Critical Peace and Conflict Studies: Feminist Interventions [1]

Authors: Laura McLeod[a] and Maria O'Reilly[b*]

a Politics, University of Manchester, UK; [b] Leeds Beckett University, UK.
b* Leeds School of Social Sciences, Leeds Beckett University, CL818 Calverley Building, City Campus, Leeds LS6 3QW. Email: m.f.oreilly@leedsbeckett.ac.uk

Abstract:

Critical Peace and Conflict Studies (PCS) as a field cares about gender. Yet, feminist work frequently receives token acknowledgement by critical scholars rather than sustained engagement and analysis. This Special Issue demonstrates why critical PCS needs feminist epistemologies, methodologies, and empirical analyses. In this introductory article, we deploy a feminist genealogical analysis of the 'four generations' of PCS and argue that the ghettoization of 'gender issues' marginalises feminist work within academia, policy, and practice. Critical PCS research has taken inspiration from feminist scholars, however there remain opportunities for deeper conversations. Addressing this marginalisation matters if we wish to decolonise PCS and develop a nuanced sensory perception of peace and conflict. Furthermore, engaging with feminist ideas can directly contribute to building more meaningful, sustainable, and equitable forms of peace. In short: feminist insights are crucial to prompting a deeper and more transformative dialogue within the scholarship and practice of critical PCS.

Keywords: gender; peacebuilding; feminism; Peace and Conflict Studies; four generations.

Introduction

What are the connections between critical and feminist approaches to Peace and Conflict Studies (PCS)? What are the similarities and differences, compared to critical research, when feminist scholars study peace? Asking these questions prompts us to consider what feminist PCS research *is*, and to consider the key insights that feminist analysis offers. These questions reoccur throughout this Special Issue, where the authors all showcase the value of feminism to their analysis of key questions and

---

[1]Note on the order of authors: The article is a product of co-authorship, with the authors introduced in alphabetical order. The authors convened workshops on 'Critical Peacebuilding: Feminist Interventions' in Manchester (UK), 20 June 2016 and in Brighton (UK), June 2017 (at the BISA annual conference). We would like to thank workshop participants for thoughtful and engaging discussions, and also thank the reviewers for very helpful comments on the draft versions of the manuscript. This article also benefited from engaging comments at the ISA Annual Convention in San Francisco (USA), in April 2018.

issues currently debated in critical PCS. In this introductory article, we explore our rationale for provoking a feminist intervention in critical PCS and highlight the reasons why a feminist intervention is needed. Our analysis reveals that feminist perspectives are frequently missing and marginalised from critical accounts of peace. We demonstrate that feminist inquiry enables PCS to move away from what Cynthia Enloe calls the 'too-simple explanations'.[2] Initially, our curiosity was provoked by our attendance at conferences and panels claiming an association with critical PCS. At these sessions, we noted the remarkable exclusion or marginalisation of feminist work on peace and conflict. Remarkable, because we felt that the contributions of feminist work were informative, and indeed often formative, of the development of critical perspectives on PCS. What we contend throughout this Special Issue is that feminist approaches, analysis, scholarship, and methods can, should, and already *do*, make significant contributions to critical PCS.

While defining 'feminist PCS research' is contentious, and indeed, there are various ways and extents to which scholarship can be feminist, we take the view that feminist PCS research seeks to develop and apply feminist theory and/or methodology to produce insights about issues of peace and conflict. Feminist approaches, while varied, understand gender as a concept or category that must be unpacked and engaged with to make sense of why conflict emerges and how peace can/should be built. Feminist PCS shares many commonalities with critical PCS scholarship, as we outline below.[3] Both represent alternative approaches to the positivist research agenda that dominates mainstream PCS. Like critical PCS, feminist PCS research aims to achieve positive social change, by critiquing dominant ideologies and methodologies of building peace that (re)produce inequalities of power along lines of gender, race/ethnicity, nationality, class, sexuality, dis/ability, and so on. Both schools tend towards bottom-up methodologies that place lived experience at the centre of the research process. However, unlike critical scholarship, feminist PCS research is characterised by an explicitly feminist commitment, firstly, to identify the androcentric nature of PCS, and, secondly, to challenge the tendency of mainstream and critical PCS researchers to ignore, minimise, or marginalise the perspectives of women, girls, and non-binary people, and/or the category of gender in their analyses. That said, it is impossible to talk of 'critical PCS' and 'feminist PCS' as coherent entities that talk at odds with each other. We do not seek to develop a grand definition of what constitutes feminist or critical PCS – both are very diverse fields, and this is to be celebrated. Acknowledging that there is much slippage, in this

---

[2] Cynthia Enloe *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics* (Second edition). (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014), 352.

[3] See: Maria O'Reilly, 'From Gendered War to Gendered Peace? Feminist Perspectives on International Intervention in Sites of Conflict', in *Handbook on Intervention and Statebuilding*, ed. Nicolas Lemay-Hébert (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing), forthcoming

Special Issue we aim to illustrate and make this slippage explicit, while demonstrating what is different when feminist scholars intervene in PCS.

This introductory article proceeds in three parts. First, we unpack the key concepts underpinning this Special Issue, making explicit why we feel a feminist intervention is necessary. Second, we chart the connections between critical and feminist approaches to PCS, via an investigation of the 'four generations' of PCS scholarship.[4] Our analysis highlights that: (a) the marginalisation of feminist ideas is a continual thread throughout the development of PCS, and (b) although the 'fourth' generation (critical PCS) has taken some inspiration from feminist scholars, there remain opportunities for deeper conversations. Third, we highlight the three key contributions that a feminist intervention into critical PCS achieves:

1. Feminist theory, epistemology and methodology is a rich resource, opening way for a less binary, more nuanced approach to PCS.
2. Feminist analysis encourages a nuanced sensory perception of peace and conflict, following several key feminist insights about the significance of the personal, of embodiment, and of experience.
3. Efforts to decolonise the modes of knowledge production within PCS cannot be fully realised without incorporating a feminist critique of concepts such as 'the local' and 'the everyday' which are currently at the heart of critical PCS scholarship.

For us, these three reasons begin to address what is different when feminist scholars contend with issues of peace and conflict. These represent three key contributions of a feminist intervention into critical PCS, which is explored further throughout this Special Issue. Finally, the article concludes by outlining suggestions for how to foster a more effective dialogue between these fields.

Key Terms: A Feminist Intervention.

Feminism is provocative, and we do not want to pin it – *feminism* – down and define it. Sara Ahmed thinks of feminism as 'homework', because 'we have so much to work out from not being at home in a world' (2017, 7). As feminists, we do not always feel at 'home' within critical PCS. A paper about feminism presented at a conference sometimes leads to an awkward silence. Why? Sara Ahmed's insight that 'when you expose a problem you pose a problem' comes to mind.[5] Or perhaps it is because

---

[4] Oliver P. Richmond, 'A Genealogy of Peace and Conflict Theory' In *Palgrave Advances in Peacebuilding: Critical Developments and Approaches* ed. Oliver P. Richmond. London: Palgrave (2010), 14-38.
[5] Sara Ahmed *Living a Feminist Life*. (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2017), 37.

'nonfeminist scholars seem convinced that feminist knowledge does not concern them – a feeling reproduced by a common understanding that feminism is only about "identity politics" or "women's stuff"'.[6] This provokes us to wonder if there has been a wilful blindness and marginalisation of the potential and actual contributions of feminist scholarship by many working in critical PCS. As stated, this Special Issue seeks to demonstrate that feminist approaches are vital to achieving a subtle and nuanced analysis of key issues in PCS. Paying serious attention to a wide range of feminist scholarship would highlight useful insights for peacebuilding policy and practice, make stronger efforts to decolonise PCS, and develop a nuanced sensory analysis within PCS scholarship.

It is useful to distinguish between the terms women, gender, and feminism. It might seem obvious, but 'women' relates to a biological sex. 'Gender' typically refers to socially constructed understandings of bodies and how they behave. Gender is a contested and slippery concept. It may be best understood as a 'category developed to explore what counts as "woman" and as "man"'.[7] Gender recognises that masculinity and femininity are culturally and socially constructed and are analytically different to categories such as male/female, boy/girl, which are (problematically) deployed to establish a sexual difference based upon bodily characteristics. Like gender, 'feminism' is tricky to define, and we do not wish to police what does or does not count as being feminist. Broadly, feminism may be understood as a political orientation and ideological movement geared towards the transformation of gendered power relations. These ideas about transformation are often informed by concepts such as inequality, patriarchy, misogyny, androcentricism, and sexism.

'Intervention' is a word that we use often in PCS. International intervention. Humanitarian intervention. Statebuilding interventions. Intervention can be understood as being intrusive. Marysia Zalewski notes that feminism's presence in International Relations (IR) is an 'explicitly gendered figure', where the shape of arrival is seen as 'an intruder's knowledge', where 'feminism's presence seemingly naturally requires explanation, justification and evaluation'.[8] Our experience is that PCS has been similar. We deliberately chose to title this Special Issue 'Feminist Interventions' because we wanted to intervene into a field stridently, and to point out what needed to be thought about differently. Our intervention is staged because we are concerned that there is a tendency within critical scholarship to engage with many concepts - hybridity, agency, the everyday, friction, the local, participation, and

[6] Linda Åhäll 'Affect as Methodology: Feminism and the Politics of Emotion' *International Political Sociology* 12, no. 1 (2018): 2.

[7] Judith Squires and Jutta Weldes 'Beyond Being Marginal: Gender and International Relations in Britain' *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 9, no. 2 (2007), 186.

[8] Marysia Zalewski *Feminist International Relations: Exquisite Corpse.* (London: Routledge 2013), 25.

narratives - without paying attention to feminist insights. As the authors in this Special Issue demonstrate, many of these concepts have deep feminist roots, stretching back decades. These roots are rarely acknowledged. Additionally, throughout the Special Issue, authors have sought to demonstrate the ways in which feminist ideas can push us to rethink key concepts, approaches, and methods in contemporary PCS. It is not that feminism is a new approach to PCS, but rather, that the moment is ripe for a sustained feminist intervention, given the increasing use of popular concepts in critical PCS that have feminist roots.

Conceptualising Peace and Conflict: Understanding gendered histories

To explore the ways that PCS rarely acknowledges feminism, we critically engage with Oliver Richmond's 2010 typology of the 'four generations' of PCS,[9] using a feminist genealogical approach to examine both feminist and critical PCS perspectives across each generation. Richmond identifies four generations of theory and practice as constituting the core of PCS scholarship: conflict management, conflict resolution, liberal peacebuilding, and post-liberal peacebuilding. These generations differ fundamentally in their understandings of the causes of conflict, and hold diverging views on whether conflict can be successfully resolved, or else merely managed. This framework is not intended as a strictly chronological narrative of PCS scholarship, and nor is it a linear story of how peacebuilding has evolved in practice. Rather, the generations are categorisations of scholarship which are aligned to different practices of engaging with conflict and conflict transformation. The 'four generations' framework allows us to identify connections between each 'generation' of PCS scholarship and peacebuilding practice and policy. It provides a means of highlighting the entrenched marginalisation of feminist approaches over time. As scholars, we need to 'cast an eye backwards' otherwise 'partial vision, entrenched location, or citational myopia may hinder movement forwards'.[10] Armed with a better understanding of how the marginalisation of feminism occurs throughout all four generations, we contend that the fourth generation (post-liberal, critical PCS) should recognise the feminist roots of many of the concepts used, and that the failure to acknowledge feminism serves to limit the potential of critical PCS.

There are three points that we wish to make in relation to this analytical move. First, that we seek to build on the 'four generations' framework to highlight gender blind-spots. A feminist gaze could ask how and why this narrative is frequently reproduced or note that, by paying it attention, we are

---

[9] Richmond, 'A Genealogy of Peace and Conflict Theory'

[10] Christine Sylvester *Feminist International Relations: an unfinished journey,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 15.

reproducing patriarchal ideas where feminism has been marginalised and excluded from the account. We deploy the 'four generations' framework because it is a reference point for both feminist[11] and critical scholars.[12] It allows us to chart the connections and concerns shared between critical and feminist PCS, whilst demonstrating the entrenched history of feminist marginalisation from thinking about peace and conflict. Despite its rich heritage, feminist work frequently receives token acknowledgement by critical scholars rather than sustained engagement and analysis.[13] This highlights that scholarship is deeply political and deeply saturated in (gendered, racialised, classed) power relations, a point that feminists have long recognised.[14] Using the 'four generations' framework as our starting point for a feminist intervention allows us to be attentive of gender blindness and to develop a more holistic understanding of PCS. There is therefore a political purpose to telling this story.

Second, we believe that the marginalisation of feminist theorising on peace and conflict is reflected within practices of peacebuilding. The citational myopia and other patterns of exclusion faced by feminist scholarship is mirrored in practice, with gender concerns often ghettoised by policymakers and practitioners. For example, the UN's expanding 'Women, Peace and Security' (WPS) Agenda is rarely, if ever, discussed by scholars not typically working within feminist 'camps'. Furthermore, research on gender within the UN Peacebuilding Commission demonstrates that references to WPS are rare within documents produced by the Peacebuilding Commission.[15] Moreover, there is a 'tendency to describe the WPS agenda as a "normative" agenda, and to engage with questions of women's participation as normative questions'.[16] Our article focuses on the marginalisation of scholars who examine the ghettoization of women and/or gender issues in practice. If we are to meaningfully transform the way that gendered and feminist goals are addressed within peacebuilding, then the 'theoretical' and 'academic' space is a productive starting place.

Finally, this is not to say that feminist and critical PCS scholars should 'merge their perspectives, modes of inquiry, and strategies for action'.[17] We agree with Christine Sylvester's argument that there

---

[11] E.g, Laura J. Shepherd *Gender, UN Peacebuilding, and the Politics of Space.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017) 29-30.

[12] E.g. Vivienne Jabri 'Peacebuilding, the local and the international: a colonial or a postcolonial rationality?' *Peacebuilding* 1, no. 1, (2013) 3-16.

[13] This point emerged during a workshop the editors convened on 'Critical Peacebuilding: Feminist Interventions' in Manchester, 20 June 2016. We thank workshop participants for thoughtful and engaging discussion of these issues.

[14] Lorraine Code 'Taking Subjectivity into Account' in *Feminist Epistemologies* eds. Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter (New York: Routledge, 1993) 16.

[15] Laura J. Shepherd 'Victims of Violence or agents of change? Representations of women in UN peacebuilding discourse' *Peacebuilding* 4, no. 2 (2016) 134.

[16] *Ibid*, 132.

[17] Betty Reardon *Sexism and the War System* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1996) 1.

are 'too many healthy ambiguities within women, and within feminist theories, for there to be any healthy reconciliation of feminist and peace projects'.[18] Rather, we want to realise and acknowledge the ways that feminist scholarship and its heritage is central to critical PCS, and that continuing to marginalise feminist analysis will result in deficiencies and limitations in our analysis of peace and conflict.

First Generation Approaches: Conflict Management & Achievement of Negative Peace
Conflict management approaches – associated with international negotiation, mediation, and traditional peacekeeping – are largely inspired by the realist belief in the inevitability of conflict and the impossibility of achieving resolution.[19] These focus narrowly on managing conflict situations and achieving 'negative peace'[20] by halting overt violence. The aim is to reinforce international order and security by 'isolating' and 'containing' conflict.[21]

There is shared agreement between critical and feminist PCS regarding the inadequacies of conflict management approaches for building sustainable peace. Traditional peacekeeping missions, for example, hold a mixed record in limiting armed conflict, and are 'virtually uniform' in their failure to achieve conflict resolution.[22] They rarely created the conditions for peace, and worked largely to 'freeze' rather than resolve conflict.[23] Women and gender issues were largely excluded from traditional peacekeeping missions: for instance, between 1957 and 1989, the number of women participating in the military component of peacekeeping missions was a mere 0.1%.[24] Furthermore, the coercive power wielded by armed peacekeepers is criticised by feminists – for reproducing violent masculinities which (re)create gendered forms of insecurity,[25] and for perpetuating relations of domination which are at the root of violent conflict.[26]

---

[18] Christine Sylvester 'Some Dangers in Merging Feminist and Peace Projects' *Alternatives* 12, no. 4 (1987) 494.
[19] Oliver P. Richmond *Transformation of Peace* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005) 89.
[20] Johan Galtung 'Violence, Peace and Research,' *Journal of Peace Research* 6, No. 3, (1969) 167-91.
[21] Oran R. Young *The Intermediaries: Third Parties in International Crises* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1967) 136-141; Paul F. Diehl *International Peacekeeping* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1994) 5-13.
[22] Diehl, *International Peacekeeping,* 89-92.
[23] Steven R. Ratner *The New UN Peacekeeping: Building Peace in Lands of Conflict After the Cold War* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1995)
[24] Louise Olsson 'Mainstreaming gender in multidimensional peacekeeping: A field perspective,' *International Peacekeeping* 7, no. 3 (2000) 2.
[25] Paul Higate and Marsha Henry 'Engendering (In) Security in Peace Support Operations,' *Security Dialogue* 35, no. 4 (2004) 481-498.
[26] Diane Francis 'Culture, power asymmetries and gender in conflict transformation,' in *Berghof Handbook of Conflict Transformation* (Berlin: Berghof Foundation, 2004) 12.

Traditional diplomacy, meanwhile, frequently produced settlements based on 'peace without justice' and often found it difficult to address the rising number of intra-state conflicts due to its state-centric view of conflict.[27] Feminist scholars have documented the long-standing absence of women from formal peace negotiations.[28] Obstacles include highly gendered norms and practices of diplomacy, which associate negotiations and mediation with men, masculinity, and military affairs.[29] The lack of recognition of women as significant peace-making actors is another factor; as is the priority afforded to high-level political and military actors (usually men), at the expense of women's interests and demands.[30]

From a feminist perspective, conflict management approaches, in theory and in practice, reflect and sustain a 'cult of power' within peace research - one which marginalises the perspectives and contributions of relatively 'powerless' non-state actors, including many women, girls, and non-binary people.[31] Furthermore, the goal of promoting negative peace, is strongly criticised by feminists, who point out that this leaves (gendered) forms of direct violence (e.g. gender-based violence), structural violence (patriarchy), and cultural violence (militarism) unaddressed.[32]

Second Generation Approaches: Conflict Resolution & Fulfilment of Human Needs
'Second generation' conflict resolution approaches to ending conflict emerged in response to the limitations of conflict management methodologies, and take the view that conflicts can be resolved rather than merely managed.[33] These approaches aim to create grass-roots mechanisms and processes capable of addressing the complex nature of 'deep-rooted'/'protracted'/'intractable' conflicts.[34]

---

[27] Oliver P. Richmond *Maintaining Order, Making Peace* (Hampshire: Palgrave, 2002) 77.

[28] Christine Chinkin and Kate Paradine 'Vision and reality: democracy and citizenship of women in the Dayton Peace Accords.' *Yale J. Int'l L.* 26 (2001): 103.

[29] Karin Aggestam and Ann E. Towns, eds. *Gendering Diplomacy and International Negotiation* (Palgrave: London, 2018).

[30] Anne Marie Goetz and Rob Jenkins 'Agency and accountability: promoting women's participation in peacebuilding,' *Feminist Economics* 22, No. 1 (2016) 211-236. For an overview of key factors enabling or constraining women's participation in peace negotiations, see: Thania Paffenholz, Nick Ross, Steven Dixon, Anna-Lena Schluchter and Jacqui True 'Making Women Count - Not Just Counting Women: Assessing Women's Inclusion and Influence on Peace Negotiations,' accessed https://www.inclusivepeace.org/sites/default/files/IPTI-UN-Women-Report-Making-Women-Count-60-Pages.pdf on 19 September 2018. Geneva: Inclusive Peace and Transition Initiative and UN Women (2016).

[31] Berenice Carroll 'Peace Research: The Cult of Power' *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 16, no. 4 (1972) 585-616; Sarai Aharoni 'The gender–culture double bind in Israeli–Palestinian peace negotiations: A narrative approach,' *Security Dialogue* 45, no. 4 (2014) 373-390.

[32] Catia Confortini 'Galtung, Violence and Gender: The Case for a Peace Studies/Feminism Alliance.' *Peace and Change* 31, no. 3 (2006) 333-367.

[33] Richmond *Maintaining Order,* 41.

[34] These terms are deployed by John Burton, Edward Azar and Louis Kriesberg respectively. See M. Hoffman 'Defining and Evaluating Success: Facilitative Problem-Solving Workshops in an Interconnected Context,' *Paradigms* 9, No. 2, (1995) 165

Through problem-solving workshops, third-party facilitation, and project-oriented approaches, bottom-up methods are employed to address the social, psychological, and structural roots of conflict.[35] Feminist scholars and activists have challenged the absence of women, gender, and feminist insights from conflict resolution theory and practice.[36]

Conflict resolution approaches are appealing, given that they engage civil society in peacebuilding, and promote a peace based around mutual agreement and justice.[37] They advocate a shift from official, Track I diplomacy towards the use of unofficial, Track II initiatives. These processes are designed to enable all parties to feel that they have 'won'[38] by satisfying basic needs – to security, recognition, political representation, and economic participation – which are considered the root cause of conflict.[39] Furthermore, the techniques deployed by third-party mediators are designed not to achieve manipulation or control, but rather to assist conflicting parties in processes of self-realisation and immanent transformation,[40] and a true resolution rather than a compromise or settlement.[41] This may unlock possibilities for achieving a self-sustaining peace.[42]

Yet, despite their early promise and innovative techniques, commentators have questioned the efficacy of these methods.[43] Critical PCS scholars highlight that, if undertaken without adequate consideration of the impact of asymmetric power relations and structural constraints, conflict resolution will merely strengthen the stronger party's position and (re)produce conditions of domination, injustice, and inequality.[44] The isolation of peace-making from the social and cultural context in which conflict is embedded is also identified as a major weakness.[45]

---

[35] Richmond *Maintaining Order,* 75-76

[36] For an overview, see: Simona Sharoni 'Conflict Resolution: Feminist Perspectives,' in *The International Studies Encyclopedia, Vol. II,* ed. Robert Denemark (Chichester: John Wiley and Sons Ltd, 2010).

[37] Oliver P. Richmond 'The Dilemmas of Conflict Resolution: A Comparison of Sri Lanka and Cyprus,' *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 10, No.2 (2004) 185.

[38] A.J.R Groom 'Problem Solving in International Relations,' in *International Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice,* eds. E. Azar and J. Burton, (Sussex: Wheatsheaf Books, 1986) 85.

[39] Edward Azar *The Management of Protracted Social Conflict: Theory and Cases,* (Aldershot: Dartmouth, 1991) 93.

[40] Mark Hoffman 'Critical Theory and the Inter-Paradigm Debate' *Millennium* 16, No. 2 (1987) 242-243.

[41] John Burton *Conflict & Communication: The Use of Controlled Communication in International Relations* (London: Macmillan, 1969) 61-62.

[42] Burton 'The Procedures of Conflict Resolution,' in Azar and Burton, eds., *op.cit.* 94.

[43] E.g. Robert C. Schehr and Dragon Milovanovic 'Conflict mediation and the postmodern: chaos, catastrophe, and psychoanalytic semiotics' *Social Justice* 26, No. 1, (1999) 208-32.

[44] Vivienne Jabri *Discourses on Violence: Conflict Analysis Reconsidered* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996) 150.

[45] Tarja Väyrynen, *Culture and international conflict resolution: A critical analysis of the work of John Burton* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001) 1-2.

Feminist researchers critique the 'gender-blindness' of mainstream theories and practices for excluding women from Track II mediation (as facilitators and participants); and note that problem-solving workshops often fail to consider the significance of gender for conflict analysis and resolution.[46] Without explicit discussion of how gender roles, identities, and structures of power are entangled in conflict and its resolution, Track II initiatives may create the 'impression that conflict and war are genderless phenomena'.[47] To ensure that conflict resolution processes and outcomes are gender-just, feminists identify the need for theorists and practitioners to build theories and methodologies that can identify and address context-specific gender norms, identities, and power structures in sites of conflict, and also recognise the 'practical' and 'strategic' gender interests of women situated in conflicted contexts.[48]

Third Generation Approaches: The Liberal Peace

Women, gender, and feminism have historically been relegated to the margins of PCS, as our discussion of the first and second generations illustrates. Yet, from the 1990s onwards, major transformations in peace operations were accompanied by a growing acceptance that gender equality is a significant aspect of peacebuilding. After the Cold War, internationally-supported peacebuilding missions were legitimated by the aim of building a 'liberal peace'.[49] Peacebuilding interventions in sites of conflict followed a standardised, top-down model of reconstruction that prioritises Western politico-cultural norms and neo-liberal economics.[50] Liberal peacebuilding combines traditional forms of peacekeeping, mediation, and negotiation, with a range of activities designed to promote democratisation and good governance, respect for human rights and the rule of law, active civil society, and the development of open market economies.[51] Such missions were deployed in Africa (Namibia), Asia (Cambodia), Europe (Croatia), and Latin America (El Salvador), from as early as 1989.[52] In many contexts, the United Nations and other international peacebuilding actors have held extensive mandates

---

[46] Cordula Reimann *Gender in Problem-Solving Workshops: A Wolf in Sheep's Clothing?* (Bern: Swiss Peace, 2004) 35.

[47] Maria Hadjipavlou and Cynthia Cockburn 'Women in projects of co-operation for peace: Methodologies of external intervention in Cyprus' *Women's Studies International Forum* 29, no. 5 (2006) 524.

[48] Sophie Richter-Devroe 'Gender, Culture, and Conflict Resolution in Palestine' *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies* 4, no. 2 (2008) 30-59. The distinction between 'practical' versus 'strategic' gender interests was introduced by Molyneux. See: Maxine Molyneux 'Mobilization without Emancipation? Women's Interests, the State, and Revolution in Nicaragua' *Feminist Studies* 11, no. 2 (1985) 227–54.

[49] Alex J. Bellamy and Paul Williams 'Introduction: Thinking anew about peace operations', *International Peacekeeping* 11, No.1, (2004) 4-5; Roland Paris 'Peacebuilding and the Limits of Liberal Internationalism,' *International Security* 22, No.2, (1997) 54-89.

[50] Roger Mac Ginty 'Reconstructing post-war Lebanon: A challenge to the liberal peace?' *Conflict, Security & Development* 7, No.3 (2007) 457.

[51] Roger Mac Ginty and Oliver P. Richmond 'Myth or Reality: Opposing Views on the Liberal Peace and Post-War Reconstruction' *Global Society* 21, No.4 (2007) 491.

[52] Roland Paris *At Wars End: Building Peace After Civil Conflict,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (2004).

to organise elections, reshape military and civil administration, maintain law and order, repatriate and resettle refugees, and rehabilitate infrastructure.[53] What is clear is that conflict management and resolution had moved a long way from simply 'freezing' a conflict.

In parallel with these changes, peacebuilding actors increasingly recognised the gender-specific impact of armed conflict, and the significant role that women play in all aspects of peacebuilding. Significantly, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security in October 2000, which urged for the integration of a gender perspective across UN peace and security processes. To date, a total of eight WPS resolutions have been adopted.[54] Taken together, these resolutions articulate an agenda to prevent sexual and gender-based violence, encourage the meaningful participation of women in peace and security processes, and to protect women's rights in conflict and post-conflict contexts. The effects of the WPS agenda has been surprisingly pervasive and wide-ranging. It has shaped funding and agendas across the UN system; programmes of national governments and regional organisations[55]; influenced feminist activism across the world[56]; and academic interest in the WPS agenda can be described as 'an industry'.[57]

Feminist scholars and activists have fought hard to integrate women and gender perspectives into peacebuilding. Yet, significant obstacles to gender justice and equality remain. For example, between 1992 and 2011, only 2 percent of chief mediators and 9 percent of negotiators in peace processes were women.[58] And, of 585 peace agreements signed between 1990 and 2010, only 16 percent contained any references to women and/or gender.[59] Post-conflict peacebuilding initiatives frequently (re-)produce a 'patriarchal gender order'.[60] There is an ongoing need to challenge masculinist visions of

---

[53] For an example, see mandate of the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC); available at: http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/past/untac.htm

[54] These resolutions are UNSCR 1325 (2000); 1820 (2008); 1888 (2009); 1889 (2009); 1960 (2010); 2106 (2013); 2122 (2013); and 2242 (2015).

[55] For an overview of the 'localisation' of WPS agenda through national (and in some cases regional) action plans, see Special Issue of *International Political Studies Review* on 'Women, Peace and Security: Exploring the implementation and integration of UNSCR 1325', Volume 37, No. 3.

[56] E.g Laura McLeod *Gender Politics and Security Discourse: Personal-Political Imaginations and Feminism in 'Post-conflict' Serbia* (London: Routledge, 2015).

[57] Laura McLeod Interview with NGO activist, New York, USA 26 August 2016.

[58] UN Women *Women's Participation in Peace Negotiations: Connections Between Presence and Influence,* accessed http://www.unwomen.org/~/media/Headquarters/Media/Publications/en/03AWomenPeaceNeg.pdf on 19 September 2018 (2012) 3.

[59] Christine Bell and Catherine O'Rourke 'Peace Agreements or Pieces of Paper? The Impact of UNSC Resolution 1325 on Peace Processes and their Agreements,' *International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 59, No. 4, (2010) 941-980.

[60] Maria-Adriana Deiana *Gender and Citizenship: Promises of Peace in Post-Dayton Bosnia-Herzegovina* (London, Springer 2018) 200.

peace as a process which excludes women, and as an outcome which fails to tackle gender-based violence and provide for gender justice and equality.[61]

Liberal peacebuilding interventions have been roundly critiqued by both critical and feminist PCS scholarship. Both 'camps' have, for example, highlighted the gulf that exists between the normative agenda espoused by liberal peacebuilding actors and the everyday realities of those groups and communities affected by peace and conflict.[62] Both approaches have examined the unequal encounters, narratives and interactions between 'local' and 'international' actors in conflicted and post-conflict settings.[63] They note the tendency for peace and security interventions to reinforce, rather than disrupt, hierarchical structures and relations of power,[64] and have examined the differential capacities of peacebuilding subjects to respond in agential and resistant ways.[65] In particular, critical PCS has questioned the failure to engage with the everyday needs, voices, and interests of 'local' stakeholders.[66] Peacebuilding, they argue, has been captured by hegemonic interests and neo-colonial agendas, and the liberal vision of peace is fatally undermined by cultural insensitivity, technocratic rationality, exclusion, and coercion.[67] Feminist scholars point to the significant gaps between international rhetoric on WPS, and the reality of implementation.[68] They highlight the propensity of liberal peacebuilding actors to articulate essentialist notions of gender and (re)produce gendered hierarchies of power in (post-)conflict environments.[69]

---

[61] For an overview see: Maria O'Reilly 'Gender and peacebuilding,' In Roger Mac Ginty, (ed). *Routledge Handbook of Peacebuilding,* (London: Routledge, 2013) 72-83.

[62] Louise Olsson and Theodora-Ismene Gizelis, eds. *Gender, Peace and Security: Implementing UN Security Council Resolution 1325* (London: Routledge, 2015); Séverine Autesserre *Peaceland: Conflict resolution and the everyday politics of international intervention* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

[63] Oliver P. Richmond *Liberal Peace Transitions: between statebuilding and peacebuilding* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009); Laura McLeod 'A feminist approach to hybridity: Understanding local and international interactions in producing post-conflict gender security' *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* 9, no. 1 (2015) 48–69.

[64] Michael Pugh, Neil Cooper, and Mandy Turner, eds. *Whose peace? Critical perspectives on the political economy of peacebuilding* London: Palgrave, 2016); Nicola Pratt 'Reconceptualizing gender, reinscribing racial–sexual boundaries in international security: The case of UN security council resolution 1325 on 'women, peace and security'.' *International Studies Quarterly* 57, no. 4 (2013) 772-83.

[65] Stefanie Kappler *Local agency and peacebuilding: EU and international engagement in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Cyprus and South Africa* (London: Palgrave, 2014); Maria O'Reilly *Gendered Agency in War and Peace* (London: Palgrave, 2018)

[66] Timothy Donais *Peacebuilding and Local Ownership: Post-conflict Consensus-building* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2012).

[67] Oliver P. Richmond and Roger Mac Ginty 'Where now for the critique of the liberal peace?,' *Cooperation and Conflict* 50, no. 2 (2015) 171-189.

[68] Nicole George and Laura J. Shepherd 'Women, Peace and Security: Exploring the implementation and integration of UNSCR 1325' *International Political Science Review* 37, no. 3, (2016): 297-306.

[69] Tarya Väyrynen 'Gender and UN Peace Operations: The Confines of Modernity' *International Peacekeeping* 11, No.1, (2004) 126, 139.

As the above discussion highlights, there is much that is shared between critical and feminist analyses of peacebuilding. Both have articulated important questions about the effectiveness and the legitimacy of the liberal peace. However, as we outline below, feminist work frequently receives token acknowledgement by critical scholars rather than sustained engagement and analysis. Despite potential connections, the synergies between critical and feminist approaches remain under-explored.

Fourth Generation Approaches: Post-Liberal Peace

Fourth generation approaches move away from the critiques of the liberal peace. They suggest that the argument which claims that international institutions and actors are imposing an agenda onto the local context is one which 'tend towards caricatures', imagining a monolithic and 'all powerful liberal internationalism'.[70] Such approaches recognise agency, noticing ways that local actors 'subvert, exhaust, renegotiate and resist the liberal peace'.[71] Using conceptual tools such as hybridity,[72] the local,[73] friction,[74] agency,[75] and resistance,[76] critical PCS scholars seek to develop sophisticated and attuned analysis of the functioning of post-conflict interventions.

'Post-liberal' peace approaches have a high level of affinity with feminist goals, insights, concepts, and methods. Both critical and feminist approaches, as noted above, share the normative aim of achieving social change. Both focus on examining everyday peace work,[77] so often undertaken 'out of sight and mind' by women in the private sphere.[78] They also both work to identify hidden narratives, networks and 'cultures of peace'.[79] Both also employ similar methodological approaches, such as the use of fieldwork, ethnography, narrative methods, and a desire to build in personal experiences of war and peace. The possibilities for meaningful synergy are countless, and indeed, some researchers have started to push in this direction. This is notable, for example, in discussions about hybrid interactions in peace interventions, with feminist insights drawing attention to the value of gendered power

---

[70] Roger Mac Ginty 'Hybrid Peace: The Interaction Between Top-Down and Bottom-Up Peace' *Security Dialogue* 41, no. 4 (2010), 391

[71] Roger Mac Ginty *International Peacebuilding and Local Resistance* (London: Palgrave, 2011), 6-7.

[72] Oliver P. Richmond and Audra Mitchell, eds. *Hybrid forms of peace: from everyday agency to post-liberalism*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

[73] Joakim Öjendal, Isabell Schierenbeck, Caroline Hughes, eds. *The 'local turn' in peacebuilding: The liberal peace challenged* (London: Routledge, 2017).

[74] Annika Björkdahl & Kristine Höglund 'Precarious peacebuilding: friction in global–local encounters' *Peacebuilding* 1, no.3 (2013) 289-299.

[75] Kappler *Local agency*

[76] Mac Ginty *International Peacebuilding and Local Resistance*.

[77] Roger Mac Ginty 'Everyday peace: Bottom-up and local agency in conflict-affected societies' *Security Dialogue* 45, no. 6 (2014) 548-564.

[78] Elise Boulding *The underside of history: A view of women through time (Vols. 1-2)* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1992) 16.

[79] Elise Boulding *Cultures of peace: The hidden side of history* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 2000); Oliver P. Richmond *Peace Formation and Political Order* (Oxford: OUP, 2016).

relations[80] and embodiment[81] in shaping the process of hybridity.[82] It is also notable in explorations of the assumed tension between the goals of gender equality and local ownership.[83] Feminist research has provided important concepts such as 'empathetic cooperation',[84] significant empirical insights such as those derived from war ethnography,[85] and innovative methods such as institutional ethnography,[86] which have inspired fourth generation debates on the 'local turn' within critical scholarship.[87]

Despite these connections and potential for positive synergies to emerge, it is both striking and puzzling as to why feminist research continues to be marginalised by the fourth generation of critical PCS scholarship. To illustrate this, we conducted a systematic review of the journal *Peacebuilding*, examining all articles included in the five complete volumes published by the time of writing (summer 2018). Our results show that although 66% of all articles do include reference(s) to women, gender and/or feminism, 67% contain no *references* to feminist scholars in PCS/IR. This is disappointing given the feminist insight that violent masculinities and gendered inequalities of power are crucial for understanding the emergence of armed conflict, the continuum of violence that spans war and peace, and ultimately the success or failure of peacebuilding initiatives.[88]

Furthermore, the articles in this Special Issue demonstrate that, when drawing upon concepts such as hybridity, the everyday, or when discussing 'the local turn', the rich heritage of feminist peace research continues to be ignored by critical PCS. As we outline below, feminist scholarship is uncited at the peril of much research in critical PCS, particularly since feminist ideas are rooted in the everyday, bottom-up, and complex relationships between actors.

Introducing the Special issue: What is different when Feminists do Peace and Conflict Studies?

---

[80] McLeod 'A feminist approach to hybridity'

[81] Hannah Partis-Jennings 'The (in)security of gender in Afghanistan's peacebuilding project: Hybridity and affect' *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 19, no.4 (2017) 411-25.

[82] See also Nicole George 'Policing "conjugal order": gender, hybridity and vernacular security in Fiji' *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 19, no. 1 (2017) 55-70.

[83] Eleanor Gordon, Anthony Cleland Welch, and Emmicki Roos 'Security Sector Reform and the Paradoxical Tension between Local Ownership and Gender Equality' *Stability: International Journal of Security and Development* 4, no. 1, (2015) 1-23.

[84] Christine Sylvester 'Empathetic cooperation: a feminist method for IR' *Millennium* 23, no. 2 (1994) 315-334. This concept has been deployed by critical scholars to conceptualise 'post-liberal' or 'hybrid' forms of peace. See e.g. Richmond and Mitchell, *Hybrid forms of peace*.

[85] Carolyn Nordstrom *A different kind of war story* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997). Nordstrom's work was cited by 10% of all articles published in the first five complete volumes of *Peacebuilding*, according to our systematic review of the journal.

[86] Dorothy E. Smith *Institutional ethnography: A sociology for people* (London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005). Smith's influence on PCS is highlighted in: Mike Klein 'Institutional Ethnography as Peace Research' in *Ethnographic Peace Research,* ed. Gearoid Millar, (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018) 65-87.

[87] For an overview of the local turn, see Roger Mac Ginty and Oliver P. Richmond 'The Local Turn in Peace Building: A Critical Agenda for Peace' *Third World Quarterly* 34, no. 5 (2013): 763–783.

[88] Cynthia Cockburn 'Gender relations as causal in militarization and war: a feminist standpoint' International Feminist Journal of Politics 12, no. 2 (2014) 139–57; Gordon et. al. 'Security Sector Reform'.

Taken together, the articles in this Special Issue demonstrate the relevance of drawing upon feminist perspectives when exploring issues in PCS. All contributors draw on feminist theory or undertake careful gender analysis to better explore international interventions in peacebuilding. The contributions of these articles are threefold. Firstly, they demonstrate the methodological, theoretical, and epistemological value of feminist perspectives to PCS. Secondly, they highlight how feminist ideas about embodiment, experience, and sensory perceptions can strengthen critical analyses of peacebuilding. Finally, they show that feminist analyses can further the project of decolonising PCS. Overall, the Special Issue spotlights the centrality of feminist scholarship to critical PCS, showcasing the implications of dislodging the boundaries between these fields.

Feminist theory, epistemology and methodology as rich resource for PCS.

Critical PCS comes under fire for reinforcing binaries – such as local/international; everyday/exceptional; male/female - and for perpetuating hierarchies between lay/expert forms of knowledge. The articles in this special issue of *Peacebuilding* all draw on feminist theory, epistemology, and/or methodology to highlight their implications for how we might critically analyse and reflect upon peacebuilding practice. One key insight is that feminist approaches open the way for a less binary, more nuanced approach to PCS. Stefanie Kappler and Nicolas Lemay-Hébert explore this in relation to hybridity, the everyday, and narratives - key areas of PCS research which may reaffirm binaries and power hierarchies if approached without care. Kappler and Lemay-Hébert introduce an 'intersectionality of peace' approach to prompt a broader understanding of power relations as they are lived and experienced on the ground by a variety of actors (including researchers and peacebuilding interveners). They show that feminist understandings of intersectionality, firstly, enable an exploration of hybrid identities without (re)producing common dichotomies; secondly, allow the complex power dynamics operating within everyday dimensions of peacebuilding interventions to be unpacked; and, finally, support an approach to narrative analysis which identifies structural inequalities. This has implications for how we analyse peace in theory and practice, pushing us to overcome rigid binaries (such as local/international, us/them, male/female), and to challenge discursive and material structures of domination which pervade (post-)conflict settings.

One reason that feminist perceptions help to destabilise binary boundaries the emphasis of feminist research practice upon reflexivity.[89] Feminist researchers recognise that 'the selection of research

---

[89] Brooke A. Ackerly, Maria Stern and Jacqui True 'Feminist Methodologies for International Relations' in *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations* eds. Brooke A. Ackerly, Maria Stern and Jacqui True (Cambridge, Cambridge

questions and … the development of (new) research practices' are among the areas 'where feminist insights can make their biggest impact'.[90] In this Special Issue, Catherine Baker explores how young people engage with popular music in Croatia, Rachel Julian, Berit Bliesemann de Guevara and Robin Redhead examine artistic expressions of silenced voices in Myanmar, and Hannah Partis-Jennings asks questions about the manifestations of the 'third-gender' in Afghanistan. These articles, and others in this Special Issue, emphasise emancipatory and participatory forms of research across a range of very different post-conflict contexts. Such approaches allow researchers to break down barriers between private and public aspects of peace. They enable scholars to tap into voices, culture and community that often remain hidden or unappreciated by existing approaches to PCS, and can introduce everyday experiences of conflict and peace that are not frequently captured. By re-centring on ideas about emancipation and participation, feminist methodologies can be deployed to subvert and address gendered power relations shaping the practice of research in PCS.

Key to the self-reflexivity of feminist research is to raise 'new ethical and political dilemmas that expand methodological inquiry'.[91] Again, all the articles in the Special Issue do this in one way or another. In particular, Julian *et al* explore the effects of methodological choice in their investigation of the 'Raising Silent Voices' project in Myanmar. They note that feminist epistemology prompted them to foreground the experiential knowledge of 'ordinary people' in conflict situations. Such knowledge, they contend, is essential for understanding the social world and should be placed at centre of analysis. The authors demonstrate how experiential knowledge can be gathered with arts-based methodologies. In doing so, they highlight the importance of knowledge about conflict/peace being produced from standpoint of women and marginalised others whose experiences are so often written out. They argue that this involves re-working and contesting hierarchical power relations between 'researched' and 'researcher'. In recognising that knowledge is produced intersubjectively, the authors note the importance of 'raising silent voices' (and indeed of the silence) of those who have experienced war. In doing so, they make a compelling case for the value of feminist insights for PCS research.

Embodiment, Experience and Sensory Perceptions
Feminism has much to offer in terms of understanding that spaces between conflict and peace are all lived, embodied experiences. A key contribution of feminism to critical PCS is the nuanced sensory

---

University Press (2006), 4. and Annick T. R. Wibben 'Introduction: Feminists Study War' in *Researching War: Feminist Methods, Ethics and Politics*. Ed. Annick T. R. Wibben (London: Routledge, 2016) 7.
[90] Wibben 'Introduction' 7.
[91] Ackerly et. al. 'Feminist Methodologies for International Relations' 5.

perception that feminist analysis offers. This arises out of several key feminist insights about the personal, about bodies, and about experience. While not all feminist work *explicitly* refers to senses, sensory perceptions shape feminist research, analysis and writing. This is because making sense of the human social experience requires us to draw on bodily senses. We cannot know about the world without seeing, hearing, touching, smelling or tasting. Senses are crucial data for perceiving the world, and how you use your senses affects how you interact and make sense of the world. Realising that senses are data is a powerful realisation: data are bits of information that we put together – but how do we access that information? Through our senses. Likewise, processes of conflict and peace are encountered/perceived through the senses – indeed, the common phrases used to describe war refer to senses, e.g. the cry for war/peace; sight of suffering; touch of violence/care; smell of death/disease; the taste of victory (sweet) or defeat (bitter). This means that developing a nuanced sensory perception of the world is crucial to better understanding the processes and practice of international peacebuilding.

Catherine Baker, in this Special Issue, explores how young people engage with (listen to, sing) popular music in post-conflict Croatia to provide insights into how understandings of everyday peace are contested. By exploring how gendered and racialised constructs are attached to and detached from material bodies within audio-visual media, she shows how feminist and aesthetic approaches can help critical PCS reach a deeper understanding of the affective politics of post-conflict masculinities. Sensory explorations are a powerful reminder of how the personal is political: apparently personal, private, 'merely' social aspects of daily life (such as popular music heard and listened to by teenagers) are 'in fact infused with power' and so are intensely political.[92] There are important connections to be made between sensory perceptions, bodies and experience, which may open the way for a more nuanced analysis within PCS.

Feminist scholars make gendered bodies and corporeality central to critical PCS. This begins from the premise that it is necessary to avoid adding 'women' as an essentialised category to analyses of peace and conflict. Rather, as noted earlier, gender as an analytical category needs to be contextualised, conceptualised and analysed in all its messy, glorious complexity. The contributions in this Special Issue do this in various ways. Tarja Väyrynen argues against abstract and theoretical understandings of peace, pointing to the significance of vulnerability and corporeality in comprehending how peace is expressed through situated, embodied encounters. Tiina Vaittinen, Amanda Donahoe, Rahel Kunz, Silja Bára Ómarsdóttir and Sanam Roohi suggest that placing feminist understandings of care and of

---

[92] Enloe *Bananas, Beaches and Bases* 348

everyday peace at the forefront of critical PCS debates on the 'local turn' would significantly expand understandings of how peace emerges in theory and practice. Vaittinen *et al* spotlight the vital contributions offered by gendered relations of care and of caring towards the construction of everyday peace. As they show, these relations are invaluable, yet are frequently neglected by critical analyses of peace. The articles by Väyrynen and by Vaittinen *et al* demonstrate that corporeality can give greater texture and depth to the role that gendered power relations play in the shift towards 'post-liberal peace'.

The feminist interest in corporeality has no doubt emerged out of a wariness 'of any attempts to link women's subjectivities and social positions to the specifics of their bodies'.[93] As noted earlier in this introduction, critical PCS tends to view gender as a problem, or an issue to solve (rather than a critical lens on the world). A feminist perspective about corporeality enables us to think about how bodies have an ability to 'extend the frameworks which contain them'.[94] The ramifications of this insight is powerfully made in this Special Issue by Hannah Partis-Jennings, who explores the use of the 'third gender' by international peacebuilders working in Afghanistan. By developing a framework of gendered hybridity, Partis-Jennings demonstrates how bodies and performances of female internationals adopting and/or assigned the category of the third gender, is central to understanding how actors perform and shape peace promotion at the everyday level. This article is a valuable addition to a growing body of scholarship on hybridity - which highlights how a feminist perspective can prompt a more complex set of questions about the gendered dynamics between local and international actors and how that shapes and produces gender in the practice and process of post-conflict reconstruction.[95]

Decolonising the concepts and methods of PCS.
Critical scholarship has been criticised for its propensity to recreate rather than adequately challenge the hierarchies, binaries, and exclusions of mainstream scholarship.[96] Bennett and Watson, for example, note 'a lack of real engagement' with local stakeholders plus a failure of 'white middle class Western researchers' to reflect on their positionality and privilege and its impact on relationships with

---

[93] Elizabeth Grosz *Volatile Bodies: Towards a Corporeal Feminism.* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994) x.
[94] *Ibid*, xi.
[95] McLeod 'A feminist approach to hybridity'; Partis-Jennings 'The (in)security of gender in Afghanistan's peacebuilding project'; Caitlin Ryan and Helen Basini 'UNSC Resolution 1325 national action plans in Liberia and Sierra Leone: An analysis of gendered power relations in hybrid peacebuilding' *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*. 11, no. 2 (2017), 186-206; George 'Policing "conjugal order"'; Maria Martin de Almagro 'Hybrid Clubs: A Feminist Approach to Peacebuilding in the Democratic Republic of Congo' *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* Online First (2018).
[96] Suthaharan Nadarajah and David Rampton 'The Limits of Hybridity and the Crisis of Liberal Peace' *Review of International Studies* 41, no. 1 (2015) 49-72.

research participants.[97] Sabaratnam highlights a tendency to disregard or downplay the agency and subjectivity of societies and communities targeted by liberal interventionism, despite critical scholars claiming to search for 'local', 'everyday', or 'subaltern' understandings of peace.[98] There is an urgent need to decolonise PCS research by challenging neo-colonial modes of knowledge production.

We do not claim that feminist scholarship has entirely escaped Eurocentric assumptions. We acknowledge that the authors in this Special Issue are in the main white scholars situated in the Global North. Furthermore, as Heidi Hudson points out, 'the exploration of gender and decoloniality in relation to peacebuilding remains underrepresented and undertheorised, with the literature focussed on gender and coloniality generally'.[99] Nevertheless, we contend that feminist scholarship is an invaluable source for critical scholars engaging with many of the difficult theoretical issues, methodological challenges, and ethical dilemmas involved in undertaking 'decolonial' research. Feminist research aims to build 'non-exploitative relationships within research' by paying attention to the significance of gender whilst attending to the intersections between sexism, racism, heteronormativity, classism, and so on.[100] Central to this is the understanding that research relationships are shot through with dynamic, shifting, yet hierarchical relations of power.[101]

Thinking about the complexity of power relations in relation to gender and decoloniality is crucial for thinking about 'local' and 'everyday' in analyses of peacebuilding. Making sense of how to use global peacebuilding architectures (such as the WPS resolutions) in local contexts requires us to draw upon feminist ideas about the local, the everyday, and lived experience.[102] Feminists have long argued that 'gender analysis offers a bottom-up foundational logic' which may counter the ways that liberal peacebuilding projects masks disparities between a range of civil society actors.[103] Building on these ideas, in this Special Issue, Tarja Väyrynen draws on a long heritage of feminist peace research about everyday embodied experiences to develop a construct of 'eventness'. Through 'eventness' she

---

[97] Bennet Collins and Alison Watson 'The Impetus for Peace Studies to Make a Collaborative Turn: Towards Community Collaborative Research' in *Ethnographic Peace Research,* ed. Gearoid Millar (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2018) 96.

[98] Meera Sabaratnam 'Avatars of Eurocentrism in the Critique of the Liberal Peace' *Security Dialogue* 44, no.3 (2013) 259-278.

[99] Heidi Hudson 'Decolonising gender and peacebuilding: feminist frontiers and border thinking in Africa' *Peacebuilding* 4, no. 2 (2016) 195.

[100] Gayle Letherby *Feminist research in theory and practice* (Buckingham, Open University Press, 2003) 73.

[101] Sabine Grenz 'Intersections of Sex and Power in Research on Prostitutes: A Female Researcher' *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30. No. 4 (2005) 2091-2113.

[102] Shweta Singh 'Gender, Conflict and Security: Perspectives from South Asia' *Journal of Asian Security* 4, no. 2 (2017) 150, 153.

[103] Heidi Hudson 'Decolonising gender and peacebuilding: feminist frontiers and border thinking in Africa' *Peacebuilding* 4, no. 2 (2016) 205.

highlights how to bring peace back to the lives of ordinary people, seeking to expose the radical potential embedded in the everyday by recognising the spectacular within the ordinary.

Part of decolonising PCS includes considering the ways that scholarship and research practices continue to perpetuate the colonial and Eurocentric nature of academia itself.[104] This awareness was especially heightened around the 'Sapphire Series' panels at the International Studies Association (ISA) annual conference in 2015, where the showpiece panels created by ISA were all-white scholars situated in the Global North.[105] Feminist approaches to research and scholarship can support decolonising the academy. To achieve this, researchers often 'engage creative strategies and a range of traditional and contemporary media as resources through which the subaltern speaks in varied social and community contexts'.[106] In this Special Issue, the articles by Julian *et al*, Väyrynen, and Baker all do this via making use of the visual arts to 'raise silent voices', personal vignettes to highlight the significance of the mundane, and audio-visual media taken from a video-sharing website to problematise masculinities.

As noted, the very practice of academic scholarship also needs decolonising. Feminists have sought to address this. One article in this Special Issue – by Vaittinen *et al* - was the product of Feminist Peace Research Network meetings organised by the Universities of Tampere, Lund and Tromsø during 2016-17.[107] This international, interdisciplinary network brings together feminist PCS researchers from both Global South and North, as well as from academic and practitioner backgrounds. One of the network's innovative practices was to group participants with similar research interests from across the Global North and South to develop a co-authored paper.[108] The impetus behind this was to build a research network celebrating diverse lived experiences and to strengthen collaborations across research communities. Both critical and feminist PCS scholars might develop similar collaborative research practices in order to democratise knowledge production within PCS and challenge institutions and practices that maintain injustice.

---

[104] In the UK, much of this debate was initially prompted by the student-led campaign 'Why is my curriculum white?'. See https://www.nus.org.uk/en/news/why-is-my-curriculum-white/ accessed 11 September 2018.
[105] Cynthia Weber 'ISA's Sapphire Series – Is Blue the New White?' http://duckofminerva.com/2015/02/isas-sapphire-series-is-blue-the-new-white.html (2015) accessed 11 September 2018.
[106] M. Brinton Lykes and Rachel M. Hershberg 'Participatory action research and feminisms,' in *Handbook of feminist research: Theory and praxis,* ed. Sharlene Janice Hesse-Biber (London: Sage, 2007) 342.
[107] Feminist Peace Research Network 'Feminist Peace Research Network' http://www.uta.fi/yky/en/feministpeaceresearch/index.html (2016) accessed 12 September 2018.
[108] See also: Annick T.R. Wibben, Catia Cecelia Confortini, Sanam Roohi, Sarai B. Aharoni, Leena Vastapuu, and Tiina Vaittinen 'Collective Discussion: Piecing-Up Feminist Peace Research,' *International Political Sociology,* oly034 (2018), online first.

Conclusions: Action Manifesto

Taken together, the articles open up the possibility of a much more gendered critical PCS by spotlighting the potential for feminist theories, concepts, methods, and empirical insights to push the boundaries of critical PCS. We believe that the articles themselves prise open the theoretical and methodological significance of breaking down boundaries between Feminist and Critical PCS. Productive dialogue can unleash positive synergies between these fields. We contend that if critical PCS scholars continue to use concepts such as 'everyday peace' or methods such as institutional ethnography without acknowledging the feminist heritage of these tools, this will indicate the persistence of a wilful blindness and marginalisation of the potential and actual contributions of feminist scholarship within PCS. Thus, we conclude not on an ending, but with an action manifesto[109] for scholars to develop potential connections within the field:

(1) *Critical PCS scholars should identify and challenge misconceptions they may hold about feminist PCS scholarship, and explore the useful insights that may be gained from feminist approaches.* Feminist research is not only relevant for studying women and gender in war and peace. Rather, as this Special Issue spotlights, feminist concepts, methods, and empirical insights are significant for a wide range of issues in PCS. When examining, for example, everyday aspects of conflict and peacebuilding, attention to feminist insights into the significance of the family/private sphere could avoid the danger of reinventing the wheel.

(2) *Seek out ways of making the curricula and teaching of PCS inclusive.* As this article has highlighted, dominant PCS epistemologies and methodologies remain rooted in colonialist, masculinist worldviews and traditions. Placing feminist research, in particular research emanating from the Global South, at the centre of PCS learning, teaching, and scholarship, can help to challenge these entrenched Eurocentric and androcentric biases. This requires ensuring students can access feminist PCS scholarship, by including feminist PCS scholarship within curricula and ordering relevant books/journals into university libraries. It is worth considering if the syllabus would benefit from feminist research appearing throughout teaching modules instead of being ghettoised into 'the week on gender'.

---

[109] Inspired by Ahmed *Living a Feminist Life* 251-268.

(3) *Seek out ways of making the scholarship and research of PCS inclusive.* Awareness that all-male and all-white panels serve to reinforce the structural inequalities of our discipline is on the increase.[110] Conference organisers could take steps to discourage such panels by insisting that panels should be diverse, and that this diversity does not only happen simply by appointing women and people of colour as panel chairs or discussants. Editorial discretion remains a significant factor in publication and citations. Journal editors can put in place a written policy identifying that citation gaps remain and giving guidance to editors, authors, and reviewers on how they could play a part in addressing this citation gap.[111] The use of feminist Special Issues and Special Sections is helpful in focussing attention on the insights that the various debates within feminist PCS provide. Yet, it is also crucial that authors and editors view feminist scholarship as integrally connected to core concepts and debates at the heart PCS, rather than separating out feminist perspectives, and thereby relegating them to the margins of PCS. We all must work hard to continue to identify gaps. For example, there is a need for all of us to promote feminist PCS scholarship from the Global South: this exploration would serve to provide an even more intersectional picture of PCS.

---

[110] The Feminist Collective 'Feminist labour at the ISA: White manels, the politics of citation and mundane productions of disciplinary sexism and racism' https://thedisorderofthings.com/2018/06/26/feminist-labour-at-the-isa-white-manels-the-politics-of-citation-and-mundane-productions-of-disciplinary-sexism-and-racism/; Saara Särmä 'Congrats, You Have an All-Male Panel!' *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 18, no. 3 (2016),470-476; Marysia Zalewski '#AllMalePanels … but … but … but … ' *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 18, no. 3 (2016) 492-495; Cai Wilkinson, Evren M. Eken, Laura Mills, Roxanne Krystalli, Harry D. Gould, Jesse Crane-Seeber & Paul Kirby 'Responding to #AllMalePanels: A Collage' *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 18, no. 3 (2016) 477-491.
[111] International Studies Quarterly asks all involved to consider citations: International Studies Quarterly 'Guidelines and Policy' https://www.isanet.org/Publications/ISQ/Guidelines-and-Policy (2015) accessed 19 September 2018.

Author biographies:

Laura McLeod is a lecturer in International Politics at the University of Manchester, UK. Her research on gender, feminism and security in post-conflict ex-Yugoslavia has been published in *International Studies Quarterly, Security Dialogue, International Feminist Journal of Politics,* and *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*. Her current project, funded by the British Academy explores how gender indicators and databases used within UN peacebuilding configure ideas about gender expertise. Laura's first book, *Gender Politics and Security Discourse: Personal-Political Imaginations and Feminism in "Post-Conflict" Serbia* was published by Routledge in 2016.

Maria O'Reilly is a lecturer in Politics and International Relations at Leeds Beckett University, UK. Her research focuses on questions of gender, agency, justice, and security in conflict and post-conflict contexts. Her work has been published in *International Feminist Journal of Politics, Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding, and Cooperation and Conflict.* Her recent book, *Gendered Agency in War and Peace: Gender Justice and Women's Activism in Post-Conflict Bosnia-Herzegovina,* was published by Palgrave MacMillan in 2018.

Funding details: