

International Studies Perspectives

Volume 8

Issue 3

August 2007

POLICY

Surge, Escalate, Withdraw, and Shinseki: Forecasting and
Retro-casting American Force Strategies and
Insurgency in Iraq Andrew J. Entertine,
J. Michael Greig

State Building and Transitional Politics in Iraq:
The Perils of a Top-down Transition Katia Papagianni

Perfect Allies? The Case of Iraq and Al Qaeda Navin A. Bapat, Daniel Ertley,
Chansonette Hall,
Mark Lancaster

Applying Analytical Methods to Study Terrorism Todd Sandler, Walter Enders

PEDAGOGY

Causation, Counterfactuals, and Critical Reading
in the Active Classroom Brian Ripley

ISP Pedagogy Forum: Mainstreaming Gender into the IR Curriculum

Introduction Charli Carpenter

Teaching Complexity with Gender Jamie Frueh

Gender in the IR Textbook and Beyond Joshua Goldstein

Teaching Gender in International Relations Julie Mertus

Teaching Gender and International Relations Joel Oestreich

Two Steps Forward, One Step Back? James Richter

Gender and Personal Pedagogy: Some Observations Laura Sjoberg

Conclusion and Rejoinder Charli Carpenter



Blackwell
Publishing

Published for the International Studies Association by Blackwell Publishing

In addition to the scant attention to men's gender among scholars, few male scholars study gender. Most research in the field of gender studies is about women, and most scholars in the field are women. This is an intractable issue because we should not want men's gender ignored and male scholars remaining ignorant about gender, but neither should we want men to come into gender discussions and dominate the talking (as I have observed) nor a watering down of the long-overdue focus on women in IR.

Many of these issues pop up in the IR field at large, and in broader academic contexts, so they are not unique to the production of a textbook. In particular, the question of segregating/concentrating feminist discussions or integrating/sprinkling them widely occurs in many contexts. In International Studies Association conferences, for instance, is it better to have a set of panels devoted to feminist theory and gender studies—allowing scholars in that subfield to interact more closely but giving those outside the subfield a free pass to ignore gender issues? In edited volumes, is scholarship really served by the common practice of devoting one chapter to women and gender while few if any of the other chapters (especially those authored by men) ever consider the impact of gender on their arguments? In IR classes should we give a week to women and gender or try to bring up gender here and there in a syllabus not explicitly acknowledging gender as a main category? These are challenges we will continue to grapple with in trying to mainstream gender in the IR curriculum.

Teaching Gender in International Relations

JULIE MERTUS
American University

What are "feminisms" and how might teaching them contribute to IR pedagogy? For the field of international relations, feminisms contribute both a methodology and a deep normative critique. This piece argues that teaching gender analysis as critique is an indispensable pedagogical tool and outlines three means by which it might be mainstreamed into IR teaching.

Keywords: gender, feminism, international relations, teaching

What are "feminisms" and how might teaching them contribute to IR pedagogy? For the field of international relations, feminisms contribute both a methodology and a deep normative critique. "While the crux of the term 'feminist' is method," Katherine Bartlett explains, "there is a critical aspect of feminist method that is substantive in nature. Feminist method works from a hypothesis which, in its simplest terms, boils down to something like this: the circumstances of women are unjust in significant respects and ought to be improved" (Bartlett 1999:34).

Each strand of feminism offers its own particular critique. The liberal feminist, for example, draws on the traditional themes of liberal theory, stressing the importance of individual rights, the rule of law and other supportive institutional mechanisms. While additional themes appear more prominently in other strands of feminism, feminists share the central concern that the approach to IR "as it should be" must be responsive to women, reflect their experiences, and seek to transform their lives in a manner that recognizes individual agency and corrects disproportionate power imbalances (Slaughter and Ratner 1999:416). Of course, feminist critiques are more nuanced and varied—but my point is that it is an important line of inquiry that draws attention to issues that would otherwise be unaddressed.

As an educator however, I argue we cannot stop with the critique. It is the combination of feminist methodology and normative critique that makes liberal feminism so useful in analysis and problem-solving. Feminist methodology includes personal experience as its theoretical starting point, narrative, contextual reasoning and multi-perspectivity. Although feminists remain interested in the exercise of power at the "top" of the international arena, we understand world events by listening to local narratives and drawing lessons from "below." Thus, instead of focusing on such "big" actors and structures at the "top"—like NATO, the United States, the Yugoslav Army—in my own work I look at the "little" actors and structures at the "bottom"—village women leaders, grassroots anti-conscription organizations and shoestring humanitarian efforts (e.g., Mertus and Goldberg 1999 and Mertus 2003). Unlike some of my peers, I am interested

not only in applying my assigned theory to an abstract but also in examining how specific local actors use or resist the theory. My inclusion of local actors sets my courses somewhat apart from many of my peers'. It is different, not necessarily better, both in content and in methodological approach.

For my students, I identify three feminist approaches to international relations. The first approach, which I term "equality feminism," looks for the ways in which women are "invisible" in international relations analysis, unless, that is, they are "like men" and play male roles. The explanation for this problem has been articulated variously as: (1) "men run the world," thus, there simply are few women in the kinds of positions that matter in international relations; (2) there are women who should be made visible, but men run the field of international relations and they will not or cannot see women; or (3) women have been there in the international relations landscape all along, but their role has been undervalued and, thus, overlooked. The most simplistic international relations policy prescription furthered by feminism has been characterized as "add women and stir," the notion that inclusion of females satisfies feminist demands for equality. In other words, all we need is more women everywhere, but in particular, in decision-making positions in the space identified as public.

The second feminist approach moves beyond "adding women" and finds that the orienting assumptions of international policy analysts—their very way of being in the world—is distorted in a manner that privileges men. Marysia Zalewski has observed that the issues deemed important and relevant in international relations, assumptions about who and what counts and how the game is played, reflect the interests of the powerful (i.e., the masculine) while the less powerful (i.e., the feminine) are pushed to the margins (Zalewski 1995:350). The explanation for this problem of ontology is the use of a "male" or "masculine" lens that accepts differences as natural and overlooks the deeply embedded impact of patriarchy. "That there are these differences (between men and women) is undeniable," Zalewski urges, "but what really matters, in terms of effects on people's lives, is how these differences are interpreted and acted upon" (Zalewski 1995:344). The use of a gender perspective thus "can be used to challenge dominant assumptions about what is significant or insignificant, or what are central or marginal concerns" (Steans 1998:5). As Spike Peterson has pointed out, a gender-sensitive ontological status would encourage analysis of the impact of state-condoned "public" violence on violence within families and, conversely, the influence of identities and values fostered in family life on the existence of "public" violence (Peterson 2000:18).

The third feminist approach finds that the dominant approach to understanding international problems is distorted by an epistemological orientation that relies on a set of inadequate claims about the world. The typical top-down analysis focuses on states, sovereignty, security, power, and conflict and overlooks individuals, social movements, cooperation and human relations. At the same time, the significance of these constructs in relationship to women's subordination is obscured. The explanation for the shortcomings, Ann Tickner has asserted, is that "[k]nowledge constructed in terms of binary distinctions such as rational/emotional, objective/subjective, global/local, and public/private, where the first term is often associated with masculinity, the second with femininity, automatically devalue certain types of knowledge" (Tickner 2001:133). The mere adoption of a gender perspective will not correct the epistemological bias. The political nature of the construction of knowledge must be interrogated and challenged. The goal of this more radical gender analysis would be to transform epistemological orientations and in so doing uncover and challenge sites of power and domination and expose and challenge the apolitical nature of methodological assumptions (Hirschmann 1992). Through my classes, I try to expose my students to each of these approaches and to encourage them to speak in their own voice.

References

- BARTLETT, KATHARINE T. (1999) Cracking Foundations as Feminist Method. *American University Journal of Gender, Social Policy and the Law* 8:31–50.
- HIRSCHMANN, N. (1992) *Rethinking Obligation: A Feminist Method for Political Theory*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- MERTUS, JULIE. (2003) Shouting From the Bottom of the Well. *International Journal of Feminist Politics*. 110–128.
- MERTUS, JULIE, AND PAMELA GOLDBERG. (1999) A perspective on Women and International Human Rights after the Vienna Declaration: The Inside/Outside Construct. *Journal of International Law and Politics* 26:201.
- PETERSON, V. S. (2000) Rereading Public and Private: The Dichotomy Is Not One. *SAIS Review* 20(2):11–28.
- SLAUGHTER, ANNE-MARIE, AND STEVEN R. RATNER. (1999) The Method is the Message. *American Journal of International Law* 93:410–424.
- STEANS, J. (1998) *Gender and International Relations*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- TICKNER, J. ANN. (2001) *Gendering World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- ZALEWSKI, M. (1995) What Is the Feminist Perspective on Bosnia? *International Affairs* 71(2):339–356.