



An examination of the feminist perspective in Latin America

Laura Guercio*

Abstract

In comparing the feminist analysis with the one conducted by other theories such as the realist theory, the author tries to highlight how the gender approach can be used as a prism to evaluate the changes taking place in some Latin American countries.

Keywords: gender, colonialism, feminism theory, native Latin American, conflict

Al comparar el análisis feminista con el realizado por otras teorías como la realista, la autora intenta resaltar cómo el enfoque de género puede ser utilizado como un prisma para evaluar los cambios que se están produciendo en algunos Países de América Latina.

Palabras clave: género, colonialismo, teoría del feminismo, nativos latinoamericanos, conflicto

Nel confrontare l'analisi femminista con quella condotta da altre teorie quali la teoria realista, l'autrice cerca di evidenziare come l'approccio di genere possa essere utilizzato come prisma per valutare i cambiamenti in corso in alcuni paesi dell'America Latina.

Parole chiave: genere, colonialismo, teoria del femminismo, nativi latinoamericani, conflitto

Introduction

Gender-based violence is a major social scourge in Latin America: 14 of the 25 countries in the world with the highest rate of femicides are in South America and the Caribbean (UN Women, 2015). According to the World Health Organization (Who), and without taking into consideration the significant difference in numbers between countries, there are approximately 160,000 cases of sexual violence in Latin America each year, with an average of 500 cases per day (World Health Organization, 2018). This type of violence is frequently not reported due to the victims' shame, as well as the perpetrators' general impunity (United Nations Development Program, 2017).

According to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, organised crime is one of the causes behind such high rate of violence against women in this particular region. Women are also frequently forced to work in the sex market, with additional violence on a daily basis. Outside of wartime, violence against women and children is rife in Latin America than anywhere else in the world, according to the UN (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2018).

Also, according to Unicef (2019) data, over one million Latin American girls and adolescents have been sexually abused, with 75% of them being under the age of 18.

* University of Perugia (Italy); e-mail: laura.guercio@unipg.it.



Abuse can have devastating psychological and physical consequences. The fact that abortion is prohibited in some Latin American countries, means that many adolescents are forced to carry out unwanted pregnancies or to resort to clandestine abortions with grave danger for their own life (Unicef, 2019).

In general, when it comes to violence in conflict or peace, an understanding of gender issues can challenge the dominant realist approach, which is based on military and state-centric conceptions, while also providing more detailed insights into the effects of social political conflicts on women. While gathering data, it is worthwhile to determine which theoretical approach best explains gender-based violence and, more specifically, the reasons for it. An understanding of gender-related issues, which provide more detailed insights into the effects of social political conflict on women, can challenge the dominant realist approach which is solely based on military and state-centric conceptions.

In the aftermath of World War II, the creation of the realist theory was prompted in part by the need to explain earlier events in a more systematic and state-centered manner. Feminists view such approach as created and promoted by men, based on androcentric notions and, as a result, gender-biased (Tickner, 1997). Realists define power primarily in terms of the amount of authority one state has over another, and consider that men and states are «mutually exclusive» (True, 2001: 254) creatures on the basis of a gendered explanation of the world as an «exclusive agency of rational man». On the other hand, feminists argue that world politics has «multiple realities» (True, 2001: 254) and that realism is responsible for the «reproduction of global hierarchies of gender and other social identities» (True, 2001: 233). The feminist analysis leads to a better understanding of violence and conflict which, according to Tickner, have been central in social dynamics while also being «an important issue for feminists» (*Ibidem*).

Realism criticism not only wants to fix the gender imbalance, but also «to influence our behaviors which have concrete repercussions for the real world of people and events» (True, 2001: 247). On the contrary, feminist studies, each with their own ontological and epistemological assumptions, offer critical viewpoints on the status quo in order to create spaces for the inclusion of theories or practices derived from women's lived experiences. In this dimension, decolonial feminism, as an emerging theoretical notion headed by Lugones (2008; 2010), deals with issues about coloniality/modernity and female identity in Latin America, while also giving a platform for the perspectives and lived experiences of oppressed and non-Western women (Bhambra, 2014; Lugones *et al.*, 2010; Paludi *et al.*, 2019; Schiwy *et al.*, 2007).

The following analysis will demonstrate how gender can be used as a prism to evaluate current challenges in Latin America. The feminist analysis focuses on power dynamics between men and women, social conceptions of masculinity and femininity, and how gender as a learned attribute shapes society, social interactions and behaviours.



1. Gender violence in Latin America

Over the last few decades, the international community has increasingly recognized violence against women as a public health issue, a violation of human rights and a barrier to economic progress. The United Nations General Assembly recognized women's right to live free of violence in the 1993 Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women, as did the Inter-American Convention on the Prevention, Punishment, and Eradication of Violence Against Women (Convention of Belém do Pará, 1994). Both of these legal tools acknowledge that the risk factors, consequences, and community responses to violence against women are heavily influenced by women's subordinate social, economic, and legal status.

Women's vulnerability to violence may be exacerbated by gender disparities in relationships and economic reliance on intimate partners. Some forms of violence against women, such as physical aggression, are frequently tolerated or even condoned by laws and social traditions.

According to the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (Eclac), 3,529 femicides occurred in this Region in 2018. The highest rates are found in El Salvador, Honduras, Bolivia, Guatemala, and the Dominican Republic, due to a combination of factors that make them particularly dangerous for women. Femicidal behavior is the result of a misogynist culture in which patriarchal society fails to take gender-based violence seriously. The situation is not improving (Eclac, 2019).

Femicides continue to be a real social scourge in Argentina with 327 women killed in 2019. Nearly three out of every four of these murders were committed by the victim's partner or former partner. Even in Brazil, despite legislative advances, the situation remains dire: 15 women are killed every day. Indigenous women and the poorest sections of the population are disproportionately affected (Eclac, 2019). Gender-based violence is an emergency within an emergency in Venezuela, where severe shortages of medicines, basic necessities, and food have forced over four million Venezuelans to flee the country as migrants or asylum seekers (UN Women, 2020). In the face of the country's general situation, the cases of the girls who were killed or disappeared, which have persisted, have faded into the background. Violence against women is also common in Mexico, where a widespread impunity exists: victims rarely report violence, and even when they do, there is rarely a trial. 66.1 percent of women and girls over the age of 15 have experienced violence at least once in their lives, with 43.5 percent being perpetrated by their partner. Between 2012 and 2013, the country recorded 3,892 cases of women being murdered, but only 613 of these were classified as femicides by the state (UN Women, 2020; Undp, 2017; Landolfo, 2020).

Ciudad Juarez, an industrial town on the border between the United States and Mexico, is the Mexican city symbol of femicides, with a large number of women killed every year. What is concerning is the criminals' impunity: official channels attempt to mitigate the phenomenon by not bringing all cases to the public's attention. The authors' trials and convictions were also unusual in the context (UN Women, 2020).



The Covid-19 pandemic has increased, as however in every part of the world, the dangers to Latin American women and girls. In Argentina, as in other countries, complaints for this cause increased by 39% during quarantine, prompting the government to take action, such as opening shelters and establishing complaint protocols (UN Women, 2020). In any case, physical violence is only one aspect of the harassment that women face in various industries. Despite labor reforms that ensure equal pay for men and women, gender bias persists in the labor market

According to the World Economic Forum's report, *The global gender gap report 2020*, the Latin American countries with the highest gender pay gap are Costa Rica (13th place), Colombia (22th place), Mexico (25th place), and Argentina (30th place). Mexican women contribute an estimated 23,200 million pesos to the economy, plus 11,317 million for unpaid activities. Even if the data provided by the World Economic Forum are contested by authors like Delphine Lacombe (Lacombe, 2014), other International Institutions underline that women in Latin America and the Caribbean work more yet receive less formal salary or benefits as a result. In fact, according to the United Nations, in the region, the average woman works 25 hours more per month than the average man (United Nations, 2015), and half of the women work for no income or profit at all (World Bank, 2016).

According to the World Bank, in Latin America and the Caribbean the percentage of employed women 15 years of age increased from 38 to 50% from 1991 to 2014, in contrast to a decrease from 49 to 46% in the rest of the world (World Bank, 2016). Individual human rights are violated when there is a salary gender disparity because it restricts individual choice based on sex (Messina and Silva, 2019). Beside this aspect, the situation in rural areas can see a deeper gender inequality: for example, in some states, like Mexico, women in rural areas represent 50.5% of the population, yet only 26% are landowners and 21.3% are decision-makers in their communities (World Bank, 2021). Also, women have suffered disproportionately from the economic impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic. Domestic workers and cooks, most of whom are women from indigenous peoples and local communities, make up 60% of Mexico's job losses due to Covid-19 (World Bank, 2021).

However, the situations described above did not deter women from taking to the streets and protesting against gender-based violence, dominant machismo and a lack of political will to address the phenomenon in all of its facets, whether cultural or legal.

In Mexico, the #UnDayWithoutWomen initiative called on the female population to stop working the day after International Women's Day on March 8, 2020. It was a never-before-seen national strike in Latin America that demonstrated the social and economic impact of women's disappearances. The economic losses on March 9 exceeded expectations, totalling 37,000 million pesos. Feminist movements have helped to advance national legislation as well. Peru, for example, enacted the law to *Prevent and punish sexual harassment in public places* in 2015 (Landolfo, 2020). Similarly, in Chile (2019) and Costa Rica (2020) a law punishing street harassment with fines and imprisonment went into effect. Due to women's protests against femicide cases in Ciudad Juárez, Mexico became



the first country to include the crime of femicide in the federal penal code in 2012 (Landolfo, 2020; Lagarde, 2005).

In other words, feminist movements have determined the socio-legal changes required to achieve not only women's protection, but also community evolution. In the case of Latin America, as occurs in almost all countries of the world, feminist movements must be examined for their distinctive features, given that there is more than one type of feminism.

2. Understanding violence against women through the Latin American feminism lens

Although gender issues have been discussed in Latin America since the 17th Century with Abya Yala and Juana de Asbaje fighting for women's education and their political influence, a feminism movement would not be realized until the 20th Century during the third feminist wave and the 1968 generational awakening (Gargallo, 2017). Indeed, the origins of Latin American Feminism may be dated back to social movements developed in the 1960s and 1970s, when it encompassed the women's liberation movement.

In Latin America, there isn't a single feminism. Although it has undergone a number of restructurings, the current of radical feminism and socialist feminism remain in force and is becoming increasingly important in Latin American society. However, other types of feminism exist in the region, including the liberal, which advocates for equal rights for men and women; the abolitionist, that opposes the commodification of the female body; transfeminism, which advocates for self-designation of identity, both biologically and psychologically; and ecofeminism, which compares land exploitation to womb exploitation, race, social class.

It should be noted that the colonization process, which resulted in the patriarchal and religious structures that still exist today, is the common denominator among Latin American countries. In this context, the radicalism of Latin American feminism and the socialist feminism advocate for a sexual revolution to end gender-based violence. However, radical feminism and socialist feminism differ in how they attribute the source of oppression against women; the former attributes it primarily to patriarchy, while the latter attributes it to the capitalist foundation on which the patriarchal system is implemented.

When considering the Latin American Region, one must consider the original division of *human* and *non-human*, which served as the ideological foundation for the subjugation of the original populations during the colonization era. It was a political and non-biological distinction that has been and continues to be functional to the upkeep of a specific power system including, but not limited to, patriarchy.

The term *original violación*, utilised by Yuderkys Espinosa Miñoso for indicating the systematic rape of indigenous women as an integral part of the project of western dominance, confirms this colonial construction of gender issues (Miñoso, 2014): the history of colonization is a history of conquest that has moved in tandem between land invasion and invasion of native women's bodies.



The “decolonial turn” was coined by Nelson Maldonado-Torres (Maldonado-Torres Maldonado-Torres, 2011): the decolonial idea emanating from Latin American contexts is of particular importance for the theoretical development of decolonial thinking. Decolonial theory examines how information created in and by the West is layered with colonial power, resulting in a politics of Western knowledge domination (Mignolo, 2007; Prasad, 2003; Said, 1978). This theoretical lens’ integration helps us to comprehend contextual qualities and lived experiences in a social, cultural, historical, and political setting (Haraway, 1988).

On these grounds, decolonial Latin American feminism investigates the colonial origins of racial and gender discrimination and oppression – often overlooked by Western currents – and relies primarily on post-colonial studies and black feminism, as opposed to Eurocentric feminism, which brings neoliberalist and capitalist models.

From this point of view, in the specific Latin American context the two forms of oppression, namely “male against female” and “racial against the population of origin”, share a common matrix that is the colonialism. The concept of colonialism, as understood by sociologists Anibal Quijano and Maria Lugones, represents the dark side of modernity: European colonialism produced the Eurocentric narrative of the world and, as a result, normalized the subordination of all non-white peoples. In other words, Westerners build race as a hierarchical concept (Quijano, 2014; Lugones, 2008).

Aníbal Quijano tends to trace gender oppression back to racial oppression and assume concepts such as *heteronormativity*, the imposition of the heterosexual model, or power imbalance (Quijano, 2014). Maria Lugones tends to question these assumptions and give gender oppression more autonomy in its complexities (Lugones, 2008).

There are also various theoretical and practical approaches that seek to investigate the presence and/or validity of the patriarchal model in pre-colonial systems. In this regard, the approach of community feminism is of particular interest.

The concept of *entronque patriarcal* (patriarchal intersection), which refers to the encounter and fusion of pre-colonial and Western patriarchal systems in Bolivia, is theorized by Aymara Julieta Paredes, a feminist activist. The relationship between an ancestral and pre-colonial patriarchy and the European and colonial patriarchy encountered in Bolivia is central to Paredes’ work. She describes the regional development of a system that continues to favor men over oppressed women at various levels. In this sense, her theory does not deny the colonial moment’s importance in current gender oppression, but it also acknowledges the existence of pre-colonial and original forms of patriarchy that merged with the European colonization (Paredes, 2020; Paredes, 2010).

At the same time, Bolivian feminism, represented by women like Petronila Infantes or Juana Azurduy, must be remembered as a claim for indigenous women’s autonomy against the original ancestral patriarchy, as well as a condemnation of the macho oppression system within indigenous communities themselves (Ellerbeck, 2015; Hill, 2017).

Within this framework, any definition of gender equality is rejected as impracticable, given that the female gender is historically and socially constructed at a lower hierarchical position than the male gender.



Based on these arguments, *communitarian feminists* have criticized the so-called *ongization*, a neoliberal turning point in western women's movements that, while cooperating with international organizations, have submitted to the imposition of a single model of woman. As a result, this approach provides a hegemonic explanation of women that is entirely abstract in terms of their concrete lives, bodies, and voices (Sanchez, 2014).

The communitarian feminism, which has materialised from a 26 year-long process in Bolivia, questioned the use of Western feminism's hegemonic language in favor of a community characteristics (Falquet, 2014; Paredes, 2015). Its proposal is revolutionary because it emphasizes the untranslatability, not just literal but also cultural, of concepts that the West considers to be universal. The communitarian feminism introduces the idea of community as a counter-proposal to individualistic society. Specifically, the dimension of the community, considered as an alternative way of understanding and organizing life, contrasts with the proposals of Western feminisms of an always individual positioning of women as the same or different from men.

Is still there a solid focus on action-based decolonisation?

Julieta Paredes, one of its representatives, during an interview released to Luis Andrés Sanabria Zaniboni has explained that «we have always said, whether for better or for worse, that feminism and feminists have significance in the world that we call an embedded semantic field, obviously hegemonically embedded by the invasion from Europe; however, it is important at this stage of our fight to adopt an attitude in the world and make decisions regarding this situation. Of course we wonder if it would have been better if we had chosen another name for our struggle and in turn not play into eurocentrism... without a doubt! (...). Calling ourselves feminists is not replicating Europe and the Usa, we challenge them on their own semantic field, we dispute the content, because: «In fact, imitating the critical spirit of the colonising power that – theoretically, at the very least – exports and prompts a depiction would but demonstrate on behalf of the receiving power the lack of its own critical spirit, given that it blindly comes to imitate it» (Amorós, 2004: 69). Communitarian Feminism does not imitate or merely criticise; it challenges and contests the semantic field of feminism because «we understand that a thought is but alive and responsive to the current global challenges or else it dies or is re-evolved» (Zaniboni, 2016: 122).

The communitarian feminism aims at overcoming gender by beginning and returning to the community dimension, which is accomplished through an internal rethinking of indigenous culture.

The *chacha-warni* (man-woman), an element of Andean cosmology that reduces everything to a male/female binomial, is specifically called into question by recalling indigenous women's subordination within the hierarchical and patriarchal communities to which they belong.

Another crucial point is the connection between the body and the territory. The latter is a very complex concept that can never be attributed solely to the land, but it includes the flora, fauna, and human communities that inhabit it in a close bond that ensures their mutual survival. In a nutshell, communitarian feminisms connect the struggle for territorial defense to the struggle for one's own bodies, redefining the right to property



in a communitarian sense and highlighting a colonial and neo-colonial process.

Then, in some Latin American countries, such as Bolivia, communitarian feminism examines the social dimension of its own community, identifying the seeds of violence against women in the ongoing colonization: the categories of race and gender, in their meaning as hierarchical constructions aimed at maintaining colonial and patriarchal power, are reflected in the behavior of subordination of women.

According to Paredes, identifying some key aspects that allow establishing the horizon from which the struggle is located, that is, an analysis that allows the recovery of our stories, is necessary for the proposal of communitarian feminism. Communitarian feminists advocate avoiding idealizations of pre-Hispanic cultures and consider that colonization cements an alliance with the pre-Hispanic patriarchy (Paredes, 2013).

In this sense, the communitarian feminist approach allows for a more complete understanding of reality as well as a focus on the social, political, and cultural dynamics that underpin violence against women. This is a feature shared by the feminist approach in general which differs from other dominant theories in the international relations system, such as the realist theories. These theories, which are based on the idea of the state as protector of its citizens, fail to analyze the social dynamics underlying gender violence.

The following sections will examine why feminist theories should be preferred over others.

3. Gender lens *versus* the myth of protection of the realist theory

Historically, security studies have been dominated by concerns about armed conflict, specifically inter-state conflict (Blanchard, 2003), which relists regard, as a «constant possibility» (Waltz, 2001: 227), a threat that can be «managed but never eradicated» (Mingst, Arregun-Toft, 2014: 250-251). Stephen Walt claims that security studies, or «statecraft», should focus solely «on war and war-related topics such as arms control and state diplomacy» (Walt, 1991: 213).

However, war is constantly changing: the essence of warring parties, their objectives, the means and methods of war used and the global context in which armed conflicts take place all vary at a rapid pace. According to the World Health Organization (Who), the frequency of inter-state wars, the most common type of international warfare, has decreased dramatically since the conclusion of the Cold War, accounting for only 0.4 percent of all deaths in 2001 (Who, 2002). Modern wars greatly differ from fighting practices implemented in armed conflicts in the past, when states engaged in duels, primarily to weaken the enemy and seize control of the territory. New wars are internal and no longer fought between states, yet strongly internationalized, and can include both state and non-state entities. Fighters no longer necessarily wrestle for territorial sovereignty but may also be motivated by ethnic rivalry or economic gain, or by seeking access to the state apparatuses, in order to control minerals and other resources. Furthermore, rather than being spared from attacks, the civilian population is



increasingly vulnerable to serious human rights violations. By the end of the 20th Century, civilians made up 90 percent of casualties of war, with most of these being women and children (Tickner, 2001). This calls into question long-held beliefs about whether the primary target of security research should be the state or the person.

What is the best way to deal with armed conflicts? Is it better to adopt a state-centered or an individual-centered approach?

According to traditional security discourse, wars occur so that states can protect their citizens from external threats posed by other states (Tickner, 2001). However, as Kan Jindy Pettman points out, the state itself can be a threat to its citizens, particularly women (Pettman, 1996): one need only consider the over 1000 allegations of rape by the Indian police against women that surfaced in the late 1980s (Watson, 1991).

Moreover, as gender scholars point out, intra-state conflicts have a significant individual impact, especially on women. Rape, for example, which has historically been used as a weapon of war and considered an acceptable outcome of the conflict (Hansen, 2000), has increased significantly in the decades since the Cold War's end and the emergence of intra-state conflicts. Mass rape was used as a tactic of warfare in the 1990s Rwandan and Bosnian conflicts, with an estimated 250,000 women raped in Rwanda alone (Peterson and Runyan, 1999).

Furthermore, given the nature of today's armed conflicts, and with many modern outbreaks of violence being ethnic or religious, women are increasingly involved in fighting. They are seen as custodians of cultural and ethnic identity, as well as carriers of future generations, and as such, they may be vulnerable to belligerent attacks or threats to change or destroy their role. Female bodies are seen as *territory* to be conquered (Kirby, 2012). This finding may promote a rethinking of a new international security paradigm that isn't based on the realist *myth of protection* any longer.

Security is a cultural construct founded on the *myth of protection* (Tickner and Sjoberg, 2010), which explains why some approaches to security have been legitimized whereas others have been suppressed. Historically, men are claimed to fight wars to defend society's vulnerable people, despite the fact that women and children suffer the most casualties in current conflicts (Tickner, Sjoberg, 2010).

The belief that wars are fought to protect women, the elderly, and children, is not only untrue but also a form of systemic violence. As Mary Caprioli explains, structural violence has four basic components: exploitation, penetration, fragmentation and marginalization. The *myth of protection* perpetuates all four core components at the same time, keeping women out of constructive security procedures, telling them that they need to be protected, isolating them from one another by keeping them in the private sphere and marginalizing them (Caprioli, 2005). Women, on the contrary, play a significant role in the security issue, providing support to their communities, fighting with males, and in many other different ways. Recognizing this component can help us reassess the security and conflict dynamics in the international relations system.

Is realism's theory, however, appropriate for this purpose?

Or is it rather necessary to adopt a gendered perspective that the realist theory doesn't anticipate?



Since World War II, the central concerns of realism, the dominant paradigm in international relations, have been issues of war and national security. Realism, which has long been a major player in international relations, holds that conflict is unavoidable and that preparing for war is the best way to ensure state security (Wibben, 2011); in this context, the state is obligated to protect its citizens from the anarchist world's threats. These considerations are harmonized with realist theories on the characteristics of the state, which are founded on notions of «objectivity», «rationality», and «reason», and are based on what Hans Morgenthau refers to as the unchanging «nature of man» (Morgenthau, 1978: 4). Strength, power, autonomy, independence, and rationality are all characteristics associated with man and masculinity and are attributed to those entrusted with conducting our foreign policy and defending our national interests. The neorealist scholar Kenneth Waltz maintains that state behaviour is based on the behaviour of the «rational economic man in the market» (Waltz, 1979: 110).

Classical realism, on the other hand, came under fire in the 1960s and 1970s, not so much for its basic assumptions and objectives, as for its methodology and analysis related to armed conflicts and other international transactions (Waltz, 1979). At the start of the 1970s, realism was put to the test as the dramatic rise in oil prices brought issues, besides war and peace and Soviet-American relations, to the forefront.

The traditional realist approach, which was solely based on political conflict in the international system, was seen as particularly inadequate in explaining economic conflicts between advanced capitalist states. Furthermore, Marxist theory has challenged realism by emphasizing concerns about equality and justice, particularly in marginalized areas of the world that have been subjected to Western colonialism, rather than concerns about order and control (Falk, 1979; Noot, 2019; Galtung, 1971).

The notion of state, and its adequacy as a tool for addressing the diverse issues on the international agenda began to be questioned. Threats to the security of populations, economic inequality, poverty, and resource constraints were seen as consequences of global capitalism's functioning, which was, and still is, out of the control of individual states (Falk, 1982). Therefore, what begins to falter is the basic idea of realism and its mainstream narrative, claiming that the world is made up of nations competing in an anarchic system to maximize their own power (Mearsheimer, 2001). Within this dimension, while realism is associated with masculine characteristics such as power and autonomy, gender has received little attention as a category of analysis: little emphasis has been placed on how social and economic policies influence women. In opposition to this approach, gender studies have criticized the state-centric orientation of realist theories (Tickner, 1992; Hudson, 2005).

4. Feminist theories and Latin American feminism

Despite the fact that the feminist movements of the 1960s and 1970s brought about a shift in the social order's perspective, gender theories have become increasingly important since the Cold War's end to better understand current



security challenges affecting women (Hudson, 2005). Feminism in its long and rich history has developed into different branches, and a single definition of it is hard to sketch. Liberal feminists criticize governments for prioritizing the interests of the dominant group in society, which is often a group of men; radical feminists regard the state as a gendered patriarchal power system, that can be oppressive; social feminists look at how government policies can harm women, such as in terms of employment and reproduction (Zajicek and Calasanti, 1998).

The different strands of feminism find a common denominator in a rejection of realism, which is founded, as previously stated, on masculinised views of the state, one that can only compete and never cooperate (Mearsheimer, 2001). Gender scholars, on the other hand, advocate for international cooperation as a crucial method for dealing with threats that cross national borders, such as terrorism (Tickner, 1992). Moreover, all the divergent feminist strands share a skepticism towards the approaches which view the state as a protector (Blanchard, 2003; Young, 2003).

They have also explained how realist studies, in focusing exclusively on external/international threats to the state and ignoring problems that allegedly fall into the private/domestic sphere, overlook some of the problems that pose serious and global threats to women (Hooper, 2001; Hudson, 2005). Feminists disagree with this approach, believing that the international and domestic spheres are inextricably linked, and that their separation could be equated to the public/private dichotomy that enables domestic abuse to continue unabated (Blanchard, 2003). Domestic abuse, for example, is frequently allocated to the category of «private individuals» and, as a result, viewed as a «problem outside the state's responsibility» (Tickner, 1992: 57).

Women's safety, on the other hand, is constantly jeopardized by such forms of violence, as well as by their experiences in conflict situations, which are increasingly intra-state conflicts rather than inter-state conflicts. Women are among the most vulnerable in these conflicts. Women's immunity is frequently ignored not only by belligerents but also by those who are predisposed to protect civilians (Tickner and Sjoberg, 2010; Tickner, 1997). Because of its monopoly on legitimate force, the state is more willing to let the weak suffer as a «necessary sacrifice» (Blanchard, 2003: 1297) during conflict while diverting resources to the military, which is paradoxically the exact opposite of what the *myth of protection* implies.

The previous considerations lead us to believe that safety studies in international relations have taken an approach that is, at the very least, incompatible with the problems relating to gender violence. By focusing on the individual rather than the state, a gender approach can help create a more inclusive definition of security. In gender studies, alternative techniques such as narratives and interviews are frequently used to reach conclusions; by including women's everyday experiences, which are frequently overlooked in the field of international relations, a completely different understanding of security emerges (Wibben, 2011).

What makes the gendered approach to international relations unique is its ability to detect hidden realities through sources such as personal experience which can tell us more about a national conflict or sentiment than regular statistics and game theory. This



approach can be criticized for being unscientific, but it nevertheless offers precious insights in the analysis of international relations, especially if we consider the inadequacy of realist theorist. A narrative-based gender approach could allow for a plethora of contradictory and overlapping accounts and narratives that provide a more complete picture of violence and conflict (Wibben, 2011).

In any case, one cannot discuss only one feminism approach.

Among the many approaches, decolonial feminism is the theoretical idea based on the work of non-Western, indigenous, and black women activists involved in women's movements, as opposed to realist theories and western feminism theories as well (Espinosa Mioso, 2017; Hernández Castillo, 2010). It implies a new way of understanding gender which emerges from oppressed women in the Global South. The third and fourth waves of feminist theory – postfeminism, point of view, postcolonial, and decolonial – challenge the white Western feminist gender's theorization (Haraway, 1988; Calás and Smircich, 2006). Non-Western feminists challenge the constructions of Global South women in Western discourse representing them as uniformly lacking development, education, knowledge, progress, wealth: thereby presenting them as the *others* (Calás, Smircich, 2006).

Decolonial feminism interacts with arguments about coloniality/modernity, indigenous identity, and gender, while allowing marginalized, non-Western women to speak about their identities (Bhambra, 2014; Schiwy, 2007).

For this reason, decolonial feminist theory, according to Espinosa Mioso (2017), is a key tool for dismantling the racist/sexist coloniality/modernity project. It is a decolonization episteme that disturbs pre-existing senses of social organization as well as the historical-political-economic order. It can help to understand violence against women because it engages with the complexities of intersectionality of several aspects, such as sex, culture and individual's origins, to recognize the unique experiences of indigenous peoples, create space for indigenous knowledge, and break the mechanical transfer of knowledge from the West.

5. An application of the feminist approach to some case studies of gender-based violence

Some case studies may show the possibility of reconstructing social dynamics using feminist theory applied to gender based violence analysis.

In the case of Colombia, for example, armed conflict has been found to be strongly associated with the prevalence of cases of violence against women. Although on November 24, 2016, the Colombian government signed a peace agreement with the country's oldest and longest-running guerrilla group, the *Fuerzas armadas revolucionarias de Colombia* (Farc), the country still faces many insurgent groups that challenge the peace process by reproducing violent behavior and endangering the well-being of many people, particularly women. The Colombia's armed conflict has served as a catalyst for violence against women. It has exacerbated the hierarchical order in social relations while also reinforcing other power relations, such as those based on



gender (Medina, Mosquera, Sinisterra, 2017).

As a result of the armed conflict, women's bodies have been exploited to be used as war zones, where they become dehumanized objects of men's abuse and attacks (Andrade and others, 2007). As the Rapporteur on the Rights of Women of the Inter-American Commission on the Human Rights quotes «through acts of physical, psychological and sexual violence, the armed actors seek to intimidate, punish and control women for having affective relationships with members of the opposing faction, for disobeying the norms imposed by the armed actors or for participating in organizations perceived as the enemy. These acts, however, do not solely intend to dehumanize the victim as women. These aggressions additionally serve as a tactic to humiliate, terrorize, and wound the “enemy”, either in the family nucleus or community of the victim» (Rapporteur on the Rights of Women of the Inter-American commission on the Human Rights quotes, 2015: par. 50).

This vulnerability that women face is caused not only by conflicts, but also by social constructions that frequently re-victimize women when they seek help.

Gender vulnerability exists even in areas that have not been affected by armed conflict. In São Paulo (Brazil), for example, structural racism is one of the key factors exacerbating gender based violence. Several studies (Hampton, Oliver, Magarian, 2003; Waltermaurer, Watson, McNutt, 2006, Mountian, Calvo-Gonzalez, 2012; Evans 2021) have revealed that women of color face double discrimination: in addition to gendered oppressive social norms, they are victims of structural arrangements that discriminate, marginalize, and punish people of color in a variety of ways.

This institutionalized racism harkens back to colonizers' enslavement, abuse, and sexual exploitation of Black women in the past. The stereotypes of women of color that exist today, such as «aggressive, domineering, castrating, independent, sexually promiscuous, and money hungry» (Hampton, Oliver and Magarian, 2003: 547), are inextricably linked to the situation that the black community as a whole has faced for centuries.

Certain aspects of institutionalized racism's structural dimension certainly merit more attention. Hampton, Oliver and Magarian (2003), for example, have identified one such factor as «frustrated masculinity syndrome», which is inextricably linked to gender, race, and class dynamics (Hampton, Oliver and Magarian, 2003: 27). Men are taught from a young age that manhood is synonymous with success, employment, economic independence, and the ability to provide for themselves and their families. However, historically black men have been denied access to socioeconomic opportunities that have favored white men over any other individual. Engaging in violent behavior as a means of resolving disputes is one way low-income black men can try to cope with their lack of success in pursuing the traditional male role. Because men tend to direct their rage and frustration at their wives and romantic partners, women are at a disproportionate risk of becoming victims of intimate partner violence as a result of these patterns. According to Robert Staples, «violence as a means of status-conferral will continue to exist among black youths in the underclass as long as the opportunity structure for other expressions of their masculinity remain blocked by the forces of



institutional racism» (Robert Staples, 1978: 173. See also de Ávila, 2020; Matos, 2019).

In Brazil, structural racism has disproportionately impacted women of color, isolating them due to affective refusal permeated by socially constructed ideals, as well as the prevalence of a long-standing position of being financially dependent on their partners (Carrijo and Martins, 2020). This last factor of financial dependence, however, is not unique to black women but rather exists on a larger scale among women worldwide.

6. Conclusion

In this article we aimed at demonstrating that feminism in many Latin American countries is linked to colonialism. The colonial system, which replaced the previous community world in Latin America, introduced a structure in contrast to pre-colonial gender dynamics, which however were not devoid of hierarchies and power structures. As Rita Laura Segato observes, in the pre-colonial system, there was a profound reciprocity between gender positions, «as people [could] move between positions given as natures and they transmute, ‘making the world of the village’ trans in many ways» (Segato 2016: 616).

In that framework, the public and private space were deeply intertwined and equally important for the functioning of the community. The arrival of colonial modernity ushered in a universalist rhetoric that sought to subsume all existence under a *One* rationality and political subject. With the advent of colonialism, «a female, non-white, colonial, marginal, underdeveloped person could only exist as a minority, devoid of ontological fullness and reduced to perform the function of *alter* or *Other* on the *One* as the representative and referent of the whole» (Segato 2016: 617). This *One* is a necessarily male figure, white, landowner, literate, the only subject of public discourse (Segato, 2016).

We also argued that this feminist approach, as other feminist theories, can better examine the aforementioned dynamics than other theories in order to understand the causes of violence against women in some Latin American countries which have been examined.

A gender perspective could provide insight into policy outcomes, as well as dispel myths, such as the *myth of protection* and civilian immunity from war, that are characteristics of the realistic theories. Realistic views of the state and security have become obsolete for understanding violence against women, due to the enormous changes that have shaken the traditional functions of the state since the advent of neoliberalism in the 1970s to the end of the Cold War in the 1990s and of youth movements starting from the 1968. Thus opening a «window of opportunity» for safety studies (Blanchard, 2003: 1291).

The concept of the state as a protector of civilians and a deterrent to external threats cannot account for a deep explanation of violence against women. Furthermore, realistic theories are incapable of explaining the intricacy of complicated dimensions, such as those found in Latin America. The feminist movements examined here, as well as those



in other countries, demand that the state step in to fill gaps in women's protection policy. Dissatisfied with realism's failure to adequately comprehend current challenges to women's security, the feminist theories offer an alternative by addressing the need to fully comprehend that contemporary violence and conflicts occur within states, can be perpetrated by state actors, and, most importantly, are profoundly gendered in their impact. A gender approach pushes scholars to «radically rethink security» (Dalby, 1992: 119) by demonstrating how the process of securitisation is highly reliant on masculinised assumptions that fail to consider the relationship between gender, power and security. Women, to paraphrase a title from a Gillian Youngs' article, are critical to understanding the world we live in (Youngs, 2004).

In this sense a feminism perspective, particularly a decolonial feminism, can have a significant impact on better understanding gender violence and discrimination in Latin America: it takes into account the specific needs of Latin American women, needs that are contestualized by colonialism's social structures. As a result, feminism in Latin America is more than just a voice for women: it aims to sensitize the state and society in preparation for a more common and inclusive community, free of racism and discrimination constructions.

References

- Adams A.E., Sullivan C.M., Bybee D., Greeson M.R., *Development of the Scale of Economic Abuse*, «Violence Against Women», 14(5), 2008, pp.563-588.
- Amorós C., *Por una ilustración multicultural*, «Quaderns de Filosofia i Ciència» 34, 2004, pp.125-147.
- Andrade Salazar J.A., Alvis Barranco L., Jiménez Ruiz L.K., Redondo Marín M.P., Rodríguez González L., *La vulnerabilidad de la mujer en la guerra y su papel en el posconflicto*, «El Ágora Usb», 17(1), 2007, pp.290-308.
- Beer F.A., Hariman R., *Realism and Rhetoric in International Relations*, in Beer F.A., Hariman R., *Post-Realism. The Rhetorical Turn in International Relations*, Michigan State University Press, East Lansing, 1996, pp.1-30.
- Bhambra G.K., *Postcolonial and Decolonial Dialogs*, «Postcolonial Studies», 17(2), 2014, pp.115-121.
- Blanchard E.M., *Gender, International Relations and the Development of Feminist Security Theory*, «Signs», 28(4), 2018, pp.1289-1312.
- Calás M.B., Smircich L., *From the "Woman's Point of View" Ten Years Later. Toward a Feminist Organization Studies*, in Clegg S.R., Hardy C., Lawrence T.B., Nord W.R. (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organization Studies*, Sage Publications, New York, 2006, pp.284-346.
- Caprioli M., *Primed for Violence. The Role of Gender Inequality in Predicting Internal Conflict*, «International Studies Quarterly», 49, 2005, pp.161-178.
- Carrijo C., Martins P.A., *Domestic Violence and Racism against Black Women*, «Estudos Feministas», 28(2), 2008, pp.1-13.



- Casafina F., *Modernità, colonialità e genere. Conversazioni a più voci dall'America Latina*, «Deportate, Esuli, Profughe. Rivista Telematica di Studi sulla Memoria Femminile», 38, 2018, pp.55-62.
- Chenoy A.M., *Bringing Gender into National Security and International Relations*, «International Studies», 37(1), 2000, pp.17-29.
- Comisión interamericana de mujeres, *Covid-19 en la vida de las mujeres. Razones para incluir los impactos diferenciados*, Comisión interamericana de mujeres, 2020, in <https://www.oas.org/es/cim>, consulted on 2/10/2021.
- Connell R., *The Sociology of Gender in Southern Perspective*, «Current Sociology», 62(4), 2014, pp.550-567.
- Crenshaw K., *Mapping the Margins. Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color*, «Stanford Law Review», 43(6), 1991, pp.1241-1299.
- Dalby S., *Security, Modernity, Ecology. The Dilemmas of Post-Cold War Security Discourse*, «Alternatives. Global, Local, Political», 17(1), 1992, pp.95-134.
- de Ávila T.P., *Gender Violence Law Reform and Feminist Criminology in Brazil*, Emerald Publishing Limited, Bingley, 2020.
- Defensoria del Pueblo C.D., *Promoción y monitoreo de los derechos sexuales y reproductivos de mujeres víctimas de desplazamiento forzado con énfasis en violencias intrafamiliar y sexual*. Organización internacional para las migraciones, Misión Colombia, Bogotá, 2016.
- Ellerbeck A., *Red Tape or Repression? Ngos Fight for a Place in the New Bolivia They Helped Evo Morales Create*, Menio Park, Mongabay, 2015.
- Enloe C.H., *Bananas, Beaches and Bases. Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*, Second Edition, University of California Press, Berkeley, 2014.
- Espinosa Miñoso Y., *De por qué es necesario un feminismo descolonial. Diferenciación, dominación co-constitutiva de la modernidad occidental y el fin de la política de identidad*, «Revista Solar», 12(1), 2017, pp.141-171.
- Evans D.P., Shojaie D.Z., Sahay K.M., DeSousa N.W., Hall C.D., Vertamatti M.A.F., *Intimate Partner Violence. Barriers to Action and Opportunities for Intervention Among Health Care Providers in São Paulo, Brazil*, «Journal of Interpersonal Violence», 36(21-22), 2021, pp.9941-9955.
- Falk A.R., *Contending Approaches to World Order*, «Journal of International Affairs» 31(2), 1977, pp.171-198.
- Falk A.R., *Towards a Just World Order*, Routledge, Abingdon, 1982.
- Falquet J., *Las feministas autónomas latinoamericanas y caribeñas: veinte años de disidencias*, «Universitas Humanística», 78, 2014, pp.39-64.
- Farmer A., Tiefenthaler J., *An Economic Analysis of Domestic Violence*, «Review of Social Economy», 55(3), 1997, pp.337-358.
- Ferguson K.E., *On Bringing more Theory, More Voices and More Politics to the Study of Organization*. «Organization», 1(1), 1988, pp.81-99.
- Fórum brasileiro de segurança pública, *Violência doméstica durante a pandemia de Covid-19*, 16 de abril de 2020, in <https://forumseguranca.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/violencia-domestica-covid-19-v3.pdf>, consulted on 2/10/2021.



- Galtung J., *A Structural Theory of Imperialism*, «Journal of Peace Research», 8(2), 1979, pp.81-117.
- Gargallo Celentani F., *Femminismo da Abya Yala. Idee e proposte delle donne indigene dei 607 popoli di nostra America*, Aracne, Rome, 2017.
- Hampton R., Oliver W., Magarian L., *Domestic Violence in the African American Community. An Analysis of Social and Structural Factors*, «Violence against Women», 9(5), 2003, pp.533-557.
- Hansen L., *Gender, Nation, Rape. Bosnia and the Construction of Security*, «International, Feminist Journal of Politics», 3(1), 2000, pp.55-75.
- Haraway D., *Situated knowledges. The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective*, «Feminist Studies», 14, 1988, pp.575-599.
- Harding E., *Violence against Women in Colombia*, Unm digital repository, The University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, 1992.
- Heise L., *Violence against Women. An Integrated, Ecological Framework*, «Violence against Women», 4(3), 1998, pp.262-290.
- Hernández Castillo A.R., *The Emergence of Indigenous Feminisms in Latin America*, «Signs. Journal of Women in Culture and Society», 35(31), 2010, pp.539-545.
- Hill D., *Top Bolivian Ngo Facing Eviction. Given Just Days to Move Archive*, The Guardian, April 8, 2017, in www.theguardian.com/environment/andes-to-the-amazon/2017/apr/08/top-boli, consulted on 4/12/2021.
- Hooper C., *Manly States*, Columbia University Press, New York, 2001.
- Hudson H., *Doing' Security as Though Humans Matter. A Feminist Perspective on Gender and the Politics of Human Security*, «Security Dialogue», 36(2), 2005, pp.155-174.
- Hudson V.M., Caprioli M., Ballif-Spanvill B., McDermott R., Emmett C.F., *The Heart of the Matter. The Security of Women and the Security of States*, «International Security», 33(3), 2008, pp.7-45.
- Kirby P., *How is Rape a Weapon of War? Feminist International Relations, Modes of Critical Explanation and the Study of Wartime Sexual Violence*, «European Journal of International Relations», 19(4), 2012, pp.797-821.
- Lacombe D., *Los datos engañosos del Global gender gap report*, Mediapart, November 4th, 2014, in <https://blogs.mediapart.fr/delphine-lacombe/blog/041114/les-donnees-trompeuses-du-globalgender-gap-report>, consulted on 4/12/2021.
- Lagarde Y de los Rios M., *Para mis socias de la vida. Claves feministas para el poderío y la autonomía de las mujeres, los liderazgos entrañables y las negociaciones en el amor*, Horas y Horas la Editorial, Madrid, 2005.
- Landolfo C., *La violenza di genere in America Latina. Analisi di una delle maggiori piaghe sociali dell'America Latina*, «Mondo Internazionale 2020», in <https://mondo.internazionale.com/academy/la-violenza-di-genere-in-america-latina>, consulted on 2/10/2021.
- Lugones M., *Colonialidad y genero. Hacia un feminismo descolonial*, Ediciones del Signo, Buenos Aires, 2008.
- Lugones M., *Heterosexualism and the Colonial/Modern Gender System*, «Hypatia», 22(1), 2007, pp.186-209.



- Lugones M., *Toward a Decolonial Feminism*, «Hypatia», 25(4), 2010, pp.742-759.
- Maldonado-Torres N., *Thinking through the Decolonial Turn. Post-Continental Interventions in Theory, Philosophy, and Critique. An Introduction*, «Transmodernity», 1(2), 2011, pp.1-15.
- Manning J., *Becoming a Decolonial Feminist Ethnographer. Addressing the Complexities of Positionality and Representation*, «Management Learning», 49(3), 2018, pp.311-326.
- Matos C., *Feminist Media Studies across Borders. Re-visiting Studies within the Brazilian National Context*, «Journal of International Women's Studies», 20(2), 2019, pp.11-25.
- Mearsheimer J.J., *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, W.W. Norton & Company, New York, 2001.
- Medina Diuza D.L., Mosquera E.K., Sinisterra Flórez S.P., *Factores de riesgo que inciden en el feminicidio y las consecuencias que se evidencian en las familias*, Universidad Cooperativa de la Colombia, Bogotá, 2017.
- Messina J., Silva J., *Twenty Years of Wage Inequality in Latin America*, Policy Research Working Paper, World Bank Group, Latin America and the Caribbean Region Office of the Chief Economist, Washington, September 2019.
- Mignolo W.D., *Introduction*, «Cultural Studies», 21(2), 2017, pp.155-167.
- Mingst K.A., Arreguín-Toft I.M., *Essentials of International Relations*, Sixth edition, W.W. Norton & Company, New York, 2014.
- Miñoso E.Y., *Aproximaciones críticas a las práctica teórico-política del feminismo latinoamericano*, En la Frontera, Buenos Aires, 2010.
- Morgenthau H.J., *Politics among Nations. The Struggle for Power and Peace*, «Political Science Quarterly», 64(2), 1978, pp.290-292.
- Mountian I, Calvo-Gonzalez E., *Race, Class and Affirmative Action in Brazil. Reflections from a Feminist Perspective*, «Feminism & Psychology», 22(2), 2012, pp.240-248.
- Noot D., *Gender and Security: Redefining the 'State' and a Threat*, «E-International Relations», 2019, in <https://www.e-ir.info/2019/09/28/gender-and-security-redefining-the-state-and-a-threat/>, consulted on 6/8/2021.
- Paludi M.I., Helms Mills J., Mills A., *Cruzando Fronteras. The Contribution of a Decolonial Feminism in Organization Studies*, «Management & Organizational History», 14(1), 2019, pp.55-78.
- Paredes J., *Despatriarcalización. Una respuesta categórica del feminismo comunitario (descolonizando la vida)*, «Revista de Estudios Bolivianos», 21, 2015, pp.100-115.
- Paredes J., *Hilando fino desde el feminismo comunitario*, CDMX: Cooperativa el Rebozo, La Paz, 2013.
- Paredes J., *Hilando fino desde el feminismo indígena comunitario*, in Espinosa Y., *Aproximaciones críticas a las prácticas teóricas políticas del feminismo latinoamericano*, En la Frontera, Buenos Aires, 2010, pp.117-120.
- Paredes J., *Para descolonizar el feminismo: 1492 - Entronque patriarcal y feminismo comunitario de Abya Yala*, Editorial FeminismoComunitario de Abya Yala, La Paz, 2020.



- Peterman A., Potts A., O'Donnell M., Thompson K., Shah N., Oertelt-Prigione S., Vari Gelder N., *Pandemics and Violence against Women and Children*, «Center for Global Development Working Paper», 528, 2020, pp.3-45.
- Peterson V.S., Runyan A.S., *Global Gender Issues*, Second edition, Westview Press, Boulder, 1999.
- Peterson V.S., *Security and Sovereign States. What is at Stake in Taking Feminism Seriously?*, in Peterson V.S., *Gendered States, Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory*, Lynne Rienner Publisher, Boulder, 1992, pp.440-444.
- Pettman J.J., *Worlding Women. A Feminist International Politics*, Routledge, Abingdon-on-Thames, 1996.
- Prasad A., *Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis. A Critical Engagement*, Springer, New York, 2003.
- Quijano A., *Colonialidad del poder, eurocentrismo y América Latina*, Centro de investigaciones sociales, Buenos Aires, 2014.
- Rapporteur on the Rights of Women of the Inter-American Commission on the Human Rights, *Violence and Discrimination against Women in the Armed Conflict in Colombia*, 2015, in <http://www.cidh.org/countryrep/colombiamujeres06eng/I-II.htm>, consulted on 4/12/ 2020.
- Roesch E., Amin A., Gupta J., García-Moreno C., *Violence against Women during Covid-19 Pandemic Restrictions*, «Thebmj», 2, 2020, in online <https://www.bmj.com/content/369/bmj.m1712>, consulted on 3/10/2021.
- Said E.W., *Orientalism*, Vintage Books, New York, 1978.
- Sánchez R., *Feminismo comunitario: Una respuesta al individualismo*, «La Jornada», 225, 2014.
- Schiwy F., *Decolonization and the Question of Subjectivity*, «Cultural Studies», 21(2-3), 2017, pp.271-294.
- Segato R.L., *Patriarchy from Margin to Center. Discipline, Territoriality, and Cruelty in the Apocalyptic Phase of Capital*, «The South Atlantic Quarterly», 115 (3), 2016: pp.615-624.
- Skjelsbæk I., *Is Femininity Inherently Peaceful? The Construction of Femininity in the War*, in Skjelsbæk I. and Smith D., *Gender, Peace and Conflict*, Sage, Newcastle upon Tyne, 2001.
- Sokoloff N.J., Dupont I., *Domestic Violence at the Intersections of Race, Class, And Gender. Challenges and Contributions to Understanding Violence against Marginalized Women in Diverse Communities*, «Violence against Women», 11(1), 2005, pp.38-64.
- Staples R., *Masculinity and Race. The Dual Dilemma of Black Men*, «Social Issues», 34(1), 1987, pp.45-70.
- Thurston A., *The Disease is Unbelief'. Boko Haram's Religious and Political Worldview*, «Analysis Paper», 22, 2016, pp.27-54.
- Tickner J.A., *Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post-Cold War Era*, Columbia University Press, New York, 2001.
- Tickner J.A., Sjoberg L., *Feminism*, in Dunne T., Kurki M., Smith S., *International*



- Relations Theory. Discipline and Diversity*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2010, pp.196-212.
- Tickner J.A., *You just don't Understand. Troubled Engagements between Feminists*, «International Studies Quarterly», 41(4), 1997, pp.611-632.
- True J., *Feminism' in Theories of International Relations*, Palgrave, London Borough of Camden, 2011.
- UN Women, *The Shadow Pandemic. Violence against Women during Covid-19*, UN Women, 2020, in <https://www.unwomen.org/en/news/in-focus/in-focus-Gender-equality-in-covid-19-response/violence-against-women-during-covid-19>, consulted on 3/10/2021.
- Unicef, *Global Annual Results Report*, Unicef, New York, 2019.
- United Nations Development Program, *Policies to end Violence against Women in Latin America and the Caribbean*, Undp, 2017, in https://www.latinamerica.undp.org/content/rblac/en/home/library/womens_empowerment/del-compromiso-a-la-accion--politic-as-para-erradicar-la-violenci.html, consulted on 13/12/2021.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Unodc, *Global Study on Homicide. Gender-Related Killings of Women and Girls*, Unodc, 2018, in <https://www.unodc.org/documents/data-and-analysis> consulted on 5/02/2021.
- United Nations, *The World's Women 2015. Trends and Statistics*, Statistics division, Department of economic and social affairs, United Nations, New York, 2015.
- Walt S., *The Renaissance of Security Studies*, «International Studies Quarterly», 35(2),1991, pp.11-239.
- Waltermaurer E., Watson C.A., McNutt L.A., *Black Women's Health. The Effect of Perceived Racism and Intimate Partner Violence*, «Violence against Women», 12(12), 2006, pp.1214-1222.
- Waltz K., *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis*, Columbia University Press, 2001.
- Watson E., *Review of Women in the Front Line. Human Rights Violations against Women*, «The Australian Journal of Social Issues», 26(4), 1991, pp.308-310.
- Wibben A.T.R., *Feminist Security Studies*, Routledge, New York, 2011.
- World Bank, *Database on Gender Statistics*, 2016, in <http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/gender-statistics>, consulted on 2/10/2021.
- World Bank, *Going the Extra Mile. Empowering Indigenous Women Living in Mexican Forest Landscapes During the Covid-19 Crisis*, in <https://www.worldbank.org/en/results/2021/11/01/going-the-extra-mile-empowering-indigenous-women-living-in-mexican-forest-landscapes-during-the-covid-19-crisis>, consulted on 8/12/2021.
- World Health Organisation, *The World Health Report. Reducing Risks, Promoting Healthy Life*, Who, Geneva, 2002.
- World Health Organisation, *Violence against Women Prevalence Estimates*, Who, Geneva, 2019.
- Young I.M., *The Logic of Masculinist Protection. Reflections on the Current Security State*, «Signs. Journal of Women in Culture and Society», 29(1), 2003, pp.1-25.



- Youngs G., *Feminist International Relations. A Contradiction in Terms? Or: Why Women and Gender are Essential to Understanding the World “We” Live in*, «International Affairs», 80(1), 2003, pp.75-87.
- Zajicek A.M., Calasanti T.M., *Patriarchal Struggles and State Practices. A Feminist, Political-Economic View*, «Gender & Society», 12(5), 1992, pp.505-527.
- Zaniboni L.A., *Communitarian Feminism is an Action Based Way of Thinking. Interview with Julieta Paredes*, «FX Education Global Research», 10 September 2016, pp.121-124.

Received: 4/09/2021

Accepted: 27/12/2021

