

Feminist International Relations After 9/11

JAN JINDY PETTMAN
Director of Centre for Women's Studies
The Australian National University

THIS ARTICLE SEEKS TO UNDERSTAND feminist international relations theory through the lenses of 9/11 and the war on terror. In times of national crisis and international violence, women and gender often disappear from view. Feminists, including IR feminist experts, are rarely asked to comment on large-scale organized violence. At first glance, 'hard' masculinity and militarism appear to be unlikely sites for feminist examination, however, feminists do have a lot to say about these forms of international politics. This article aims to demonstrate how gender is an essential component of the relations and reactions reviewed in the readings of 9/11 and the war on terror.

85

Feminism is a complicated and contested project. It sits uncomfortably with older theoretical Social Science models of international relations because of its explicitly normative stance. The feminist movement's links to the many manifestations of the women's movement and to everyday gender politics further differentiate it from these Social Science models. IR appeared as a 'gender free zone' for some seventy years of its disciplinary history. Born in the immediate aftermath of World War I, it was charged with understanding the causes of war and peace and coincided with a vibrant and visible international peace movement highlighted by women's voices and experiences. These voices included sophisticated and passionate analyses of the causes of war and conditions for peace. For example, the 1915 Hague Peace Conference drew together over 1,000 women from the states involved in World War I, who urged a very different peace settlement from the one imposed through Versailles. They founded the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), aimed at tracing the links between war, nationalism, masculinity, and violence.¹ Other imagined futures were also circulating, including the writings of Rosa Luxembourg and other international social-

JAN JINDY PETTMAN is Professor and Director of the Centre for Women's Studies at the Australian National University

Copyright © 2004 by the *Brown Journal of World Affairs*

ist feminists, for whom imperialism and the nature of the capitalist expansion lay at the heart of the cause of war. But international relations theory chose different ways to work. Its exclusions and inclusions were inevitably constitutive of the disciplinary territory. These concepts were accepted as crucial to *the* authoritative reading of world politics, power, and peace.

The so-called “third debate” and its recent offspring and relations have been challenging the territorial disciplinary boundaries of IR for decades. This is particularly true through a range of critical and post-positive positions, of which feminism is one.² These positions lack clear boundaries. Feminism itself is often pluralised to indicate its divisions over both the difference it makes to be male or female, and how gender figures into other dimensions of power and identity.³ However, what feminism does bring to IR is a clear understanding that both IR and the world politics that provide IR’s rationale are already gendered. Feminists also argue that our intellectual competence extends well beyond ‘women’s issues’ and those marked by conspicuous gender; indeed, feminists argue that gender is constitutive of both international politics and the discipline.⁴

Feminists in IR are nurtured by developments both within critical IR⁵ and within feminism in its other disciplinary homes. Feminism is by nature and politics interdisciplinary, so neat borders cannot contain it—a tendency that leads some IR colleagues to suspect disciplinary disloyalty, even before any particular analysis unsettles their territory. Feminism as a political project is informed by and informs political struggles inside and outside the academy. Feminism has had an impact on other aspects of international politics, such as the UN and international media, as much as it has on IR.⁶ The last decade was remarkable for a series of international conferences that culminated in the 1995 women’s conference at Beijing. This process saw the elaboration of detailed and documented analyses of women’s economic, political, social, and cultural rights and constraints. It also saw the development of an international conceptual and political language to advance claims and a transnational women’s movement that lobbied, mobilized, and built links between the national and the international. This transnational movement is a reaction to and an aspect of intensifying globalization.⁷

The series of international conferences in the 1990s were, in part, a response to the end of the Cold War and to international agency attempts to figure out the new international landscape. However, challenges to which feminism was forced to respond, analyze, and confront marked the decade. In quick summary, women and feminist struggles (along with other democratic struggles) were caught up in a pincer movement of globalization and fragmentation. Globalization and especially its neo-liberal market manifestation have had severe gender impacts, affecting and often devastating women’s lives and family livelihood, and drastically reducing political space for making claims against the state.⁸ Increasingly exclusivist political identity movements produced ‘new

wars,' mostly in non-western states, but with deep western implication, as with the global arms trade.⁹ Women were and are crucial to these identity movements, in ways already well documented by feminists, particularly those who tracked the cultural reassertions that were at the heart of more virulent identity conflicts and the "new wars."¹⁰ These studies placed feminist IR in a strong position to draw on and to contribute to understandings of nationalism, militarization, war and peace, identity conflicts, and religious fundamentalisms. In addition, this work positioned feminist IR to grapple with its symbiotic relations with the global political economy and other aspects of globalization, including global militarism. These features were already evident in the Yugoslav wars that began in the early 1990s, and were dramatically transposed into the heartland of global power and economy on 9/11.

A FEMINIST POSITION ON VIOLENCE AND WAR

Two illustrations become especially relevant to the argument below. The first is the international campaign against gender violence. The UN Decade for Women and international conferences in the 1990's provided a forum for women's international networks and non-governmental organizations to publicize these issues, with many state leaders and media present. They also provided the space for NGOs to develop their strategies, knowledge and contacts. These in turn supported the legitimization of the problem of violence against women as an international issue.¹¹ In applying the emerging language of women's rights to human rights, this campaign led to the 1993 UN General Assembly Declaration opposing Violence against Women. It also supported the demands for a focus on gender and war in the Balkan and other wars in the 1990s. From the moment of this declaration onwards, women and armed conflict were incorporated into the international agenda. One outcome was a Security Council Resolution in 2000 that insisted on the importance of involving women at all stages of peace negotiations and reconstruction. This Resolution amounted to gender mainstreaming in UN policy although its implementation is still very uneven on the ground.¹²

The traffic between feminist academics, practitioners, and activists has proven highly productive and has been a reality check that insists that everyday women's experiences be factored into the international account.¹³ However, conversation is still not entirely congenial in feminist politics and in the different work cultures of universities, INGOs, government consultants, and activists. While there were significant outcomes in international political forums on the whole, feminists were still not seen as contributing useful knowledge to IR in the post Cold War world. Challenges to IR feminists along the lines of 'So what is the feminist position on Bosnia?' exemplified a common IR response.¹⁴ Marysia Zalweski responded to this challenge with a survey of feminist

JAN JINDY PETTMAN

interventions in questions of identity, nation, and militarism, tracing gender in the construction of war as well as making women visible beyond their usual stereotypical and symbolic uses in war.¹⁵ This is an example of feminists telling ‘a different kind of war story’ that takes us deeper into the politics of violence and the practice of peace.¹⁶ Feminists were well prepared, then, to recognize crucial dimensions of 9/11 and its likely after effects.

A FEMINIST POSITION ON 9/11 AND THE WAR ON TERROR

9/11 is a condensed symbol of spectacle, loss, and grief; it calls for retribution and a dramatic refiguring of international politics. Those lost and those who suffered losses in 9/11 experienced shocking violence, replayed many times in the living rooms of homes across the globe. While responses to terrible loss are not always or inevitably violent, in this case grief turned to, or was turned to, official retaliation and revenge literally overnight.¹⁷ Military reaction, indeed war, was chosen as if there were no alternatives. Dissent became difficult and penalized in the face of military security and war talk. IR feminists recalled Carol Cohn’s critical reflection on strategic security language, including “how gender discourse affects the quality of thinking” and “stops thought”.¹⁸ She asks “[w]hat is it that cannot be spoken?”¹⁹ Feminists and others have since closely examined the discourse around 9/11 and the war on terror in similar terms.

88

In an early response to this crisis, Ann Tickner asked, “What can a feminist analysis add to our understanding of 9/11 and its aftermath?”²⁰ She demonstrated that feminists do have some very important things to say regarding the gender of identity, violence, and war, and specifically developed these insights in relation to 9/11 and Afghanistan. Likewise Hilary Charlesworth and Christine Chinin²¹ began their commentary with the claim that ‘concepts of sex and gender provide a valuable perspective on these devastating actions’.²² Both articles noted the apparent disappearance of women in the violence and what followed, as men—hijackers, rescuers, national security officers, and media commentators—filled our screens and newspapers.²³ “September 11 and its repercussions have appeared, then, to be all about men attacking, saving lives, and responding through further attack,” which seems normal.²⁴ Substitute 19 women hijackers, commentators, and leaders, and a different scenario develops.²⁵ So too women, let alone feminists, were not seen as authorities having anything to add to the analysis. For example, according to the *Guardian* survey of almost 50 opinion pieces in the *New York Times* in the first six weeks after the attack, only two were by women.²⁶

It is quite wrong however to suggest that gender had disappeared or even that women were not present. Women appeared in ways long embedded in the gendered war story. They appeared alongside men as victims and relatives of victims of 9/11.

Quite quickly Afghan women also appeared as victims of the deadly Taliban regime. They figured in a familiar guise, as symbols of difference, of Otherness, as border guards of the boundaries between Us and Them, marking their culture/religion, lack of civilization, barbarity, and unreformed religion.²⁷ They were utilized in the equally familiar rescue romance, an international triangle: our men setting out to rescue their women, from their men. The myth of protection foists upon men responsibilities of soldiering and on women the function of being those for whom men must fight, underlining men as agents and women as passive pawns in international politics, regardless of what individual men and women are doing. These gendered civic

The myth of protection foists upon men responsibilities of soldiering and on women the function of being those for whom men must fight, underlining men as agents and women as passive pawns in international politics, regardless of what individual men and women are doing.

identities also legitimize the military solution as a humanitarian, indeed progressive intervention. As many feminists, Afghani and international, pointed out, this was too easy a discovery of outrage and too sudden a conversion to the rights of Afghan women as “rights of convenience.”²⁸ In a disconcerting twist, the plight of Afghan women was highlighted after 9/11 by Laura Bush and Cherie Blair, wives of the primary war leaders, as if it was a “women’s issue” or auxiliary aspect rather than a human rights or human security issue. Why not before? Why not now? Why not in other states hostile to women’s rights, for example in Saudi Arabia?²⁹

“[T]he worry about Afghan women has become a battle cry of the West only after 9/11. It never prevented the United States in the past from supporting the Taliban against the Soviets or for them to support now the Northern Alliance forces that have been similar in their approach to women’s rights. Significantly, in the Western discussion on the post-Taliban government in Afghanistan there is constant mention of the West insisting on multi-ethnic participation in this government as a precondition for establishing democratic rule in Afghanistan. However, there is virtually never any mention let alone insistence that the women of Afghanistan would constitute part of this political process.”³⁰

Despite the 2000 UN Security Council Resolution stressing the importance of including women in peace negotiations, and the Bonn Agreement on Afghanistan which called for the participation of women, only two women were included in the interim administration. At the same time, a meeting of Afghan women in Brussels issued a Proclamation which called for gender justice across a full range of issues, beyond those

usually labelled women's.³¹ In Iraq, only three women were appointed to the post-Saddam interim council. Once again, participants stressed ethnic and regional diversity as issues of representation. But they largely ignored the most general aspect of democratic participation, that of the presence of women of each ethnic, regional and political grouping. Meanwhile, the brief Allied governments' courting of RAWA (Revolutionary Association of Women of Afghanistan), a feminist group strongly advocating women's rights in Afghanistan and Pakistan, elapsed when they proved ungrateful, political, and critical of both Taliban and other women's rights abusers in the region, and of U.S. led bombing and invasion.³²

While at first crowded out in the mainstream media and politics, international feminist responses to 9/11 spread quickly through email, the internet, and feminist journals and newsletters. An early feminist IR response to 9/11 and the declaration of the war on terror was an invitation from the editors of the *International Feminist Journal of Politics* to the journal's international board members for their thoughts.³³ A number of themes and claims emerged, which exemplified feminist 'takes' on violence and war while addressing international politics in general.

First is the refusal of dichotomies, an explicit rejection of Bush's 'Either you are with us or you are with the terrorists,' and of the sum-zero approach that dominates mainstream IR approaches to security and power. Dichotomies and binaries have long focused feminist attention as artificially restricting vision and foreclosing options, and as allowing for partial and inaccurate readings of the complexity and mess of multiple, shifting identities, and of international power relations in general.³⁴ In the former Yugoslav wars, for example, rapid political moves to enforce nationality and ethnicity as the primary identity, including on women/feminists, were refused by peace activists. Cynthia Cockburn's careful response to NATO bombing of Serbia includes the observation: 'another casualty of this war, right now, is the willingness to live with ambiguity and contradiction, to say "not this (not ethnic cleansing), but not that (bombing) either."³⁵ A recurrent thread through feminist responses to 9/11 is 'not this (terrorism) and not that (the war response) either.'

In the wake of 9/11, international feminists once again critiqued war talk, the privileging of 'security' understood in statist terms, and the military solution. They asserted the need for contextualized and nuanced accounts that try to make political and ethical sense of any international confrontation. Feminist commentaries repeatedly called for situated and multifaceted analysis. V. Spike Peterson referred to "learning strategies," which include contextualizing events, identities, and policies and actions, with a series of questions to facilitate these searches.³⁶ The group, working under the name Transnational Feminists, provided further examples of how to contextualize in relation to 9/11.³⁷

Feminists in IR routinely ask questions that are not usually asked in the discipline. They also attempt to listen to voices excluded from IR's evidence and resources. In so doing, feminist responses brought another powerful dimension lacking in much mainstream IR, and in western readings of 9/11, by internationalizing the account.³⁸ As a discipline, IR has long been U.S.-dominated, and therefore shaped by U.S. strategic and global interests and attention.³⁹ IR feminists often draw on networks and affiliations with other international feminists, and pay attention to women's voices in transnational forums and circuits, recognizing that these are always partial, and situated, including for many of us, only communicating in English. These links have widened substantially through the emergence of e-mail and the Internet as key tools in transnational feminist and women's organizing. Always acknowledging the horror and loss of 9/11, these were placed alongside other dreadful and violent losses to other people in other places. These responses also reclaimed the international identity of 9/11, rejecting the appropriation of the tragedy as only "American," that ignored the many other nationalities among the victims.

Feminists resisted the ways that 9/11 and its aftermath privileged the military solution and deployed 'women' in the war story as a method of legitimization.

Such moves, meant to complicate, internationalize, and gender the account, relate to long-held feminist anxieties about the "unitary masculine actor" problem in IR that "turns a complex state and set of forces into a singular male opponent."⁴⁰ This personification of enemy states makes their demonization easier. It also facilitates America's translation into victim/redeemer, reproducing bounded state identities that suppressed connections across and divisions within the different player states. Such constructions unleashed competitive masculinities into action: hence the 'hard masculinity' privileged in the dominant national/alliance mode.⁴¹ Feminists resisted the ways that 9/11 and its aftermath privileged the military solution and deployed 'women' in the war story as a method of legitimization. Feminists pointed to the use of women in the culture wars that lurked within the war talk, and shored up the binary Them vs. Us yet again.⁴² They also resisted the effect of masculinized responses in removing women as agents of knowledge. This in turn prompted the constant reassertion 'not in our name,' lest women's plight/danger became grounds for masculinized action yet again.

International feminists have long critiqued the cycle and cost of violence, and now critique the dramatic privileging of hyper masculinity and the prerogative state after 9/11. These effects were felt well beyond those aspects of foreign policy related to Afghanistan and then Iraq. They include highlighted surveillance and curtailment of civil liberties in the name of homeland security and increasing intolerance and division

JAN JINDY PETTMAN

within those homelands. These forms of repression made 'saying no' even more dangerous, and difficult, within the United States especially.⁴³

POST 9/11 AND THE WAR ON TERROR

9/11 did not change the world for feminists. The terror attacks and their aftermath forcefully demonstrated, anew, crucial feminist insights into international politics and war. They activated bounded and binary international identity politics in which both women and gender played a central part, in representation and legitimation. They authorized military action in ways that typified gendered civic identities and responsibilities. They effectively excluded other ways of knowing, of doing, of being in the world. They replayed the usual close associations of nationalism, war, and masculinity, and generated competing masculinities and stigmatized femininities. They also disrupted and damaged the slow uneven moves towards the incorporation of some feminist concepts into international politics and policy making.⁴⁴

9/11 and the war on terror brought to the forefront those aspects of globalization related to militarization. They staged the return of the prerogative state, always understood by feminists to be a gendered state, to the center, and further militarized aspects of national security, intelligence and immigration too.⁴⁵ They reminded us that earlier talk of the demise of the state had never applied to the high politics long favored in IR.


92

FEMINIST IR FUTURES

9/11 and its aftermath did not silence feminists or transnational women's analysis and action for a more peaceful world. Feminists do have important things to say about these post Cold War times. Their critiques reveal that war is not natural or inevitably a part of interstate relations – it has to be made afresh each time. Nor are the international and national identities whose boundaries mark the killing lines natural or inevitable. And gender plays a constitutive part in the making and reproduction of identities and war. This analysis does not stop at deconstruction or at clearing space for new thinking and action. There are many feminist lessons, strategies, and understandings developed in war and conflict fields that offer alternative courses of action. These ideas have been tested in severe conditions of organized violence, identity difference, and hurt.⁴⁶ Why then is feminism so fiercely resisted, both within IR and at times of national and international crisis and violence?

Feminism is not without its difficulties and dangers. Beyond the obvious exhaustion that results from working constantly against the grain, confronting power relations where challenges to existing gender relations and gender scripts threaten the iden-

tity and interests of the more powerful, feminists are also caught in potentially deadly dilemmas involving women's rights and relations amongst women. While difference is much attended to in feminism, both in terms of difference between men/masculinity and women/femininity and amongst women, it remains volatile and tricky. International feminists have learned, often the hard way, about power and identity differences between women too, becoming acutely aware of issues of location, situation, and privilege.⁴⁷ Early on, some IR feminists took race, culture, and colonialism into their accounts. Now feminist post-colonial critiques respond to the recent intensification of 'cultural reassertion' and reactionary political religion.⁴⁸ These critiques underline how dangerous 'culture' can be to women, especially in its contemporary political mobilizations. Now, culture and religion circulate as key, and always gendered, markers of identity. Feminists face the challenge of respecting cultural difference while not becoming complicit in culture's uses of women; nor abandoning those women who politic for women's rights against national and international hostility or disinterest. In this context, international feminists seek to devise and sustain modes of practice beyond another false binary: 'civilization'/Western superiority vs. cultural relativism.⁴⁹

In the wake of 9/11 feminists have much to contribute to the account. Still it seems especially difficult for feminists to be heard, including in IR. Indeed, the very features of international conflict, including the gender politics which feminists identify as shoring up militarization and state right, work against feminist voices and gender justice. 

NOTES

1. Linda Gordon, "The Peaceful Sex? On Feminism and the Peace Movement," *NWSA Journal* 2, 4 (1990): 624-634.

2. L.H.M. Ling, "Feminism in International Relations: From critique to Reconstruction," *Journal of International Communications*, 3, 1 (1996): 26-41; J. Ann Tickner, *Gendering World Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001).

3. Gender is also a contested term, including among feminists. Here I deploy it at its simplest, as the cultural construction of what it means to be male, or female; and gender relations as power relations in which the masculine is routinely privileged. See also Sandra Whitworth, *Feminism and International Relations* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1994).

4. Whitworth, *op cit.*, Jan Jindy Pettman, *Worlding Women: a feminist international politics* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996); V. Spike Peterson and Ann Sisson Runyan, *Global Gender Issues*, 2nd edition (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1999).

5. While feminist IR is frequently characterised as post-positive, there is a growing field of empirical studies, and more that utilise and extend feminist theory in situated and particular case studies. Tickner, *op. cit.*, 2001.

6. Jan Jindy Pettman, "Critical Paradigms in International Studies: Bringing it all Back Home?" Frank Harvey and Michael Brecher (eds.), *Critical Perspectives in International Studies* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002).

JAN JINDY PETTMAN

7. Deborah Stienstra, "Dancing Resistance from Rio to Beijing: Transnational Women's Organizing and United Nations Conferences, 1992-1996," in M. Marchand, and A.S. Runyan eds. *Gender and Global Restructuring*. (London: Routledge, 2000) 209-244; Catherine Eschle, *Global Democracy, Social Movements and Feminism* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2000); Mackie, Vera. "The Language of Globalization, Transnationality and Feminism." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 3, 2 (2001): 180-206.

8. Marchand and Runyan, op. cit.; Shirin Rai, *Gender and the Political Economy of Development* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002); Jan Jindy Pettman, "Gendering Globalization in Asia through Miracle and Crisis," *Gender, Technology and Development* 7, 2 (2003) 171-187; Jill Steans, "Gender Inequalities and Feminist Politics in a global perspective" in Eleonore Kofman and Gillian Youngs eds *Globalization: Theory and Practice* (London and New York: Continuum, 2003).

9. Mary Kaldor, *New and Old Wars: Organised violence in a global era* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999).

10. Valentine Moghadam ed. *Identity Politics and Women: Cultural Reassertions and Feminisms in International Perspective* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994); Nira Yuval-Davis, *Gender and Nation* (London: Sage, 1998); Jill Steans, *Gender and International Relations* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998).

11. Jutta Joachim, "Shaping the Human Rights Agenda: the Case Against Violence Against Women," in Mary Meyer and Elizabeth Prugl (eds.), *Gender Politics and Global Governance* (New York: Rowan & Littlefield, 1999):142-160.

12. Hilary Charlesworth and Mary Wood, "'Mainstreaming Gender' in International Peace and Security: East Timor," *Yale Journal of International Law*, 26 (2001) 313-317; Elisabeth Rehn and Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, *Women, War, Peace – The Independent Experts' assessment on the Impact of Armed Conflict on Women and Women's role in Peace-building* (New York: UNIFEM, 2003).

13. Though these are often the same person.

14. Another was 'So what about Maggie Thatcher?' See also Tickner, 2001 *op. cit.*, 138-9 for such challenges to 'explain' the 'real world.' They frequently homogenise feminism, and so ask for the feminist position, rather than recognising a range of positions depending, among other things, on location, identity, politics...

15. Marysia Zalweski, "Well, What is the feminist perspective on Bosnia?" *International Affairs* 71, 2 (1995): 339-356.

16. Carolyn Nordstrom, *A Different Kind of War Story* (Philadelphia: Philadelphia University Press, 1997). See also Jean Bethke Elshtain, *Women and War* (New York: Basic Books, 1987); Lois Ann Lorentzen and Jennifer Turpin eds, *The Women and War Reader* (New York: New York University Press, 1998); Cynthia Enloe, *Maneuvers: the International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000); Marguerite Waller and Jennifer Rycenga eds, *Frontline Feminisms: Women, War and Resistance* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 2000); Joshua Goldstein, *War and Gender* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2001); Caroline Moser and Fiona Clarke (eds.), *Victims, Perpetrators or Actors? Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence* (London: Zed Books, 2001; Unicef, *op. cit.*

17. Though some relatives of victims were appalled by this appropriation and argued back 'not in our name', as did many feminists in the United States and outside it.

18. Carol Cohn, "War, Wimps and Women: Talking Gender and Thinking War," in Miriam Cooke and Angela Wallacott eds *Gendering War Talk* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993): 227-246.

19. *Ibid.*, 231.

20. J. Ann Tickner, "Feminist Perspectives on 9/11," *International Studies Perspectives* 3, 4 (2002): 336.

21. Feminist international lawyers, who work closely with feminist IR scholars. There are close parallels in the long exclusion and difficult appearance of feminism in the 2 disciplines, including through the effects of the sovereignty story. See Hilary Charlesworth, Christine Chinkin and Shelley Wright, "Feminist Approaches to International Law," in *International Rules: Approaches from International Law and International Relations*, edited by R.J. Beck et al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

22. Hilary Charlesworth and Christine Chinkin, "Sex, Gender and September 11." *The American Journal of International Law* 96 (2002): 600.

23. Despite Condoleeza Rice, an African-American woman who as National Security adviser played a

minor role especially compared with Secretary of State Colin Powell and Secretary of Defence Rumsfeld, along with the President himself.

24. Charlesworth and Chinkin, *op. cit.*, 602.

25. Though what the scenario is depends on the kinds of feminism deployed. See eg Mary K. Burguières, "Feminist Approaches to Peace," *Millennium* 19, 1 (1990): 1-18 for different feminisms' take on women and peace, and women in power.

26. Charlesworth and Chinkin, *op. cit.*, 601

27. Yuval-Davis, *op. cit.*; Pettman, *op. cit.*, 1996.

28. Cynthia Enloe, "Forum: The Events of 11 September 2001 and Beyond," *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 4, 1 (2002): 103.

29. Charlesworth and Chinkin, *op. cit.*, 602.

30. Nira Yuval-Davis, in "Forum: The Events of 11 September 2001 and Beyond." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 4, 1 (2002): 102.

31. Charlesworth and Chinkin, *op. cit.*

32. Krista Hunt, "The Strategic Co-option of Women's Rights," *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 4:1 (2002):116-121. For further information on RAWA, see the RAWA website: <http://www.rawa.org>.

33. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* "Forum: The Events of 11 September 2001 and Beyond." 4, 1 (2002). See also *Inter-Asian Cultural Studies* September 11 and its Aftermath: Movement Statements." 3, 1 (2002) 121-133; Ammu Joseph and Kalpana Sharma eds. *Terror, Counter Terror Women Speak Out* (London and New York: Zed Books, 2003), *Signs*. Roundtable: "Gender and September 11." 28, 1 (2002): 431-480.

34. Cohn, *op. cit.* Peterson and Runyan, *op. cit.*; Transnational Feminists. "Transnational feminist practices against war." in Ammu Joseph and Kalpana Sharma (eds.), *op. cit.*, 266-272.

35. Cynthia Cockburn, "Women in Black: Being Able to Say Neither/Nor," *Canadian Women's Studies* 19, 4 (2000): 9.

36. V. Spike Peterson, in "Forum: The Events of 11 September 2001 and Beyond." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 4, 1 (2002):111.

37. Transnational Feminists, *op. cit.*; see also IfJP *op. cit.*; *Inter-Asian Cultural Studies*, *op. cit.*; Rosalind Petchesky, "Phantom Towers: feminist reflections on the battle between global capitalism and fundamental terrorism," in Joseph, Ammu and Sharma, Kalpana (eds.), *op. cit.*, 52-68.

38. Pettman, *op. cit.* 2002.

39. Of the many Millennium panels taking stock of IR at the 2001 International Studies Association conference, only 5 of the 48 panelists were from outside North America, and only 10 were women – half of them on the Feminist panel 2002. Steve Smith, "Alternative and Critical Perspectives." in Frank Harvey and Michael Brecher eds. *Critical Perspectives in International Studies* (Ann Arbor: the University of Michigan Press, 2002): 27-44.

40. Cohn, *op. cit.*, 239.

41. Hypermasculinity was a feature of both 'sides' of the war on terror. See Tickner, *op. cit.* 2001; Agathangelou, A.M. and Ling, L.H.M. (forthcoming) "Power, Borders, Security, Wealth: Lessons of Violence and Desire from September 11." A substantial current in feminist IR now addresses masculinities in international politics. See Marysia Zalweski and Jane Parpart, eds. *The "Man" Question in International Relations* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998); Terrell Carver, "Gendering International Relations," *Millennium* 27, 2 (1998): 343-51.

42. IfJP, *op. cit.*, Joseph and Sharma, *op. cit.*

43. Joseph and Sharma, *op. cit.*, xi; Transnational Feminists, *op. cit.*; Susan Sontag, "The 'Traitor' Fights Back," in Ammu Joseph and Kalpana Sharma (eds.), *Terror, Counter Terror Women Speak Out* (London and New York: Zed Books, 2003): 100-110; Sunera Thobani, "War Frenzy," Ammu Joseph and Kalpana Sharma eds. *Terror, Counter Terror Women Speak Out* (London and New York: Zed Books, 2003): 90-99.

44. Though the rise of the neo-cons in the United States and of religious-inflected fundamentalisms internationally had already sorely tested these moves, leading southern feminist advocacy network DAWN and other transnational feminists to advise against another international women's conference, lest the gains of the early-mid 90s, already under severe attack, were further undermined. Claire Slatter, "Tensions

JAN JINDY PETTMAN

in Activism: navigating the global spaces at the intersections of state/civil society and gender/economic justice.” Paper to the Gender and Globalisation in Asia and the Pacific: Feminist Revisions of the International Workshop. Canberra: Australian National University, 2001.

45. Peterson and Runyan, *op. cit.*; Pettman, *op. cit.*, 1996.

46. Some examples include Cockburn, *op. cit.*; Enloe, *op. cit.* 2000; Julie Mertus, “Grounds for Cautious Optimism,” *International Feminist Journal of Politics*. 3, 1 (2001): 93-103; and addressing 9/11 specifically, 12 Points 2003 and other contributions to Joseph and Sharma, *op. cit.* and to the *International Feminist Journal of Politics* symposium, *op. cit.*.

47. Chandra Talpade Mohanty, “‘Under Western Eyes’ Revisited: Feminist Solidarity Through Anti-capitalist Struggles,” *Signs*, 28, 2 (2003): 499-537.

48. Pettman, *op. cit.*, 1996; L.H.M. Ling, *Postcolonial International Relations* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).

49. Brooke Ackerly, “Women Human Rights Activists as Cross-Cultural Theorists,” *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 3, 3 (2001): 311-346; Transnational Feminists, *op. cit.*; Jan Jindy Pettman, “Multiculturalism and Identity Politics in/for Feminist IR”, Feminist Methodologies for IR International Studies Association workshop 2003.