



Author Series
July 29, 2011
Washington, DC

***Women & War:
Power and Protection in the 21st Century***

Dr. Kathleen Kuehnast
Director, Gender and Peacebuilding Center, United States Institute of Peace

Dr. Chantal de Jonge Oudraat
Director, Jennings Randolph Fellowship Program, United States Institute of Peace

Patricia Ellis: Good afternoon everyone and welcome. I'm Patricia Ellis, president of the Women's Foreign Policy Group. We're so pleased to see you. It's almost August, late July—it's really hot, and it's fantastic that you could all come out. We have a great group for a very interesting conversation coming out of this very interesting book, *Women & War*. Our two speakers are Kathleen Kuehnast and Chantal de Jonge Oudraat, and they both are currently with the US Institute of Peace. I'm just going to give you brief highlights of their careers so we can spend as much time as possible hearing from them and engaging in a conversation. Afterwards we have the book for sale and they'll be happy to sign it.

Before I actually start, I just wanted to recognize two WFPG friends and partners who are here: Sarah Craven, who heads the UNFPA office here, and Fred Tipson, who heads the UNDP office here, because I hope that as part of our conversation we will talk about the role of the UN, UN Women, interaction, coordination, and all the above. So we also have some diplomats here. Can they raise their hands? Okay, if you could just tell us who you are and which country you're from? Thank you.

Alexis Ntukamazina: Thank you, my name is Alexis Ntukamazina—I'm from the Embassy of Burundi.

Ms. Ellis: We're happy to have you. We want men here too; we don't just want women. Thank you, we're so glad you could come.

Mabel Gomez-Oliver: Hi, my name is Mabel Gomez-Oliver and I'm the Deputy Chief of Mission at the Embassy of Mexico.

Elise Crane: Hello, I'm Elise Crane from the State Department. I'm going out to my first tour in Uganda.

Tshire Kau: I'm Tshire Kau. I'm from the Embassy of South Africa.

Ms. Ellis: Thank you, thank you so much. And Diana, our Board member.

Diana Negroponte: I'm Diana Negroponte, and I'm a trustee of this organization.

Ms. Ellis: Thank you very much. We don't have time to recognize everybody, but because we're talking about an issue that crosses the whole globe I thought it would be nice to have a sense of some of the different countries that are represented.

In terms of the Women's Foreign Policy Group, for many of you who are not familiar with us, we promote women's voices, women's leadership on pressing issues of the day. And lately we've done

programs on Egypt, Libya, and women in the Middle East. We had an event with African women ambassadors talking about trade, investment, and women's empowerment. We also had a conversation with the Ambassador of Pakistan, who is not a woman, but who was interviewed by Karen DeYoung of *The Washington Post*. And I wanted to mention, and I hope some of you will be able to join us, next week we have an event on famine in the Horn of Africa, and we'll be briefed by Allan Jury, who heads the World Food Programme office here in Washington.

So I would like to now introduce our two experts and two of the co-authors of this book, *Women & War*. Kathleen Kuehnast is director of Gender and Peacebuilding, and she's had a long career in development and gender at places such as the World Bank where she spent a lot of time in the Asian Development Bank, etc. I'll let you get the rest of the details from the bio. And Chantal, who currently directs the Jennings Randolph Fellowship Program at US Institute of Peace. Chantal, I wanted to mention, comes out of the security community, while Kathleen comes more out of the gender and anthropology community, so this is a nice mix. Chantal has been at Georgetown, SAIS, and Carnegie. We do a lot of co-sponsorships and collaborations with other groups and this is the first time that we are working with our colleagues from the US Institute of Peace. We look forward to many more occasions.

Now clearly this is an issue that has engaged so many people, and this turnout is a recognition of the interest in the important work you've been doing, the administration's been working on, and the international community, particularly the UN, and so I'm glad that we have people representing these many different communities. Please join me in welcoming Kathleen and Chantal. [Applause.]

Kathleen Kuehnast: I want to say on behalf of the Institute of Peace and Tara Sonenshine, a friend and colleague of Pat, we are very happy to be here and we look forward to more opportunities where we can work together. I think we have very much in common and we hope today we can engage you. We don't only want your questions and answers; we want your ideas as well on the table. The way we're going to work this is that we tackled this book on two pillars: power and protection. Chantal, the security side of this partnership, is going to talk about power. As the more development side of the partnership here, I will be talking about protection. And so I'm going to turn it to Chantal first, and we'll pick up at the Q&A.

Chantal de Jonge Oudraat: Thank you Kathleen and thank you Pat. It's a pleasure to be here. We're going to keep our remarks fairly short so that we indeed have some time for discussion. What we thought we'd do is maybe I'll set a little bit the stage and the context of the issue of gender and women and war. Then we'll talk a little about this landmark Security Council Resolution 1325. Kathleen will talk also a little about the National Action Plans, and then we'll sort of end it up with what's next and what's next for the future.

In terms of context and to set the stage, the whole issue of women and war and of gender is actually a fairly recent issue, particularly in the security field and in the international relations field. And I must say to my chagrin, it remains an issue that is still very much on the margin, although we have made some strides in the last few years. The reason why this issue has been pushed on the agenda has to do with, I think, two issues. First is the changing nature of warfare, and second is a very small but very strong and active lobby of women and some men who really pushed this issue on the international agenda. And that cumulated in 1995 was the world conference on women in Beijing. Now when I talk about the changing nature of warfare, you know, it was the end of the Cold War. The predominant form of violent conflict is no longer about conflict between states, but it's really about conflict within states. This has led also to a gradual change in perspective of security issues, a perspective that turned a little bit away from a strictly military definition of security and is looking at security more through a human-security lens, looking more at non-military issues of security, and the whole notion of human security that focuses more on the individual and on the relationships between groups within societies. And I think this changed perspective of what it means, security, has also led to a greater emphasis on the whole notion of gender. Now, as I said, at the international level, the first real major boost was in 1995 with the world conference on women in Beijing. And I think, Pat, you were at Beijing—

Ms. Ellis: No, I was not, but I followed it very closely.

Dr. de Jonge Oudraat: Some of you might have been there and of course one person who was there as well and was a very strong voice was Hillary Clinton, our current Secretary of State. That conference was then followed five years later by this landmark resolution, 1325, adopted in the UN Security Council. As you know, the UN Security Council is the supreme organ of the United Nations, responsible for the maintenance and restoration of international peace and security. And the fact that in October 2000 it recognizes the importance of the role of women in conflict resolution, in peacebuilding, recognizes gender to be a key issue for conflict analysis is huge. The Security Council, sort of in the mid 1990s, started to take on more or pay more attention to non-military aspects of security, and this gender resolution is key. Now, there are two core interrelated ideas in this Resolution 1325. One has to do with gender equality. And that is really about power and, as Kathleen said, our book was really anchored around these two core ideas of the resolution: power and protection. Gender equality is about gender balance; it's about numbers; it's about the need to give women voice at policy negotiations.

The other key issue is gender sensitivity. And gender sensitivity is about protection. It is about the notion that the world's problems, solutions, look different depending on who you are, whether you're a man or a woman. It being understood in most societies, men and women have socially different constructed roles, and so it's this relation, it is this understanding that women and men might occupy different roles and responsibilities in societies, but also the realization that these roles and responsibilities can change over time, that they are not fixed. And gender sensitivity has been, I think, in the implementation of Resolution 1325, in our thinking, has been mostly connected to the protection side, to the notion that women in particular are stricken in a different way, in particular by violent conflict, and suffer more and in different ways. But in a way gender sensitivity also feeds back to the whole notion of gender equality and to the notion of giving voice to women.

Now last year we celebrated the tenth anniversary of this Resolution 1325 and a lot of observers were a little bit dismayed because they looked at the track record of this resolution and they said "Well, we haven't really advanced very much." I think one of the reasons why we hadn't advanced as much has to do with the fact that one year after this resolution we were struck with 9/11. I think the impact of these terrorist attacks and the impact of the war thereafter meant that security was again being defined in very military terms and we were turning away from this more sort of broader definition of security. And you could see it, I think, very clearly in terms of commentary on security issues, be it on TV, in the newspapers, etc. That said, and I think particularly in the last few years and in part because of the wars, that the US and their allies have fought in Afghanistan and Iraq, we've gradually come to realize that a strictly military perspective on these issues isn't going to help us very much and it's very interesting to see how actually the military has come to understand the importance of introducing gender perspectives in their thinking in particular when you're thinking about counter-insurgency issues and the military has come to this realization not only in terms of that it gets better intelligence, etc. but has really thought of—started to see this as a very interest-based and effectiveness-based type of issue. And I think it particularly in Afghanistan, to some degree in Iraq, but particularly in Afghanistan, the engagement of the female engagement teams has done an enormous lot for a change in perspective within the military.

Maybe I'll just sort of end up with this setting of the stage. The one issue I'd like to really emphasize is that when we talk about gender, it is really about the socially constructed nature of the relationship between men and women. And at the heart, this whole agenda about women and war and gender perspective is ultimately about how power is distributed within societies and what kind of access possibilities the different groups have. As we well know, and I think it's very clear in the recent report that was published by The World Bank and the development report, peace and security issues are very complex issues and I think the gender relationships within society are also very complex, and maybe we'll talk a little bit later about some of the complexities, in particular when we're dealing with non-Western countries. So let me turn it over maybe to Kathleen.

Dr. Kuehnast: Thank you Chantal. This is really exciting to be with such a knowledgeable group, as I look through the list of participants. What I really want to emphasize here, in picking up on what Chantal has been talking about, I'm actually "the glass is half full" when it comes to the UN Resolution 1325. I don't think we'd be sitting here today if somehow that policy mechanism was not set in motion. And I think what Chantal lays out is the particular context and certainly the hurdles we've had to overcome in the last decade, but I actually think that this arena is setting really the stage for major policy changes throughout many governments and certainly ours and I'm going to foreshadow now and I'll discuss it in a few moments.

The book really attempts to shed light on the gap between our international policy and the approaches and really the persistent obstacles that block women's potential roles in decision-making, especially around peace processes. I think of 1325—and by the way we have a little 101 tutorial on our website for those of you where this is a new idea—it's really about two things. One, we need to start counting women in war, not just as victims—and by the way, we don't count them. We literally do not body count women and civilians. We put this kind of term "civilians" so we really don't know what's the sex-disaggregated count. We need to put them in the perspective on all sorts of policies that women are now engaged as rebels, as legitimate soldiers, as peace-makers, as supporters to all sorts of violence and also as victims. But what we're trying to do is kind of shift our lens as you will or as Abby Disney says, "Take the lens out of John Wayne's helmet and start to look at war through the lens of women, because we are engaged in war." So that is the first part of 1325: recognizing all of these different roles.

The second part is really about getting women to be, helping them build capacity, to be a part of the decision-making processes when it comes to peace processes—not just the final signature, but all the way through the process. And that of course as you well know and you probably have seen the stunning summary of stats that the UN has put out, very few, less than 3% of the signatories on the last peace agreements since 1994 have included women at the table and very few, less than 16% even address issues of women.

Now, what is the problem here? Well, we think, and this is one of the premises of the book, unless women are part of the process, the chances of violence increasing or morphing will probably go up, and we are beginning to see evidence of that and certainly the world development report has started to show correlation between access to economic empowerment and lowering violence in these societies.

Now what we want to do in the book is really say three things; we need to start really putting money into research—research, empirical evidence. We are running around Washington right now as we develop a National Action Plan. We're about the 26th country in world by the way to engage in this National Action Plan process, which is a part of the 1325 mandate. We can't find quote "evidence" and in fact there is very little evidence. We think it's a good idea, but we need to start funding researchers, fellows and putting this on international relations agendas, anthropological agendas, foreign policy agendas, because it's necessary. We need to begin opening the aperture and seeing that women are a significant part of war and they play many roles. We need to call for sex-disaggregated data. The World Bank has only started to do this in the last really seven years in a consistent manner. We have a long ways to go in our own government. We have to start collecting the data as it stands. And it not only needs to be sex-disaggregated, but it has to be age-disaggregated, because women are a heterogeneous group. We know that roles and demands on time and certainly on the dynamics of their roles in society change with age.

We also have to see the agenda as a part of security equality. And this is where protection comes in. There has been good collection of evidence. We know that over 70% of IDPs [Internally Displaced Persons] in armed conflict are women and children. That's a lot—that's an enormous number. We also know that when women are part of security forces, it enhances civilian access to health, and yet in UN security right now 7% are made up of women. So, one of the thoughts that we propose, it's not enough to get women into security, we know from the work of women in international security, it's how to retain

women as a part of security forces. And so we support the idea of institutional changes. Women have been adapting but the fact is most societies around the world, women are still the primary caregiver, not only of the young, but of the elderly. And it is a big job to also take on these security positions which do not allow families to travel with them. So we have to look at institutional changes if we're really going to talk seriously about protection issues. We know the UN has women's forces from India, Nigeria, Nepal, Bangladesh; we need to expand this. So security equality is one of the ways to start looking at protection because when the conflict is over, violence does not end. What was public violence we know moves into private, domestic arenas. There is no end of violence; it keeps going on. And so part of beginning to look at the protection agenda is how we bring women also into the security forces and the police forces.

Now we know this whole sphere is highly contextual, very, very complex, and the book does not pretend to have all the answers. But I will give you an example of something that we're dealing with every day in our work at the Institute of Peace. And that is disarmament, de-mobilization, and re-integration [DDR]. Most of DDR has been framed and policies set-up with only the lens of men as soldiers carrying guns. But women play as many significant roles. We know especially in the research coming out of Africa, Sierra Leone, and Rwanda, children were recruited 50/50, boys and girls. We know that in Sri Lanka, girls were a key part of the forces. We must bring a gendered lens to our policies so that we make sure we have a more sustainable peace. We have to re-asses. We have to realign and we have to re-deliver on these types of policies. The key to ending violence is being able to address how conflict moves from a public domain to private spaces and recycles itself.

Gender is inclusive and policies must reflect this, not gender-neutral, as our last chapter Donald Steinberg, now second at USAID, talks about. He learned it the hard way in Angola. He was very proud of a gender-neutral agreement and in the end he realized anything gender-neutral is bad for women.

We have to start seeing also the fact that the flip side matters and this is something that I talk about a lot in terms of the DRC. The research that is coming out of the sexual violence in DRC is beginning to shed light on the perpetrators as also victims of sexual violence. This is the big secret in policy worlds is the number of boys and men who are sexual violated in conflict and out of conflict. And we have to start seeing the gendered continuum here if we're ever going to get our hands around the sexual violence and the use of it as a weapon of war in the DRC and other parts of our world, including most recently in Liberia. That is a big secret; it's something that we have to come to terms with when we really look at gender inclusivity.

So I'm going to close with saying that we can't do it alone. Women being aware, women being advocates have been fabulous formula but we're in the 21st century where war is happening at our doorsteps. It's not the 20th century; it's not the Cold War. We need men and women to begin to address these issues in their work, in their policy-shaping and in the policy-making. Peace itself is not enough to protect or empower women. Peace is a process and it requires both the awareness that war is a highly gendered activity and we must bring the lens to it. And I hope on those notes, we'll turn it back to Chantal for her future comments but thus give you an outline of the *Women & War* book.

Dr. de Jonge Oudraat: I think in terms of what is next and what's really on the agenda is of course first of all the implementation. We have now these ideas; we have a start of an awareness, although I think that we still have a lot of work to do in this field. We need implementation of our policy ideas. We also need more research and Kathleen was mentioning this. And in this respect maybe just to remark, you know oftentimes in policy discussions they say, "Well, we can't really do anything about this issue because we don't have the data and we need more research." And we should be careful that the pull for more research and more data doesn't become an excuse of not doing anything. I think we need to have a sort of double-pronged approach to this issue.

And there are some very counter-intuitive findings that we do find in some recent research. One of those findings is for example that after conflict has ceased, the death rate of women is actually

becoming bigger than during conflict, and those are astonishing types of results. I think we need to better understand why that is so that we can have policies that can deal with this type of issues. The types of issues I think we have to work on, it's a legal impediment to greater empowerment, there are cultural impediments, and maybe we can talk about that a little bit in the Q&A, particularly as it pertains also to the situation in Afghanistan, what is going on there with the reconciliation effort and are the women sort of being thrown under the bus in this effort. In what way local, regional, international norms help or are constructive of this agenda.

Ultimately, as I have said before, I think this is an agenda that is not just about structures and institutions I think we have a number of instruments available particularly at the international level, but ultimately this is a political issue. And it is about the distribution of power in societies and in that sense it is maybe a revolutionary issue but a very important issue.

Why should we care? We probably should start it with this very important question. The reason why we should care is because the way we've been doing things up until now have not been working. The statistics from the UN are very clear that a lot of these peace agreements break down within a period of five years, and one of the reasons is because not everybody in society has been consulted, brought in and implicated in the implementation of these agreements. I think we need to do it a different way. There are effectiveness arguments; there are sort of interest-based arguments. Some people might have moral arguments or an equity human rights-based argument. I think ultimately what really will sway a lot of the policymakers is the effectiveness argument that if we don't take account of 50% of population, we're not going to get good policies.

Dr. Kuehnast: And on that note I'll just say a few remarks about what is happening on the National Action Plan. On October 23, 2010, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton announced that the US would engage in developing their own plan of action on what is called "Women, Peace, and Security," another name for UN 1325. And over the last eight months, USAID, the State Department, and DoD have each individually engaged in cross-cutting dialogues throughout their agencies on key factors of what would go into national action plans and accountability measures. They have hopes that by early spring 2012—maybe around March 8th has been the new date that has been floated, International Women's Day—that these agencies would roll out an integrated plan of action. I will say that the Institute of Peace has been playing the role of convener for the US civil society organizations to make sure that civil society is part and parcel of this process since there are many civil society organizations that are on the ground in conflict zones with a particular eye toward women's issues and concerns. And they themselves have also been developing benchmarks in which these actions plans would be measured against. It is I think really exciting the feedback that we hear from other countries in the world that have already engaged in National Actions Plans. First, it's like about time, and second, we're really looking forward to what the United States says and does because that's really key right now—the deliverables and how this will be translated into our own policies.

And on that note I just wanted to underline something that Chantal said. And I think a surprise for both us, but the Department of Defense and the various militaries have been actually among the most proactive in seeking information, research, understanding, engagement about how all of this fits together. So I think its an important leadership role that the military is actually playing on this front of women and war. And we welcome all of the agencies' approaches and we now turn it over to you Pat and thank you very much for your attention.

Ms. Ellis: Well, that was great—fantastic. It really set the stage. [*Applause.*] I'm going to throw out a few different questions and then we'll get to the audience.

I was just at a conference where Bob Zoellick, President of The World Bank, was speaking and he raised the issue of data and he said that The World Bank has recently opened up—so much data that they had which was not accessible before. This is just a comment. That should hopefully be helpful

because they deal with the world and he also mentioned for all interested in this that in September they will be releasing a new report on gender and development.

Okay, so there are many questions I have. Since this is the Women's Foreign Policy Group, I'd like to talk about the role of women leaders because we've seen what an important role Hillary has played in putting these issues in center stage and I'm just wondering there are now more and more women heads of state, women foreign ministers, women ministers of defense, ambassadors, prominent women diplomats, do you see—I'm going to ask a few questions together—do you see a role for these groups to play both individually and together? And also ministers of defense are really key because Michelle Bachelet was minister of defense, and it's a real pathway to leadership before she became president and she thinks that that was really key, not only in her ascendancy but also to be able to interact with so many groups in society because she could understand the culture. So that's one question.

Of course, we're all interested and so pleased that there are a number of men here because so many of these discussions do not include men and the issue is how to get men—and there are plenty of men supporters—but really how to get the men really engaged and as you said the issues have always been on the sidelines: "These are women's issues, so we don't need to go. This is not about NATO, this is about refugees, women and other things." What is the strategy for that?

Recently we had Michelle Bachelet speak to us in New York. The UN has not only so many different parts of it working on these issues, but you have this great asset of this dynamic, accomplished, charismatic leader who wants to bring change. The question is, is there money that is going to come along to support all the great ideas and all the people that you know are committed to doing things such as Michelle Bachelet? And I guess one last question: coordination. I want to roll them in and this could launch off. I hope others are just going to jump in with your expertise in this.

Dr. de Jonge Oudraat: I'll just start off. The role of women has increased and I think we have really made some progress. And thanks to you, Women's Foreign Policy Group, thanks also to groups like Women In International Security (WIIS), and we've seen the enormous appetite for this type of networks internationally as well. So we've made some progress but just recently I think it was maybe last month ago *Foreign Policy* published this article about think tanks and how few women were actually in leadership positions in think tanks. You look at pay scales, even in a developed country like the United States, the pay scales remain very uneven. And I think the other issue is that you might have women at the top and you get more and more women at the top. You have women at the bottom, but then in the middle they disappear. And you know that has to do with the way work is organized; it has to do with family issues and the way that businesses be they private business or administrations, public business, are just not geared towards retaining that sort of middle group that you really need if you really want to make some influence.

Lastly, maybe on the money side, UN Women, Michelle Bachelet, they couldn't have picked a better person to lead this organization. She's a political animal and that is what you needed but the money side is of course worrisome. And particularly we look in Washington today, you look at the Hill and US Congress—money is tight everywhere. Now, I also would argue that in this respect, money might not necessarily be the greatest obstacle. I mean ultimately, this is also—

Ms. Ellis: Well, for the research you will need that.

Dr. de Jonge Oudraat: I mean, yes, you need that for the research. And these are small amounts of money we're talking about. Ultimately, it's really about political engagement of political leaders.

Dr. Kuehnast: Yeah, and I was going to first just comment. I think we are at a tipping point. It's taken generations, but there are women in key leadership roles around the world. A month ago we had Ellen Johnson Sirleaf talk at the Institute. And just to see her trajectory and some of the key policy arrangements she's putting in place, you know, you say "Okay, we have this. We've made great

progress.” Leaders are not enough. I mean, you need a lot of grass root efforts and we know that everyday people can make a difference.

But I think Chantal what said about this the void of the middle—I’ve already brought it up in terms of age. We can’t lose sight of what happens to women across the age cycle. I think this is critical and again, institutions have to adapt. Women have been adapting for so long that yes, half of them leave but there are institutional arrangements that can make the ability to stay in a career more possible for people who choose to have families or not.

The other thing we have to keep our eye on, and I’m an optimist here, is that women live longer than men and they are going to have money, because this generation of women have worked and they will put that money into things that make sense and I think will give back to society. So I think we should be especially in our financial institutions, I’d like to see as many financial institution men and women here as policy because we need to capture their imagination and I think it really is capturing imagination.

And on that note I just want to suggest to all of you and to your friends that beginning on October 11th, we’re going to take the book side and it’s going to be a visualization of women, war, and peace. Abby Disney, the producer who put out *Pray the Devil Back to Hell*, which has been its own revolution, is going to introduce a five-part series across the country on PBS at 10 p.m. for five consecutive Tuesdays. And for the first time, the camera will be in, I guess, the helmet of a woman or a peacebuilder but you will begin to see. Part of it is we need to visualize what does it all look like, because 1325 is terribly abstract, even with the few—

Ms. Ellis: It needs to be concrete.

Dr. Kuehnast: This will make into a new concrete conversation. So I hope, spread the word, we’ll have a lot of activity around that. But I say that as a very critical part of making this change happen. And you’re right; it requires funding to make this kind of film. It was very hard for Disney to convince PBS and their affiliates to carry five Tuesdays of women, war, and peace, and these are difficult hours to watch because what happens with women in wars is not pretty but they’re also hopeful stories on women’s account.

Ms. Ellis: That’s great. Well, we’re going to open it up for questions. A lot of people are here, so I’m going to take three questions together.

Dr. Negroponte: Diana Negroponte, both a trustee and from The Brookings Institution. My question, my focus is around the building up of constituencies. Obviously, we have very successful constituencies here but they are harder to form in many other countries. Now my comment. There are constituencies in Mexico who with the wonderful participation of Mabel’s girls succeeded this week in introducing a piece of legislation which makes the specific assault against a woman, the murder of a woman, the aggression of a woman a federal crime. This is in a country where the males have dominated the whole system. And this came as a result of a very strong constituency within Mexico, which sought and persisted over seven long years to introduce and get passed through the Congress this piece of legislation so Mabel could collaborate on it. My question is: what examples can you share with us, in countries other than Mexico and the United States, of the creation of these gendered constituencies focused on the issues that we’re discussing this afternoon?

Question: Stanley Kober. Quick question: how do you do negotiations with the Taliban?

Question: I’m Jillian Foster. I was recently discussing with someone this topic, and they said that conflict in war presents an opportunity for changing gender roles. I’m curious if you think that’s true or if you think that the gender participation, the participation of men and women in conflict, has always been there and we’re just now realizing it?

Ms. Ellis: And after you make your comments, if Mabel, you wanted to say anything about what Diana just raised?

Ms. Gomez-Oliver: What I would like to know is whether you see any perspective of taking this Resolution 1325 further? You have talked about civil conflicts, but we all know that there are other threats to peace and security in all regions of the world. [*Inaudible.*] It would be great if we could talk about these kinds of issues in the debates on international organized crime. I'm not talking only about drug trafficking, I'm talking about the illegal trade of weapons, human trafficking, all that kind of international crimes that are right now a global phenomenon. I think it would be great if we could talk further, and educate.

Ms. Ellis: So why don't we just start with those. We'll take the next round after that.

Dr. Kuehnast: Well, can I pick and choose here? I'm going to start with Jillian's first. I call this the "Chutes and Ladders" game of war and peace. You remember that game? Chutes and Ladders? I think it's so contextual how conflict really impacts gender roles. Sometimes it improves them, there is this window of opportunity where women have taken over by default because there are no men power and decision-making positions. But we see as many regressive examples as with Taliban, so I love the idea of putting a silver lining on conflict in war and somehow it opens up a space for women but I think the real question, and somebody else mentioned it, it comes to issues of rule of law, the fact is even though, and this came up in the Liberian president's remarks, 80% of agricultural work in Liberia is done by women. Women own 2% of the land. There's a big gap, okay? So, again, even with the best case scenarios—Liberia we think is kind of a success story—we have a long ways to go and so yes changing gender roles it takes huge amount of constituency at the bottom and at the top and sustained in the middle.

In terms of other examples, there are so many. And that is part of the missing story in our media. We need 20 of these books with fabulous stories like what just went on in Mexico. There is a problem again with finding the appetite for them but one example of course is Nick Kristof and his colleague, wife, *Half The Sky*. We see that everyday people are making major changes and can affect laws and changing identity. I wanted to say that there is a movement among youth in Uganda and some of the other Great Lakes region led by a group called Men Up that is really attempting to dispel that gender violence is a way to assert masculinity. It is challenging these really identity-formations that go on in every society about what makes me a man and what makes me a woman. And there are so many grassroots attempts to make those changes stick.

Dr. de Jonge Oudraat: Maybe a few brief remarks on conflict and war. Of course they change gender roles. What has happened though oftentimes is that okay the conflict is either in that state where everybody is tired or the conflict or is being forth into negotiations and then there are the warriors who are negotiating. Women are not at the table who had these changed roles. And the warriors come home and they take up their old roles. So the change that had happened during conflict and war is not being conducted afterward in the post-conflict situation. And in part because the international actors who've been very involved in a lot of these war and environments, settlements, have not been paying attention to these types of issues, so that's one.

In terms of constituency, it's very important and it's very important that the constituency is both female and male because only then can you move the issue forward and I think Liberia is of course a wonderful example although there the constituency was mostly female and the men had a hard time actually signing on to that. We've seen more recently in Côte d'Ivoire also women protesting but I think it only works if indeed men are engaged in this conversation.

In terms of other threats to security, yes, and I think a more gender perspective, a broader notion of security that includes drug trafficking, the role of illegal criminal groups that includes a focus not just on the state but on non-state actors will take more will pay more attention to these types of issues. And I

think conceptually, analytically we are there. I think the war against al Qaeda has sort of set us back some but I think we're back into broadening the aperture in part also for a lot of countries, these are vital security issues.

Lastly on the Taliban, I'm very pessimistic. And despite what political leaders may say here in the US or elsewhere, our immediate concern is how to get out of Afghanistan, it's the draw-down of troops, and I think women are just at the bottom of the agenda.

Dr. Kuehnast: I will say that Secretary of State Clinton now that she says that this is the end of her term, she has stepped up in nearly every day saying something about women in Afghanistan. It's important and we see it happening on the Hill with the Women's Caucus on Afghan Women, so there are political and policy mechanisms in motion but there's going to have to be something much more dramatic to make an impact. I just spent three days with Afghan women and they're very, very concerned, needless to say.

Ms. Ellis: Fred, do you want to say anything about what's going on on the ground? UNDP is involved in conflicts and follow-up to conflicts all over the world. You don't have to; I don't want to put you on the spot here or anything.

Fred Tipson: UNDP's role is generally in the early recovery phase after a natural disaster or a conflict, trying to make the transition from immediate relief to longer-term reconstruction development. It's become sort of a mainstream focus not only of our latest leader, Helen Clark, but I think it goes back to even Mark Malloch Brown that the whole role of women in these settings is so critical to longer-term improvement of conditions that it's fundamental to everything that we do and think about for the overall effect. I think that more and more, even despite the creation of UN Women, it's actually going to reinforce in the other agencies the focus on the role of women is, what they said they would be involved in. Whereas some people would say that UN Women sort of takes away from the other agencies this responsibility for emphasizing gender considerations, in fact it's actually going to highlight for the overall system the vital role, particularly because of the way Michelle Bachelet is going about collaborating with her colleagues and not just—

Ms. Ellis: Good news, collaboration.

Mr. Tipson: But first it helps to have people like Helen Clark, another very strong woman, leading some of the other agencies as well.

But I'm particularly struck listening to this conversation about the situation in Afghanistan and Pakistan because despite the best intentions of the outsiders, there are some fundamental cultural realities in both of those places that are going to make this challenge particularly huge and I know it's one of the biggest concerns that most of us have about how to withdraw from Afghanistan in a responsible way that we leave behind something better than what appears to be the case with respect to the role of women. I think it's probably the most risky exposure that we have in this withdrawal process, because we all know what the Taliban does and it's probably going to be even more reinforced if there's a wave of Taliban taking control in certain parts of the country. I don't suggest that that's what's going to happen, I still have some sense of optimism in at least certain parts of Afghanistan we can maintain some of the progress that's been made in some of these issues but clearly that's one of the big exposures.

Dr. de Jonge Oudraat: I would say also in terms of Afghanistan, you have had actually a fairly effective network of women in Afghanistan, but you've also seen particularly in the last elections that the women are not a heterogeneous group and they have different interests and there are some women who are basically mouthpiece for some of the warlords and then you have women who want to have a more progressive agenda. You have some divisions between women who come out of the capital elite, well-educated women in the countryside and you can't just gloss over these differences

that exist and that are real. And so it's a very complex and difficult situation but I'm not very optimistic about the end result and I think in particular as Kathleen said, listening to the Afghan women including women parliamentarians with whom we met late last year, they're not very optimistic about how the situation will be in the future. So I think there's responsibility on us to keep this on the agenda and to keep our policymakers with their feet to the fire.

Dr. Kuehnast: I just want to say something. This is the anthropologist in me. Nothing is more adaptive than human society. And I think we have to think about our framing that this is somehow a cultural embedded notion. Violence is a learned activity. The Taliban has learned to use violence as a very effective tool, not only against women but against men, against anyone they think is weak and they want something that the other group has. I think we have to be very careful with over-culturalizing the Taliban in the sense. The Soviets were in there in the '70s, there was a whole generation of women who were well-educated. All of that is to just say that adaptivity happens every day and violence may become a behavior in a society but it is not necessarily a culture per se.

Ms. Ellis: Let's go to some more people. I'm going to take people who have not made a comment or asked a question. We'll start right over here. If you could just raise your hands.

Question: My name is Josh Reiman; I'm from the Institute of International Education. I was wondering if you could speak a little bit about—in the international development field, dollars are also pretty limited and there's always a constant debate about where to allocate those dollars in the way of women's empowerment type of activities. I'm wondering if you could talk a little bit about the comparable impacts of putting money towards women's education, women political participation, being involved in the markets, civil society, and so on.

Question: I just had—it's more of a comment. I just wanted to follow up on your question. One of the things I've noticed has a really great impact and I think the US government should do more and more of this is scholarship programs for you people so that they study abroad and they can experience a difference culture. They are supported through their activism. That has had a great impact in societies that are very closed and do not support or encourage this sort of activity.

Ms. Ellis: Our colleague from South Africa and then Stephenie.

Ms. Kau: You are talking about Mexico and Liberia. I think you should tend more of your focus to South Africa. There's too much going on, on gender representation in South Africa. Across the racial line, across all government, private sector, business—the women—and it's being legislated. We even have a department of gender issues. We have a minister who deals with gender issues. I think you must go and find more about South Africa.

Ms. Ellis: And you've had a minister of foreign affairs—

Ms. Kau: Yes, foreign minister, minister of defense, so many ministers, the department of trade and investment there are two deputy ministers for the trade and investment. Women are represented in all sectors in South Africa. Even the first speaker of parliament was a woman.

Ms. Ellis: When you're looking for the examples, you need to have all kinds of examples and I think that's a very poignant point but you also are grappling with violence issues within the society. Could you address that as well?

Ms. Kau: Yes. There are legislations within South Africa—remember we're still a small democracy. So even violence against women and children is legislated. So that there are so many, it's just that—I can share information if I can just get emails so that I can get a sense of what South Africa is doing in terms of gender equality. Even in peace-making conflict negotiations, now they have started involving women. Like the negotiation in Zimbabwe, there's a woman who's part of the conflict mediators in Zimbabwe.

Question: Hi, Stephenie Foster. My question is, and I'm sure you address this in the book but I haven't read it yet, what do you think needs to be done in a very concrete way to ensure that more women are involved in peacebuilding, and not just as outside actors? Because clearly we've seen that that can have an impact on the process, but what kinds of actions do governments need to take and international institutions to ensure that women are at the table, because the UN statistics are appalling and we need to obviously build them up. So I'm curious from all the work you've done, what are the things that works and what can we push out and try to get more people and more governments to do?

Ms. Ellis: Can I just follow up on that? I mean, what are the first priorities where we can see progress, concrete progress, because I think that's very important. There have been lots of commitments, lots of strong support, but I think to encourage people even more, they're going to have to see some examples and get information that things are indeed changing. Yes, Tara?

Question: My name is Tara Lee, and I'm at DLA Piper, which is a law firm. My legal practice involves a lot of work in conflict areas and involves a lot of work in security companies. And I was wondering if you could talk a bit if there is data or if there is a way to measure the importance of women in peacebuilding systems, whether in private security or police forces. If that has happened, could you please talk about that?

Dr. de Jonge Oudraat: I'll start with your remark, Pat, on concrete progress. One of the things that struck me in The World Bank's [World] Development Report is the emphasis that development stabilization is a long-term process. You cannot have immediate results. Of course you want to have some low-hanging fruit and see that we are all on a road that made some progress but I think one has to realize this is a long-term investment of society and we need to accept that and it's going to be complex. We should not sort of you know put that aside.

Ms. Ellis: One idea I had was, for example, we just heard that there's a woman negotiating in Zimbabwe, I had never heard that. If we get this kind of information, make sure to get it out there for people to see that—

Dr. Kuehnast: That comment about media and platforms that allow for it because it isn't as interesting as war for many people, that's why the Disney five-part series—those are very concrete examples of progress. And I will tell you that, for those of you who have not seen *Pray the Devil Back to Hell*, which was about Christian and Muslim women in Liberia who came together to affect the peace process. That movie has had enormous impact on men and women in countries across the globe. Abby goes around and the stories alone that she hears about that impact, like if it could happen in Liberia, it could happen in Sri Lanka. There are stories out there.

Dr. de Jonge Oudraat: In terms of scholarship, I direct the fellowship program at USIP so you won't be surprised that I say, "Yes, yes, yes we need more money for that." [*Laughter.*] But that ties in also with your question, what do you think is most important. For me, it would be education, education, education. I think that is really key. Of course, there are a number of economic issues I think we should try to move away a little bit from the micro-lending type of issues. They have not always been very successful and have actually in some cases managed to keep sort of women in a little ghetto where they weave baskets and that's about it. So for me it would be education, education, education.

Dr. Kuehnast: I disagree. I think education is critical. I actually think we need more emphasis on higher education. I think we forget about higher education. We're beginning to actually make progress on elementary and tertiary but that higher education is critical. That's what we're hearing from Afghan women, that they want more opportunities to make a difference in that way. But I am really believing more on the entrepreneurial track and I don't mean microfinance, I mean really some new innovative approaches because women coming out of a war zone aren't—I mean, they have three to 10 kids. They have to feed them. They don't have the time to learn to read in many of these cases. They need

really opportunities and ideas and ways to tackle a very narrow corridor toward the other side and survive it. Security is first, and then beginning to build possible opportunities. But I think sometimes we are as Abraham Maslow says, if the only tool you have is a hammer, then everything's a nail. Education's important but when you're talking about different age groups, you have to look at different tools. And entrepreneurialism and innovation has to be a part of our repertoire in terms of development.

Ms. Ellis: Now what about women in security forces and the police?

Dr. de Jonge Oudraat: Well, I think we have some anecdotal evidence that it has been very effective, that the fact that you have this Indian battalion of police in Liberia has been very effective in then attracting women into Liberian security forces, including police forces. But for now the evidence is kind of anecdotal. We think it works; we've seen some data but there's no systemic really research on this issue and that is true for a whole bunch of other issues, including mediation when you get more women around the table what difference does it make? If you look at the issue of what's the impact of quotas in terms of civil servants, parliament. etc. I think there again it's often more complex than just let's put some more numbers toward it and that will solve the problem. And I think some of the research that is coming out is showing the complexity of social relationships within societies.

Ms. Ellis: I hope we've gotten to everybody's questions, comments. So we've come to the end of a great program and discussion. Thank you so much. These issues are so complex, they're so important, and we have to keep monitoring them and just want to thank you for your hard work on them and thank you all so much for coming, for your good questions. [*Applause.*]