

An illustration of a diverse group of people, including men and women of various ethnicities, standing in a circle with their hands raised and palms facing each other. They are wearing brightly colored clothing in shades of purple, yellow, blue, green, and red. The background is a solid orange color.

International Alert.

GENDER IN PEACEBUILDING

Taking stock

Judy El-Bushra
June 2012

Understanding conflict. Building peace.

About International Alert

International Alert is a 26-year-old independent peacebuilding organisation. We work with people who are directly affected by violent conflict to improve their prospects of peace. And we seek to influence the policies and ways of working of governments, international organisations like the UN and multinational companies, to reduce conflict risk and increase the prospects of peace.

We work in Africa, several parts of Asia, the South Caucasus, the Middle East and Latin America, and have recently started work in the UK. Our policy work focuses on several key themes that influence prospects for peace and security – the economy, climate change, gender, the role of international institutions, the impact of development aid, and the effect of good and bad governance.

We are one of the world's leading peacebuilding NGOs with more than 159 staff based in London and 14 field offices. To learn more about how and where we work, visit www.international-alert.org.

The contents of this document are the sole responsibility of International Alert and can under no circumstances be regarded as the position of DFID.

© International Alert 2012

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without full attribution.

Layout and illustration by D. R. ink, www.d-r-ink.com

GENDER IN PEACEBUILDING

Taking stock

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Judy El-Bushra is an independent consultant specialising in research and programme design on conflict and peace. She has over 35 years' experience in the field of gender, peacebuilding and development, the last 13 of which she has spent in senior-level management positions with International Alert and ACORD and engaging in African fragile state-focused consultancy work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank the UK Department for International Development (DFID), who contributed to funding this research through a Programme Partnership Agreement with Alert. We are also grateful to the participants of the Nepal and Burundi roundtables and the Alert Nepal and Burundi field staff, and to Minna Lytikainen, Charlotte Onslow and Ndeye Sow for their contributions to the field research and to the report.

CONTENTS

Executive summary	4
Introduction	5
1. What light can a gender perspective throw on conflict analysis?	7
2. How can an understanding of gender identities contribute to effective peacebuilding?	10
3. What does “gender and peacebuilding” mean to practitioners and decision-makers in the field? What do they do and what challenges do they face?	13
4. What are the different approaches that underlie “gender and peacebuilding” work?	17
Conclusion	20

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report reflects the findings of the preparatory stage of a three-year research project exploring the role of gender in peacebuilding. The starting point for the research was International Alert's belief that a gender approach, as a key component in the understanding of power dynamics, is critical to successful peacebuilding. The research hypothesis was that gender dynamics form a resource for peacebuilding which peacebuilders generally make insufficient use of, but that examples of projects and research do exist from which to draw lessons, and thereby improve peacebuilding practice.

This first stage of research confirmed the hypothesis, but identified a number of conceptual challenges and contradictions in the field of "gender and peacebuilding". To facilitate the further exploration of these, a broad typology of peacebuilding programmes was proposed, based on the identification of three different approaches to gender:

Type 1: **gender-blind approaches**, in which the possibility of differential outcomes for men and women, or of outcomes that impact on relations between them, is either not acknowledged or considered to be incidental;

Type 2: **approaches developed in the frame of UN Security Council Resolution 1325**, in which it is axiomatic that women are more vulnerable and marginalised than men, and which apply gender analysis with the specific aim of counteracting this tendency for the betterment of women and of society more broadly;

Type 3: **gender-relational approaches**, which take a context specific relational gender analysis as their starting point and which aim at better benefit sharing generally, on the assumption that this leads to more peaceful outcomes for all.

Programmes adopting a Type 3 approach are under-represented in peacebuilding portfolios. As a result, little evidence is available on which to base discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach. During the remainder of the research project, Alert will work with other organisations in a number of peacebuilding contexts to identify and examine examples of gender-relational projects, and draw lessons about their design and implementation which can be applied by peacebuilders.

INTRODUCTION

This report reflects the findings of the preparatory stage of a three-year research project exploring the role of gender in peacebuilding. The report is the outcome of the two main activities undertaken in the preparatory phase: the first a review of current literature relevant to the roles of men and women, and of gender relations, in violent conflict and peacebuilding; and the second a series of workshops in Burundi and Nepal which explored how practitioners, government representatives and donors viewed the issues. The report summarises the findings of these two activities, and presents tentative conclusions that will be further explored in later phases of the research.

The starting point for the research was International Alert's belief that a gender approach, as a key component in the understanding of power dynamics, is critical to successful peacebuilding. International Alert formulated its initial thinking for this research project in the following terms:

'If we are to be effective as peacebuilders, we need to respond to the power dynamics and norms that influence peace and violent conflict at the household, community, national and international levels. To do this, we need to be aware of the diversity of gender and other identities across groups of men and women. Therefore, gender analysis is key in helping us understand identity and violence, and, as a result, act effectively.'

The field of gender and development has gained increasing legitimacy and acceptance since the Beijing Conference on Women in 1995. In relation to the peacebuilding and humanitarian fields, the passing of the UN Security Council's (UNSC) Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security in 2000 put "women and peace" firmly on the map. This was followed by a rapid escalation of policies and projects devoted to promoting and protecting women and girls. However, progress has been disappointing. In 2010, ten years after the passing of Resolution 1325, and responding to widespread demands to galvanise the international community into a more tightly targeted response, the Secretary-General in his report 'Women's participation in peacebuilding' felt obliged to propose a seven-point plan to address outstanding blockages to women's participation in peace processes and in post-conflict recovery. Alert's observation, based on interactions with donor, government and civil society organisations working on the ground, suggests that the issue is not just a lack of focus on the task; there is also a range of conceptual and practical divisions and confusions, leading to missed opportunities both for delivering results and for learning from them. Divergent perspectives on what gender *is* as a conceptual dimension of peacebuilding are

paralleled by confusion on what peacebuilders are expected to *do* to integrate it into their work.

International Alert's three-year research project seeks to identify and clarify some of the challenges and contradictions within the "gender and peacebuilding" field. At the same time, it aims to develop a re-formulation that contributes more clearly to a transformative peacebuilding approach. This report outlines some initial thoughts on how such a re-formulation might be approached, and addresses four broad questions:

- What can gender analysis tell us that would help us understand conflict and peace better?
- In what ways would the design and implementation of peacebuilding work be enhanced if it incorporated a gender approach?
- What progress do peacebuilders on the ground (in donor, government and non-government agencies) think they have achieved in engendering their work?
- What are the different approaches that underlie gender and peacebuilding work?

These four questions are addressed in turn and form the structure of the report.

QUESTION 1

What light can a gender perspective throw on conflict analysis?

Are women peaceable?

A number of assumptions about the relationship between men, women and violent conflict are common in peacebuilding. For example, it is often said that women are the first and main victims of conflict, and are at the same time the most active advocates for peace; that a type of solidarity exists between women that transcends social and political divisions. One view is that the archetypal distinction between nurturing womanhood and aggressive masculinity is real, that male aggression is genetically and hormonally determined (i.e. by sex not gender), and that war is by definition “war against women” – that the purpose of war is to appropriate both “women’s property” and “women as property”. For others, however, the issue is more structural, and the behaviour of individual actors needs to be understood through a historical and cultural lens, examining the impact on them of global and historical trends such as colonialism, aid and militarisation. A prevalent idea amongst both these groups is that military-economic alliances dominate at a global level, mobilising patriarchal structures in different parts of the world; these are supported by global institutions that encourage militarism, and by global communications media which manipulate gendered imagery to manage popular acceptance of militarism.

Globally, men do predominate not only as actors in war but also as perpetrators of violence, practitioners of extreme physical feats, and decision-makers in institutions that underpin violence. Women (with some exceptions) are less commonly engaged directly in combat or violence, yet they support violence in many indirect ways, e.g. by providing services to fighters, through the way they educate their children, and by encouraging men to engage in violence. As such they may be key players in the creation of “murderous ideologies”. A review of data from different parts of the world and different historical periods shows that both men and women can be both victims and perpetrators of violence, and both men and women can exert extraordinary efforts, overcoming fearful odds, for peace.

Do gender relations change as a result of violent conflict?

Further assumptions are often made about the potential impact of violent conflict on gender relations. On the one hand, a “backlash” against women is often thought to exist in the immediate post-conflict period. On the other, the “post-conflict moment” is often believed to be one where windows of opportunity present themselves for radical change in women’s status. The literature suggests that both assumptions may be justified. Whereas gender *roles* adjust quickly to new circumstances, gender *identities* are not so much changed as thwarted, as both men and women are prevented by circumstances from living up to their own and other people’s expectations (a development which may trigger interpersonal violence on a wide scale).

Changes in the gender division of labour (gender roles) are a society’s practical and immediate response to managing crisis. However, they do not in themselves alter the institutional or ideological underpinnings of gender relations. If things are not to go back to how they were before, change may need to be institutionalised through active policy. However, institutions (that generate policy) are themselves gendered, in that they are both products and shapers of existing gender relations in the society from which they draw their individual members. The nation-state, for example, is made up of male and female citizens, and at the same time shapes their gendered identities through the promotion of ideals such as patriotism and citizenship, which may have different meanings for men and for women. Global institutions, too are gendered, and significantly influence local processes – as classically evidenced by the way global military-economic alliances impact on gender relations found in societies located around military bases.

Under what circumstances do conflicts turn to violence? Do gender relations themselves contribute towards violent conflict?

Sociologists have suggested that violence (most notably but not exclusively by men) is the result of gender identities being “thwarted”, i.e. conditions (e.g. of poverty, conflict, disaster, political oppression) prevent gendered aspirations from being fulfilled. The idea of a “continuum of violence” is another concept that offers a framework for describing how different types and levels of violence interact with each other, showing how the behaviour of individuals is conditioned as much by structural as by individual factors. Some scholars suggest that gender relations have changed as a function of changing patterns of violence, although opinions differ as to the direction of causality – does reduction of violence lead to gender equality, or the reverse?

While academics (especially feminist academics) have grappled for some time with the issue of where men fit in an understanding of gender, policymakers

and activists have tended to focus instead on advancing women's protection and participation, as evidenced by the passing of UNSC Resolution 1325. The latter group has tended to view men as either perpetrators to be excluded, as "gatekeepers" whose support has to be sought, or as potential active champions of women's cause. There is a small but growing stream of work acknowledging the potential vulnerabilities of men, and seeking re-interpretations of mainstream thinking on specific topics such as sexual violence as a weapon of war.

QUESTION 2

How can an understanding of gender identities contribute to effective peacebuilding?

Activists stress the importance and variety of women's roles in peacebuilding and the need to support women's peace organisations. UNSC Resolution 1325 echoes this concern, and represents a global policy commitment to support women's role in peacebuilding and in post-conflict reconstruction. Resolution 1325 is seen as a tool to promote women's empowerment, as well as a basis for mobilising women as a resource to render peace processes more effective.

Women's peacebuilding activities encompass a wide range, and indeed what women do for peace is sometimes said to expand the view of peacebuilding itself. For example, reconciliation figures high in what women's peacebuilding organisations do, yet it receives little attention from formal donor-supported peacebuilding initiatives. Women's work in reconciliation includes mediating in localised conflicts within families (such as husbands rejecting their wives after rape, or disputes between siblings over inheritance), bringing estranged communities together, and supporting mechanisms to resolve inter-communal conflicts. Women engaged in formal peace negotiations often bring a non-partisan, process-oriented approach to bear, ensuring that the needs of a broad range of stakeholders, rather than just the previously violent protagonists, are on the agenda. Many women's organisations which promote the role of women in community-level reconciliation and dialogue view their work as having a secondary but important outcome of enhancing popular perception of women's potential contribution, leading to greater acceptance of women's empowerment generally.

While Resolution 1325 is generally viewed as an important milestone in the international acknowledgement of the need for women's empowerment in the peacebuilding arena, some reservations have been expressed about what it actually achieves. It has been critiqued on the grounds that it de-politicises women's political agency and presents an unproblematic view of women as having an innate capacity for peace. On the other hand, some, especially some feminist academics, see women's peace activism instead as being a reaction to oppressive global structures of violence, and therefore the basis for a movement of "anti-war feminism".

Men's role in high-level peace negotiations, and in post-conflict reconstruction and state-building, is assumed as the norm and hence barely commented on. However, peace activism by men can sometimes be regarded as either treasonable or effeminate, or both; pacifist men are often derided and excluded, especially in highly militarised societies.

To what extent can gender equality be seen as a component of peace?

"Lasting peace", as described in Alert's peacebuilding framework, is an aspirational vision: a society that resolves the conflicts and contradictions within it in a constructive and inclusive fashion and which is thereby rendered relatively immune to mass or systemic violence. In this approach, values such as inclusion or gender equality are an inherent and indissoluble part of lasting peace. Building peace then is a transformative process which comprises, amongst other things, the promotion of women's rights and empowerment. At the same time, the broader processes of peacebuilding can also be used as a means of leveraging social change. This might include according women a more prominent place in post-conflict reconstruction, as well as the idea of "reconstructing masculinities" through security sector reform, and promoting a human rights agenda as part of humanitarian interventions and governance reforms.

How can gender equality be incorporated into post-conflict reconstruction interventions?

The international policy framework around peacebuilding is currently dominated by donor concerns with state-building in fragile and conflict-affected states. The state-building, governance and fragile states agenda has in the past been dominated by the technical approaches of international donors; however, these approaches have been challenged as being donor-driven, top-down, technicist and divorced from reality. As various civil society organisations have argued, one of the starting-points for reconstruction must be the re-establishment of peaceful interaction and equitable resource management at the community level, building up from there. Gender critiques of state-building have urged it to go beyond "add women and stir", instead aiming to ensure women's full participation in post-conflict recovery. State-building approaches should aim to create "a state fit for women" as well as for men, and to take advantage of the opportunities state-building offers for advancing women's political involvement. A gender approach to state-building would bring it down to earth – for example, by helping to ensure civilian oversight of security sector reform, making interventions locally relevant, prioritising state-civilian relations, and supporting local, rather than external, drivers of change.

These critiques have led to a reformulation of the "peacebuilding and state-building" agenda, spelled out most recently for example in the "Monrovia Roadmap"

produced as part of the International Dialogue for Peacebuilding and Statebuilding. This consensus identifies five key state-building objectives – politics, security, justice, economy, and revenues and services, with gender as a cross-cutting theme. Although there has as yet been little attention to formally engendering the state-building framework, some of the more obvious aspects of a gender dimension to the state-building agenda are summarised in the table below, which is based on a similar table prepared recently by Alert for the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

Table: A gender dimension to state-building objectives

State-building objectives	Some possible gender dimensions
Politics	Women are absent from formal peace negotiations and have limited opportunities for political participation.
Security	Men predominate in security forces, although it is often assumed (without evidence) that recruiting women would change the ethos and the behaviour of the military. A new vision of security is required, one that meets the needs of all citizens, including women, men, girls and boys, rather than the state-centric model that currently dominates.
Justice	Transitional justice mechanisms are generally poor in addressing war-time abuses of women, although crimes of sexual violence receive increasing attention, and conflict-related sexual violence has now entered the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court as a breach of international humanitarian law.
Economy	Women play important economic roles during and after conflict, but post-conflict reconstruction devotes little attention to supporting them, or to reinforcing the gains in status and equality they may have attained during phases of violence.
Revenues and services	There needs to be a better balance between people's economic contribution and the level of services they receive from the state. "Gender-sensitive budgeting" (measuring the proportion of budgets allocated to activities that meet the different needs of women and men) is one way of checking how far services respond to women's concerns. This can be extended to raising other equality concerns (such as regional allocations) in respect of state spending.

QUESTION 3

What does “gender and peacebuilding” mean to practitioners and decision-makers in the field? What do they do and what challenges do they face?

What themes are most critical for Alert’s partners and collaborators in Burundi and Nepal?

The project held workshops, in Bujumbura and in Kathmandu, in March 2012, to initiate discussion amongst people working on gender and peacebuilding from different perspectives. In each case, separate workshops were held for practitioners (working in NGOs) and for officials (donor and government representatives). In Burundi, where the NGO participants made the decision to form a “community of practice” to take the discussion forward, a delegation from the group made a presentation to the officials group, based on the discussion at their workshop.

Economic recovery: In both countries, there was a dominant concern that women are largely excluded from access to economic resources (most notably land and credit) as well as to decision-making about resources. There was a particularly acute concern in both countries about the depth of poverty present in the two countries and the fact that women are strongly represented within the ranks of the extremely poor. High levels of illiteracy and women’s general lack of awareness of their rights perpetuate this exclusion. Both country groups noted that despite some policy commitments, interventions are not currently focused on identifying and overcoming the barriers women face to economic empowerment. In Burundi, the consultation process on the most recent Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) has been more gender-sensitive than previous iterations of the process, in the sense that women, including grassroots women, have taken part in official consultations around the PRSP and many of their concerns have been incorporated into the final document. It remains to be seen whether the implementation of the strategy will live up to its promise to enable women, and especially poor, vulnerable (for example, disabled) and rural women, to gain advantage from poverty alleviation strategies. In Nepal, there is currently a preoccupation with reintegration of ex-combatants, and a concern that the opportunity has been missed to design the standard reintegration package with women’s priorities in mind. These would have featured psycho-social counselling as well as support for income-generation and marketing.

Justice: Women’s lack of access to justice is a second major concern in both countries. In Nepal, the problem was associated with inadequate legal aid, a lack of female lawyers, and limited access to crisis support services outside district capitals. In Burundi, where women are officially acknowledged to constitute 60 percent of victims of war-related human rights violations, transforming their legal status (for example in relation to inheritance) and removing the social stigma attached to the victims of sexual violence are key steps to enabling them not only to access justice, but also to challenge the underlying conditions which make abuse possible. The Tripartite Commission on transitional justice, in which international bodies and the Burundian government made recommendations for the formation of a Truth and Justice Commission, recommended women’s involvement in the proposed transitional justice mechanisms. However, it is yet to be seen whether gender balance will be upheld when the mechanisms are set up.

Political participation and leadership: In Nepal, women’s rights are enshrined in the interim constitution, particularly in terms of reproductive rights, inheritance and citizenship. However, in practice there are limitations on women’s political participation, and there is a need to find the right political structures and processes to facilitate it, in parliament, in political parties, and at the level of decentralised government. In Burundi, the debate was around the issue of the “myth of women’s solidarity” – the expectation that, once in positions of leadership, women will pursue a common “women’s agenda”. Women have guaranteed places in parliament and in state institutions, yet this has made little difference so far to the lives of ordinary women, who often have divergent identities and interests. Some activists saw the lack of solidarity between women as being an impediment to their work, while others considered an acceptance of diversity as being part and parcel of a gender approach.

There were some differences between the priorities of workshop participants representing government and donors and those of civil society. In Burundi, the representative of one donor agency suggested that security be seen as an additional thematic priority. The agency concerned is currently engaged on a large security transformation programme working with both the police and the military, which has enhancing women’s security as a substantial sub-theme. Alert has conducted research on women’s perceptions of security in Burundi in the past and identified it (especially domestic violence) as an important threat to their well-being. Similarly, Alert’s research on security in Nepal has shown that security interventions have largely failed to acknowledge the breadth and depth of security-related issues affecting women. However, civil society participants, in either Nepal or Burundi, did not identify security as a theme.

What other concerns did they express?

In addition to thematic interests, participants at the workshops raised a number of general issues, which again showed much similarity between the two cases.

In both cases, discussion at the workshops illustrated a divide between what might be termed political and apolitical approaches to gender and peacebuilding. For example, some in Nepal were keen to adopt “social harmony” as a goal, while others worried that such vague expressions of general good might be used as a way of limiting diversity and perpetuating conservative values. In Burundi, a range of opinions was expressed on the issue of reconciliation. For some, reconciliation is an aspect of post-conflict recovery, to be addressed technically through decisions on, for example, reparations, rehabilitation of victims, and transitional justice. For others, it is an overarching goal, under which all other themes can be subsumed. A similar range of concerns arose about the roles and goals of women’s peacebuilding organisations: do they have a role in changing women’s self-perception, developing solidarity between women, and shifting attitudes towards women in the community at large; or do they promote a stereotypical view of women’s solidarity, thrift and willingness to volunteer, which precludes a broader evolution towards women’s agency?

A number of institutional capacity issues came to the fore in both countries. NGO partners in Burundi had the perception that policymakers have made progress in acknowledging women’s role in post-conflict recovery processes, as evidenced in the extent of consultations with women’s civil society organisations. However, they did not feel that there was evidence of change on the ground. Nepali NGOs believe there are still big policy gaps and failures to acknowledge what women’s priorities are or to ask their opinion. For their part, some staff members of donor and government agencies, including those from agencies considered to have relatively advanced policy approaches, expressed confusion about basic concepts of gender and peacebuilding, claiming that gender as a policy agenda is imposed within their organisations without clarity as to what it means in practice. In both countries, there were calls for clarity in the gender and peacebuilding discourse, and for further capacity building.

Participants in the consultations in both Burundi and Nepal took a definitively women-focused perspective, with little reflection on involving men. Where men were discussed in terms of their participation in gender activists’ work, it was largely to find ways of mitigating men’s negative role. The predominant framework explores diversity between men and women, rather than amongst

men and amongst women. However, there was some unresolved discussion about how women's equality advocates should see men. While many people agreed that 'gender is not just about women', it was difficult, especially for women's rights activists, to move on from this idea and see what else it could be about, or to envisage men as anything other than barriers to women's advancement.

QUESTION 4

What are the different approaches that underlie “gender and peacebuilding” work?

In summary, the conceptual basis for taking a gendered approach to peacebuilding is fraught, and the confusions inherent in it spill over into its practical application in peacebuilding. Not only is gender a complex, multi-layered and contested concept which is poorly understood, but it is to some extent “imposed”, through donor conditionality – a combination of factors which effectively excludes a high proportion of peacebuilding actors from having confidence in using the approach. Barriers exist between those who understand and accept the need in principle to distinguish the impacts of policies on men and on women, and those few remaining dinosaurs who do not, or who simply pay lip-service to it as a policy demand. But equally, they exist between those for whom “gender mainstreaming” is an area of professional competence and those for whom it is a passionately fought campaign for women’s rights; and equally between those for whom women’s advancement takes precedence over all other policy goals, and those who see gender as a concept that informs an understanding of exclusion and marginalisation more broadly. Further distinctions can be made between activists, policymakers, peacebuilding practitioners and academics, each of whom have their own gender discourses, as well as shared understandings and professional structures and career paths.

Amongst all the confusions and contestations, what emerges is that different ways of interpreting gender lie at their root. There is little disagreement about the basic definition of gender as the socially and culturally constructed identities of men and women, but there is very little consensus on its applications. For some, the prevalence of women’s subordination is a given, and overcoming the barriers to the respect of women’s human rights is a clear priority; this is an uncontested commitment in international policy, and further justification is considered unnecessary. Gender analysis then is a way of exploring the form which that subordination takes in any particular context. For others, gender analysis – posing open-ended questions about how men and women relate to each other – is the starting point, and it may or may not lead to the conclusion that overcoming women’s subordination is the priority. Our conclusion is not that either of these positions is wrong, but rather that the second proposition has not yet been given enough of an airing. It might however be of particular relevance in relation to violent conflict, since it enables an exploration of how men and women both relate to conflict and violence as victims, perpetrators and supporters, and of how they might contribute to lasting peace.

Based on the above analysis, we can identify three broad approaches to gender that are evident in peacebuilding:

Gender-blind approaches: In the first approach, the notion that interventions involve and impact on men and women in different ways is not recognised. These “gender-blind” projects assume that what works for people in general works for both men and women and that there is no need to distinguish between them. Some gender-blind projects do have specific women-centred projects, triggered perhaps by the insistence of a donor. However, these projects tend to be managed by a separate and junior department or run by “gender specialists” whose work is not understood or supported by the rest of the team. Others do work with women, but do so to address women’s specific practical and/or biological needs (for example in the health sector), rather than as an outcome of a gendered analysis.

Resolution 1325 approaches: In the second approach, it is axiomatic that women are more vulnerable than men and more marginalised from decision-making. Thus, interventions are required which counteract this tendency, making women’s protection, promotion and participation explicit goals of all activities, as is required by UNSC Resolution 1325. Such projects are mandated by international, and frequently national, law and policy. In addition to being justified in terms of women’s human rights, women’s advancement is now widely recognised as bringing general benefits to society at large, including, for example, benefits to the micro economy and to child health, and to governance in general.

Gender-relational approaches: The third type of approach is based on a strategy of benefit sharing and solidarity building between men and women, using a gendered power analysis to identify the appropriate modalities for the context. A key part of this analysis would be to look at socialisation mechanisms, as they relate to both men and women, within major societal institutions such as the household, the school, the state, and religious systems, which are sites of reproduction of gender relations in a given time and place. The resultant activities might involve dialogue between men and women (for example to address violence against women) or address vulnerabilities experienced by men that are often overlooked (for example as victims of sexual violence or as potential recruits into militias or gangs). The presumption is that men and women will equally contribute to, and benefit from, this relational approach, and that it will avoid the risks of backlash and male alienation, sometimes incurred by women-focused initiatives.

This typology is an oversimplification of the varied approaches that exist, many of which could fit under more than one heading: however, it appears useful as a tool for assessing experience to date and developing new insights. The key difference

between types 1 and 2 is to do with women: the problem at the heart of type 1 is that, given pre-existing power imbalances between men and women, few interventions can realistically be considered gender-neutral, but will rather reinforce existing imbalances, in possibly undesirable ways. In contrast, the key difference between types 2 and 3 is to do with men. What role should men play in projects that aim to transform gender relations? Should they be seen as “spoilers”, gate-keepers or champions of women’s advancement, as co-contributors to a transformed “gender order”? Or are the gendered vulnerabilities of men also worthy of being addressed as a priority? The link between masculinity and violent conflict emerges as a key conceptual and practical issue. It also raises the possibility that men too might be the focus of gender and peacebuilding programmes, perhaps by finding ways of discouraging their recruitment into militias, or by providing services to male victims of sexual violence.

Each of the three types approaches the issue of “gender analysis” in a different way. For type 1 projects, there is no need to separate out the needs or perspectives of different stakeholders, as the project’s benefits are assumed to accrue to all without distinction. For type 2 projects, the starting point is women’s exclusion, which the project aims to overcome: once this goal has been fixed, gender analysis is a means to this end, as it involves mapping the particular forms of disadvantage faced by women in the context under discussion. For type 3 projects, gender analysis is the starting point, and consists in asking a range of open-ended questions about the nature of gender relations and roles in the context concerned. Gender analysis is then a preparatory step towards defining the problem to be addressed, and might result in addressing the needs of either men or women, or both, in a variety of ways. The approach to gender analysis is therefore a key determinant of the project’s outcome.

Type 3 approaches are at present under-explored, both in terms of theory and policy, and in terms of practice. Moreover, although lip-service is often paid to the idea that ‘gender is not just about women’, many people who express that view find it difficult to identify what an approach that goes beyond “just women” would mean in practice. And yet it does have potential relevance for peacebuilding, as it holds out the prospect of maximising the engagement in social transformation processes of both men and women, who, as we have seen above, can be both victims and perpetrators of violence, and exert extraordinary efforts, overcoming fearful odds, for peace. This should not be taken to imply that type 2 projects are not legitimate, or not of interest, or not “really gender”. On the contrary, for an organisation to espouse a gender approach to peacebuilding, it needs to have an overarching frame into which both types 2 and 3 can fit, as well as having a portfolio of projects that reflect both.

CONCLUSION

In the remaining two years of the research project, International Alert will explore the validity of the type 3 approach as an effective strategy, both for analysing conflict and for designing peacebuilding interventions. It will do this by identifying existing “type 3” projects and documenting and analysing what they do, why and how, and what lessons they offer for peacebuilding. In the meantime, our preliminary findings are a reminder of the need for greater clarity about how to integrate gender into programming in conflict-affected contexts, and for institutional incentives to be aligned with this need.

International Alert.

346 Clapham Road, London SW9 9AP, United Kingdom

Tel +44 (0)20 7627 6800, Fax +44 (0)20 7627 6900

general@international-alert.org

www.international-alert.org

ISBN: 978-1-906677-99-2