

2010

# The Road to Hell is Paved With Good Intentions: The Construction of Femininity Within and Through the Human Security Paradigm

Chelsea Moore

*Occide*, [chelseacmoore@gmail.com](mailto:chelseacmoore@gmail.com)

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholar.oxy.edu/dwa\\_student](http://scholar.oxy.edu/dwa_student)

---

## Recommended Citation

Moore, Chelsea, "The Road to Hell is Paved With Good Intentions: The Construction of Femininity Within and Through the Human Security Paradigm" (2010). *DWA Student Scholarship*.

[http://scholar.oxy.edu/dwa\\_student/7](http://scholar.oxy.edu/dwa_student/7)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Diplomacy and World Affairs at OxyScholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in DWA Student Scholarship by an authorized administrator of OxyScholar. For more information, please contact [cdla@oxy.edu](mailto:cdla@oxy.edu).

**Occidental College Senior Honors Thesis, Department of Diplomacy and World Affairs**

**The Road to Hell is Paved With Good Intentions: The Construction of Femininity Within and Through the Human Security Paradigm**

**Abstract:** This paper uses a particular form of postmodern feminism to analyze the construction of femininity within and through the human security paradigm. It explores the ways in which human security has been implicated in the power-knowledge system of patriarchy. It does so in order to investigate the human security discourse that has shaped the subject position of the individual suffering from insecurity. It establishes and interrogates the following questions: How is the power-knowledge system of patriarchy implicated in human security? Has the insecure individual's subject position in the human security paradigm negatively affected the way that the paradigm addresses agency? This paper argues that human security is feminized and denigrated in relation to national security. Further, human security's epistemological foundations remain in the power-knowledge system of patriarchy. These bases of power-knowledge are implicated in the feminization of human security as a concept, as well as the feminization of insecure individuals. The paper is organized into three main sections. First, it provides an overview of how traditional national security and human security are gendered concepts. Second, it analyzes the feminization of the insecure individual to demonstrate how this political action marginalizes individual agency as it paradoxically attempts to "protect" people from insecurities. Drawing upon a case study of United States anti-trafficking efforts, it examines how pre-existing humanitarian gender motifs have influenced human security, preventing effective policy from emerging in a contemporary form. Third, it outlines how a postmodern feminist approach can create a site for, and insert individual agency into the center of socio-political scholarship.

## Table of Contents

<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>GENDERING SECURITY</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>LITERATURE REVIEW: SECURITY AND MASCULINITY</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>THE FEMINIZATION OF HUMAN SECURITY</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>THE PRODUCTION OF THE FEMININE SUBJECT</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>TO MAKE A RESCUE FANTASY ADD- “WOMENANDCHILDREN”-MOTIF-AND-STIR</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>CASE STUDY: HUMAN TRAFFICKING LAWS AND DISCOURSE IN THE UNITED STATES</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>THINKING OUTSIDE PATRIARCHY: POSTMODERN FEMINISM AND HUMAN SECURITY</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>HUMAN SECURITY AND SITES OF DISSONANCE</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>HUMAN SECURITY AND THE AGENCY TO ARTICULATE</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>FINDING AGENCY IN THE PRACTICE OF POWER</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>39</b>

## Introduction

National security is conceptualized as traditional security. It is primarily concerned with external, inter-state threats and the state's ability to respond to these threats with the use of military force. Since the dissolution of the Cold War, however, the world has witnessed an influx of unique security concerns not traditionally recognized as national security threats. These issues, linked with poverty and inequality, include but are not limited to intra-state conflicts, human rights violations, HIV/AIDS, gender violence, and famine. They also encompass global difficulties that make no distinction between national borders including (but certainly not limited to) transnational organized crime, human trafficking, and environmental degradation. This heterogeneous nexus of issues manifests as the current form of global politics; therefore, the traditional national security paradigm no longer speaks to the multiplicity of insecurities faced daily by individuals living within supposedly "secure" state borders, and is being reevaluated.<sup>1</sup>

The concept of human security emerged in the mid-1990s as a response to the inadequacies of the national security paradigm. This model offers a broader and deeper definition of what constitutes threats and responses to insecurity. It concerns itself with both internal and trans-state threats to security, which do not necessarily constitute inter-state relations. Most importantly, the human security paradigm places the referent of security onto the individual rather than the state. It indicates a political awareness that territorial integrity does not

---

<sup>1</sup> This is not to argue that traditional security ever fully spoke to the diverse array of issues faced by individuals, but rather that current global developments have heightened the awareness of these issues.

necessarily incorporate individual security and that in order to ensure the wellbeing of individuals, resources and attention must be directed toward human development, human rights and their correlation with the security of the individual.

This paper uses a particular form of postmodern feminism to analyze the construction of masculinity and femininity within and through the human security paradigm. Its framework focuses on the relationships between masculinity, femininity, knowledge and power. I contend that femininity and masculinity exist in a symbiotic relationship, particularly when applied to human security conflicts and resolutions. In the field global politics and security, femininity is defined and devalued in terms of masculinity. Individuals are masculinized or feminized according to various social factors including race, sexual orientation, and socio-economic status. Therefore, “masculine” and “feminine” exist beyond categorized differences in sex to incorporate asymmetrical power relationships among women and men within their respective genders.

The social interactions that comprise gender relations are constituted within and reproduced by, substantively gendered systems and institutions. For the purpose of this paper the systematic overvaluation of masculinity and the denigration of femininity will be referred to as patriarchy.<sup>2</sup> Patriarchy is a system of power-knowledge,<sup>3</sup> in that patriarchy is legitimated by the “knowledge” that the current gender hierarchy is supposedly “fixed” and “natural.” Political power<sup>4</sup> produces and reproduces this patriarchal “knowledge” through the use of discourse,<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Throughout this paper patriarchy and hierarchical gender relationships are used synonymously. Both refer to the systematic overvaluation of masculine traits and the denigration of feminine traits.

<sup>3</sup> Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality an Introduction: Volume I* (New York: Random House, 1978), 92 - 102.

<sup>4</sup> Political power takes the form of such things as academia, policy, and law.

<sup>5</sup> Discourse is understood as the production and representation of meaning which establishes a framework for understanding, action, and imagination. See: Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences* (New York: Random House, 1970).

which in-turn shapes knowledge in a continuous cycle. Power-knowledge systems, in other words, are always already self-reproducing.

This paper explores the ways in which human security has been implicated in the power-knowledge system of patriarchy. It does so in order to investigate the human security discourse that has shaped the subject position of the individual suffering from insecurity. It establishes and interrogates the following questions: How is the power-knowledge system of patriarchy implicated in human security? Has the insecure individual's<sup>6</sup> subject position in the human security paradigm negatively affected the way that the paradigm addresses agency? This paper argues that human security is feminized and denigrated in relation to national security. However, human security's foundations remain in the power-knowledge system of patriarchy. These bases of power-knowledge are implicated in the feminization of the human security as a concept, as well as the feminization of insecure individuals. This feminization marginalizes agency to the detriment of effective human security policy. A postmodern feminist analysis applied to human security will expose the constructions of masculinity and femininity in the paradigm. In addition, it will reveal how these constructs are implicated in patriarchal power-knowledge practice. In doing so, the analysis can identify strategies for realizing a more agency-centered approach to human security, through recognizing the inherent agency in the practice of power-knowledge.

For the purpose of this study, this paper is organized into three main sections. First, it provides an overview of how traditional national security and human security are gendered concepts. Second, it analyzes the feminization of the insecure individual to demonstrate how this political action marginalizes individual agency as it paradoxically attempts to "protect" people from insecurities. Drawing upon a case study of United States anti-trafficking efforts, it

---

<sup>6</sup> An individual who is experiencing the insecurities recognized by the human security paradigm.

examines how pre-existing humanitarian gender motifs have influenced human security, preventing effective policy from emerging in a contemporary form. Third, it outlines how a postmodern feminist approach (with emphasis placed on the deconstruction of patriarchal power-knowledge in human security) can create a site for, and insert individual agency into the center of socio-political scholarship. In order to do so, those in positions of power within the field of security must recognize their own agency in perpetuating the current patriarchal system.

## **Gendering Security**

### **Literature Review: Security and Masculinity**

This section analyzes how the concepts of national security and human security are masculinized and feminized, respectively. Before delving into the topic of human security, the first task of this paper is to ground the conceptualization of masculinity and femininity within traditional neorealist security. This subsection highlights the ways in which masculinity is construed as the hegemonic norm, and femininity the lacking other.

We can identify how the prevailing, traditional—and inherently masculine—definition of security is based in the neorealist theory of anarchy and decentralization as a formulation of global politics. This theory of international relations asserts the global system is inherently anarchic and decentralized. Within this context of anarchy, self-interest determines the behavior of states. In this political system, nations are in competition to gain relative power over other nations in the form of national capabilities. This competition leads to minimal cooperation between states, for fear of relative gains. Instead of international agreements and cooperation,

neorealism asserts states should derive their power from their own capabilities in order to survive in the Hobbesian international system, where war is always a looming possibility.<sup>7</sup>

Within this framework, competition for security and power is based upon the accumulation of military power. States strategically build up military capabilities to deter other states from taking any action against them that could reduce their relative power in the international system. Neorealism construes the international system as inherently anarchic, therefore national security is seen as the defense of territory against external military threats.<sup>8</sup> In the neorealist tradition the central referent of security is then the state, which is the only recognized actor in global politics. This leads to the focus of security studies on external national threats and the use of military force to address said threats. Tellingly, in his review of security studies, Stephen Walt asserts that the study of security has been the study of international war.<sup>9</sup>

It is important to analyze the underlying gendered constructions inherent in neorealist theory. Donna Haraway problematizes the masculine premise on which the entire notion of realist relations and security is built. Haraway argues that realist understandings of international relations are based in false “sciences,” which unfoundedly understand human nature as amoral and self-interested. From this false understanding of human nature, theories of international relations are constructed in order to explain states’ behavior.<sup>10</sup> This leads to the privileging of specific types of state behavior over others, particularly masculine behavior. For example, if states are viewed as inherently self-interested and amoral, building up arms to deter existential threats from other states will be privileged over diplomacy. In order to secure the all-important

---

<sup>7</sup> Kenneth Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (Boston : Addison-Wesley , 1979).

<sup>8</sup> Kenneth Waltz, "Structural Realism Afterh the Cold War," *International Security* , 2000: 5 - 41.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, 25

<sup>10</sup> Donna Haraway, *Primate Visions: Gender, Race, and Nature in the World of Modern Sciences* (New York: Routledge, 1989), 4.



state, neorealism stresses such masculine traits as strength, autonomy, power, independence, and rationality within foreign policy and the military.<sup>11</sup>

These valued traits are strikingly stereotypical masculine adjectives. They reflect how states are substantively masculine institutions in that “the overwhelming majority of top office-holders are men because there is a gender configuring of recruitment and promotion, a gender configuring of internal division of labour and systems of control, a gender configuring of policy making, practical routines, and ways of mobilizing pleasure and consent.”<sup>12</sup> Therefore, men<sup>13</sup> in positions of power are the ones who have been able articulate what constitutes global politics, peace, and security.<sup>14</sup> This has resulted in the overvaluation of particular masculine traits such as autonomy, violence, and aggression in policy and discourse. In addition to relying mostly on strength and force, the prevailing conceptualizations of security within the realist/masculine tradition “involves domination and subordination, control and power over environment, ‘other’ people, and nations...It relies on weapons, from an individuals use of mace or guns to a nation’s stockpiling of arms, high military budgets, and the international arms trade.”<sup>15</sup>

These traits and systems of militarized security are associated with hegemonic masculinity. Hegemony, theorized by Antonio Gramsci in relation to class, identifies and explains how a dominant group maintains their status through the persuasion of the subordinate group to subscribe and adopt the “culture” of the dominant group. Applied to gender relations, hegemonic masculinity therefore is the most valorized form of all masculinities both

---

<sup>11</sup> J. Ann Tickner, *Gendering World Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 29.

<sup>12</sup> R.W. Connell, *Masculinities: Knowledge, Power, and Social Change* (Los Angeles: Polity Press, 1995), 73.

<sup>13</sup> While there may be women in positions of power, historically these positions have been held by men.

<sup>14</sup> J. Ann Tickner, *Gender in International Relations* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992), 36.

<sup>15</sup> Margo Okazawa-Rey and Gwyn Kirk, "Maximum Security," *Social Justice*, 2000: 121.

transhistorically and transnationally, that is at any given time, in any given space/site.

Hegemonic masculinity “can be defined as the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women.”<sup>16</sup> Both men and women subscribe to the “culture” of hegemonic masculinity through the patriarchal power-knowledge system.<sup>17</sup>

The dominant/subordinate relationship of “men” and “women” does not necessarily mean the homogeneous domination of Man over Woman, but rather, the valorization of masculine traits and the devaluation of feminine traits. Individuals, whether male or female, rarely embody completely a gendered stereotype. For example, even within The Masculine multiple forms of masculinity materialize. Current hegemonic definition of masculinity is that of a white heterosexual masculinity, portrayed in popular culture. It is different from “black masculinity” or “homosexual masculinity” in a way that it produces a hierarchy of masculinities within power structures and international relations.<sup>18</sup>

Furthermore, women may also benefit from the patriarchal order through participation in masculine institutions, especially by holding positions of power. In this sense, gender has little to do with biological determination according to sex. Women do not always embody what is historically considered totally feminine, and vice versa in regards to men and masculinity. As

---

<sup>16</sup> R.W. Connell, *Masculinities*, 77

<sup>17</sup> As stated in the introduction to this paper, patriarchy is a system of power-knowledge. It is legitimated by the “knowledge” that the current hegemonic masculinity is “fixed” and “natural.” Political power then produces and reproduces this “knowledge” through discourse, which in-turn shapes “knowledge” in a continuous cycle.

<sup>18</sup> R.W. Connell, 76

aforementioned, individuals are masculinized or feminized according to various social factors, regardless of sex.<sup>19</sup>

The social interactions that comprise gender relations are constituted within and reproduced by substantively gendered institutions. Therefore, masculine security institutions such as the state and the military are rooted in patriarchal structures supported by the behavior of both men and women.<sup>20</sup> As Cynthia Enloe argues, “It is not men-on-top that makes something patriarchal. It’s men who are recognized and claim a certain form of masculinity, for the sake of being more valued, more ‘serious,’ and ‘the protectors of/and controllers of those people who are less masculine’ that makes any organization, any community, and society patriarchal.”<sup>21</sup> Within this structure there is an overvaluation of masculine traits such as rationality, domination, activity, and logic. Conversely, there is a denigration of “feminine” characteristics such as passivity, submission, and irrationality.

When discussing femininity it is important to examine how it is defined. Femininity is only characterized in relation to masculinity. According to Luce Irigaray, “the sexes are now defined only as they are in and through language. Whose laws, it must not be forgotten, have been prescribed by male subjects for centuries.”<sup>22</sup> Femininity, in this context, is understood and defined in relation to masculinity, as “feminine” has been articulated by those in position of power within masculine institutions, which historically has been males.

---

<sup>19</sup> This is not to discount the fact that biological “sex” plays an enormous role in the gendering of individuals.

<sup>20</sup> Mary Burguières, “Feminist Approaches to Peace: Another Step for Peace Studies,” *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 19, no. 1 (1990): 9.

<sup>21</sup> Carol Cohn and Cynthia Enloe, “A Conversation with Cynthia Enloe: Feminists Look at Masculinity and the Men Who Wage War,” *Signs*, 2003: 1192.

<sup>22</sup> Luce Irigaray, *This Sex Which Is Not One* (Ithica : Cornell University Press, 1977), 87.

A useful way of conceptualizing the symbiotic relationship between masculinity and femininity is through Lacanian psychoanalytic theory. Lacan identifies the phallus as the master signifier, the unmarked term through which all other objects derive their meaning in relation. Therefore, femininity is defined in relation to the phallus as symbolically lacking—that is lacking masculinity or the phallus. In essence femininity is not masculinity, and masculinity is the unmarked norm through which all else is symbolically related to. Femininity, currently understood, as it “only occurs within models and laws devised by male subjects” cannot exist without its relationship to masculinity.<sup>23</sup> In this gender model masculinity, the unmarked term is assumed to be the “natural” state of being and experiencing. Therefore, masculinity is detrimentally constructed as gender-neutral. This critique of neutrality is seen in Haraway’s aforementioned examination of the underlying “truths” of human nature, upon which neorealist theory is based. In addition to Haraway, many other feminist political theorists have identified how interpreting current discourse and institutions in the field of international relations as gender-neutral, disguises gendered workings of power, which similar to the phallic signifier, cast hegemonic masculinity as the norm.<sup>24</sup>

Within the discipline of security studies this phallogocentric system has played out in the separation of “hard” security and “soft” security. Hard security is understood to be “traditional” security, or realist understandings of security. It is primarily concerned with external, inter-state security threats and the state’s ability to respond to these threats with the use of military force, and/or a credible threat. Hard security is therefore narrowly defined and places the referent of security onto the state. In addition, the understanding of security as strictly “hard” security

---

<sup>23</sup> Luce Irigaray, *This Sex Which is Not One*, 86

<sup>24</sup> Jean Bethke Elshtain, *Women and War* (London: The Harvest Press, 1987). ; Wendy Brown, *Manhood and Politics: A Feminist Reading in Political Theory* (New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield, 1988). ; Judith Butler and Joan W Scott, *Feminist Theorize the Political* (New York: Routledge , 1992).

“involves the build-up of forces as an inherent strategic element,” whereby the arms race is “a natural element” of hard security, and “military logic” uses spatial, geopolitical strategy.<sup>25</sup>

Unlike narrow, militarized “hard” security, “soft” security offers a broader definition for what constitutes both threats and responses to insecurity. Soft security is concerned with internal and trans-state threats to security, which do not necessarily constitute inter-state relations. Soft security methods are primarily policy/political based, ensuring “efficient internal management of society with a pronounced conflict-prevention dimension.”<sup>26</sup> Soft security therefore deals with threats to security that are not neatly compartmentalized into the category of national threat and are seen as less important than hard security threats.

However, like femininity in relation to masculinity, soft security is seen as inherently lacking the correct constitution that warrants the significant attention received by issues of traditional/national/hard security. Ramesh Thakur argues the concept of national security has been used to privilege the military sector which, in turn, diverts significant amounts of money into weaponry, while marginalizing soft security issues and “failing to protect citizens from chronic insecurities of hunger disease, shelter, crime and environmental hazards.”<sup>27</sup> In relation to hard security, soft security has been feminized. However, this is not to say that issues of “soft” security have not put themselves on the radar of traditional security.

### **The Feminization of Human Security**

The following builds upon the patriarchal notions of masculinity and femininity (in relation to security) established above. It does so to demonstrate how “soft” human security has

---

<sup>25</sup> Aleksandar Fatic, "Conventional and unconventional - hard and soft security: the distinction," *South-East Europe Review*, 2002: 94.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid, 94

<sup>27</sup> Ramesh Thakur, "'A Political World View'," *Security Dialouge*, 2004: 348.

been feminized in relation to “hard” national security. This relationship indicates human security’s epistemological foundations remain in the power-knowledge system of the patriarchy.

With the dissolution of the Cold War, there has been an influx of security issues not traditionally recognized as hard security issues. The challenges such as intra-state conflict, transnational issues, poverty, and inequality have forced those in positions of power to rethink what constitutes security. As Taylor Owen writes, “To many, there is little doubt that (in and of itself) the traditional state-based security paradigm is failing in its primary objective—to protect people. Millions a year are killed by communicable disease, civil war, environmental disasters, and famine, none of which fall under the mandate of current security thinking.”<sup>28</sup>

Human security, first articulated in the 1994 United Nations Development Program’s *Human Development Report*, seemed to be the answer to internationalized security threats, which no longer fit neatly into state security. The report states, “the concept of security has for too long been interpreted narrowly: as security of territory from external aggression, or as protection of national interests in foreign policy, or as global security from the threat of nuclear holocaust...Forgotten were the legitimate concerns of ordinary people who sought security in their daily lives.”<sup>29</sup> In addition, the report identifies two main aspects of human security: “first, safety from such chronic threats as hunger, diseases and repression. And second... protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life—whether in homes, jobs, or communities.”<sup>30</sup> Within the framework of these two aspects the report identifies seven elements of human security: 1) Economic Security 2) Food Security 3) Health Security 4) Environmental

---

<sup>28</sup> Taylor Owen, "Human Security--Conflict, Critique and Consensus: Colloquium Remarks and a Proposal for a Threshold-Based Definition," *Security Dialogue*, 2004: 374

<sup>29</sup> United Nations Development Program, *Human Development Report*, 1994 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 2

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid*, 23

Security 5) Personal Security 6) Communal Security 7) Political Security.<sup>31</sup> In addition, the report asserts that there are four main characteristics of security, which are: universalism, interdependency, focus on early prevention, and of course, people-centered.<sup>32</sup> While there is a fluctuating and charged debate on what precisely constitutes human security, specifically broad versus narrow definitions, and what the concept's impact potential is, the UNDP report remains the "most authoritative" and widely cited articulation of the term.<sup>33</sup> Focal to any argument over what constitutes human security is always the centrality of the individual.

Human security, as a re-articulation of contemporary security thinking, arguably substitutes for antiquated *realpolitik* concepts of national security without compromising an emphasis on hegemonic masculinity.<sup>34</sup> Many in the field, however, have emphasized that human security does not replace national security, but rather complements it. Edward Newman argues, aligning himself with this version of human security theory, that territorial integrity does not necessarily correlate with individual security, "and that a overemphasis upon statist security are a necessary but not sufficient condition of human welfare. The citizens of states that are 'secure' according to the traditional concept of security can be perilously insecure to a degree that demands a reappraisal of the concept."<sup>35</sup> Newman suggests that the human security paradigm can reorient the asymmetrical amount of attention and resources given to traditional security, not necessarily replacing traditional security but rather complementing it. Newman is not alone in

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 23.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 22.

<sup>33</sup> John G. Cockell, "Conceptualizing Peacebuilding: Human Security and Sustainable Peace," in Michael Pugh, ed., *Regeneration of War-Torn Societies* (London: Macmillan, 2000), 21

<sup>34</sup> That is, human security's epistemological foundations remain within the patriarchy.

<sup>35</sup> Edward Newman, "Human Security and Constructivism," *International Studies Perspectives*, 2001: 240.

emphasizing the complementary potential of human security.<sup>36</sup> This focus indicates an unwillingness to fully move away from the masculine neorealist security paradigm, even within human security.

Others have attempted to assimilate human security threats into national security.<sup>37</sup> This has resulted in the attempted securitization of issues of “soft” security as potentially impacting the “hard” security of a nation. Yeun Foong Khong states critically, “the purpose of securitizing certain issues, while leaving others alone, is obvious. Once an issue like drug trafficking is securitized, its status in the policy hierarch changes. It becomes an urgent issue, worthy of special attention, resources, and fast-track or immediate amelioration or resolution...”<sup>38</sup> The attempted securitization of soft issues has not really had the effect Khong envisions—issues of soft security still remain of lesser concern to those in control of security institutions. However, the assimilation approach illuminates the gendered hierarchical relationship between human security and national security.

As stated in the previous section, national security is a hegemonic masculine concept enforced by substantively masculine institutions, and supported by both men and women. Much like femininity is defined and articulated through the language of men, so too is human security articulated through the language of masculine realist security. Attempts to prove that human security can be incorporated into traditional security by complementation or assimilation signifies that human security, in and of itself, is not seen as a complete notion of security--like

---

<sup>36</sup> Taylor Owen, "Human Security--Conflict, Critique and Consensus: Colloquium Remarks and a Proposal for a Threshold-Based Definition," *Security Dialogue*, 2004: 373 - 387.

<sup>37</sup> Andrew Mack, "A Signifier of Shared Values," *Security Dialogue* 35 , no. 7 (2004): 366 - 367.

<sup>38</sup> Yuen Foong Khong, "Human Security: A Shotgun Approach to Alleviating Human Misery?," *Global Governance* , 2001: 231.



femininity in the phallogocentric order it is lacking. Human security, in this particular way, still relies on national security to derive its meaning.

Examining the gendered discourse used in the debate on human security illuminates the feminization of the paradigm. Critics have called the widening and deepening of security “sentimental, feminine, utopian, and therefore incapable of transferring into the international arena for rigorous analysis.”<sup>39</sup> Indeed, authors such as Edward Newman problematize the paradigm for its *lack* of analytical capabilities.<sup>40</sup> Human security has been accused of being “blatantly subjective and highly personalized set of normative values.”<sup>41</sup> Other adjectives used to critique human security include “naïve,” “unsubstantiated,” and “motherhood and apple pie.”<sup>42</sup> All of these terms used to challenge human security have distinct feminine connotations.

Yuen Foong Khong asserts the paradigm is overly broad and optimistic thus leading to false hopes, priorities, and causal assumptions. He remarks, that human security, not actually concerned with “real security,” might as well be called the study of safety.<sup>43</sup> The underlying implication of these criticisms is that “feminine” human security does not meet the standards or warrant the same concern of traditional security, defined and prioritized by those in power of masculine institutions. Whereby, “security must be rooted within the eradication of large-scale violent conflict, and anything else—everyday security or the securities and insecurities of individuals themselves, such as health, food economic or environmental issues—is *not* security, at least by the standards of those who matter, those being realist-oriented security

---

<sup>39</sup> Bill McSweeney, *Security, Identity and Interests: A Sociology of International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

<sup>40</sup> Edward Newman, "A Normatively Attractive but Analytically Weak Concept," *Security Dialogue*, 2004: 558.

<sup>41</sup> Thomas Nicholas and William Tow, "Gaining Security by Trashing a State? A Reply to Bellamy and McDonald," *Security Dialogue* 379 - 382.

<sup>42</sup> Anonymous, "Human Security: A Conversation," *Social Research*, 2002: 657.

<sup>43</sup> Yuen Foong Khong, "Human Security: A Shotgun Approach to Alleviating Human Misery?," *Global Governance*, 2001: 236.

researchers...”<sup>44</sup> The gendered rhetoric of national security versus human security has constructed national security as the masculine norm and human security feminine other.

If and when those in power of security institutions recognize human security threats as issues of security, the recognition does not indicate human security is no longer implicated in the feminine/masculine hierarchy inherent in neorealist security. Instead, human insecurities are addressed in a way that casts those in charge of masculinized security institutions in paternal roles where they “save” or “protect” individuals from insecurities.<sup>45</sup> This discourse operates through these masculinized institutions to substantially and symbolically gender individuals who experience human insecurities. This gendering discursively constructs a narrative that positions these individuals as feminine, passive, and weak.

## **The Production of the Feminine SubObject**

### **To Make a Rescue Fantasy Add- “Womenandchildren”-Motif-and-Stir**

This section turns to analyzing the feminization of the individual who is experiencing insecurity. It does so to examine how this feminization is to the detriment of agency-centered policy. In addition, the following subsection identifies how the construction of femininity within the insecure individual perpetuates the power-knowledge system of patriarchy as it relates to human security.

---

<sup>44</sup> Gunhild Hoogensen and Kirsti Stuvøy, "Gender, Resistance, and Human Security," *Security Dialogue*, 2006: 210.

<sup>45</sup> Emily S. Rosenberg, "Rescuing Women and Children," *The Journal of American History*, 2002: 456 - 465.

Human security reflects the current patriarchal system of gender relations, in that its epistemological foundations are based within hegemonically masculine institutions. On a macro level, this has resulted in the feminization of the concept of human security; however, on a more close up level this has resulted in the feminization of individuals who are experiencing human insecurities. Through discourse, insecure individuals are constructed as feminine, weak, passive, and infantile. These (mis)understandings of insecure peoples marginalize their agency. If an individual is defined as passive and weak in this system, then policies to eradicate national and global insecurities will not make individual agency a central tenet in establishing human security.

The incorporation of the insecure individual as passive participant rather than agent is illuminated through the discourse used by NGOs, international organizations, governments, academics and activists to mobilize support for those experiencing insecurities.<sup>46</sup> The clearest method to explicate the ways in which gendered discourse has marginalized agency is to examine how biological women have been positioned within and through the human security debate. As stated in the previous section it is important to analyze how the masculinization or feminization of an individual exists beyond biological sex. However, it is worthwhile to note that this gendering can occur within individuals whose biological sex is associated with the specific gendering. For example males can be masculinized and females can be feminized according to different social and economic factors.

Looking at the hyper-feminization of women in human security can help reveal how gendered power relationships have marginalized individual agency in realizing security. Women,

---

<sup>46</sup> Yuka Hasegawa, "Is a Human Security Approach Possible? Compatibility between the Strategies of Protection and Emancipation," *Journal of Refugee Studies* 20, no. 1 (2007): 1 -20.

specifically “womenandchildren”<sup>47</sup> have been situated as the poster face for the insecure individual of both sexes, for the purpose of mobilizing “support.” Therefore, looking the subject position of “womenandchildren” within human security discourse, we can identify how marginalized individuals (both men and women) are subjected to discourse, and positioned within the paradigm.

The dominant textual theme regarding women in human security is that of vulnerability i.e. the particular weakness and instability of “womenandchildren” and how this vulnerability makes them a central concern of human security. In “A Useful Concept That Risks Losing Its Political Salience” Neil MacFarlane writes, “the essence of human security is a shift of the referent of the concept of security from the state to the individual (and to particularly vulnerable groups such as womenandchildren).”<sup>48</sup> The inclusion of gender<sup>49</sup> in the human security paradigm in reference to particularly vulnerable populations is not uncommon. Lloyd Axworthy, the former Minister of Foreign Affairs in Canada, identifies one of the main challenges of human security as the suffering of vulnerable populations, specifically “womenandchildren.”

In addition, the phrases “womenandchildren” and “particular vulnerability” are used in multiple UN documents concerning women and human security.<sup>50</sup> Human rights groups and

---

<sup>47</sup> Cynthia Enloe, *The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War* (Berkeley: Berkeley CA University Press, 1991). Enloe uses “womenandchildren” in one word to demonstrate how governments, leaders, militaries, academics, and activists tend to conflate women with children. I have decided to use “womenandchildren” throughout my paper to highlight how this common phrase in the field of international relations quietly erodes differentiation between women and children. It constructs women as infantile and without any agency.

<sup>48</sup> Neil MacFarlane, “A Useful Concept that Risks Losing its Political Salience,” *Security Dialogue*, 2004: 368.

<sup>49</sup> In the texts that refer to gender, the authors use gender it as synonymous with biological sex.

<sup>50</sup> For examples see World Bank, ‘Demobilization and Reintegration Programs: Addressing Gender Issues 227(June 2003); United Nations Security Council ‘Report of the Secretary-General on Women and Peace and Security’

NGO's are particularly fond of these phrases as well.<sup>51</sup> The victimization/infantilization of individuals (especially of the global south) is exacerbated by western activists' attempts to mobilize support for their charitable causes through the infantilization of women, constructing a moral responsibility to help the "poor" "womenandchildren" who cannot help themselves.<sup>52</sup> By evoking feminine motifs of infantile women in need of protection masculinized systems of power gather support for charitable campaigns.<sup>53</sup> While "womenandchildren's" narratives are used as the poster face for the campaigns, many of these organizations support both men and women.<sup>54</sup>

Narratives and discourse surrounding individuals' "soft," or human security threats, positions the writers and campaigners (who are mostly from the west) in a masculine, paternal role. Individuals and groups working to further the concept of human security, or to establish human security through policy, are often those in positions of privilege and power. In fact, most of the debate on what constitutes human security and how it should be implemented comes from western academic journals. These works are written by people educated and employed in higher learning institutions, or international organizations, who presumably are not experiencing any of these insecurities.<sup>55</sup> This position situates those working in the field of establishing and articulating human security from the top-down in paternal/masculine roles, whereas those experiencing insecurity are cast in feminine roles. In the feminine subject position of the insecure

---

<sup>51</sup> For an example see Amnesty International USA <http://takeaction.amnestyusa.org>

<sup>52</sup> For an example see Russo, Ann, "The Feminist Majority Foundation's Campaign to Stop Gender Apartheid: The Intersections of Feminism and Imperialism in the United States 6(7): 557-580

<sup>53</sup> Doezenia, Joe. 'Loose women or lost women? The re-emergence of the myth of white slavery in contemporary discourses of trafficking in women', *Gender Issues*. 18(1), 24.

<sup>54</sup> For interesting research on why humanitarian organizations use the language of "womenandchildren" and other gender essentialisms see: R. Charli Carpenter, "Women and Children and Other Vulnerable Groups: Gender, Strategic Frames and the Protection of Civilians as a Transnational Issue," *International Studies Quarterly* 49 (2005): 295 - 334.

<sup>55</sup> See the major debates over human security, which have unfolded over the past ten years in *Security Dialogue*, a journal published in Norway.

individual, it is clear how patriarchal discourse and knowledge are self-reproducing within the human security paradigm.

The portrayal of insecure individuals as feminized “womenandchildren” produces and shapes a “knowledge” of these individuals, which situates them as fundamentally infantile, weak, and passive. This “knowledge” is constructed as “natural” as opposed to situational or structural. Political power, in the form of academia, policy, and law produces and reproduces this “knowledge” of the individual through discourse, which in turn shapes “knowledge” of the insecure individual as feminine in a continuous cycle. In examining the very real threat to individual security that is human trafficking, the way in which this cycle unfolds is concretely exposed.

### **Case Study: Human Trafficking Laws and Discourse in the United States**

Only When Human sorrows are turned into a toy with glaring colors will...people become interested—for a while at least...The “righteous” cry against the white slave traffic as such a toy. It serves to amuse the people for a little while, and it will help to create a few more at political jobs—parasites who stalk about the world as inspectors, investigators, detectives, and so forth.

--Emma Goldman<sup>56</sup>

In this section, I will use human trafficking eradication efforts as an example of how the feminization of insecure individuals marginalizes, and even stigmatizes, individual agency in the establishment of human security. In addition I will explore how discourse has positioned those at the forefront of the campaigns against trafficking as masculine/paternal. I have chosen to do this case study within the United States to demonstrate threats to human security are pervasive throughout the world, not simply the global south.

---

<sup>56</sup> Emma Goldman, *The Trafficking in Women*, 1910 Cited in Kamala Kempadoo, "From Moral Panic to Global Justice: Changing Perspectives on Trafficking," in *Trafficking and Prostitution Reconsidered: New Perspectives on Migration, Sex Work, and Human Rights*, vii - xxxiv (Boulder, 2005).

Within a framework of increasing concern for the individual's security (and a securitization of "soft" security threats) human trafficking became a widely recognized concern in the late 1990's. In 2000 the United Nations adopted the *Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime*, which amongst two others, contained the *Protocol to Prevent, Suppress, and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children*. The United States is a signatory to this convention and protocol. In 2000 the U.S. enacted its own *Trafficking Victims Protection Act*. It is arguable as to whether or not the TVPA as well as the UN Convention, and Protocol, approach the security of the individual appropriately. Regardless of the functionality of the documents, increasing concern over issues other than orthodox security and international relations caused anti-trafficking measures to become incorporated into international documents and domestic laws. All three documents are cited in the 2003 *Human Security Now Report* as moving toward an individual security centered approach.

In addition, many in the field of human security have paid particulate attention to the problem of human trafficking in writing and policy. In the chapter on human security in his book, *The United Nations Peace and Security*, Ramesh Thakur dedicates a relatively significant amount of attention to demonstrating how the international problem of human trafficking is evidence of the inadequacies of the national security paradigm. He asserts, "the dominant national security paradigm tends also to treat the problem as a crime against the state..." where as "it would seem more fruitful to view this as a crime against the individual person within the framework of humans security."<sup>57</sup> In reorganizing the threat of human trafficking as a main concern of individual security, trafficked persons will be more likely to receive assistance from state apparatuses such as police, immigration, and criminal justice systems.

---

<sup>57</sup> Thakur, *The UN Peace and Security*, 88.

The phrase, “trafficking in humans,” will almost undoubtedly evoke images of desperate and wide-eyed third world “womenandchildren” featured on campaign posters and PBS documentaries. Sex trafficking of “womenandchildren” has become the poster face for human trafficking, and has constructed the global sex trade as nearly synonymous with the trafficking in humans. Because of this, there has been a tendency in policy and academia to focus research almost exclusively on the global sex trade. This focus has been to the detriment of research on other prevalent forms of trafficking and exploitation,<sup>58</sup> specifically bonded labor and domestic servitude.<sup>59</sup> Emphasis on the sexual slavery of “womenandchildren” in the United States can be traced to the origins of the anti-trafficking campaign against the “White Slave Trade” at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The “White Slave Trade” was a moral panic concerning the abduction of white European women for prostitution by “non-white” men in the colonies. Jo Doezema, argues that although history has proven the White Slave Trade to be a myth, the discourse and rhetoric of the campaign against the sexual slavery of white women are similar to those used by the current anti-trafficking movement. Both campaigns rely on moral panic around women’s sexuality and agency to gain support. Women trafficked into sexual slavery are portrayed as “unempowered,” hyper-feminine and are largely infantilized. Often times their ability to make an uncoerced decision to work in the sex trade is ignored.<sup>60</sup> Doezema writes, “then as now, the

---

<sup>58</sup> For the purpose of this paper trafficking/exploitation are used as synonymous when written together. I specifically include exploitation in addition to trafficking, because some cases of exploitation could be considered trafficking, but are not under the narrow definition of the law, or untrained eyes of law enforcement agents.

<sup>59</sup> NN Haanstad, "Data and Research on Human Trafficking: A Global Survey," *Review of Research on Human Trafficking in North America*, July 2006: 2033-2034.

<sup>60</sup> A Murray. (1998). Debt Bondage and Trafficking: Don’t Believe the Hype, in K. Kempadoo J. Doezema (eds.) *Global Sex Workers: Rights, Resistance and Redefinition*.



paradigmatic image is that of a young native innocent lured or deceived by evil traffickers into a life of sordid horror from which escape is nearly impossible.”<sup>61</sup>

Instead of the virginal white woman in need of protection from the foreign “other,” campaigns now stress the protection of “womenandchildren” from non-western countries being trafficked into not only the west, but into other countries of the global south as well. Then and now, anti-trafficking efforts have involved an odd cooperation between prostitution abolitionist feminists and the religious right.<sup>62</sup> In contrast to feminized trafficked victims, these activists are masculinized for their roles as supposed “protectors” and “saviors.” Chandra Mohanty refers to the paternalistic approach used by both the religious right and abolitionist feminists as the “colonial gaze of western feminists.”<sup>63</sup> This gaze feminizes trafficked women, strips them of their agency as immigrants, and emphasizes their femininity and victimization.

The lobbying efforts of the religious right and abolitionist feminists operating under the “colonial gaze” have greatly influenced the feminization of trafficking so that it has become a women’s/morality issue. The Coalition Against Trafficking in Women (CATW), one of the most prominent contemporary abolitionist feminist groups, elicits public support for their campaign through the mobilization of “moral responsibility” to propagate “civility” within the global south. According to Nandita Sharma, within modern anti-trafficking campaigns traffickers “are represented as ruthless outlaws affirming their masculinity through abuse and exploitation of ‘their own’ women.”<sup>64</sup> This campaign discourse produces and reproduces patriarchal notions of

---

<sup>61</sup> Joe Doezema, "Loose Women or Lost Women? The Re-emergence of the Myth of White Slavery in Contemporary Discourses of Trafficking in Women," *Gender Issues* (2000): 24.

<sup>62</sup> Tony Carnes. (2000, March 6). Odd Couple Politics: Evangelicals, feminists make common cause against sex trafficking. *Christianity Today*.

<sup>63</sup> C Mohanty, "Under Western Eyes: Feminists Scholarship and Colonial Discourses," *Feminist Review* (1998): 3-28.

<sup>64</sup> Nandita Sharma, "Anti-Trafficking Rhetoric and the Making of Global Apartheid," *NWSA Journal* 3 (2005): 88.

femininity and masculinity. It does so by using representations of hegemonic masculinity<sup>65</sup> as the civilizer/rescuer, subordinate masculinity<sup>66</sup> as the barbaric threat, and femininity as the innocent in danger.

In a Washington Post article titled “Feminism in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century” two prominent CATW activists, Phyllis Chesler and Donna Hughes, construct trafficking as a threat to civilization, and call upon feminists to “*actively*”<sup>67</sup> oppose the traffickers,” and therefore defend civility. In this way, the fight against trafficking is seen as a moral fight for civility, or a defense of hegemonic masculinity.<sup>68</sup> In addition, moral indignation surrounding prostitution and women’s sexuality allow abolitionist feminists and the right to blatantly disregard the possibility that women could have the agency to freely choose to participate in sex work. The use of rescue discourse that relies upon the depiction of men from the global south as barbaric and women in the global south as brutally oppressed by those men, helps anti-trafficking campaigns/lobbiests establish moral appeal to citizens in the U.S. Such a construction emphasizes the need to defend the “honor” of women’s sexuality and continue the proliferation of civility within these “backward” nations.

The feminization of trafficking into a women’s/morality issue has permeated into policy and legislation. In fact, under the Clinton Administration, the President’s Interagency Council on Women established the first modern version of a definition for trafficking in persons.<sup>69</sup> The current legal definition for severe forms of trafficking, which came out of the legal definition

---

<sup>65</sup> White heterosexual masculinity.

<sup>66</sup> In this case, non-white masculinity.

<sup>67</sup> My emphasis added.

<sup>68</sup> Phyllis and Donna M. Hughes Chesler, "Feminism in the 21st Century," *The Washington Post*, February 22, 2004: B7.

<sup>69</sup> President's Interagency Council on Women, "Executive Memorandum on Steps to Combat Violence Against Women and Trafficking in Women and Girls" (March 11, 1998).

established by the Council in 1998,<sup>70</sup> was presented in the 2000 Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act (now the TVPA):

- (a) sex trafficking in which a commercial sex act is induced by force, fraud, and coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such act has not attained 18 years of age; or
- (b) the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision or obtaining of a person for labour or services, through the use of force, fraud or coercion for the purpose of subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debtbondage, or slavery<sup>71</sup>

Persons identified as having suffered severe forms of trafficking are able to obtain protection/assistance through non-immigrant T or U visas. T and U Visas are a limited number of non-immigrant visas that provide temporary legal status to victims of trafficking and other enumerated crimes identified within the TVPA. The allotted visas are reserved exclusively for victims who assist in the investigation and prosecutions of the criminal activity committed against them.<sup>72</sup> T visas allow trafficked victims to apply for residency contingent upon their cooperation with law enforcement and their meeting of certain set criteria.<sup>73</sup> Persons who may need assistance or support, but do not meet the above criteria (or are not immediately recognized as trafficked victims) are marginalized, criminalized and denied access to assistance, largely in part because of their illegal status and their agency in migrating.<sup>74</sup>

Evoking motifs of naïve women in need of protection strikes a moral chord that helps to rally support for anti-trafficking campaigns. This support is made possible in the post 9/11 anti-immigration climate through the construction of the “innocent” trafficked victim. By portraying

---

<sup>70</sup> Haanstand, “Data and Research,”

<sup>71</sup> TVPA

<sup>72</sup> TVPA

<sup>73</sup> TVPA

<sup>74</sup> Dina Francesa Haynes, "Used, Abused, Arrested and Deported: Extending Immigration Benefits to Protect the Victims of Trafficking and to Secure the Prosecution of Traffickers," *Human Rights Quarterly* (May 2004): 221.

and gendering trafficked persons as innocent and feminine, anxieties surrounding the dangerous immigrant “other” are calmed. As Sharma asserts, “this is because the more influential versions of anti-trafficking campaigns do not see the victims of trafficking as women exercising agency (however much constrained) in crossing national borders. Instead, anti-trafficking campaigns view women solely as victims forced or dumped into migration for the sole benefit of the predatory trafficker.”<sup>75</sup>

Wendy Chapkis applies a critical lens to the TVPA and surrounding debates on trafficking.<sup>76</sup> She argues the language used incorporates divisions of gender and sexuality to separate “violated innocents” from “illegal immigrants.” She claims in addition to its dividing nature the law also “mobilizes anxieties surrounding sexuality and gender in service of immigration control.”<sup>77</sup> The fact that the TVPA only deems persons who have experienced “severe forms of trafficking” worthy of assistance (through T and U visas) serves to further divide the “innocent” from the “guilty,” or rather passive/feminine from the active/masculine. Immigrants who knowingly (actively) cross international borders are stigmatized.

Popular discourse of “severe trafficking” produces the archetype of an “object of exchange” rather than an “exploited worker.”<sup>78</sup> Framing the issue in this way then makes it the good citizen’s “moral” responsibility to *protect* the victim, much like the global north has constructed itself to be in the moral position to deliver security to the global south. The moral debate is a diversion from addressing real issues of exploitation both within the United States and globally. Construction of the feminine/deserving victim projects a complete lack of consent on behalf of the trafficked survivor.

---

<sup>75</sup> Sharma, “Anti-Trafficking Rhetoric,” 102

<sup>76</sup> Wendy Chapkis, “Trafficking, Migration, and the Law,” *Gender and Society* (2003): 926.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 924

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 960

The separation of innocence and agency (and the subsequent marginalization of agency) in anti-trafficking discourse stigmatizes and marginalizes immigrants who assert their agency—albeit limited—in not only their initial migration, but in organizing against exploitation and individual insecurities as well. In order to eradicate human insecurity in all forms, it is paramount that barriers to the realization of individual agency are removed. In the U.S., these barriers both constitute and are perpetuated by patriarchal power relationships, which informs policy. This policy stigmatize immigrants who posses agency or are seen as subordinately masculine, but who do not fall into the feminized category of “trafficked victim.” By examining the intersections between hegemonic gender discourse and power in the United States’ effort to eradicating human trafficking, it is clear how the feminized subject position of the insecure individual is to the detriment of effective policy. In fact, not only does this feminization marginalize agency, but also it punishes and stigmatizes individuals who assert their agency in actively seeking to eradicate their individual insecurities.

## **Thinking Outside Patriarchy: Postmodern Feminism and Human Security**

### **Human Security and Sites of Dissonance**

Feminist security studies have demonstrated how fundamental structures of gender that overvalue masculinity, not only perpetuate, but create insecurity. These security instabilities take the forms of both “hard” and “soft” security concerns, from increased militarization to structural adjustment programs, environmental degradation and beyond.<sup>79</sup> This paper argues that in addition to manifestations in security instabilities, patriarchal gender relations has been implicated in the discourse employed by academics and practitioners. This discourse relies on

---

<sup>79</sup> Ann Tickner, *Gender in International Relations*

patriarchal notions of femininity and masculinity to construct individuals who are experiencing insecurity.

Un-extrapolated, human security's epistemological foundations remain fixed in a gendered hierarchy, which through discourse, constructs insecure individuals as feminine, apolitical, ahistorical objects. This adoption of a human security framework derived from men's experiences and reproduced through masculinized institutions has permeated into harmful gendered policy and discourse. As this paper has previously asserted, these patriarchal relationships surface in a multiplicity of socio-political arenas in anti-trafficking campaigns and laws. These foundations, generated through patriarchy have negative ramifications on individual agency and eradication efforts, which are formed within a gendered "knowledge" of insecure individuals as weak and feminine. Through this relationship between knowledge and discourse it is clear how discourse equals/directly corresponds to power. Discourse defines and shapes our framework for understanding, acting, and ultimately imagining, political solutions, security sites, and individual identity by producing and reproducing knowledge.<sup>80</sup> This "knowledge," through speech and discourse informs all aspects of our daily lives, from laws to individual relationships, concepts to practices.

Gendered hierarchies, inherent in the human security paradigm, have manifested as asymmetrical power relationships in discourse, knowledge, and power. This power nexus is to the detriment of effective policy, as it relies too heavily on ineffective top-down approaches to establish security. The feminization of insecure individuals and the masculinization of individuals holding power positions within the field of security has led to an overvaluation of the role of that the international community has in the eradication of insecurities. The

---

<sup>80</sup> Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings* (New York: Pantheon, 1980).

masculinization/feminization paradigm overlooks the role local non-state actors, civil society, social movements, and even insecure individuals can assume in the realization of human security.<sup>81</sup> Paradoxically, in discursively maintaining these gendered hierarchical power relationships, human security has centered the individual as a referent while simultaneously marginalizing individual agency. This has led to the negation of agency-centered approaches in the realization of individual security.

Despite these failures of the concept of human security, the entire paradigmatic development must not be dismissed. Dianne Otto argues that “while it must be remembered that both discourses of human rights and development are effects and tools of global elites and therefore treacherous terrain for feminists, nevertheless such powerful knowledge systems also produce resistance from those they subjugate, which is how feminist strategies are generated.”<sup>82</sup> Although she is speaking of human rights and development, her comments are critical for understanding the potentials of human security. Postmodernism, and the array of other “posts” and critical theories can offer an important deconstruction of the hierarchical relationships reproduced through and within the human security paradigm. However, totally deconstructed the subjugated have few tools or discourses to negotiate their emancipation within a well-established power-knowledge system. Feminist theory identifies spaces of dissonance within the “treacherous terrain”<sup>83</sup> of security, which can serve as sites that harbor the development of non-hierarchical relationships and approaches to the establishment of human security.

---

<sup>81</sup> Frederic Mergret, "Beyond the Salvation Paradigm: Responsibility to Protect (Others) vs the Power of Protecting Oneself," *Security Dialogue*, 2009: 575 - 595.

<sup>82</sup> Dianne Otto, "Post-Beijing Reflection on the Limitations and Potential of Human Rights Discourse for Women," in *SYMPOSIUM ON THE FUTURE OF INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS: The Mid-Life Crisis of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (Washington and Lee University, 1998), 116.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, 116

These sites of dissonance (and, therefore, potential) in human security are clearly recognizable. The national security paradigm does not speak to the multiplicity of insecurities faced daily by individuals living within “secure” borders. Increases in globalization through technology, migration, the economy and so on have revealed again and again porous national borders and fluid trans-state threats. Traditional notions of national security are dysfunctional, to say the least. Feminist scholarship has for decades sought to revalue the voices and experiences of marginalized individuals particularly, but not exclusively women ignored by traditional politics.<sup>84</sup> Arguably human security, in its most bare form seeks to do something quite similar to feminist practices—bring the needs and wellbeing of individuals to the forefront of policy and scholarship. The disconnect between recognizing these inadequacies and eradicating them occurs through the inclusion of detrimental hierarchical relationships within policy and discourse, and through the disregard for structural hierarchical relationships, which perpetuate insecurity. As Tickner articulates in her concluding chapter of *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security*, alleviation of nontraditional insecurities:

cannot be completely successful until the hierarchical social relations, including gender relations, intrinsic to each of these domains are recognized and substantially altered. In other words, the achievement of peace, economic justice, and ecological sustainability is inseparable from overcoming social relations of domination and subordination; genuine security requires not only the absence of war but also the elimination of unjust social relations, including unequal gender relations.<sup>85</sup>

While individuals continue to be constructed as passive, leading to ineffective top-down securitization policy. While hegemonic masculinity continues to be overvalued in foreign policy, security, and individuals leading to the naturalized use of violence and force. The individual

---

<sup>84</sup> Annick T.R. Wibben, "Feminist International Relations: Old Debates and New Directions," *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 2004 : 97 - 114.

<sup>85</sup> Ann Tickner, *Gender and International Relations*, 128



security needed to ensure the full emancipation of individuals from fundamental threats to wellbeing is not possible.

Therefore, postmodern feminist perspective examines structures and discourses--which are mutually constitutive, reinforcing, and reproducing--that cause and perpetuate insecurities. These discursive structures marginalize the agency and voices of individuals experiencing human insecurity. Hierarchical gendered discourse in national security and human security naturalizes the current marginalization of insecure individuals. This is clearly revealed when looking at the main contestation within human security—the definitional debate.

### Human Security and the Agency to Articulate

*Definitions belong to the definers—not the defined.*

-Toni Morrison<sup>86</sup>

The central point of concern over human security is always how the concept should be defined. This question has largely taken the form of the broad versus narrow debate, in other words, the freedom from fear versus the freedom from want. Preoccupation with securing a definition for human security is seen in the Human Security Colloquium published in the September 2004 issue of *Security Dialogue*. The issue featured 21 authors who were asked to briefly provide their thoughts on human security, its status and relevance ten years after the publishing of the UNDP's 1994 *Human Development Report*. Most authors participating included, if not focused, on their position within this definitional debate.<sup>87</sup> All of the authors participating in the debate make well-articulated arguments for their respective sides. However,

---

<sup>86</sup> Quoted in Zillah Elsenstein, *Against Empire: Feminism, Racism, and the West* (London: Zed Books).

<sup>87</sup> Taylor Owen, "Human Security--Conflict, Critique and Consensus: Colloquium Remarks and a Proposal for a Threshold-Based Definition," *Security Dialogue*, 2004: 373 - 387.

only one piece draws attention to the actual implications of participating in this academic/policy debate.

In recognition of the connection between knowledge and power, Kyle Grayson draws attention to the necessary recognition of the ‘aspiration to power’ that is “inherently in any definitional claim be exposed and debated in terms of both what is being positively affirmed as comprising human security and what is concurrently disqualified.” He concludes “there must be analytic sensitivity given to people, places and things that are marginalized when an ‘expert’ claims to be providing a precise/scientific/workable definition of human security that is of practical use.”<sup>88</sup> Rather than engaging in the tired debate of broad versus narrow policymakers and academics should instead examine the power that is constitutive of the power-knowledge system of human security. Those in positions of power who are able to articulate authoritatively what constitutes human security position themselves as masculine. Whereas those individuals on whom they are subjecting discourse, and who are positioned as incapable of articulating their own needs, are feminized. Arguably in placing the referent of security onto the individual, security concerns should emanate from the individual-up, instead of identified by the official down. Paradoxically, ignoring the inherent gendered power-knowledge practice within the debate, the conversation over how human security should be defined marginalizes the voices and experiences of the very individuals experiencing human insecurities.

Those individuals who are in the worst positions within the manifestations of insecurity are able to give the most nuanced picture of these situations. There is a significant need to analytically and experientially anchor analysis of global issues within the most marginalized

---

<sup>88</sup> Kyle Grayson, "A Challenge to the Power over Knowledge of Traditional Security Studies," *Security Dialogue*, 2003: 357.

communities.<sup>89</sup> This perspective makes the relationships, politics and manifestations of the current patriarchal power-knowledge system more transparent. This non-dominant perspective can provide the most holistic understanding of security and insecurity as individuals experience them. From this perspective the concept of security or insecurity is defined differently in different social and cultural contexts through symbolic and cultural contexts.<sup>90</sup> Reflecting on her research on the Indigenous Mayan women's experiences of (in)security, Maria Stern concludes that these women's narratives must be taken as valid texts on security. These narratives are texts which have the potential to radically challenge the "knowledge" of the security discipline.<sup>91</sup> The texts reveal experiences of security and insecurity are understood in intersecting contexts of sexism, racism, classism, nationalism and various other forms of identity and power. These intersections clearly cannot be neatly confined within the argument regarding the freedom from fear versus the freedom from want.

Opening up the security debate to the narratives of those who are experiencing insecurity disrupts the power-knowledge practice of patriarchal relations. Such a motion challenges the feminized monolithic image of the insecure individual created through security discourse. It does so by centering the agency of individuals in order to allow them to articulate their own experiences of insecurity. Anchored in the unique discourses of insecure individuals, defining human security subjectively and contextually through lived experiences, challenges the current hierarchical gendered human security paradigm. It alters the discursive "knowledge" of the

---

<sup>89</sup> Chandra Mohanty, "'Under Western Eyes' Revisited: Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalist Struggles," *Signs* 28, no. 2 (2003): 510.

<sup>90</sup> Donna Winslow and Thomas Erikson, "A Broad Concept that Encourages Interdisciplinary Thinking," *Security Dialogue* 35 (2004): 361 - 362.

<sup>91</sup> Maria Stern, "Racism, Sexism, Classism, and Much More: Reading security-identity in marginalized sites," in *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*, 195 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

insecure individual as weak and passive and places them within the contexts of their daily lives and experiences of insecurity. However, in order to successfully incorporate this perspective there is a need to create a discursive space in which the structurally excluded insecure individual can speak.<sup>92</sup> This requires a further destruction of the embedded patriarchal power-knowledge system in human security.

### **Finding Agency in the Practice of Power**

In order to identify and overcome these patriarchal relationships of power it is necessary to examine how they function. Dominant/subordinate social relationships, manifested through gendering, are part of a reproductive system of interactions between individuals, groups, and structures. In fact, the term gender derives from an ancient Indo-European word-root which means 'to produce' i.e. to generate. From this linguistic root came words which denote this gendering as 'kind' or 'class' i.e. genus.<sup>93</sup> In this way, gender is a produced classification.

R.W. Connell draws a parallel between the derivation of the word "gender" and the social implementation of gender on the individual and structural levels. The derivation of gender from the root meaning "to produce" implies a process; however, further developments from the root have connoted the fixing of the production into a classification. Connell understands this fixed "unchanging" category as an illusion. He argues, "there is no fixed biological base for the social process of gender. Rather there is an arena in which bodies are brought into social processes, in which our social conduct does something with reproductive differences." In this social conduct, "gender arrangements are reproduced socially (not biologically) by the power of

---

<sup>92</sup> Gunhild Hoogensen and Kirsti Stuvøy, "Gender, Resistance, and Human Security," *Security Dialogue*, 2006: 207 - 228.

<sup>93</sup> RW Connell, *Masculinities* 7

structures to constrain individual action, so they often appear unchanging.”<sup>94</sup> Although they appear as “fixed” or “natural” unequal gender relationships are constantly being produced and reproduced by both men and women. These deceptively “fixed” gender relationships are then permeated into discourse, which shapes laws and policies surrounding the establishment of security.<sup>95</sup>

In this way, there is no single identifiable source of the subjugation of femininity within this system. Instead power is present throughout the actions and interactions which constitute gender, creating an omnipresence of power, which according to French Philosopher, Michel Foucault, is:

not because it has the privilege of consolidating everything under its invincible unity, but because it is produced from one moment to the next, at every point, or rather in every relation from one point to another. Power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere. And ‘power’ insofar as it is permanent, repetitious, inert, and self-reproducing, is simply the over-all effect that emerges from all these motilities, the concentration that rests on each of them and seeks in turn to arrest their movement.<sup>96</sup>

Systems of domination examined by security discourse, like the domination of one group over another or of the sovereign state over its citizens, are systems of power Foucault identifies as not “given on the outset,” but rather as the “terminal forms power takes.”<sup>97</sup> The “omnipresence of power” in the social practices of hierarchy, which manifest into discourse and “terminal forms of power” can be a paralyzing realization. If the constructed and constructive power systems of

---

<sup>94</sup> Ibid, 7

<sup>95</sup> This paper has focused primarily on the manifestations of unequal gender relationships in national security and human security. However, it is important to remember that these relationships exist in other political concepts such as development, human rights, environmental sustainability etc.

<sup>96</sup> Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, 93

<sup>97</sup> Ibid, 92

gendered hierarchy are everywhere, and in everything, where are the spaces of resistance? Recognizing that like gender, power is something that is practiced, embodied and enacted, but not possessed, is the first step in resistance. Patriarchy (a terminal form of power) is legitimated by the “knowledge” that the current gendered hierarchy is timeless and fixed. In turn, power reproduces knowledge by shaping it according hegemonic notions of knowledge, simply because it is hegemonic. The subordination of femininity to masculinity is maintained through the practice of power-knowledge. This power-knowledge system of gender is individually internalized and implicated in the ways in which academics and policymakers have responded to and constructed human security as a concept and practice.

## Conclusion

The end result of the inattention paid to this internalization has been the feminization of the concept, as well as the feminization of individuals experiencing insecurity. However, understanding that the individual embodiment and enactment of power-knowledge is neither fixed nor totally unconscious situates the locus of resistance within the same site of power, the individual. Just as Gryson draws attention to the power-knowledge practice in attempting to define human security, it is important for individuals working within the field to understand their positions in the power-knowledge practice. As those in the field continue create knowledge about security and insecurity of individuals they must recognize that the way they write on, talk about, and theorize (or “know”) security and insecurity of individuals is even more effective (that is, it can affect individuals both positively and negatively) than their good intentions for that individual.

A postmodern feminist analysis of human security discourse identifies how individuals have been feminized and marginalized in academia and policy within the contexts of patriarchal power-knowledge. Therefore, it is important to recognize how insecure individuals are subjected to discourse within this power-knowledge system. Insecure individuals have been feminized within masculinized security structures, so that they are construed as objects of power-knowledge. This marginalizes the insecure individual, preventing her/him from being able to articulate his/her own experiences of security, as well as ignores the potential of local responses to security threats. The most important result of a postmodern feminist analysis of human security is its centralization of the insecure individual's agency. It repositions her/him as a subject of power-knowledge, especially in terms of his/her own security. This rearticulating of individual agency occurs first and foremost through individuals in the field recognizing their own agency in perpetuating or resisting the current patriarchal power-knowledge system.

## Bibliography

Abu-Lughod, Lila. "Do Muslim Women Really Need Saving? Anthropological Reflections on Cultural Relativism and Its Others." *American Anthropologist* 104, no. 3 (2002): 783-790.

Ackerly, Brooke A., Maria Stern, and Jacqui True. *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Act, The United States Patriot. "Library of Congress." <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d107:hr03162:%5D>.

Almanzar, Damien Cave and Yolanne. "Tactics Used in US Raids Draw Claims of Brutality." *New York Times*, December 10, 2008: A28.

Anonymous. "Human Security: A Conversation." *Social Research*, 2002: 657 - 676.

Bajpai, Kanti. *Human Security: Concept and Measurements*. Occasional Paper, Kroc Institute, 2000.

Basch, Linda. "Human Security, Globalization, and Feminist Visions." *Peace Review*, 2004: 5 - 12.

Blanchard, Eric. "Gender, International Relations, and the Development of Feminist Security Theory." *Signs*, 2003: 1289 - 1312.

Brock, Debi. "Trafficking and Prostitution Reconsidered: New Perspectives on Migration, Sex Work, and Human Resources." *Resources for Feminist Research* 31, no. 3 (2006): 151.

Brown, Wendy. *Manhood and Politics: A Feminist Reading in Political Theory*. New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield, 1988.

Bunch, Charlotte. "Feminism, Peace, Human Rights and Human Security." *Canadian Woman Studies*, 2003: 6 - 15.

Bunch, Charlotte. "Women's Rights and Gender at the United Nations: The Case for a new Gender Equality Architecture." *Vereinte Nationen: German Review on the United Nations*, 2009.

Burguières, Mary. "Feminist Approaches to Peace: Another Step for Peace Studies." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 19, no. 1 (1990): 1 - 18.

Butler, Judith, and Joan W Scott. *Feminist Theorize the Political*. New York: Routledge, 1992.



- Carnes, Tony. "Odd Couple Politics: Evangelicals, Feminists, Make Common Cause Against Sex Trafficking." *Christianity Today*.
- Carpenter, R. Charli. "Women and Children and Other Vulnerable Groups: Gender, Strategic Frames and the Protection of Civilians as a Transnational Issue." *International Studies Quarterly* 49 (2005): 295 - 334.
- Chapkis, Wendy. "Trafficking, Migration, and the Law." *Gender and Society* 17, no. 6 (2003): 926.
- Chesler, Phyllis and Donna M. Hughes. "Feminism in the 21st Century." *The Washington Post*, February 22, 2004: B7.
- Cohn, Carol, and Cynthia Enloe. "A Conversation with Cynthia Enloe: Feminists Look at Masculinity and the Men Who Wage War." *Signs*, 2003: 1187 - 1207.
- Connell, R.W. *Masculinities: Knowledge, Power, and Social Change*. Los Angeles: Polity Press, 1995.
- Cook, Susan E. "Subersion Without Limits: From the Secretary's Transgressive S/M to Exquisit Corpse's Subersive Sadomasochism." *Discourse* Winter (2006): 121-141.
- Delanty, Gerard. "The Cosmopolitan Imagination: Critical Cosmopolitanism and Social Theory." *The British Journal of Sociology*, 2006: 26 - 47.
- Doezema, Joe. "Loose Women or Lost Women? The Re-emergence of the Myth of White Slavery in Contemporary Discourses of Trafficking in Women." *Gender Issues* 18, no. 1 (2000): 24.
- Donnell, Elzbieta M Gozdiak and Margaret Mac. "Closing the Gaps: The Need to Improve Identification and Services to Child Victims of Trafficking." *Human Organizations* 66, no. 2 (2007): 171.
- Dubriwny, Tasha N. "First Ladies and Feminism: Laura Bush as Advocate for Women's and Children's Rights." *Women's Studies in Communication* 1, no. 28 (Spring 2005): 84-114.
- Elshtain, Jean Bethke. *Women and War*. London: The Harvest Press, 1987.
- Enloe, Cynthia. *The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War*. Berkeley: Berkeley CA University Press, 1991.
- Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*. New York: Pantheon, 1980.
- . *The History of Sexuality an Introduction: Volume I*. New York: Random House, 1978.

—. *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Random House, 1970 .

Franks, Mary Anne. "Obscene Undersides: Women and Evil Between the Taliban and the United States." *Hypatia*, 2003: 136 - 137.

Fraser, Nancy, and Linda J Nicholson. "Social Criticism without Philosophy ." In *Feminism/Postmodernism*, by Linda Nicholson, 19 - 39, 20. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Free the Slaves & Human Rights Center University of California Berkeley. "Hidden Slaves: Forced Labor in the United States." 2004.

Grayson, Kyle. "A Challenge to the Power over Knowledge of Traditional Security Studies ." *Security Dialogue*, 2003: 357.

Grayson, Kyle. "Securitization and the Boomerang Debate: A Rejoinder to Liotta and Smith-Windsor." *Security Dialogue* 337 - 343.

Haraway, Donna. *Primate Visions: Gender, Race, and Nature in the World of Modern Sciences*. New York: Routledge, 1989.

Hasegawa, Yuka. "Is a Human Security Approach Possible? Compatibility between the Strategies of Protection and Emancipation." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 20, no. 1 (2007): 1 -20.

Haynes, Dina Francesca. "Used, Abused, Arrested and Deported: Extending Immigration Benefits to Protect the Victims of Trafficking and to Secure the Prosecution of Traffickers." *Human Rights Quarterly* 26, no. 2 (May 2004): 221, 52.

Hoogensen, Gunhild, and Kirsti Stuvøy. "Gender, Resistance, and Human Security." *Security Dialogue*, 2006: 207 - 228.

Hoogensen, Gunhild, and Svein Rottem. "Gender Identity and the Subject of Security." *Security Dialogue*, 2004: 155 - 171.

Hudson, Valarie M., Mary Caprioli, Bonnie Ballif-Spanvill, Rose McDermott, and Chad Emett. "The Heart of the Matter: The Security of Women and the Security of States." *International Security* 7 - 45.

Irigaray, Luce. *This Sex Which Is Not One*. Ithica : Cornell University Press, 1977.

Kempadoo, Kamala. "From Moral Panic to Global Justice: Changing Perspectives on Trafficking." In *Trafficking and Prostitution Reconsidered: New Perspectives on Migration, Sex Work, and Human Rights*, by Kamala Kempadoo, vii - xxxiv. Boulder, 2005.

- Khong, Yuen Foong. "Human Security: A Shotgun Approach to Alleviating Human Misery?" *Global Governance*, 2001: 231 - 236.
- Krause, Keith. "Is Human Security "More than Just a Good Idea"?" Edited by M. Brzoska and P.J. Croll. *Promoting Security: But How and For Whom? Contributions to BICC's Ten-year Anniversary Conference*. Bonn International Center for Conversion, 2004. 44.
- Larrinaga, Miguel de, and Marc C. Doucet. "Sovereign Power and the Biopolitics of Human Security ." *Security Dialogue* 39, no. 5 (October 2008): 517-537.
- Lavato, Roberto. "Building the Homeland Security State." *NACLA Report on the Americas* 41, no. 6 (Nov/Dec 2008): 15-21.
- Lewis, Peter Maynard. *Promoting Social Cohesion: The Role of Community Media*. Media and Information Society Division, Council of Europe, 2008.
- Mack, Andrew. "A Signifier of Shared Values." *Security Dialogue* 35 , no. 7 (2004): 366 - 367.
- Maclure, Richard, and Myriam Denov. "'I Didn't Want to Die So I Joined Them': Structuration and the Process of Becoming Boy Soldiers in Sierra Leone." *Terrorism and Political Violence* , 2006: 119 - 135.
- Martin, Emily. "The Egg and the Sperm: How Science Has Constructed a Romance Based on Stereotypical Male-Female Roles." *Signs* 16, no. 3 (1991): 485-501.
- McFarlane, Neil. "A Useful Concept that Risks Losing its Political Salience." *Security Dialogue*, 2004: 368 - 369.
- McSweeney, Bill. *Security, Identity and Interests: A Sociology of International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Mergret, Frederic. "Beyond the Salvation Paradigm: Responsibility to Protect (Others) vs the Power of Protecting Oneself." *Security Dialogue*, 2009: 575 - 595.
- Mohanty, C. "Under Western Eyes: Feminists Scholarship and Colonial Discourses." *Feminist Review* 30 (1998): 3-28.
- Mohanty, Chandra. "'Under Western Eyes' Revisited: Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalist Struggles ." *Signs* 28, no. 2 (2003): 499 - 535, 510.
- Murray, A. "Debt Bondage and Trafficking: Don't Believe the Hype." *Global Sex Workers: Rights, Resistance and Redefinition*, 1998.
- Narayan, Uma. "Essence of Culture and a Sense of History: A Feminist Critique of Cultural Essentialism." *Hypatia* 13, no. 2 (1998): 87 - 106.

Newman, Edward. "A Normatively Attractive but Analytically Weak Concept ." *Security Dialogue*, 2004: 558.

Newman, Edward. "Human Security and Constructivism ." *International Studies Perspectives*, 2001: 239 - 251.

Nicholson, Linda J. *Feminism/Postmodernism*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Okazawa-Rey, Margo, and Gwyn Krik. "Maximum Security ." *Social Justice*, 2000: 120 - 132.

Otto, Dianne. "Post-Beijing Reflection on the Limitations and Potential of Human Rights Discourse for Women." *SYMPOSIUM ON THE FUTURE OF INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS: The Mid-Life Crisis of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Washington and Lee University , 1998. 116.

Owen, Taylor. "Human Security--Conflict, Critique and Consensus: Colloquium Remarks and a Proposal for a Threshold-Based Definition." *Security Dialogue*, 2004: 373 - 387.

Paris, Roland. "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air." *International Security*, 2001 : 88.

Pickett, Brent L. "Foucault and the Politics of Resistance ." *Polity*, 1996: 464.

Rosenberg, Emily S. "Rescuing Women and Children." *The Journal of American History*, 2002: 456 - 465.

Russo, Ann. "The Feminist Majority Foundation's Campaign to Stop Gender Apartheid: The Intersections of Feminism and Imperialism in the United States." *International Journal of Feminist Politics* 8, no. 4 (December 2006): 557-580.

S, Jeffery. *Anticlimax: A Feminist Perspective on the Sexual Revolution*. NY, NY: New York University Press, 1993.

Sarma, Nandita. "Anti-Trafficking Rhetoric and the Making of Global Apartheid." *NWSA Journal* 17, no. 3 (2005): 88 - 112.

Security, Department of Homeland. *Prime Contractors*.  
[http://www.dhs.gov/xopnbiz/smallbusiness/gc\\_1192641073262.shtm](http://www.dhs.gov/xopnbiz/smallbusiness/gc_1192641073262.shtm) (accessed March 24, 2009).

Stern, Maria. "Racism, Sexism, Classism, and Much More: Reading security-identity in marginalized sites." In *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*, by Brooke Ackerly, Maria Stern and Jacqui True, 174 - 197. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Suhrke, Astri. "A Stalled Initiative." *Security Dialogue*, 2004 : 365 - 366.

- Suhrke, Astri. "Human Security and the Interest of States." *Security Dialogue* 1999: 265- 276.
- Sylvester, Christine. *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Thakur, Ramesh. "'A Political World View'." *Security Dialogue*, 2004: 347 -348.  
— . *The United Nations, Peace and Security*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- The Human Security Report Project and The World Bank. *miniAtlas of Human Security*. Mini, Myriad, 2009.
- Tickner, Ann. *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives On Achieving Global Security*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1992.
- Tickner, J. Ann. *Gendering World Politics* . 2001: Columbia University Press, 2001.
- Tickner, J. Ann. "On the Frontlines or Sidelines of Knowledge and Power? Feminist Practices of Responsible Scholarship ." *International Studies Review* 383 - 395, 383.
- Ullman, Richard H. "Redefining Security ." *International Security* 8, no. 1 (1983): 129-153.
- Walt, Stephen. "The Renaissance of Security Studies." *International Studies Quarterly* 1991: 211 - 239.
- Waltz, Kenneth. "Structural Realism After the Cold War." *International Security* , 2000: 5 - 41.  
— . *Theory of International Politics* . Boston : Addison-Wesley , 1979.
- Wibben, Annick T.R. "Feminist International Relations: Old Debates and New Directions ." *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 2004 : 97 - 114.
- Wilson, Thomas C. "American's Views on Immigration Policy: Testing the Role of Threatened Group Interests." *Sociological Perspectives* 44 (November 2001): 485-501.
- Winslow, Donna, and Thomas Erikson. "A Broad Concept that Encourages Interdisciplinary Thinking." *Security Dialogue* 35 (2004): 361 - 362.

Chelsea Moore