may involve an examination of how they work to create conditions for resistance to a dominating discourse. Milliken claims that investigation of subjugated knowledge has the potential to show how the world could be interpreted differently; she claims that, since it requires fieldwork, often in non-Western-language environments, it is not a method that has been much used in IR. Nevertheless, some of the ethnographic work of IR feminists that brings marginal voices to light (see above) and the kinds of challenges that feminists are mounting to dominant discourses in development studies (discussed in chapter 3) demonstrate that this type of research is being done by feminists. Not only have feminists investigated subjugated knowledges built out of the lives of ordinary people's everyday experiences, they have also examined dominant discourses, noting how frequently their legitimacy is created and sustained through types of hegemonic masculinity (see chapter I). Carol Cohn has described her analysis of strategic discourse (discussed in chapter 2) as being transdisciplinary, using a methodology that combines textual cultural analysis and grounded methods of qualitative sociology and ethnographic anthropology. Echoing Charlesworth's metaphor of an archaeological dig, Cohn talks of her methodology as the juxtaposition and layering of many different windows. Her fieldwork with national-security elites allowed her to "follow gender as metaphor and meaning system through the multisided terrain of national security. As a participant observer of national-security elites, Cohn was "studying up" rather than "studying down," or doing anthropological research about those who shape our attitudes and control institutional structures.54 Motivated by her claim that the power of language and professional discourse shapes how and what people think, Cohn also used textual analysis of U.S. Department of Defense official reports, military documents, and media accounts to investigate how national-security practices are "shaped, limited and distorted" by gender. 55 In these analyses, she asks how gender affects national-security paradigms, policies, and practices. Assuming that reality is a social construction available to us through language, Cohn has described her research in terms that she compares to Barbara McClintock's-learning, listening, and finding out what is there without imposing preconditions about subjects and issues. For this reason, she also rejects the idea of proving a point or testing a hypothesis.

#### Discourse if key to change – dominance is expressed through discourse

Harris 89(Adrienne, Ph.D. 1972, University of Michigan, Studies In Gender and Sexuality, Rocking the Ship of State. Pg 155, Harris)

My second objective goes beyond describing and understanding this discourse. Stated in the strongest possible terms, I wish to render this discourse "impotent and obsolete" (to borrow a phrase from Ronald Reagan). I wish to expose its limits and distortions, its underlying assumptions and values, and the vast gaps between what it claims to do and what it actually does, so as to break its stranglehold on our scholarship, our policy decisions, our national political processes, and our imaginations. I wish to examine and unravel the methods, procedures; and claims that constitute this kind of thinking and thus expose the ways in which a discourse that claims to be rational, objective, realistic, and universal is, in fact, anything but. My third objective is to foster the development of more truly realistic, effective, and humane ways of thinking about international security and cooperation. I see the deconstruction and delegitimation of technostrategic discourse as a necessary, a not sufficient, condition for this project. A crucial step is the juxtaposition of ways of thinking from other disciplines, other political traditions, and other cultures, as well as ways of thinking that arise arise from the experience of nondominant groups within this culture. My goal is not to put forth a fully developed and unified policy alternative but rather to open some new space and make some new connections. Contemporary feminist theory is an invaluable tool in this project, especially that strain of feminist theory that takes as its object of scrutiny discourses produced by men. This kind of feminist work aims to explore the discourses' underlying assumptions, methods, procedures, and techniques of theory, development, their use of criteria and methods of inclusion and exclusion; and the ways in which these discourses work and how they exert their dominance. This work is a method, a strategy, whose goal is to destabilize, delegitimize, and dismantle patriarchal discourses--to render their systems, methods, and resumptions unable to retain their dominance and power and thus to open spaces for other voices to be heard. Destabilizing and interrupting patriarchal discourse are seen as the prerequisites for establishing in new paradigms and different theoretical tools and for creating systems of knowledge based on different values and interests.

## \*\*\*Answers To

### AT: Mobilities =/= necessary

#### Revisiting mobilities is key to understand view of world

**Uteng an Cresswell 8** (Tanu Priya, Research Fellow in the Department of Civil and Transport Engineering-Norway, and Tim Cresswell, Professor in the Department of Geography at Royal Holloway-UK, “Gendered Mobilities”, http://books.google.com/books?id=g1mHrOAHHGwC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\_ge\_summary\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false , page 1) LL

Mobilities have truly become the hallmark of modern times. But how this hallmark is experienced and represented is far from stable. On the one hand it is positively coded as progress, freedom or modernity itself; on the other hand it brings to mind issues of restricted movement, vigilance and control. Through these dimensions of freedom and control, the understanding of ‘mobilities’ has offered a cohesive way of viewing the highly globalised/mobilised world we inhabit today. As Lash and Urry (1994,252) put it, ‘modern society is a society on the move’. Similar ideas have been professed in disciplines ranging from philosophy, physics and astronomy to film, photography, architecture and urban planning. However, on our overtly optimistic journey towards progress, we have finally come to terms with the reality of our limits. We have no choice but to pay heed to the threats of climate change and its direct linkage with various aspects of mobility. Consumption, and its connections to mobility, needs to be revisited. Given such contradictory outlooks on the theme, mobility has become a most elusive theoretical, social, technical and political construct. In order to deal with it in a systematic way, it is necessary to revisit the implications of mobility in a holistic manner.

#### Mobilites are central to understanding gendered practices

**Uteng an Cresswell 8** (Tanu Priya, Research Fellow in the Department of Civil and Transport Engineering-Norway, and Tim Cresswell, Professor in the Department of Geography at Royal Holloway-UK, “Gendered Mobilities”, http://books.google.com/books?id=g1mHrOAHHGwC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\_ge\_summary\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false , page 1) LL

Understanding the ways in which mobilities and gender intersect is undoubtedly complex give that both concepts are infused with meaning, power and contested understanding. The concept of gender does not operate in a ‘binary’ form. It is never given but constructed through performative reiteration. The resultant interpretations of gender are also historically, geographically, culturally and politically different, enabling a certain slippage between the different realms in terms of how genders are ‘read’. This point is central to an analysis of how mobilities enables/disables/modifies gendered practices. We can uses mobility as an archive and present indicator of discourses, practices, identities, questions, conflicts and contestations to understand its gendered nuances.

### AT: Perm

#### The Permutation fails- it’s presentation of the alternative as a harmonious process that can be simply added to regular policy objectives denies the potential for a core reconceptualization of gender relations and marginalizes the feminine voice.

**Verloo 5** (Mieke, Sr Lecturer in Political Sciences and Gender Studies at Radboud-University Nijmegen and Research Director of an EU, “Displacement and Empowerment:  Reflections on the Concept and Practice of the Council of Europe Approach to Gender Mainstreaming and Gender Equality”, Social Politics, 12.3) LL

Some **studies that focus on assessing the success of gender mainstreaming practices** at the level of the European Union **point to a similar phenomenon of “adding other goals**,” as happened in the Message to the Committee of Ministers to Steering Committees of the Council of Europe on Gender Mainstreaming. In Hafner-Burton and Pollack’s analysis (2000) of five areas (structural funds, employment and social affairs, development, competition and science, research and development), the accent is on explaining cross-sectional variety within the European Commission in the start and the implementation of gender mainstreaming. They show how important it has been that political opportunities in Europe have widened and increased over the course of the last decade, for instance as a result of the entrance of the Nordic countries. They also show how important lobbying and modernization have been, for instance the lobbying of WISE (the European organization for women’s studies) in the case of gender mainstreaming in science, research, and development. In assessing the success of gender mainstreaming, they refer to classical power mechanisms that are at the heart of social movement theory: political opportunities and mobilizing. In the context of this article, **the most interesting part** of their analysis **is their use of the concept of strategical framing,** another power mechanism conceptualized in social movement theory. Strategical framing is **a dynamic concept that enables us to see how different actors adapt existing policy frames to pursue their prospective goals**. Strategical framing is defined as attempting to construct a fit between existing frames, or networks of meaning, and the frames of a change agent. Hafner-Burton and Pollack show that gender mainstreaming is “sold” as an effective means to the ends pursued by the European Commission, rather than as an overt challenge to those ends. They argue that **the gender mainstreaming efforts, because of this strategical framing, might turn into an integrationist approach, integrating women and gender issues into specific regular policies rather than rethinking** the fundamental aims of the European Union **from a gender perspective.** Especially since the European Union is one of the most successful implementers of gender mainstreaming so far, **this threatens the transformative potential of gender mainstreaming**, they say. Mary Braithwaite’s work on gender mainstreaming in the structural funds (1999) corroborates these findings. She finds that because of the absence of precise objectives on reducing gender inequalities, gender is easily located within and has been subjected to other goals, such as employment creation, economic growth, or poverty reduction. This is not to say that these are abject goals, just to stress that they are not synonymous with gender equality. Braithwaite concludes that gender equity suffers from the dominance of efficiency and effectiveness in gender mainstreaming practices in the structural funds. Strategical Framing and Power The studies presented point out that “success,” in the sense of starting a process of gender mainstreaming, seems to be connected to the “stretching” of the goal of gender equality, to strategical framing, and they also show that **the actual goal of gender mainstreaming is not articulated clearly**. In the last section of this article, I will therefore take a closer look at framing processes, at the politics of framing. What happens in processes of strategical framing? Why would it be that integration rather than transformation is the inevitable result of strategical framing processes? **Strategical framing refers to a process of linking a feminist goal, such as gender equality, to some major goal of an organization that should engage or is engaging in gender mainstreaming, thereby securing the allegiance of these organizations to gender mainstreaming**. In technical terms, this means that until now strategical framing in gender mainstreaming practices has usually involved framing bridging or frame extension6(Benford and Snow 2000). The strategies chosen do not challenge the other, mainstream goals of policy makers, but provide for a link by “stretching” the gender equality goal. **This means that the dual agenda that is mostly present in gender mainstreaming (of the feminist goal and some other goal) is presented as the possibility of a win-win situation.** **In such conceptualizations, power seems to evaporate; it is put between brackets**. **Gender mainstreaming is presented as a harmonious process**, certainly in the Council of Europe report. The state is also mostly conceptualized as “friendly,” probably connected to the fact that Sweden and the Netherlands have been among its pioneers, countries that to some extent have been “friendly” states in the past. **Yet, if gender inequality is about power and privileges, then gender mainstreaming should be about abolishing privileges, and if gender mainstreaming is about eliminating gender bias in policy making, then the state should be problematized. Why then is a process of abolishing privileges and gender bias conceptualized as harmony?** The answer provided in the studies discussed earlier is that it helps in organizing acceptance of gender mainstreaming, by making it less threatening. **The consequence of this avoidance of struggle is the exclusion of opposing voices**, including radical feminist voices.

#### Permutation fails- gender mainstreaming approaches are an economic approach to inclusion which fail to disrupt gender norms

**Perrons 5** (‘Work, life and time in the new economy: an introduction. Time and Society”, 14 (1): 51–64.) LL

This article takes a rather different approach, by developing a conceptualization of the new economy that highlights the market's tendency to widen gender and class inequalities: unless challenged, this will make the goals of gender mainstreaming difficult to realize. The new economy is understood as a new era, with inherent tendencies toward widening social divisions, which are in turn gendered. The argument is mainly theoretical and correspondingly may have resonance for countries attempting to establish a knowledge-based economy, especially **[End Page 390]** along a broadly neo-liberal path. Market processes develop differently within different contexts, so in this article the policy focus is the European Union. Likewise, outcomes—in terms of everyday living—are shaped by global, supranational, and national processes and policies; but these are nonetheless locally situated, so the illustrative case study material comes from one location, London. The empirical findings cannot therefore be generalized. Nevertheless, these findings and the theoretical analysis may provide some insight into the processes sustaining contemporary gender and class inequalities especially, which in turn makes the goals of gender mainstreaming difficult to attain. Focusing on the European Union, I begin by suggesting that gender mainstreaming is driven by a mixture of motivations, only some of which relate to the moral or ethical issue of equality between women and men. Drawing upon the work of an economist, Danny Quah (2003), I then illustrate how market logic in the new economy widens social divisions in the labor market. Gender is absent from his analysis, so I refer to feminist economists—in particular, Nancy Folbre and Julie Nelson (2000)—to show why the social divisions are likely to take a gendered form. I then adapt and extend the labor theory of value to illustrate schematically, via a threefold household typology, how tensions between "productive" and "reproductive" work—created in part by the increasing female employment rate—can be resolved within households. These tensions are resolved in ways that may promote greater gender equality in the higher echelons of the labor market, but simultaneously widen class divisions between women. This economic analysis rests on market logic. It is mediated in practice by supranational and national policies, levels of development, prevailing welfare regimes, and gender norms. Empirical outcomes will therefore vary, nationally, regionally, and locally. Correspondingly, in the final section I illustrate the analysis by referring to some qualitative research carried out in London. If the current efforts to transform the European social model by more neo-liberal economic policies succeed, these UK findings may be the shape of things to come in Europe and perhaps elsewhere. These inequalities are sometimes assumed a relic of a bygone era, so it is important to restate them, before explaining why they are likely to widen with the development of the new economy. Horizontal segregation continues to follow stereotypical patterns, with women overrepresented in activities relating to nurturing, care, clerical work, and sales, and men overrepresented in sectors and occupations involving money, management, and machinery.8 Women have been gaining entry into professional jobs, but segregation follows, with men overrepresented in mathematical and engineering professions, and women in health and education. Vertical segregation is also prevalent, **[End Page 392]** highlighted by the underrepresentation of women in management—with only 21% of the workforce having a woman as their immediate superior, 63% having a man, and the remainder having no immediate supervisor (Fagan and Burchell 2002). There are national variations in the extent of segregation, but all states share this general pattern (European Foundation 2005). Segregation is linked to the gender pay gap, currently varying from 4% in Malta to 25% in Cyprus, as work done by women is consistently valued less than work done by men (European Foundation 2005, Fagan and Burchell 2002).9 Furthermore, in recent times there has been a tendency for collective bargaining and stable hierarchical structures to be displaced by greater fluidity, and by more individualized pay and reward systems, which allow greater discretion and make monitoring equality more difficult. This trend is found even in Denmark and Sweden, as well as in the liberal market UK, and has been shown to be to the disadvantage of women (see Jämo 2003 and Gonäs, Bergman, and Rosenberg 2006).10 Some of the differences between women and men in terms of weekly incomes and lifetime earnings can also be attributed to the gender difference in working hours. One of the most significant changes in recent years has been the growth of dual-earning heterosexual households, including those with children.11 However, while there are national variations, the modal pattern is for the man to work long full-time hours (40+) and the woman to work long part-time hours (20+) (Eurostat 2002 and 2003).12 Time-use survey data also confirms that gender divisions remain in the domestic division of labor, and even though the extent of inequality is lower in households where children are older, it by no means disappears (see Eurostat 2003). Correspondingly, when women do enter the labor market, the extent of their participation is often constrained by the gender-differentiated division of reproductive labor.

#### Alt solves and the permutation fails- only replacement of existing structures of transportation planning can reverse gender based oppression and allow for the perspectives of women to guide future transportation infrastructure projects

Riveria 7 (Roselle Leah K., Assis. Professor Dept of Women and Development Studies-Unviersity of the Philippines, “Culture, Gender, Transport: Contentious Planning Issues”, *Transport and Communications Bulletin for Asia and the Pacific*, http://www.unescap.org/ttdw/Publications/TPTS\_pubs/bulletin76/bulletin76\_fulltext.pdf) LL

The preceding discussion shows in many ways that there needs to be a rethinking of the outdated notions of work, the economy and development. The economy is not solely the productive or commercially oriented economy (formal and informal) that is measured solely in quantitative terms. A purely technology or infrastructure orientation continues to dominate the transport sector; therefore, there must be pressure to push for the social and cultural aspects of transport to be clearly articulated in the policy planning process. Integrating gender into transport policies must take the centre stage in this rethinking process. The work of women, excluded in policy and planning because it is not traditionally produced for exchange in the market, must be made visible and be given value. Excluding the economy of social reproduction from the transport sector framework translates into ignoring equity the aspect in the design and delivery of transport sector activities. The crucial task of re-examining conventional notions means treating the transport sector as a gendered structure, recognizing the implications of transport policies for men and women and the implications of gender relations for sector level analysis and policy options. This way, the crucial element of equity, or fairness, could be tackled head on. This approach is not meant to complement existing approaches, but to replace outdated approaches. The present approach calls for efficiency, even at the expense of equity, but the proposed approach calls for equity as the primary objective, with efficiency socially accorded and guaranteed. Research on women and transport in the developing world, specifically in Asia and the Pacific, is in its infancy. Researchers working in the developing world must take the lead in discovering women, gender and transport with serious intention and attention. The call is now for serious researchers enlightened by progressive perspectives to guide policy and search for new ways to reconsider thinking about transport in women’s lives.

## \*\*\*AFF Answers

### Impact Turn – Essentialism

#### Feminism creates the idea of the universal ‘women’ recreating the same stereotypes created under patriarchy

Witworth 94 (Sandra, professor of political studies and female studies at York University, <http://www.nyu.edu/classes/gmoran/WHITWORTH.pdf>, pg 20) jjv

Even when not concerned with mothering as such, much of the politics that emerge from radical feminism within IR depend on a ‘re-thinking’ from the perspective of women. What is left unexplained is how simply thinking differently will alter the material realities of relations of domination between men and women. Structural (patriarchal) relations are acknowledged, but not analysed in radical feminism’s reliance on the experiences, behaviours and perceptions of ‘women’. As Sandra Harding notes, the essential and universal ‘man’, long the focus of feminist critiques, has merely been replaced here with the essential and universal ‘woman’. And indeed, that notion of ‘woman’ not only ignores important differences amongst women, but it also reproduces exactly the stereotypical vision of women and men, masculine and feminine, that has been produced under patriarchy. Those women who do not fit the mould – who, for example, take up arms in military struggle – are quickly dismissed as expressing ‘negative’ or ‘inauthentic’ feminine values (the same accusation is more rarely made against men). In this way, it comes as no surprise when mainstream IR theorists such as Robert Reohane happily embrace the tenets of radical feminism. It requires little in the way of re-thinking or movement from accepted and comfortable assumptions about stereotypes. Radical feminists find themselves defending the same account of women as nurturing, pacifist, submissive mothers as men do under patriarchy, anti-feminists and the New Right. As some writers suggest, this in itself should give feminists pause to reconsider this position.

#### Essentialism is bad – you shouldn’t associate woman and peace

**Tickner 1** (J Ann, professor, School of International Relations, University of Southern California, Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post-Cold War Era, pg 6) jjv

Feminists have claimed that the likelihood of conflict will not diminish until unequal gender hierarchies are reduced or eliminated; the privileging of characteristics associated with a stereotypical masculinity in states' foreign policies contributes to the legitimization not only of war but of militarization more generally. Wary of what they see as gendered dichotomies that have pitted realists against idealists and led to overly simplistic assumptions about warlike men and peaceful women, certain feminists are cautioning against the association of women with peace, a position that, they believe, disempowers both women and peace. The growing numbers of women in the military also challenges and complicates these essentialist stereotypes. To this end, and as part of their effort to rethink concepts central to the field, feminists define peace and security, not in idealized ways often associated with women, but in broad, multidimensional terms that include the elimination of social hierarchies such as gender that lead to political and economic injustice.

#### Turn-The kritik is essentialist, reproducing the exact stereotypes produced under patriarchy

**Whitworth 94** (Sandra, Assistant Professor of Political Science-York University, “Feminism and International Relations: Towards a Political Economy of Gender in Interstate and Non-Governmental Institutions”, p. 20) LL

Even when not concerned with mothering as such, much of the politics that emerge from radical feminism within IR depend upon a 're-thinking' from the perspective of women. What is left unexplained is how simply thinking differently will alter the material realities of relations of domina­tion between men and women.46 Structural (patriarchal) relations are acknowledged, but not analysed in radical feminism's reliance on the expe­riences, behaviours and perceptions of 'women'. As Sandra Harding notes, the essential and universal 'man', long the focus of feminist critiques, has merely been replaced here with the essential and universal 'woman'.47 And indeed, that notion of 'woman' not only ignores important differ­ences amongst women, but it also reproduces exactly the stereotypical vision of women and men, masculine and feminine, that has been produced under patriarchy.48 Those women who do not fit the mould - who, for exam­ple, take up arms in military struggle - are quickly dismissed as expressing 'negative' or 'inauthentic' feminine values (the same accusation is more rarely made against men).49 In this way, it comes as no surprise when main­stream IR theorists such as Robert Keohane happily embrace the tenets of radical feminism.50 It requires little in the way of re-thinking or movement from accepted and comfortable assumptions and stereotypes. Radical fem­inists find themselves defending the same account of women as nurturing, pacifist, submissive mothers as do men under patriarchy, anti-feminists and the New Right. As some writers suggest, this in itself should give feminists pause to reconsider this position.51

#### Essentialism leads to oppressive representations of identity—Producing classism, sexism and homophobia

**Gosine 2** (Kevin, Brock University Sociologist, “Essentialism Versus Complexity: Conceptions of Racial Identity Construction in Educational Scholarship,” Canadian Journal of Education, 27(1), http://www.csse.ca/CJE/Articles/FullText/CJE27-1/CJE27-1-06Gosine.pdf ,)LL

Researchers might consider employing postmodern perspectives to highlight the various ways individuals negotiate, engage, and resist such collective identifications from the multiplicity of subject positions that comprise a given racial community. Put differently, it is important to account for the unique ways different social statuses continually intersect to complicate collective strivings for coherent racial identities. Although collective or intersubjective forms of racial identity can frequently work to protect and empower racialized youth living within a hostile, Eurocentric environment (Miller, 1999), the imposition of defensively situated (counter-hegemonic) essentialisms can be, as Yon’s (2000) interviews with Trevor and Margaret illustrate, just as confining or oppressive as the negatively valued representations that circulate within the dominant society. In both cases, human subjects are objectified through the imposition of confining, static labels — a situation that provides fertile ground for intra-communal classism, sexism, and homophobia. For this reason, it is worthwhile to explore the diverse effects of these racialized communal forms of consciousness along with the multiplicity of ways in which individuals negotiate and make sense of them. Accounting for intra-group division, ambivalence, and rupture exposes the unstable and fluid nature of collective identities.

### Perm Solvency

#### Working with in the states key

Tickner 1 (J. Ann, professor, School of International Relations, University of Southern California, Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post-Cold War Era, pg 123) jjv

More recently, certain feminists undertaking empirical studies in a variety of states have challenged these structural accounts of states' gendered and racialized policies and drawn more nuanced conclusions. Some see states as contingent and historically variable. R. W. Connell has claimed that while states have historically been patriarchal, they are not essentially so: since they are constantly changing and dynamic, there is room for new political possibilities. States are active players in gender politics, regulating gender relations in various ways-through family policies, population policies, child care, and education. These policies have different implications for different groups inside states; the way states regulate gender and race also filters up into international institutions such as the United Nations and the International Labor Organization. While it is true that, in most liberal states, gender policies have reinforced the public/private divide that has worked in the interests of men, Connell believes that variability allows room for change.88 He hypothesizes replacing the liberal state with a demilitarized and participatory democracy; however, this would not be possible until the gender distinctions between public and private are abolished. Clearly, this would mean a very different kind of state, one with an expansion of the realm to which democracy applied'"'

#### Perm Solves – we can include interests of women in policy making

Lovenduski 5 (Joni, University of London http://www.cambridge.org/asia/catalogue/catalogue.asp?isbn=9780521852227&ss=exc) jjv

Since the last quarter of the twentieth century there has been a proliferation of (state) agencies established to promote women’s status and rights, often called women’s policy agencies. WPAs are sometimes termed state feminist. State feminism is a contested term. To some it is an oxymoron. It has been variously defined as the activities of feminists or femocrats in government and administration (Hernes 1987; Sawer 1990), institutionalised feminism in public agencies (Eisenstein 1990; Outshoorn 1994), and the capacity of the state to contribute to the fulfilment of a feminist agenda (Sawer 1990; Stetson 1987). In this book we define state feminism as the advocacy of women’s movement demands inside the state. The establishment of WPAs changed the setting in which the women’s movement and other feminists could advance their aims, as they offered, in principle, the possibility to influence the agenda and to further feminist goals through public policies from inside the state apparatus. WPAs could increase women’s access to the state by furthering women’s participation in political decision-making, and by inserting feminist goals into public policy. Thus WPAs may enhance the political representation of women. WPAs vary considerably in their capacity, resources and effectiveness, raising questions about the circumstances under which they are most likely to enhance women’s political representation. To understand them we need to consider in detail the part they play in processes of incorporating women’s interests (substantive representation) into policy-making, a requirement that is particularly important when the decisions are about political representation itself.

#### Perm solves – feminism has empirically succeeded with in policy making

Lovenduski 5 (Joni, University of London <http://www.cambridge.org/asia/catalogue/catalogue.asp?isbn=9780521852227&ss=exc>) jjv

The representation of women in a political system is a good test of its claims to democracy. The claims that women make for representation are claims for their citizenship and at the heart of their engagement with politics. Political representation is therefore a fundamental feminist concern, although its importance has not always been acknowledged. The women’s liberation movements that began in the 1970s were, in many countries, ambivalent about formal political representation. However, by the end of the twentieth century women’s movements were active to secure equality of representation throughout the world. From the moment that women’s movements were making demands on the state the issue of their political representation was in play. Whilst suffrage campaigns were explicit movements for political participation and representation, campaigns over rights to education, to paid work, to equal pay, to personal dignity and security, to sexual autonomy were also in part about the inclusion of women’s interests in policy-making. Later movements for representation in legislatures and assemblies were movements for presence that challenged political arrangements and sought to insert women’s interests into policy-making by ensuring they were amongst the policy-makers. The connection between agenda status for women’s interests and the claim for equal political representation continues. Since the nineteenth century women’s movement activists have demanded state action on a range of issues that includes anti-discrimination policies, anti-violence policies, reproductive rights, childcare and political equality. In the late twentieth century governments responded, some more slowly than others, by developing a set of agencies to take responsibility for such demands. These women’s policy agencies (WPAs) vary in scope, size, resources, stability and location. They appeared at different times in different countries but are now part of the political landscape. Their existence is, at least in symbolic terms, an acknowledgement of women’s demands for representation.

### AT Econ link

#### Patriarchy not capitalism is the source of women’s oppression

Thomas, Wilkin 99 (Caroline, Peter, professor at University Texas, Lancaster University, Globalization, Human Security, and the African Experience, pg 51) jjv

In her study of African women, April Gordon has claimed that paid work is an important source of power for women; like Lim, she sees no necessary connection between capitalism and the exploitation of women. Citing the African case, she predicts that a transition to capitalism-which is already leading to the increased participation of women in the waged sector-will actually enhance women's position relative to men and break the hold of African patriarchy that pre-dates both capitalism and colonialism. For Gordon, therefore, patriarchy, not capitalism, is the real source of women's oppression.

### AT: Warming Link

#### Both the causes and consequences of global warming are gendered

Cudworth, Hobden 10 (Erika, Stephen, University of East London, <http://www.jhubc.it/ecpr-porto/virtualpaperroom/021.pdf>) jjv

Global problems and differential effects. International Relations with its tradition of state‐based analysis, has difficulties in dealing with the global character of many environmental issues. Both the globalised character of some environmental problems needs to be fully appreciated, whilst also being cognisant of the differential impact of problem effects in the context of profound and persistent inequities. Global warming is the clearest and most pressing example of a global environmental problem. Other environmental issues may not be so ‘global’ in impact. Land pollution is often localized; humans pollute land where they bury industrial and consumer waste, or locate industrial processing. However, the international trade in commercial and industrial waste, and the practices of dumping waste in international waters and on other countries, adds a global dimension. The pollution of seas is global, as almost all seawater is connected; as is air pollution, carried over considerable distances by prevailing winds (Yearley 1996: 33‐34). The loss of species biodiversity has also come to be defined as an environmental problem for the maintenance of healthy ecosystems, and the widespread character of this collapse of species diversity has been labelled the ‘sixth extinction’ (Leakey and Lewin 1996). This said, most authors argue that the impacts of global climate change will have greater impact on the South. Devereux and Edwards argue that the effects of global warming will be ‘globally stratifying’. Those countries where drought is already a problem are likely to become drier. These same countries are more dependent on agriculture where the possibilities for diversification are more limited. It is likely, they argue, that ‘the prevalence and depth of hunger will deteriorate in those countries and population groups where food security is already significant’ Devereux and Edwards 2004: 28). Furthermore, as Rogers (2004: 99‐100) points out, extreme weather events tend to have a much more drastic impact on countries of the South compared to the North. Goldblatt (1996) argues that the exploitation of the South’s environment commenced during the colonial period and has continued since the end of the European empires. In this sense the ‘North’ has exported much of its environmentally damaging industrialization, making the notion of environmental security on a national basis nonsensical. In addition, the extent to which gender inequalities differentiates human causes of environmental changes and their effects, is absent from most accounts in the environmental security literature. Salleh argues that the impact of gender inequalities is absent from the notion of ecological footprint that has been used in an essentialist way, as it differentiates humanity only in terms of Northern or Southern location (Salleh, 2009: 11). This ignores the gendered qualities of paid and unpaid work and of transport and energy use and the feminization of poverty. Collectively, as Spitzner notes, these inequalities mean that both the causes and consequences of global warming are gendered (2009: 218‐222).

### Patriarchy =/= War

#### Patriarchy doesn’t lead to war

Cockburn 10 (Cynthia, Department of Sociology, The City University London, 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) jjv

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.

#### Patriarchy is caused by war

AFP 4 (Agence France Presse, December 10, 2004, <http://www.worldrevolution.org/news/article1702.htm>) jjv

Raped, treated as the sexual 'booty' of war or slain by indiscriminate bombings, women are too often the first victims of conflict, Amnesty International charged Wednesday in a report demanding legal redress. The London-based human rights group called for action by the International Criminal Court to halt oppressive violence against women. "Patterns of violence against women in conflict do not arise 'naturally' but are ordered, condoned or tolerated as a result of political calculations," its secretary general Irene Khan said in introducing the 120-page report on women in war. Not only are women "considered as the legitimate booty of victorious army," the report said, but "the use of rape as a weapon of war is perhaps the most notorious and brutal way in which conflicts impact on women." "Women's bodies, their sexuality and reproductive capacity are often used as a literal battleground," it said. Khan, the first women, the first Asian and the first Muslim to head Amnesty International, told AFP in an interview that "it's quite interesting to see that women rights have been used as justification for military intervention, in the cases of both Iraq (news - web sites) and Afghanistan (news - web sites)." But, she added, "on the ground the situation changes very little in favor of women ... In the case of Afghanistan we have seen no improvement. "Warlords are occupying parts of the territory and see women as commodities for trading, to settle land dispute. Abductions and forced marriages are about as bad, if not worse, than at any time in Afghan history. "Warlords are not being pulled out, they're not being prosecuted, they're not being investigated for the crimes that are openly committing." Even where women are not deliberately targetted, they are the main victims of so-called collatoral damage, whether caused by "precision" bombing or landmines, the report said. "In Iraq in 2003, US forces reportedly used more than 10,500 cluster munitions containing at least 1.8 million bomblets. An average failure rate of five percent would mean that about 90,000 unexploded munitions are now on Iraqi soil." The report urged the International Criminal Court to "pick up and prosecute one or two high-profile cases because that will send the message that violence against women cannot continue in such an impunity, which is the norm today." The court, headquartered in The Hague (news - web sites), began operating in July 2002 and is mandated to try genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes. Kahn acknowledged the way ahead would be tough, but said she hoped the report would generate pressure for change. Women and children make up 80 percent of the world's 40 million refugees, but they have no voice, and injustices go unpunished," she added. "If you take the example of the Korean women, the comfort women in Japan, who were used as sex slaves during the second world war, even now they're still battling for the recognition of their case," Khan said. The report detailed widespread rape in conflicts around the world, including the Darfur region of Sudan, Colombia, Nepal, Chechnya (news - web sites), India and, earlier this year, in the tiny Pacific territory of the Solomon Islands. Tens of thousands of women and young girls were raped during the conflicts sweeping the Democratic Republic of Congo (news - web sites). "Ten years on from the genocide in Rwanda, where violence against women was a central element of the strategy to eliminate a particular ethnic group, little or nothing seems to have been learned about how to prevent such horrors," the report said.

### No Alt Solvency – General

#### Accepting hegemonic understandings of gender recreates the impact of the kritik

Lugones 7 (Maria, professor of philosophy, interpretation, and culture and comparative literature-Binghamton University and Ph.D, in philosophy and political science and is an expert on feminism, ethics, race, and gender, " Heterosexualism and the Colonial/Modern Gender System “. *Hypatia* http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2007.tb01156.x/full) LL

**This is too narrow an understanding of the** oppressive **modern/colonial** **constructions of** the scope of **gender**. **Quijano** also assumes **patriarchal and heterosexual understandings of the disputes over control of sex**, its resources, and products. **Quijano accepts the global, Eurocentered, capitalist understanding of what gender is about**. **These features of the framework** serve to veil **the ways in which nonwhite colonized women have been subjected** and disempowered. **The heterosexual and patriarchal character of the arrangements can themselves be appreciated as oppressive by unveiling the presuppositions of the framework**. **Gender does not need to organize social arrangements**, including social sexual arrangements. But gender **arrangements need not be either heterosexual or patriarchal**. They need not be, **that is**, as **a matter of history**. **Understanding these features of the organization of gender** in the modern/colonial gender system—the biological dimorphism, the patriarchal and heterosexual organizations of relations—**is crucial to an understanding of the differential gender arrangements along “racial” lines**. Biological dimorphism, heterosexualism, and patriarchy are all characteristic of what I call the light side of the colonial/modern organization of gender. Hegemonically, these are written large over the meaning of gender. **Quijano seems unaware of his accepting this hegemonic meaning of gender**. In making these claims I aim to expand and complicate Quijano's approach, while preserving his understanding of the coloniality of power, which is at the center of what I am calling the modern/colonial gender system.

#### Alt doesn’t solve- reductionist logic undermines efficacy of alternative and recreates disenfranchising universalism that turns the alt

**Jarvis 0** (Daryl, Lecturer in Government and International Relations – University of Sydney, International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism: Defending the Discipline JGC)

Celebrating and reifying difference as a political end in itself thus run the risk of creating increasingly divisive and incommensurate discourses where each group claims a knowledge or experienced based legitimacy but, in doing so, precluding the possibility of common understanding or intergroup political discourse. Instead, difference produces antithetical dis­cord and political-tribalism: only working class Hispanics living in South Central Los Angeles, for instance, can speak of, for, and about their com­munity, its concerns, interests and needs; only female African Americans living in the projects of Chicago can speak "legitimately" of the housing and social problems endemic to inner city living. Discourse becomes con­fined not to conversations between identity groups since this is impossible, but story telling of personal/group experiences where the "other" listens intently until their turn comes to tell their own stories and experiences. Appropriating the voice or pain of others by speaking, writing, or theoriz­ing on issues, perspectives, or events not indicative of one's group-identity becomes not only illegitimate but a medium of oppression and a means to silence others. The very activity of theory and political discourse as it has been understood traditionally in International Relations, and the social sciences more generally, is thus rendered inappropriate in the new milieu of identity politics. Politically, progressives obviously see a danger in this type of discourse and, from a social scientific perspective, understand it to be less than rig­orous. Generalizing, as with theorizing, for example, has fallen victim to postmodern feminist reactions against methodological essentialism and the adoption of what Jane Martin calls the instillation of false difference into identity discourse. By reacting against the assumption that "all indi­viduals in the world called `women' were exactly like us" (i.e. white, mid­dle class, educated, etc.), feminists now tend "a priori to give privileged status to a predetermined set of analytic categories and to affirm the exis**­**tence of nothing but difference." In avoiding the "pitfall of false unity," feminists have thus "walked straight into the trap of false difference. Club words now dominate the discourse. Essentialism, ahistoricism, uni­versalism, and androcentrism, for example, have become the "prime idiom[s] of intellectual terrorism and the privileged instrument[s] of polit­ical orthodoxy." While sympathetic to the cause, even feminists like Jane Martin are critical of the methods that have arisen to circumvent the evils of essentialism, characterizing contemporary feminist scholarship as imposing its own "chilly climate" on those who question the method­ological proclivity for difference and historicism. Postmodern feminists, she argues, have fallen victim to compulsory historicism, and by "rejecting one kind of essence talk but adopting another," have followed a course "whose logical conclusion all but precludes the use of language." For Martin, this approaches a "dogmatism on the methodological level that we do not countenance in other contexts.... It rules out theories, categories, and research projects in advance; prejudges the extent of difference and the nonexistence of similarity." In all, it speaks to a methodological trap that produces many of the same problems as before, but this time in a language otherwise viewed as progressive, sensitive to the particularities of identity and gender, and destructive of conventional boundaries in disci­plinary knowledge and theoretical endeavor.

#### The alt can’t solve the aff- transforming gender relations does not disrupt the war machine. Solving the affirmative is a precondition for the alt

**Goldstein 1** (Joshua, Int’l Rel Prof @ American U, 2001, War and Gender, p. 412 JGC)

First, peace activists face a dilemma in thinking about causes of war and working for peace. Many peace scholars and activists support the approach, “if you want peace, work for justice.” Then, if one believes that sexism contributes to war one can work for gender justice specifically (perhaps among others) in order to pursue peace. This approach brings strategic allies to the peace movement (women, labor, minorities), but rests on the assumption that injustices cause war. The evidence in this book **s**uggests that causality runs at least as strongly the other way. War is not a product of capitalism, imperialism, gender, innate aggression, or any other single cause, although all of these influence wars’ outbreaks and outcomes. Rather, war has in part fueled and sustained these and other injustices.9 So,”if you want peace, work for peace.” Indeed, **i**f you want justice (gender and others), work for peace. Causality does not run just upward through the levels of analysis, from types of individuals, societies, and governments up to war. It runs downward too. Enloe suggests that changes in attitudes towards war and the military may be the most important way to “reverse women’s oppression.” The dilemma is that peace work focused on justice brings to the peace movement energy, allies, and moral grounding, yet, in light of this book’s evidence, the emphasis on injustice as the main cause of war seems to be empirically inadequate. "men of Africa" as a group?) are seen as a group precisely because they are generally dependent and oppressed, the analysis of specific historical differences becomes impossible, because reality is always apparently structured by divisions—two mutually exclusive and jointly exhaustive groups, the victims and the oppressors. Here the sociological is substituted for the biological in order, however, to create the same—a unity of women. Thus, it is not the descriptive potential of gender difference, but the privileged positioning and explanatory potential of gender difference as the origin of oppression that I question. In using "women of Africa" (as an already constituted group of oppressed peoples) as a category of analysi**s**, Cutrufelli denies any historical specificity to the location of women as subordinate, powerful, marginal, central, or otherwise, vis-a-vis particular social and power networks. Women are taken as a unified "Powerless" group prior to the analysis in question. Thus, it is then merely a matter of specifying the context after the fact. "Women" are now placed in the context of the family, or in the workplace, or within religious networks, almost as if these systems existed outside the relations of women with other women, and women with men. The problem with this analytic strategy is that it assumes men and women are already constituted as sexual-political subjects prior to their entry into the arena of social relations**.** Only if we subscribe to this assumption is it possible to undertake analysis which looks at the "effects" of kinship structures, colonialism, organization of labor, etc., on women, who are already defined as a group apparently because of shared dependencies, but ultimately because of their gender. But women are produced through these very relations as well as being implicated in forming these relations. As Michelle Rosaldo states: " . . . woman's place in human social life is not in any direct sense a product of the things she does (or even less, a function of what, biologically, she is) but the meaning her activities acquire through concrete social interactions."" That women mother in a variety of societies is not as significant as the value attached to mothering in these societies. The distinction between the act of mothering and the status attached to it is a very important one—one that needs to be made and analyzed contextually.

#### The alt is built on false universals about the feminine which destroys it’s emancipatory potential – they can’t solve K or the aff

**Stearn and Zalewski 9** (Maria, researcher @ Gotberh University and Marysia, director centre for gender studies @ Univ of Aberdeen,

“Feminist fatigue(s): reflections on feminism and familiar fables of militarization” Review of International Studies 35.3)

In this section we clarify what we mean by the problem of sexgender and how it transpires in the context of feminist narratives within IR – which we will exemplify below with a recounting of a familiar feminist reading of militarisation. To re-iterate, the primary reason for investigating this is that we suspect part of the reason for the aura of disillusionment around feminism – especially as a critical theoretical resource – is connected to the sense that feminist stories repeat the very grammars that initially incited them as narratives in resistance.To explain; one might argue that there has been a normative feminist failure to adequately construct secure foundations for legitimate and authoritative knowledge claims upon which to garner effective and permanent gender change, particularly in regard to women. But for poststructural scholars this failure is not surprising as the emancipatory visions of feminism inevitably emerged as illusory given the attachments to foundationalist and positivistic understandings of subjects, power and agency. If, as poststructuralism has shown us, we cannot – through language – decide the meaning of woman, or of femininity, or of feminism, or produce foundational information about it or her;[42](http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayFulltext?type=6&fid=5895844&jid=RIS&volumeId=35&issueId=03&aid=5895840&fulltextType=RA&fileId=S0260210509008675#fn42) that subjects are ‘effects’ rather than ‘origins of institutional practices and discourses’;[43](http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayFulltext?type=6&fid=5895844&jid=RIS&volumeId=35&issueId=03&aid=5895840&fulltextType=RA&fileId=S0260210509008675#fn43) that power ‘produces subjects in effects’;[44](http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayFulltext?type=6&fid=5895844&jid=RIS&volumeId=35&issueId=03&aid=5895840&fulltextType=RA&fileId=S0260210509008675#fn44) or that authentic and authoritative agency are illusory – then the sure foundations for the knowledge that feminist scholars are conventionally required to produce – even hope to produce – are unattainable. Moreover, post-colonial feminisms have vividly shown how representations of ‘woman’ or ‘women’ which masquerade as ‘universal’ are, instead, universalising and inevitably produced through hierarchical and intersecting power relations.[45](http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayFulltext?type=6&fid=5895844&jid=RIS&volumeId=35&issueId=03&aid=5895840&fulltextType=RA&fileId=S0260210509008675#fn45) In sum; the poststructural suggestion is that feminist representations of women do not correspond to some underlying truth of what woman is or can be; rather feminism produces the subject of woman which it then subsequently comes to represent.[46](http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayFulltext?type=6&fid=5895844&jid=RIS&volumeId=35&issueId=03&aid=5895840&fulltextType=RA&fileId=S0260210509008675#fn46) The implications of this familiar conundrum are far-reaching as the demands of feminism in the context of theknowledge/political project of the gender industry are exposed as implicated in the re-production of the very power from which escape is sought. In short, feminism emerges as complicit in violent reproductions of subjects and knowledges/practices. How does this recognisable puzzle (recognisable within feminist theory) play out in relation to the issues we are investigating in this article? As noted above, the broad example we choose to focus on to explain our claims is militarisation; partly chosen as both authors have participated in pedagogic, policy and published work in this generic area, and partly because this is an area in which the demand for operationalisable gender knowledge is ever-increasing. Our suggestion is that the increasing requirement[47](http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayFulltext?type=6&fid=5895844&jid=RIS&volumeId=35&issueId=03&aid=5895840&fulltextType=RA&fileId=S0260210509008675#fn47) for knowledge for the gender industry about gender and militarisation re-animates the sexgender paradox which persistently haunts attempts to translate what we know into useful knowledge for redressing (and preventing) conflict, or simply into hopeful scenarios for our students.

### No Alt Solvency – State DA

#### Your critique over determines patriarchy decreasing the social and political relevance of the alternative. The aff strengthens the state which is necessary to increase the interest of women’s representation

Rhode 94 (Deborah L., Law Prof-Stanford, “Changing Images of the State: Feminism and the State, CHANGING IMAGES OF THE STATE: FEMINISM AND THE STATE, Ha*rvard Law Review*) LL

In many left feminist accounts, the state is a patriarchal institution in the sense that it reflects and institutionalizes male dominance. Men control positions of official power and men's interests determine how that power is exercised. According to Catharine MacKinnon, the state's invocation of neutrality and objectivity ensures that, "[t]hose who have freedoms like equality, liberty, privacy and speech socially keep them legally, free of governmental intrusion." n15 In this view, "the state protects male power [by] appearing to prohibit its excesses when necessary to its normalization." n16 So, for example, to the extent that abortion functions "to facilitate male sexual access to women, access to abortion will be controlled by 'a man or The Man.'" n17 Other theorists similarly present women as a class and elaborate the ways in which even state policies ostensibly designed to assist women have institutionalized their subordination. n18 So, for example, welfare programs stigmatize female recipients without providing the support that would enable them to alter their disadvantaged status. n19 In patriarchal accounts, the choice for many women is between dependence [\*1185] on an intrusive and insensitive bureaucracy, or dependence on a controlling or abusive man. n20 Either situation involves sleeping with the enemy. As Virginia Woolf noted, these public and private spheres of subordination are similarly structured and "inseparably connected; . . . the tyrannies and servilities of the one are the tyrannies and servilities of the other." n21 This account is also problematic on many levels. To treat women as a class obscures other characteristics, such as race and economic status, that can be equally powerful in ordering social relations. Women are not "uniformly oppressed." n22 Nor are they exclusively victims. Patriarchy cannot account adequately for the mutual dependencies and complex power dynamics that characterize male-female relations. Neither can the state be understood solely as an instrument of men's interests. As a threshold matter, what constitutes those interests is not self-evident, as MacKinnon's own illustrations suggest. If, for example, policies liberalizing abortion serve male objectives by enhancing access to female sexuality, policies curtailing abortion presumably also serve male objectives by reducing female autonomy. n23 In effect, patriarchal frameworks verge on tautology. Almost any gender-related policy can be seen as either directly serving men's immediate interests, or as compromising short-term concerns in the service of broader, long-term goals, such as "normalizing" the system and stabilizing power relations. A framework that can characterize all state interventions as directly or indirectly patriarchal offers little practical guidance in challenging the conditions it condemns. And if women are not a homogenous group with unitary concerns, surely the same is true of men. Moreover, if the state is best understood as a network of institutions with complex, sometimes competing agendas, then the patriarchal model of single-minded instrumentalism seems highly implausible. It is difficult to dismiss all the anti-discrimination initiatives of the last quarter century as purely counter-revolutionary strategies. And it is precisely these initiatives, with their appeal to "male" norms of "objectivity and the impersonality of procedure, that [have created] [\*1186] leverage for the representation of women's interests." n24 Cross-cultural research also suggests that the status of women is positively correlated with a strong state, which is scarcely the relationship that patriarchal frameworks imply. n25 While the "tyrannies" of public and private dependence are plainly related, many feminists challenge the claim that they are the same. As Carole Pateman notes, women do not "live with the state and are better able to make collective struggle against institutions than individuals." n26 To advance that struggle, feminists need more concrete and contextual accounts of state institutions than patriarchal frameworks have supplied. Lumping together police, welfare workers, and Pentagon officials as agents of a unitary patriarchal structure does more to obscure than to advance analysis. What seems necessary is a contextual approach that can account for greater complexities in women's relationships with governing institutions. Yet despite their limitations, patriarchal theories underscore an insight that generally informs feminist theorizing. As Part II reflects, governmental institutions are implicated in the most fundamental structures of sex-based inequality and in the strategies necessary to address it.

#### Best empirical data shows the alt will fail to impact the state or war fighting

Johnston and Sapiro 93 (Pamela, Ph.D. in political science and professor-University of North Carolina & Virginia, Ph.D. in Political science, “Gender, Feminist Consciousness, and War”, American Journal of Political Science, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2111544?seq=1) LL

We begin by considering three general orientations toward the conduct of foreign affairs: militarism, isolationism, and fear of war. Specifically, the Pilot Study included three questions tapping basic attitudes toward militarism. Should the United States be willing to use force to solve international problems in the future? Was it important for the United States to have a strong military force “in order to be effective in dealing with our enemies”? Should defense spending be increased or not? (see the appendix for details on questions). These items combined to form a “militarism” scale on which high scores indicated strongly militaristic responses. “Isolationism” was measured by a single question asking whether respondents agreed that “this country would be better off if we just stayed home and did not concern ourselves with problems in other parts of the world”; responses were coded so that high scores indicate opposition to isolationism. And finally, “fear of war” was assessed by summing the responses to two questions: one concerning conventional war and the other nuclear war; high scores on this scale indicate greater fear of war. Conventional stereotypes and previous research suggest that there should be a significant gender gap on these three measures (see Shapiro and Mahajan 1986; Smith 1984). In keeping with these expectations, women were, indeed, more likely than men both to adopt an isolationist stance (Pearson’s r = -.16) and to be fearful of war (Pearson’s r = .23). But contrary to expectations, there was no significant gender gap on the militarism measure (Pearson’s r = .03). We are left with three questions. First, does the gender gap for isolationism and fear of war persist when other variables are controlled? Second, does feminist consciousness have an independent effect on any of these general orientations? And third, is there any evidence that women and men have different ways of thinking about these issues? To address the first two of these questions, we regressed the militarism, isolationism, and fear of war measures on gender and feminist consciousness, a set of background measures (race, age, income, education) and key attitudinal variables (symbolic patriotism, liberal-conservative identification, and party identification). Then, to explore potential gender differences in the structure of thinking, we repeated the analysis separately for the male and female subsamples. The results of all three analyses are displayed in Table 1. How do our hypotheses fare? Contrary to expectations, militarism is unaffected by both gender and feminist consciousness. Instead, it is a product of a strong sense of patriotism, a conservative ideology, and lower levels of education. Gender fares better on the remaining measures where it is a significant predictor of both isolationism and fear of war. A feminist consciousness is also a significant determinant of fear of war, though it has little impact on isolationism.

### No Alt Solvency – Political Action Good

#### Incorporating political action solves best

**Peterson 92** (Spike, Gendered States: Feminist (Re) Visions of International Relations Theory, p. 8)

In general, the deconstructive project documents the extent and tenacity of androcentric bias and the cultural codification of men as “knowers.” It reveals women’s exclusion from or trivialization within masculinist accounts and, especially, women’s “absence” there as agents of social change. But even more significant, “adding women” to existing frameworks exposes taken-for-granted assumptions embedded in those frameworks. Across disciplines, feminists discover the contradictions of “adding woman” to constructions that are literally defined by their “man-ness”: the public sphere, rationality, economic power, autonomy, political identity, objectivity. The systematic inclusion of women – our bodies, activities, knowledge – challenges categorical givens, disciplinary divisions, and theoretical frameworks. It became increasingly clear that it was not possible simply to include women in those theories where they had previously been excluded, for this exclusion forms a fundamental structuring principle and key presumption of patriarchal discourse. It was not simply the range and scope of objects that required transformation: more profoundly, and threateningly, the very questions posed and the methods used to answer them…needed to be seriously questioned. The political, ontological, and epistemological commitments underlying patriarchal discourses, as well as their theoretical contents required re-evaluation. The reconstructive project marks the shift “from recovering ourselves to critically examining the world from the perspective of this recovery…a move from the margin to center.” Not simply seeking access to and participating within (but from the margins of) androcentric paradigms, feminist reconstruction explores the theoretical implications of revealing systemic masculinist bias and systematically adding women. Not surprisingly, the shift from “women as knowable” to “women as knowers” locates feminism at the heart of contemporary debates over what constitutes science and the power of “claims to know.” This is difficult terrain to map, so I start from a vantage point that I hope is reasonably familiar.

### No Alt Solvency – Totalizing

#### Framing gender as an ontologically superior explanation of history is incorrect and relies on the same totalizing assumptions they criticize

**Jarvis 0** (Darryl, Studies Government and International Relations at U. of Sydney, International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism, “Feminist revisions of international relations,” p. 162-3)

Critical research agendas of this type, however, are not found easily in International Relations. Critics of feminist perspectives run the risk of denouncement as either a misogynist malcontent or an androcentric keeper of the gate. At work in much of this discourse is an unstated political correctness, where the historical marginalization of women bestows intellectual autonomy, excluding those outside the identity group from legitimate participation in its discourse. Only feminist women can do real, legitimate, feminist theory since, in the mantra of identity politics, discourse must emanate from a positional (personal) ontology. Those sensitive or sympathetic to the identity politics of particular groups are, of course, welcome to lend support and encouragement, but only on terms delineated by the groups themselves. In this way, they enjoy an uncontested sovereign hegemony over their own self-identification, insuring the group discourse is self constituted and that its parameters, operative methodology, and standards of argument, appraisal, and evidentiary provisions are self defined. Thus, for example, when Sylvester calls for a "homesteading" of IR she does so "by [a] repetitive feminist insistence that we be included on our terms" (my emphasis). Rather than an invitation to engage in dialogue, this is an ultimatum that a sovereign intellectual space be provided and insulated from critics who question the merits of identity-based political discourse. Instead, Sylvester calls upon International Relations to "share space, respect, and trust in a re-formed endeavor," but one otherwise proscribed as committed to demonstrating not only "that the secure homes constructed by IR's many debaters are chimerical," but, as a consequence, to ending International Relations and remaking it along lines grounded in feminist postmodernism.93 Such stipulative provisions might be likened to a form of negotiated sovereign territoriality where, as part of the settlement for the historically aggrieved, border incursions are to be allowed but may not be met with resistance or reciprocity. Demands for entry to the discipline are thus predicated on conditions that insure two sets of rules, cocooning postmodern feminist spaces from systematic analyses while "respecting" this discourse as it hastens about the project of deconstructing International Relations as a "male space." Sylvester's impassioned plea for tolerance and "emphatic cooperation" is thus confined to like-minded individuals, those who do not challenge feminist epistemologies but accept them as a necessary means of reinventing the discipline as a discourse between postmodern identities—the most important of which is gender.94 Intolerance or misogyny thus become the ironic epithets attached to those who question the wisdom of this reinvention or the merits of the return of identity in international theory.'"' Most strategic of all, however, demands for entry to the discipline and calls for intellectual spaces betray a self-imposed, politically motivated marginality. After all, where are such calls issued from other than the discipline and the intellectual—and well established—spaces of feminist International Relations? Much like the strategies employed by male dissidents, then, feminist postmodernists too deflect as illegitimate any criticism that derives from skeptics whose vantage points are labeled privileged. And privilege is variously interpreted historically, especially along lines of race, color, and sex where the denotations white and male, to name but two, serve as generational mediums to assess the injustices of past histories. White males, for example, become generic signifiers for historical oppression, indicating an ontologicallv privileged group by which the historical experiences of the "other" can then be reclaimed in the context of their related oppression, exploitation, AND exclusion. Legitimacy, in this context, can then be claimed in terms of one's group identity and the extent to which the history of that particular group has been “silenced.” In this same way, self-identification or “self-situation” establishes one’s credentials, allowing admittance to the group and legitimating the “authoritative” vantage point from which one speaks and writes. Thus, for example, Jan Jindy Pettman includes among the introductory pages to her most recent book, Worlding Women, a section titled “A (personal) politics of location,” in which her identity as a woman, a feminist, and an academic, makes apparent her particular (marginal) identities and group loyalties.96 Similarly, Christine Sylvester, in the introduction to her book, insists, “It is important to provide a context for one’s work in the often-denied politics of the personal.” Accordingly, self-declaration reveals to the reader that she is a feminist, went to a Catholic girls school where she was schooled to “develop your brains and confess something called “sins” to always male forever priests,” and that these provide some pieces to her dynamic objectivity.97 Like territorial markers, self-identification permits entry to intellectual spaces whose sovereign authority is “policed” as much by marginal subjectivies as they allege of the oppressors who “police” the discourse of realism, or who are said to walk the corridors of the discipline insuring the replication of patriarchy, hierarchical agendas, and “malestream” theory. If Sylvester’s version of feminist postmodernism is projected as tolerant, perspectivist, and encompassing of a multiplicity of approaches, in reality it is as selective, exclusionary, and dismissive of alternative perspectives as mainstream approaches are accused of being. Skillful theoretical moves of this nature underscore the adroitness of postmodern feminist theory at emasculating many of its logical inconsistencies. In arguing for a feminist postmodernism, for example, Sylvester employs a double theoretical move that, on the one hand, invokes a kind of epistemological deconstructive anarchy cum relativism in an attempt to decenter or make insecure fixed research gazes, identities, and concepts (men, women, security, and nation-state), while on the other hand turning to the lived experiences of women as if ontologically given and assuming their experiences to be authentic, real, substantive, and authoritative interpretations of the realities of international relations. Women at the peace camps of Greenham Common or in the cooperatives of Harare, represent, for Sylvester, the real coal face of international politics, their experiences and strategies the real politics of “relations international.” But why should we take the experiences of these women to be ontologically superior or more insightful than the experiences of other women or other men? As Sylvester admits elsewhere, “Experience … is at once always already an interpretation and in need of interpretation.” Why, then are experience-based modes of knowledge more insightful than knowledges derived through other modes of inquiry?98 Such espistemologies are surely crudely positivistic in their singular reliance on osmotic perception of the facts as they impact upon the personal. If, as Sylvester writes, “sceptical inlining draws on substantive everydayness as a time and site of knowledge, much as does everyday feminist theorizing,” and if, as she further notes, “it understands experience…as mobile, indeterminate, hyphenated, [and] homeless,” why should this knowledge be valued as anything other than fleeting subjective perceptions of multiple environmental stimuli whose meaning is beyond explanation other than as a personal narrative?99 Is this what Sylvester means when she calls for a re-visioning and a repainting of the “canvases of IR,” that we dissipate knowledge into an infinitesimal number of disparate sites, all equally valid, and let loose with a mélange of visceral perceptions; stories of how each of us perceive we experience international politics? If this is the case, then Sylvester’s version of feminist postmodernity does not advance our understanding of international politics, leaving untheorized and unexplained the causes of international relations. Personal narratives do not constitute theoretical discourse, nor indeed an explanation of the systemic factors that procure international events, process, or the actions of certain actors. We might also extend a contextualist lens to analyze Sylvester’s formulations, much as she insists her epistemogical approach does. Sylvester, for example, is adamant that we can not really know who “women” are, since to do so would be to invoke an essentialist concept, concealing the diversity inherent in this category. “Women” don’t really exist in Sylvester’s estimation since there are black women, white women, Hispanic, disabled, lesbian, poor, rich, middle class, and illiterate women, to name but a few. The point, for Sylvester, is that to speak of “women” is to do violence to the diversity encapsulated in this category and, in its own way, to silence those women who remain unnamed. Well and good. Yet this same analytical respect for diversity seems lost with men. Politics and international relations become the “places of men.” But which men? All men? Or just white men, or rich, educated, elite, upper class, hetero-sexual men? To speak of political places as the places of men ignores the fact that most men, in fact the overwhelming majority of men, are not in these political places at all, are not decision makers, elite, affluent, or powerful. Much as with Sylvester’s categories, there are poor, lower class, illiterate, gay, black, and white men, many of whom suffer the vestiges of hunger, poverty, despair, and disenfranchisement just as much as women. So why invoke the category “men” in such essentialist and ubiquitous ways while cognizant only of the diversity of in the category “women.” These are double standards, not erudite theoretical formulations, betraying, dare one say, sexism toward men by invoking male gender generalizations and crude caricatures. Problems of this nature, however, are really manifestations of a deeper, underlying ailment endemic to discourses derived from identity politics. At base, the most elemental question for identity discourse, as Zalewski and Enloe note, is “Who am I?”100 The personal becomes the political, evolving a discourse where self-identification, but also one’s identification by others, presupposes multiple identities that are fleeting, overlapping, and changing at any particular moment in time or place. “We have multiple identities,” argues V. Spike Peterson, “e.g., Canadian, homemaker, Jewish, Hispanic, socialist.”101 And these identities are variously depicted as transient, polymorphic, interactive, discursive, and never fixed. As Richard Brown notes, “Identity is given neither institutionally nor biologically. It evolves as one orders continuities on one’s conception of oneself.”102 Yet, if we accept this, the analytical utility of identity politics seems problematic at best. Which identity, for example, do we choose from the many that any one subject might display affinity for? Are we to assume that all identities are of equal importance or that some are more important than others? How do we know which of these identities might be transient and less consequential to one’s sense of self and, in turn, politically significant to understanding international politics? Why, for example, should we place gender identity ontologically prior to class, sexual orientation, ethnic origin, ideological perspective, or national identity?103 As Zalewski and Enloe ask, “Why do we consider states to be a major referent? Why not men? Or women?”104 But by the same token, why not dogs, shipping magnates, movie stars, or trade regimes? Why is gender more constitutive of global politics than, say, class, or an identity as a cancer survivor, laborer, or social worker? Most of all, why is gender essentialized in feminist discourse, reified into the most preeminent of all identities as the primary lens through which international relations must be viewed? Perhaps, for example, people understand difference in the context of identities outside of gender. As Jane Martin notes, “How do we know that difference…does not turn on being fat or religious or in an abusive relationship?”105 The point, perhaps flippantly made, is that identity is such a nebulous concept, its meaning so obtuse and so inherently subjective, that it is near meaningless as a conduit for understanding global politics if only because it can mean anything to anybody.