Introducing Gender in Conflict and Conflict Prevention: Conceptual and Policy Implications[*]

Tatjana Sikoska and Juliet Solomon
INSTRAW

Introduction

Rather than diminishing threats to world peace, the end of the Cold War has brought about new and complex ones. The number of conflicts inspired by ethnic, religious and civil strife has changed the very nature of the modern security system based on the nation-state as both an actor and a guarantor of peace and security. Increasingly, individual security, particularly that of groups traditionally considered excluded from combat both as participants and targets, such as women and children, has become threatened. Today, it is claimed that approximately 75 per cent of all war-deaths are civilian and in part this is because they have become targets of war activities.[1]

The focus on threats to individuals compels us to also change our focus of the analysis of conflicts and the measures we use to prevent their violent eruptions. The changing conceptual and practical understanding of conflict – to include a variety of causes such as environmental degradation, violation of human rights, and bad governance – and consequently that of conflict prevention, management, and peacekeeping requires a change in perception of actors and instances of action. As the key issue in conflict becomes how to avoid and/or minimize its violent expression, many have suggested that new partnerships between traditional conflict prevention actors i.e., governments, and new conflict prevention actors i.e., civil society, would provide a more comprehensive and multi-layered framework for handling conflicts in their early stages.

Within this new approach to origins of conflict and conflict prevention, the importance of integrating women and gender in conflict and peace themes has risen, particularly after the Fourth World Conference n Women (Beijing, 1995), which called for increased access of women to conflict prevention and resolution[2] and raised the consciousness of the international academic and policy-making community about women's role in peace activism and in creating conditions of trust and confidence among conflicting parties.[3] Resolution 1325 (2000) of the United Nations Security Council reaffirmed that a gender perspective in conflict and conflict prevention and resolution would include measures that supported women's peace initiatives and indigenous processes for conflict resolution. It also stated that gender-sensitive initiatives should involve women in all the implementation mechanisms of peace agreements, and ensure the human rights of women and girls, particularly those related to constitutions, electoral systems, police and judiciaries.

As can be seen from the above, there has been both a shift and an interchangeable use of the terms "women" and "gender" theoretically and in practice in the analysis of conflicts and in prescriptions for their management and resolution. However, the implications of the distinction between "women" and "gender" are more than semantic ones; an analytical framework based on socially-assigned roles and identities to women and men is more useful in its application to given societal problems than the framework based on women alone. Hence, whenever gender is mainly relegated to women and to areas traditionally associated with women such as the household, children and community, the gender difference argument is neglected. As a result gender roles

---

and identities are excluded from conflict analyses and conflict prevention strategizing and implementation.

We argue in this paper that while it is important to include women into the analysis of conflict and in conflict prevention strategies, it is equally important to understand the impact of the gender difference argument on the origins and the dynamics of conflict on the one hand, and on the conflict prevention strategies on the other. But for that to happen, as Zalewsky points out, "it is not enough rhetorically and theoretically to 'add women and stir' [but we need to change] the empirical focus…[and] start questioning how belief and myths about gender play an important part in creating, maintaining and ending wars."[4]

This paper intends to explain why and how gender matters in the analysis of the origins of conflicts i.e., the analysis of the structural and the subjective causes of conflict, and in conflict prevention. It does so by proposing a framework for gender analysis that consists of three main components: causes of conflict; impact of conflict; and conflict prevention planning and implementation. But before elaborating on this, we will first briefly explain the conceptual and analytical aspects of gender and their implications for conflict prevention.

Why Gender in Conflict Matters?

Gender, as much as ethnicity, race, class or religion is an important determinant of individual and group identities. If conflicts are about different needs, interests and perceptions of needs and interests, then gender identity becomes an important determinant in creating, maintaining and ending violent conflicts and wars. But before we elaborate on some of the implications of introducing gender as analytical concept in conflict and conflict prevention, let us first briefly define gender. Gender is a concept that refers to a system of roles and relationships between women and men which are determined not by biology but by the social, political and economic context[5]. Gender can be seen as a "process by which individuals who are born into […] male or female become the social categories of women and men through the acquisition of locally defined attributes of masculinity and femininity".[6] To adopt a gender perspective is to distinguish between the naturally and socially constructed and in the process to renegotiate the boundaries between the natural-and hence relatively inflexible - and the social-and hence relatively transformable".[7]

As an analytical category, gender propels us to ask whether women and men as social and political agents are carriers of different and distinctive sets of values. And if so, how does this affect their role within society, their interests and needs, and their capacities to actively engage in diverse social, economic and political processes? It also propels us to adopt approaches that consider the factors rooted in the division of labour and power between women and men and inform us of their impact on the origins of conflict, on conflict dynamics as well as on conflict prevention. In practical terms, gender refers to patterns in which women are generally disadvantaged over men, which as we will see later, are very important for the analysis of root causes of conflicts.

Roughly, there are two major streams in feminist thinking that address these questions, each based on particular interpretation of the core determinants of gender identity. The essentialist gender theorists claim that behaviour, attitudes and values of women and men are different by nature. "This interpretation suggests that, throughout history, men and women have tended to do what they are naturally good at. Gender difference thus becomes a matter of nature rather than nurture. Consequently, the essentialist position conceptualizes gender identity and gender differences as a static entity: all men are masculine and all women are feminine.[8] According to this line of thought, the issue of gender and conflict is looked at through a simple dichotomy: men are the aggressors and perpetuators of conflict and women are victims, passive observers and

bearers of the social burden of societies torn by conflict. Consequently, women's potential in conflict prevention is largely seen in terms of their mothering role i.e., educating and raising children with peaceful attitudes and creating conditions for their protection. As Kaplan argues, "women are morally superior to men because they are inherently more peaceful and globalistic than men."[9]

The constructionist position argues that gender and gender identities are constructed rather than naturally predetermined.[10] Hence, gender identity is not fixed but constantly shaped by given historical and cultural processes and conditions. "It is very common, if not universal, in many contrasting social and cultural contexts, for the conceptualization of femininity to include some of the opposite qualities of masculinity: of seeking non-confrontational methods of conflict resolution; willingness to work for the good of the collective; and even passivity. Such qualities have clearly more potential for conflict resolution and peace-building, and there is a long tradition of identifying female qualities with a rejection of war and conflict".[11] On the other hand, men are socialized so as "egoistical [and] dominant behavior are common features of cultural definitions of masculinity, as is men's dominance over women at a general level".[12]

Within this stream of thought, the post-modernist feminist theories,[13] for example, strongly contest the essentialist arguments and focus their analysis on the dynamics between the social construction of individuals and the individual's construction of them. They clearly argue for a distinction between the concepts of 'women' and 'gender', whereas "women have to be defined as women. We are the social opposite, not of a class, a caste, or of a majority, since we are a majority, but of a sex: men. We are a sex and categorization by gender no longer implies a mothering role and subordination to men, except as a social role and relation recognized as such, as socially constructed and socially imposed."[14] The constructionist feminists claim that the difference in women's experiences from those of men, are due to the differences in access to material and symbolic resources resulting from patriarchy. This institutional system of oppression (the patriarchy) and the consequently developed inequalities between women and men create various conflicts at different social levels that invade all human and group interactions.[15] This last argument, as we will see later, is extremely important where the effectiveness of conflict prevention is concerned.

A Framework for Analysis of Conflict and for Conflict Prevention from a Gender Perspective[16]

In order to study and analyze the origins of conflict and conflict prevention from a gender perspective, it is essential to consider the following:

a) What are the roles, experiences, needs and capabilities of women and men in conflict;

b) What are the gendered aspects of the causes of conflict, both structural or macro and subjective or micro; and

c) What are the implications of these two perspectives for conflict prevention planning and implementation?

These three sets of interrogations will be addressed through a framework for gender analysis, which provides for:

- Analysis of the causes of conflict through profiling of gender aspects of access and control of material and symbolic resources, including those factors influencing access and control in the early stages of conflict;

- Analysis of the effects of conflict on traditional gender roles and identities; and

- Ensuring gender-sensitive conflict prevention policy planning by gender-specific risk and impact assessment.

Gender Analysis of the Causes of Conflict: A Gender-Sensitive Profile

Any conflict prevention policy and strategy should be directed at eliminating or reversing of the effects of the factors that cause violent and destructive conflict. But in order to devise gender-sensitive conflict prevention policies and strategies, we first need to understand or profile the particular conflict under examination from a gender perspective. To do so, we need to: analyze the specific relationships of women and men to those factors - material as well as symbolic - identified as causes of a particular conflict; to analyze the specific interests of women and men in that particular conflict situation as well as their perceptions of causes and opportunities for solution; and to identify the risks and opportunities for both women and men.

A brief overview of the most important modern theories of conflict and conflict prevention and resolution shows that they tend to neglect the importance of gender-specific relationships with and responses to different conflict factors. The behaviourist or micro theories of conflict, for example, claim that the root causes of conflict are in human nature. Individuals react to an external stimulus, translating individual frustration into a group reaction. Although there are different schools within this theory, they all take as a starting point the frustration-stimulus-response hypothesis and use this as a paradigm for the analysis of the individual within the wider social environment.[17]

Classical or macro conflict theories, to the contrary, tend to focus their analysis of the roots of conflict on the competition between groups for the pursuit of power and resources. They assume that humans are rational actors that make rational decisions, including ones related to engagement of human conflict. Schelling[18] has developed a conflict model which views conflict in its interdependency with cooperation and competition among different actors. That is to say, conflict occurs when competing group goals, objectives, needs or values clash and aggression, although not necessarily violence, results. Horowitz,[19] claims that "control of a state, and exemption of control by others are among the main goals of ethnic conflict." In ethnically diverse societies, ethnic groups claim power over a variety of issues such as development, education, health, land policy, etc., and each of these issues therefore become potentially the central focus of power games and manipulation by the competing ethnic groups.

Both micro and macro theories of conflict as well as the combination theories such as the Enemy System Theory[20] and Human Needs Theory[21] lack gender sensitivity in their analysis. Nowhere do they consider that human beings, apart from their ethnic, class, religious, etc., identities that determine their stake and action in particular conflict are also bound by their gender identity, and hence, have different stakes and activities in conflict and conflict prevention. That is to say that an entire dimension of analysis has been neglected by the non-recognition of the gender difference argument. The recognition of the gender difference i.e., different identities of women and men which are socially, culturally and historically constructed, would imply that their goals, objectives, needs and values are neither discounted nor assumed to be the same.[22]

As stated earlier, in order to see what are the stakes of women and men in particular conflict situation, any serious conflict prevention policy-maker or practitioner needs to undertake analysis of the conflict that will identify: a) the core causes of the conflict; b) different stakeholder needs, interests, perceptions of causes and solutions, etc.; and c) risks and opportunities. This could be done by applying the commonly used techniques in gender planning for development to the conflict situation. For example, when analyzing the causes of particular conflict, we need to ask the following questions: do women and men have the same access to and control of the disputed resource (territory, state, governance, human rights, economic power, etc.)? Do women and men have the same access and control over the factors that influence the particular state of access and control of the disputed resources (state creation, political decision-making; economic power; social and cultural norms; etc.)? Do women and men have the same interests in these resources?

Furthermore, as many feminist scholars have argued, women and men have different perceptions about the origins of the conflict and about their solutions.[23] Hence, distinguishing the gendered aspects of the main stakeholders in the particular conflict becomes very important. That could be done by asking very simple questions: do women and men have the same or differing perceptions of the causes of conflict and the opportunities for conflict resolution? What are the risks and opportunities involved in preventing violent eruption of that particular conflict given the gender specific interests, stakes and perceptions previously analyzed?

Some research that integrates such gender-specific questions into the analysis of conflict show the importance of it as in times of conflict different individual identities interplay and manifest themselves in a non-linear, and many times conflicting manner. It is not true that all individuals of a particular ethnic or religious group, for example, approach certain issues or factors that constitute the core cause of the dispute or conflict as frustration, nor do all of them react to the same stimulus with aggression and violence. Research on the pre-war conflict in former Yugoslavia[24] shows indeed the shortcomings of the frustration-stimulus theory of conflict. Bracewell notes that reactions to the spreading of nationalistic propaganda and rising social, political and economic tensions in former Yugoslavia were as much gender-biased as class and social status biased as well. Women adopted less aggressive approaches than men, who affected by the deteriorating economic and social conditions and in the face of the increased political competition for control of Yugoslavia, tended to identify with the nation and react with aggression and increased violence on the street and at home. Women, because of their traditional roles within the household, that is to say different level of access and control to the disputed material and symbolic resources, seemed better suited to develop coping strategies on a day-to-day basis, and hence, were able to adjust more effectively to the deteriorating social conditions.

The implications of undertaking gender-sensitive analysis of the origin of the particular conflict, the interests and perceptions of the stakeholders and the assessment of the risks and opportunities for conflict prevention are many. Since women, as a social group, are by and large excluded from this ownership and control of contested resources they have different perceptions of why certain conflict developed; how it should be handled, and what are the opportunities there to prevent its escalation and violent eruption. Such profiling of conflict through a gender-sensitive analysis would certainly help conflict prevention policy-makers and practitioners address more effectively the factors that influence unequal control of and access to resources by women and men which may be related to: general economic conditions (poverty levels, infrastructure, access to employment and employment benefits, etc,); nature of governance, socio-cultural and religious beliefs and norms; demographic factors, legal system and norms, etc.

Consequently, such analysis will also inform us that men and their traditional roles associated with their "public" life, (and hence developed institutions and structures of social organizations) should be challenged. Moreover, such analysis on the origins of a particular conflict would also enrich our understanding of the importance of individual *vis-à-vis* group identity, which could be important tool for risk and opportunities assessment when particular conflict prevention policy is planned.[25]

Analysis of the effects of conflict on gender roles and relationships

This component of the gender analysis framework of conflict for conflict prevention should help us understand what is happening to women and men during conflict and how their traditional roles and identities are being shaped and reinforced in order to sustain the newly developing social fabric under conflict situations. By doing this, the analysis of conflict could reveal how different conflict stages affect gender roles and relationships and how these in turn affect the dynamics of the conflict itself i.e., act as accelerators of the conflict. It also means explaining how

traditional notions of masculinity and femininity facilitate the transition from early stages of conflict to their violent expressions. If the main objective of conflict prevention is to avoid acceleration of conflict and prevention of its violent eruption, then gender analysis becomes an important tool in conflict prevention strategizing and prescription. As Enloe notes "when a community's politicized sense of its own identity becomes threaded through with pressures for its men to take up arms, for its women to loyally support brothers, husbands, sons and lovers to become soldiers, it needs explaining. How were the pressures mounted? What does militarization mean for women's and men's relationship to each other? What happens when some women resist those pressures?"[26] But also, what does it mean to men, for we know of many examples where militarization has forced men who do not wish to fight into exile or imprisonment.

It is commonly acknowledged that "war of all types creates militarized societies, and in many different cultural contexts, militarization is linked with masculinity- not as a socio-biological attribution but as a cultural construction of manliness'.[27] Research carried out in former Yugoslavia by Maguire[28] also shows that in the build-up to the war, the number of reported women victims of domestic violence committed by their fathers, brothers and husbands increased significantly and that violence occurred especially after TV programmes full of patriotism, national honor, and glorification of national history.

Pre-war patterns of gender-specific behaviour could help us observe better the warning signs of impending armed conflict. As Korac notes, "the first instances and control and violation of women's rights during the transition from state socialism to ethnic nationalism were restrictions on their reproductive freedoms."[29] The increase of violence and tightening up of traditionalist moral values accompanying the breakdown of political stability, economic activity and deterioration of social services, mostly fell disproportionately on women. Men, on the other hand, underwent a process of increased militarization and preparation for armed struggle.[30] As Yuval Davis, when analyzing the Israeli/Palestinian experience points out, "the more primordial the rendering of people and nation, the more are the relations between men and women essentialized. Women are reminded that by biology and by tradition they are the keepers of heart and home, to nurture and teach children 'our ways'. Men by physique and tradition are there to protect women and children, and the nation, often also represented as "the motherland".[31] In part this could explained by feminist analysis of similar situations that point out that "depressed wages and high unemployment among male bread-winners destabilizes relations in the family. Young men are at risk of being attracted or forced towards crime and militarism."[32]

In addition to the examination of the role of gender in the cycle of conflict, there is also a need to understand more clearly the effect of conflict on gender roles and relations. As we will se below, more and more research on women and conflict shows that "the consequences of conflict have been contradictory, offering opportunities for rupturing patriarchy through women's self-awareness, empowerment and emancipation, while at the same time, reinforcing patriarchy through greater subordination of women."[33]

At the early stages of the conflict in former Yugoslavia a process of reassessment of gender roles in the family and in the society took place. Women's working role, established under the socialist system, has been violently attacked by the proponents of nationalism. A return to a "womanhood" that would safeguard the survival of the nation implied that women should reassert their reproductive and caring roles. A symbolic connection between the mother and the nation was reinforced in order to legitimize the idea of the national community as the most natural part of the patriarchal gender and kinship relations. But also, to reinforce the view that motherhood is not only the primary role of women but is their patriotic duty as well. As Bracewell argues, this shift towards more patriarchal gender roles required a questioning of progressive socialist policies towards women, such as the right to abortion, work, divorce, etc.[34] The predominance of women's reproductive gender role in all of the political discourses in former Yugoslavia has also brought

about a primacy of national interests over individual interests. The needs and interests of individual women, and men for that matter, should be subordinate to those of the nation.

Such nationalist discourses and policies directed at women and men in the early stages of the Yugoslav conflict served many political purposes. First, nationalist politicians used the ideas related to the primacy of the family, the importance of motherhood and the survival of the nation as a way to distinguish themselves from the former socialist politicians, thus gaining credibility with voters. Second, sending women back to the household also served the economic needs of the former Yugoslav republics, by reducing the labour surplus and transferring costs of caring back to the women and the family. And third, reinforcement of patriarchal gender roles was also used by politicians as a mechanism for the installment of law and order in times of disintegration of the previous system.[35]

"Accounts of war, through news reporting, government propaganda…tended to cast men as the 'doers' and women as passive, innocent victims... As we have come to know more of the whole range of different women's experiences, it has become clear that there are many different ways in which women live through wars: as fighters, community leaders, social organizers, workers, farmers, traders, and in many other roles."[36] Some conflict situations provide many examples of how have women intervened in war activities (Ethiopia, Somalia and Sudan) in order to create peace opportunities among warring factions of men.[37] Women have also engaged in activities aimed at preserving the social fabric through different forms of community organization and welfare provision (Burundi, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Rwanda). Others have openly stood up against war and destruction by risking their lives and opposing the regimes responsible for war and destruction (Israel/Palestine and Yugoslavia,).[38] Many of these experiences were new for women, and "in some wars, many women found that, even in the midst of the horrors of conflict, there were moments of liberation from the old social order. As the need arose for them to take on men's roles in their absence, so they had to shake of the restrictions of their cultures and live in a new way. […] they were able to persuade their political movements to take seriously the demands of women for improved rights, and to accept women's political representation in the post conflict situation. The allocation of places for women on the local resistance Committees in post-1986 Uganda is a good example, with the establishment of a Ministry for Women also being common."[39]

Yet, not all conflict situations result with such positive balance for women. In the case of the former Yugoslavia, at the "resolution" stage of a conflict, patriarchal gender relations were being reinforced and institutionalized, thereby resulting in deterioration in the status of women despite their "emancipated" role within the conflict (for example taking on the traditional male responsibilities in the absence of the men or actually taking part in the conflict as combatants).[40] In Algeria, Eritrea, Mozambique, Namibia and Zimbabwe, and other places torn by conflict and war, the situation for women has become worse in post conflict situations. As Pankhurst notes, "The challenge to gender relations often becomes too great for patriarchal societies to maintain in times of peace, and women find their historical contribution marginalized in both official and popular accounts of war, and their freedoms in peacetime restricted or removed."[41]

Gender sensitive conflict prevention planning and implementation

Having explained the importance of a gender sensitive analysis of the causes of conflict and the linkages between gender and conflict, it is time to also explain the implications of these to gender-sensitive conflict prevention planning and implementation. A gender-sensitive profile of the origins of the particular conflict and a clear understanding of the effects of the conflict on the gender roles and relationships will enable policy makers and conflict prevention practitioners to integrate them into the planning process so as to inform the choice of objectives in particular

conflict prevention exercise; and to inform the strategies to be used for their achievement as well as the instruments for conflict prevention implementation.

If the idea of conflict prevention is to anticipate the sources and signs of conflict and act early, the tools for doing so are many and varied: early warning, dialogue between conflictive parties, use of media for education; monitoring; mediation and use of good offices; preventive deployment of troops, and so on. The challenge we face is how these multiple tools and actors can become gender sensitive, gender responsive, and ensure overall conflict prevention effectiveness? One possible way of facing up to this challenge is to introduce gender-specific risk assessment and impact assessment exercise in conflict prevention planning and implementation. Gender sensitive risk assessment implies asking how much a given conflict prevention policy strengthens traditional gender identities and inequalities? How much will such policy be able to change the relationships of women and men with the conflicting resources without creating further conflicts?[42]

Impact assessment, on the other hand, should tell policy-makers and practitioners how a particular conflict prevention strategy impacts change in the access and control of resources and the factors that influence such control and access. Indicators, such as those aimed at measuring the economic and political empowerment of women could be used to measure this, thus provide important guarantee for gender sensitive conflict prevention. Examples of such indicators could be: the extent to which given conflict prevention action has facilitated access and control by women and young girls to basic social and economic assets; the extent to which conflict prevention has brought about greater autonomy and political empowerment for women; the extent of increased female employment; increase of women in political decision-making; and so on.

Conclusion

A gender-aware analysis of conflict opens up the possibility of changing gender roles in conflict and post-conflict situations, as violent conflicts and wars tend to challenge gender relations A gender analysis suggests that social norms about masculinity strongly influence the prevalence of, and tendency towards, the violent expression of conflict in many places. Conflict prevention therefore should challenge these norms as a way for creating conditions for long-term peace. Gender analysis also suggests that women are not only passive victims in conflict situations but tend to perform different activities and have different stakes and interest in the given conflict. These should be seriously taken into consideration in the analysis of risks and opportunities for prevention of that particular conflict. Yet, conflict prevention should also promote norms that will bring about a change in the status of women in society as well as norms that meet women's needs in conflict and post-conflict situations.

A GENDER ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

FOR CONFLICT PREVENTION

CONFICT PROFILE ANALYSIS

- CAUSES OF CONFLICT
- STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS
- RISK AND OPPORTUNITIES

ANALSIS OF CYCLE OF CONFLICT AND EFFECTS ON GENDER ROLES AND IDENTITIES

- IDENTIFICATION OF GENDER-BASED IMPACT OF CONFLICT;
- IDENTIFICATION OF GENDER-BASED CONFLICT ACCELERATORS

CP POLICY PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT

- **Objective**
- **Strategies**
- **Instruments**
THROUGH

CAUSES OF CONFLICT

- ACCESS AND CONTROL OF MATERIAL AND SYMBOLIC RESOURCES AND MEANINGS;
- FACTORS/CONDITIONS THAT INFLUENCE SUCH ACCESS AND CONTROL

STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

- INTERESTS OF WOMEN AND MEN;
- PERCEPTIONS OF CCAUSES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR SOLUTIONS

GENDER AWARE RISKS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR CONFLICT

RISK ASSESSMENT

- HOW MUCH A GIVEN POLICY STRENGTHENS TRADITIONAL GENDER IDENTITIES AND INEQUALITIES?

Impact assessment

- **CHANGE IN ACCESS AND CONTROL OF RESOURCES**
- **INDICATORS**: economic and political empowerment of women

Notes

1 Skjelsbaek, I. and Smith, D. 2001. "Introduction", in *Gender Peace and Conflict,* Sage Publications: London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.

2 "In a world of continuing instability and violence…the equal access and full partic ipation of women in power structures and their full involvement in the prevention and resolution of conflicts are essential for the maintenance and promotion of peace and security." Platform for Action, Beijing, 1995.

3 An illustration of this is the fact that for the first time in its history, the United Nations Security Council held a two-day open meeting on 24-25 October 2000 to consider the issue of women, peace and security. During the discussion, an overwhelming number of speakers stressed the need to include women in every aspect of peace-building initiatives, specifically calling for their involvement in decision-making processes. On 31 October 2000, The Council unanimously adopted resolution 1325, which called on all actors involved in negotiating and implementing peace agreements to adopt a gender perspective and take into account the special needs of women and girls during repatriation and resettlement, rehabilitation, reintegration and post-conflict reconstruction.

4 M. Zalewsky. 1995. "Feminism and War: Well, What Is the Feminist Perspective on Bosnia?" *International Affair*s, Vol. 71, No. 2, p.347.

5 INSTRAW. 1996. *Gender Concepts in Development Planning: A Basic Approach.* INSTRAW: Santo Domingo.

6 Kabeer, Naila. "Gender, Development and Training: Raising Awareness in Development Planning", Paper presented at National Labour Institute/Ford Foundation Workshop Gender Training and Development. Bangalore.29 November – 6 December, 1990. *GADU Newspack, Nu.14.* Oxfam. Oxford 1990.

7 Kabeer, Naila. *Ibid.*

8 Skjelsbaek, Inger. 1997. *Gendered Batterfields. A Gender Analysis of Peace and Conflict,* International Peace Research Institute (PRIO): Oslo.

9 Gisela Kaplan. 1997. 'Comparative Europe: Feminism and Nationalism: The European Case', in Lois, A. West, ed., *Feminist Nationalism.* Routledge: London.

10 For more information about social constructionism, see Viviene, Burr. 1995. *An Introduction to Social Constructionism.* Routledge: London.

11 Byrne, Bridget; Marcus, Rachel; and Power-Styvens, Tanya. 1996. 'Gender Conflict and Development: Case Studies'. *Bridge Report, No. 35.* IDS, Brighton, University of Sussex.

12 Byrne, Bridget. 1996. 'Towards a Gendered Understanding of Conflict'. *IDS Bulletin, No. 27 3,* IDS. Brighton, University of Sussex.

13 Post-modernist fe minism influenced by French thinkers such as Michael Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Jean-Francois Lyotard and others, made significant shift from analyzing women's position in the world of work and the sexual division of labour to the analysis of identity cons truction, including issues of hegemony, culture and representation.

14 Joan Kelly Gadol. 1986. 'The Social Relations of the Sexes: Methodological Implications of Women's History', in *Women, History and Theory,* University of Chicago Press: Chicago.

15 For more on issues of construction of gender identities in relation to given power structure and the consequent conflicts and struggles against and/or for hegemony, see for example: Seyla Benhabib. 1994. 'Democracy and Difference: The Metapolitics of Lyotard and Derrida, in *The Journal of Politica Philosophy* 2, No. 1. January, and Michelle Barret and Anne Phillips, eds. 1992. *Destabilizing Theory.*Polity Press: Cambridge.

16 See schematic representation in Annex I.

17 Social Learning Theory for example, cla ims that humans react to frustration by aggression because they have learned through their socialization to respond to individual or group frustration by aggression. The Social Identity Theory emphasizes the need of individuals to create a group identity in opposition to or different from that of the other groups.

18 Thomas Schelling.1960. *The Strategy of Conflict,* Harvard University Press: Cambridge.

19 Donald Horowitz. 1985. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict* University of California Press: Berkley 1985.

20 According to Vamik, the Enemy System Theory is based on the central hypothesis that "humans have a deep rooted psychological need to dichotomize and establish clear distinction between enemies and allies." D.V. Vamik. 1990. "An Overview of Psychological Concepts Pertinent to Interethnic and/or International Relationships," in D.V. Vamik, J. Demetrios and J. Montville, eds., *The Psychodynamics of International Relationships: Volume I: Concepts and Theorie*s, Lexington Books: Lexington. The identification with

particular ethnic or national group determines how we relate to people within our own group as well as to those of the other groups. However, the relationships between two groups are, in turn, determined by their historic relations as well as by their needs, interests and actual control of power and resources.

21 The Human Needs Theory, claims that in conflict situations, human beings are compulsively struggling in their respective environments to satisfy their basic needs: security, identity, recognition and development. See J. Burton. 1991, "Conflict Resolution as a Political System," in D.V. Vamik et al., eds., *The Psychodynamics of International Relationships: Volume II: Unofficial Diplomacy at Work*, Lexington Books: Lexington.

22 Women, for example often have cross-cutting concerns which unite them as a group across conflict lines such as those of ethnicity or religion. One example of this is the Northern Ireland Women's Coalition (NIWC). A non-sectarian, broad-based coalition of women of all political and religious persuasions, constituted in 1996 and managed to get two delegates elected as representatives to participate in the Northern Ireland Peace Talks. In their own words they represent "the perspectives of women in the home, in business, trade unions, community groups, voluntary sector, education and all walks of life. They are Protestant, Catholic, Unionist, Nationalist, Republican and Loyalist *(NIWC Website at http://www.niwc.org).*

23 As Birkoff argues, much research on conflicts in the workplace suggests that women and men have different interpretations of the origins of disputes and dispute handling mechanisms, and the outcomes of resolution processes were also interpreted differently. There also seems to be gender difference in situations of emerging conflicts in the interpretation and perceptions of vulnerability and empowerment. Pre –conflict situations often create conditions in which women lose the social structure that enables them to feel secure, and hence they tend to experience increased vulnerability, while men experience the societal changes in conflict situations many times as an opportunity for empowerment. As a result, men strengthen their traditional attitudes and exercise increased control and oppression of women at home, on the streets and in the community at large. See J. Birkoff. 1999. "Gender, Conflict and Conflict Resolution," in *Advanced Mediation Training,* The Mediation Center, Inc, (available on the Mediation Center Website).

24 See among others W. Bracewell. 1995. "Mothers of the Nation," in *War Report*, Bulletin of the Institute for War and Peace Reporting, No. 36, London; and M. Korac. 1998. *Linking Arms: Women and War in Post-Yugoslav State*s, Life and Peace Institute: Uppsala. 25 By risks, we refer to analysis of how much a given conflict prevention policy (with its strategy, objectives and instruments) strengthens traditional gender identities and gender inequalities. This is an important issue to be considered when conflict prevention policies are designed so that they can bring about women's empowerment and change of the unequal social relationship between women and men, and hence deter the impact of it to the root causes of conflict and its dynamics.

26 Cynthia Enloe. 1993. *The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold Wa*r, University of California Press: Berkeley, p.250.

27 Donna Pankhurst.2000. *Women, Gender and Peacebuilding.* Working Paper No. 5. Department of Peace Studies, University of Bradford, Bradford. p.11.

28 S. Maguire. 1998. "Researching a 'family affair': Domestic Violence in Former Yugoslavia and Albania," in C. Sweetman, ed., *Violence Against Wome*n, Oxfam Publications: Oxford.

29 Korac, op.cit.

30 Korac, op.cit.

31 Nira Yuval-Davis . 1997. *Gender and Natio*n. Sage Publications: London. Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.

32 Cynthia Cockburn. 1999. "Gender Armed Conflict and Political Violence', paper presented at a Workshop on *Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence,* The World Bank, Washington DC. 33 Yakin Ertürk 1997. "From the Cold War to the Hot Peace," in INSTRAW: *Women and Human Settlements in the Conflict Zon*e, Proceedings from a Round Table at the Second United Nations Conference on Human Settlements, Habitat II, 1996, Turkey, p.27.

34 Bracewell, op.cit..

35 Bracewe*ll,* op.cit..

36 Pankhurst, op.cit.

37 Tsehai Berhane-Selassie. 1994. 'African Women in Conflict resolution', in *Center Focus, No.* 120, March. Pankhurst, op cit.

38 Dona Pankhurst, ibid.

39 Pankhurst, ibid.

[40] Croatia is a particularly important example of this where the end of the conflict with Serbia and the "normalization" of the Croatian state brought about a reinforcement of traditional values. Women, especially those associated with anti-war and pro-democratic activities have been increasingly exposed to pressures and violations of their human rights by the current regime.

[41] Pankhurst op.cit.

[42] Change of access and control of resources between women and men i.e., the power relationships between them, is many times accompanied by conflict that manifests itself in different forms, but mostly by increased violence against women.