I. News articles:
   A. Women in military prompted by military brass, not civilians
      1. In 2009, Obama advisor said he opposed including militarily-qualified women in military operations.
      2. “Mr. Panetta’s decision came after he received a Jan. 9 letter from Gen. Martin E. Dempsey, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who stated in strong terms that the armed service chiefs all agreed that 'the time has come to rescind the direct combat exclusion rule for women and to eliminate all unnecessary gender-based barriers to service.'”
      3. Pentagon lifts ban on women in January 2013
   B. NYT article on Mohammed Morsi’s slurs against Jews
   C. Htun and Weldon article on violence against women

II. Introduction
   A. Our identities matter BUT our identities are “socially constructed”
   B. “Contemporary feminism is also committed to progressive or emancipatory goals, particularly the goal of achieving equality for women through the elimination of unequal gender relations” [Tickner, 1997, 616].
   C. Important concept: social theories cannot only describe and explain. They, by definition, also influence and change the social processes they attempt to describe and explain. Thus, claims by mainstream IR of simply explaining what is, are disingenuous since even if all they try to do is explain, they also reinforce existing reality in ways that make its continuity, rather than its change, more likely. Knowledge cannot be divorced from its political consequences [Tickner, 1997, 622].
   1. Morality in the sense of views about how the world should be are inextricably intertwined in attempts to explain how the world is.
   2. More interested in “why this world and not some other world”, not “how does this world work”
   3. Critical theory vs. problem-solving theories (like realism and institutionalism) that “takes the world as it finds it and implicitly accepts the prevailing order as its framework” [Tickner, 1997, 619].
   D. Conflict not only over what is studied in IR (leaving women out of the picture) but how we study IR, in that standard existing methodologies themselves can reproduce, perhaps unwittingly but nonetheless influentially, the existing world rather than re-creating a new one.
   E. Explaining “the behavior of states run by men and an international system that is the result of the interactions of states run by men” rather than the “behavior of states and an international system that is the result of the interactions of those states”
   F. By association of women with peace, they are essentially kept out of international politics and thereby disempowered not only in expressing themselves but also in helping re-create the world in whatever different ways it would be re-created if they were

III. Basics of disenfranchised theory IR theory
   A. The “facts:”
      1. Men are 95% of the world’s heads of state, Cabinet ministers and senior positions in national policymaking and intergovernmental organizations
      2. Women do 70% of world’s productive work, grow half of world’s food but receive 1/10th of world’s income and own 2% of property.
      3. Women disproportionately illiterate, impoverished, overworked, underrepresented, killed at birth.
      4. ~200,000 US women raped/assaulted each year; ~1 in 6 chance of lifetime rape; 2/3rds by someone known to victim. Higher among military: 19,000 per year of 1.4M military. 10% to 33% report attempted or completed rape while serving in the military” (Turchik and Wilson, 2010).
      5. A Department of Defense survey revealed 19,000 rapes a year among the 1.4 million service members. “Of those, only 13 percent report because they know what happens — They get shoved out of the military, involuntarily honorably discharged for ‘personality disorder.’”
      6. Yet, not all sex-specific outcomes favor men.
         a) Women’s life expectancies are consistently higher.
         b) Suicide, incarceration, alcoholism, conscription, occupational fatalities hit men harder
         c) Sex specific massacre
      7. Whether it works in men’s or women’s favor in any particular context, a defining characteristic is the stratification of human well-being and political power based on sex.
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B. Disenfranchised theory in a Nutshell:
   1. Structural inequality leads to individual insecurity
   2. Consistent pattern is absence of women from practice and scholarship of international relations
C. Has as much of a legacy as realism
   1. Lysistrata tale - women have different perspective.
   2. Trojan War: Helen stolen (as chattel of Menelaus) by Paris of Troy from Spartans. Agamemnon is asked to sacrifice Iphigenia, his daughter, to get more favorable winds for his fleet.
   3. Has linkages and parallels to Marxism, dependency theory, and post-colonial theories that attempt to explain why different countries receive different outcomes that are not otherwise readily explainable
D. Three different meanings of feminist approach to IR. Proposed by Sandra Harding and applied to IR by Christine Sylvester. Feminist empiricism; Feminist standpoint; and Feminist postmodernism unified by notion that traditional IR has neglected attention to gender.
E. Definition of security: security as “multidimensional and multilevel . . . – as the diminution of all forms of violence, including physical, structural, and ecological” (Tickner, 1997, 624).
   1. Definition of security – does state provide for the security of all its citizens as assumed in prior discussion of IR theory? Questionable realist/liberal construction: “Anarchy and danger on outside and security and order on the inside” (Tickner, 1997, 625). States provide security for the state but not for women.
   2. Military are often source of individual insecurity rather than security; they create national security but individual insecurity.
   3. Rape of noncombatants in war; “comfort women” of WWII
   4. Consider assaults of women both inside and outside the home
   5. Consider continuity of this problem across states – compare to environmental problems which occur universally within states that its easy to see as appropriate subjects of IR
F. Gender/Sex: “Data show . . . women are not less militaristic than men, but women and men who are more supportive of gender equality are also more favorably disposed to compromise” [Tickner, 1999, 11].
G. Would goals of states differ if women had power & over time, constructed overarching social structure
IV. An outline of disenfranchised theory of IR and an expansion to include other marginalized categories of people
   A. Focus = global gender relations. Conflict between genders, rather than between states.
      2. Inequality and individual security and consequences of war rather than causes (Tickner, 1997, 625).
         We have assumed so far that war leads to survival and security, at least for the winner. Feminists and others call this into question; demonstrate that may not be true for women, even in “winning” state.
      3. Much of international relations represents an often-silent gender divide but a sometimes-much-clearer racial divide. How do we explain this? Colonialism and slavery: Marxism, dependency theory, post-colonial theory, all argue that colonialism arises from a deep-seated and well-accepted (by Europeans) of white racial superiority, parallel to feminist argument about acceptance by males of male superiority
   B. Actors = gendered individuals; masculine and feminine (also men and women) are important focus and states and other social institutions as embodiments of gendered roles.
      1. Marginalized groups have a different perspective or “standpoint” from which to understand international relations AND are treated systematically differently than those determining the rules of the game
      2. AND racial identity matters as much as gender identity or national identity
         a) Understanding the conflict in Rwanda or Burundi requires understanding how the Belgian state manipulated notions of Hutu and Tutsi in ways that led to wars in those countries
         b) Do you think race/ethnicity play a role in Israel/Palestinian conflict?
         c) Why does US put Japanese-Americans but not German-Americans in internment camps?
         d) Does terrorism of 9/11 have anything to do with racial, ethnic, and gender identities?
   C. Goals = individual security and well-being (different meaning than security and well-being of state)
      1. Produce domination/subjugation of women, others, environment, continuation of existing hierarchy
      2. Can be obvious domination or subtle, covert, unconscious, routinized, and structural domination
      3. Individual security and well-being is the goal but is NOT well-provided for by the state if you are a woman or a person of color
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a) American Revolutionary War did NOT lead to increased security, well-being, or independence for African-Americans

D. Means = use of identities (gender but also race), even by the state, in service of the state
1. Conversion of men into soldiers through hyper-masculinization. Gender as important tool of state
2. Use of women in western militaries to contrast liberated west from controlled Islamic women
3. Why can’t African Americans/Native Americans serve in military until World War II?
4. Different modes of power:
   a) Lysistrata story
5. Mahatma Gandhi: “The Quit India Movement … was a civil disobedience movement in India launched on 9 August 1942 in response to Gandhi’s call for immediate independence of India and against sending Indians to World War II. He asked all … to leave their … jobs and take part in this movement. Due to Gandhi’s political influence, request was followed on a massive proportion of the population.” [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indian_independence_movement]

E. Organizing principle = patriarchy or gendered and racial hierarchical structure at all levels of social interaction
1. Colonial maps – who put small European countries in charge?
2. Dynamics of system = construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of gendered hierarchies at all levels
   a) Resistance and compliance with hierarchies and gender roles
   b) Reconstruction of gendered AND racial hierarchies
3. Agricultural subsidies and failure to reduce tariffs on agricultural goods: Major cleavage is between North and South

G. Theories and social norms lead to women being victims and objects rather than agents and subjects
H. Note the relationship of agent and structure in feminist theory and how notions of transformation exist within feminist theories of IR By seeing masculinist theories as source of international relations theory and therefore also of international relations practice, allows for a transformative logic in which alternative conceptualizations can make room for social change.

A. Disenfranchised theory fits less well into the model (focus, actors, goals, means, org. principle, dynamics) I have been promoting
1. Problems with applying this structure to capture this theory
2. New tenet: Social implications of theory – transformative or reconstitutive?
   a) Realist – reconstitutive of given structure
   b) Institutionalist – revisionist of outcomes within given structure
   c) Disenfranchised – transformative of structure

VI. Three variants of feminist theory / but think more broadly
A. Feminist empiricism: facts about women neglected
1. Same intellectual project, different facts. Critique of what we traditionally study in IR.
2. Shift from exclusive attention to states and capitalist system to attention to social structures and attitudes that genderize IR.
3. Forces focus on other dependent variables and consequences of IR system, e.g., use of state and international system to oppress women, not just make war.
4. Women’s Strike for Peace during CMC and Jody Williams with ICBL today.
B. Feminist standpoint: perspectives of women neglected and marginalized
1. Same intellectual project, different theories. Critique of theories we use to explain what we traditionally study in IR.
2. Overarching idea: Views of people who have been marginalized differ from those who have not. The oppression and antipathy that is bred by gender-based and race/ethnicity-based marginalization is the source and a breeding ground for violence, both domestically and internationally
3. “Standpoint of people who have been systematically excluded from power” and power making positions (Keohane, 1989, 245). Provide different insights and perspectives onto the problem of understanding international relations. What we see depends on where we stand. New perspectives, if different even if not perfect, provide new insights that help improve vision. Triangulation on the truth.
4. Charge that intellectual foundations of IR theory are gender-based notions of MAN’s reasons for going to war. Primary focus of IR is war, which reflects a certain standpoint and set of priorities. Even terms of IR debate reflect non-feminist views.
   a) “Power as control” rather than “power as concert in action” or ability to work together and cooperate.
   b) Basic notion of realist “self-help system” starts from male-oriented view of people as separate and competing vs. feminist view of people as collective and connected entities. Hobbes “state of nature” involves men threatening each other rather than nurturing each other.
   c) Dichotomous views vs. more open-minded views of world in which actors and concepts form networks rather than form opposing and contrasting sides.
   d) Even the three categories Keohane creates posits this analytic category making. Likewise my own view of things. This viewpoint itself is inaccurate, according to feminist theory. My causal analysis of A --- B is itself problematic.

5. Rebecca Grant position: can women have a feminist standpoint once become part of the policy-making and war-making process. As women’s empowerment and liberation succeeds, feminist standpoint erodes. E.g., women in Israeli army, Margaret Thatcher, Republican women in US Congress. “Feminist epistemology must take the experience of women as its starting point,” but, as experience of women approximates that of men, then becomes harder to posit feminist standpoint different from male standpoint and “to be female is not necessarily to be feminist” (Grant, 93).

C. Feminist postmodernism: deep notions of inquiry and truth are gendered.
   1. Different intellectual project. Critique of methodologies by which we develop theories we use to explain what we traditionally study in IR.
   2. Most radical of three: questions notion of one true world “out there” which we can understand from any single perspective. Notion of single Truth entails male notion of hierarchy of knowledge that is epistemologically false, i.e., misunderstands what it is possible for people to know about the world, and misunderstands what “knowing something about the world” really means.
   3. Can only achieve interpretations of the world, rather than truths about the world. No impartial, objective viewpoint exists: all views are subjective and partial and therefore of equal validity. Objectivity is not possible.
   4. Refutes notion that we can generalize to other cases. Contingency rather than generalization matters.
   5. Social sciences differ from other sciences in the object of study - what we are studying has meaning for those who are creating it. Thus cannot study it independent of the meaning that those people have on it. There is no truth separate from that experience.
   6. Social construction of meaning: what is peace? what is war? If people are not fighting war, but you ask them and they say they are at war, how does one interpret it?
   7. In this view, no basis on which to evaluate different claims of truthfulness. This approach is more threatening to many because undermines the intellectual project and whole basis on which a debate can take place.
   8. Questions the “scientific” method as a coercive force in society that oppresses views other than the dominant male paradigm. This class itself is a means of indoctrination into that worldview.
      a) Increase connection with subject, avoiding distance. Empathy and self-knowledge rather than distance and analysis.
      b) Engage other perspectives, esp. of disadvantaged
c) Avoid closure of scholarly debate by deciding “we know.” Search for consensus rather than parsimony or rigor.

D. Keohane differentiates between three feminist theories and privileges and evaluates two over the other one. Meanings we give to words like power, sovereignty, reciprocity, anarchy, etc. influence how we think about world. Critique by Weber
   1. Keohane sees only those aspects of feminist standpoint theory that accord and reinforce own agenda.
   2. Keohane performs a co-optation of feminist standpoint theory that simultaneously simplifies and misrepresents that view at the same time that it puts it to use to support neoinstitutionalism.
   3. Feminist empiricism is discounted as immature and unable to contribute.
   4. Keohane’s discomfort with feminist postmodernism arises from inability to comprehend it
   5. What I call analysis (vs. synthesis), Weber would call mutilation and fetishization.
   6. Keohane as disciplinary enforcer/gatekeeper of what is valid as IR theorizing and research.
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VII. Where do we see gender AND identities when we think about militaries? (This section owes much to Dr. R. Charli Carpenter)

A. Conflict based in religious identities that are not “natural” nor are they always states
   1. 1050-1300: Roman Catholic military engagements against Muslims in the Middle East
   2. Partition of British India in 1947 is based on religion with two states: primarily Hindu India and primarily Muslim Pakistan.
   3. Formation of Israel in 1948 as a Jewish state
   4. Ireland/Northern Ireland from 1960s through late 1990s as primarily a conflict between Roman Catholics and Protestants
   5. Modern conflict in Iraq between Shia and Sunni and much of conflict between Iran and it's neighbors arises from fact that Iran is Shia and other states are Sunni
   6. Breakup of the former Yugoslavia is primarily a religious one between Orthodox Christians and Muslims
   7. Islamic Jihad as a conflict between some fundamentalist Muslims and others

B. Conflict based in racial identities that are not “natural” nor are they always states
   1. All European states treated other European states quite differently than they did the peoples of Africa and the Americas
   2. Hutu and Tutsi differences as central to the wars in both Rwanda and Burundi (though these racial differences themselves owe much to Belgian colonialism)
   3. Nazism and WWII was based on belief in an ethnically pure Aryan race
   4. Kurds vs. Muslims in Iraq
   5. Armenia and Azerbaijan ethnic conflict over the Nagorno-Karabakh

C. Who gets conscripted into militaries? why primarily men? Are all men natural killers and rapists? NO. Why else would the state be forced to pour expenditures into training regiments designed to TURN THEM INTO killers? And how is this accomplished? By denigrating those aspects of men’s behavior that are not conducive to the military project as womanly, as “gay” and as unpatriotic.

D. Women also play a role in making modern military work. Mothers must be convinced to take pride in son’s military careers not feel state is stealing children. Girlfriends need to be convinced to feel loyalty to soldier-boyfriends overseas, to write letters. If you want soldiers who feel good about dying for their women and children back home, they need to feel that women and children back home support them.

E. How does gender influence the way we think about that state?
   1. States >>> What is a state? (authority, legitimacy, force, decision-making) The state is a masculinized concept. In IR theory for example, states(men) are rational, strategic, self-interested, autonomous, calculating, sovereign. We expect them to act in very masculine ways.
   2. Nations. Compare that thinking to the idea of nation. A nation is not same as state, though we’re sometimes thinking they are. State is sovereign decision-making authority; nation is the people on whose behalf state claims to act. The language of nationalist is not a language of reason or self-interest; it is a language of sacrifice. Emotion. Kin. Homeland, blood, family: the nation is a feminized concept. We often visualize nations as women whose interest must be defended against the threat of domination or penetration by enemy forces. (E.g., “the rape of Kuwait.”)

VIII. Disenfranchised/feminist theory contributions

A. Feminist postmodernism suggests that even notion of evaluating its contribution rather than as replacing or providing a completely alternative vision becomes difficult.
   1. One way might be to see as explaining cooperation: if humans, including men, seen not as separate and oppositional but as altruistic and connected, then “puzzle” of cooperation vanishes.
   2. Alternatively, when men are in touch with their masculine sides they go to war, and when in touch with feminine sides they cooperate and find ways to resolve conflict without war.

B. Some questions
   1. How does inclusion of women in the practice of foreign policy, war, and international relations alter that practice?
      a) Equality without transformation in Grant’s terms.
      b) Is there any distinction between men and women independent of their positions in society? If gender distinctions vanish once position distinctions vanish, is gender important viewpoint?
      c) Does war become unacceptable if women involved in combat?
      d) Does psychology of warfare change with women in combat? Does military service require women to largely ignore their femaleness to play their required role in military context.
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2. How does inclusion of feminist perspective in the study of foreign policy, war and international relations alter international relations make a difference? New perspective can make a difference even if subject of study remains constant.

3. How does inclusion of feminist postmodern perspective influence methodologies by which we study international relations?

4. Something new to say about war? Something new to say about cooperation?

5. Both sides will need to work out what is the clear theory that feminists are posing as alternative to traditional IR approach

IX. Summary of feminist theories of IR:

A. Three linked feminist perspectives/approaches. Perhaps best seen as different levels in a single feminist critique of existing theories of IR.

B. Confront us with problematic nature of international relations itself, the study of international relations, and the methodology of the study of international relations and other social sciences.