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Foreword

Here is a simple yet profound truth: If we hope to prevent conflicts and build lasting peace wherever war, violence, and instability threaten communities, we must empower women as full and equal partners at every step.

The moral argument is clear. Women are half the population. It is only right that they participate in the discussions and decisions that will shape their futures. But this is also a strategic goal because women are not only victims of conflict, but they are also agents of peace. There are remarkable stories of women crusading for peace and lasting security in places such as Colombia, Kosovo, Liberia, Yemen, Iraq, and too many others to list.

Around the world, dozens of conflicts are undermining stability, ravaging the fabric of society, and destroying populations. Persuading warring factions to lay down their arms is only the first step. An enduring peace needs reconciliation and justice. Citizens need opportunity and lasting security. Societies need to rebuild trust. Without these, peace can be hollow and fleeting. Indeed, we know from history how frequently peace agreements fail.

There is a growing body of evidence that shows how outcomes are better for whole societies when women participate in peace talks, security-sector planning, and reconstruction efforts. For example, women often raise day-to-day issues such as human rights, citizen security, employment, and health-care, which make peace and security plans more relevant and more durable. They speak on behalf of marginalized groups, often crossing cultural and sectarian divides, which helps give voice to everyone seeking a peaceful future. And once consensus is reached, women can help translate peace from an agreement on paper into changes that make a real difference in people’s lives.

On a practical level, women often know about the dynamics and events in the community through their daily interactions. As women carry out daily activities within their communities, for instance, they may see and hear things in a way that men do not. When women serve as police officers or military members, they make the security sector more representative of the population. Their networks help security forces better understand the undercurrents of the community, serve its needs more effectively, and earn its trust. Women’s leadership in the security sector also reinforces
the importance of women’s participation in every part of society and opens up opportunities for other women to be engaged.

Women are a powerful force for peace across all of these dimensions. The United States has seen this clearly through our experience with armed conflict in areas where women leaders have sought every day to create stability and opportunity—even when the prospects for peace seemed elusive. Building on these lessons and those of our partners across the international community, in December 2011 President Barack Obama released the U.S. National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security. The plan offers a comprehensive roadmap for accelerating and institutionalizing our efforts to advance women’s participation in making and keeping the peace. In short, the U.S. Government has made it a foreign policy and national security priority to put women at the heart of our peace and security efforts.

During our tenures as Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense, we witnessed the major contributions women have made in areas affected by conflict, crisis, and transition. Take Afghanistan, where our Servicemembers, diplomats, and development experts are working with the Afghan people to help build a stable, prosperous society. Because there can be no lasting peace in Afghanistan without the full participation of women, we have worked to include women at every step. We sent teams of female Marines to work directly with Afghan women and help them advocate for their rights. Our Provincial Reconstructions Teams engage with communities to curb violence against women and end practices that destabilize societies, such as honor killing and female immolation. And we are training more Afghan women to join the security forces and the national police so that they can help protect women’s rights and uphold the rule of law.

In active conflict zones, we know women often suffer disproportionate burdens, including rape as a tactic of war. We also know women can be valiant warriors. American women in uniform have faced the reality of combat and proved their willingness to fight and to die to defend our country. That is why in January 2013, the Defense Department rescinded the restriction excluding women from direct ground combat units and positions. The challenge for all of us moving forward is how we can better engage women as equal partners in all aspects of peace and security.

This book springs from our government-wide commitment to advance that mission. You will read about the experience of leaders such as Admiral James Stavridis, USN (Ret.), former North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)
Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, and Admiral William McRaven, USN (Ret.), former commander of U.S. Special Operations. Both are skilled and accomplished leaders who understand the importance of women as security actors. You will hear from multilateral partners such as NATO, which made a policy commitment to support women’s participation at the highest levels of decisionmaking about building global security, resolving crises, and preventing future instability. You will find the firsthand accounts of people such as Michelle Bachelet, Princeton Lyman, and Navi Pillay, who have partnered with women to build peace, defend human rights, and promote accountability around the world. And you will hear from women on the ground whose names you may not yet know, but who are working each day toward a better, more peaceful future.

With this book, we hope to advance the critical dialogue on the importance of women in international peace and security. General Martin Dempsey, USA, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has recognized that we undercut the contributions of women at our own peril. We cannot deny ourselves half the talent, half the resources, and half the potential of the population. Instead, we must recognize that women are indispensable partners in creating peace and lasting stability. Working together, we can change the way we think about conflict and how we prevent it.

Hillary Rodham Clinton  
67th U.S. Secretary of State

Leon Panetta  
23rd U.S. Secretary of Defense
Preface

This book reflects President Barack Obama’s commitment to advancing women’s participation in preventing conflict and keeping peace. It is inspired by the countless women and girls on the frontlines who make a difference every day in their communities and societies by creating opportunities and building peace. Secretary of State John Kerry, Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel, and the administration are working with partners across the international community to engage women leaders and ensure they have a seat at the table as decisions are made that impact their lives and the future of their countries.

Around the globe, policymakers and activists are working to empower women as agents of peace and to help address the challenges they face as survivors of conflict. When women are involved in peace negotiations, they raise important issues that might be otherwise overlooked. When women are educated and enabled to participate in every aspect of their societies—from growing the economy to strengthening the security sector—communities are more stable and less prone to conflict.

Every moment of every day our world is becoming more interconnected, and we are wise to engage all stakeholders in finding solutions to our most difficult challenges. Acknowledging the barriers many societies still impose on women’s participation and encouraging the potential of women to promote peace—in their own countries and around the world—are parts of this process.

Our understanding of the importance of women in building and keeping peace is informed by a wide range of experts, from diplomats to military officials and from human rights activists to development professionals. The goal of this book is to bring together these diverse voices. As leaders in every region of the world recognize, no country can reach its full potential without the participation of all its citizens. This book seeks to add to the chorus of voices working to ensure that women and girls take their rightful place in building a stronger, safer, more prosperous world.

Catherine Russell
U.S. Ambassador-at-Large for Global Women’s Issues

left: First Lady Michelle Obama, Deputy Secretary Heather Higginbottom, and U.S. Ambassador-at-Large for Global Women’s Issues Catherine Russell with 2014 Secretary of State’s International Women of Courage Awardees, Washington, DC, March 2014 (State Department)
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Integrating Women into U.S. Defense and Foreign Policy

The empowerment of women in unstable countries benefits not only them, but all of us. It is, to my mind, a crucial component of a comprehensive approach to the security challenges of the 21st century. . . . We should remember that allowing all women to exercise their full rights is not only an obvious moral imperative. It may have far-reaching geopolitical consequences as well.

—Anders Fogh Rasmussen
12th North American Treaty Organization Secretary General
1. What Took Us So Long? Expanding Opportunities for Women in the Military

By Michael Mullen

In 1975, 7 years after I graduated from the Naval Academy, I went back to Annapolis, Maryland, to serve as a staff officer. I was looking forward to a break from life at sea and spending more time with my family. It was, I thought, going to be a respite—the opposite of the constant churn that fleet duty demanded.

Then a telegram arrived one day from Washington, DC, telling us that women would soon join the Brigade of Midshipmen. We were going to have to change. Congress had done the right thing.

So much for my respite. The challenges to come were many.

I began my naval career in the thick of the Vietnam War. I will be the first to admit that a woman's role in the military was not top—or even near the top—on the list of things that preoccupied me. My high school was all male. The Naval Academy had been all male. The ships I served on were... well, you get the idea. If I wanted a woman's perspective on things, I had to go home to get it. I would like to think that I was not stuck in the Stone Age, but during the Vietnam era, women in the military were anything but equal. Equality was not even a genuine topic of discussion.

I had been selected to serve on the admissions board that would choose the first female Midshipmen about the same time that telegram arrived. There was not much time to get it done. The Naval Academy put together a task force of eight Navy men and one female psychologist. It is fair to say that the psychologist had her hands full. Though we were committed to the task, we were to a large degree ignorant about the challenges these young women would face. But it was a great lesson because it forced us to look at problems as best we could through someone else's eyes.
That is a lesson that I carried with me throughout my career and it extends far beyond just the issue of diversity: It is vital to have people and voices at the table who, collectively, offer broader perspectives than anyone could alone. There is no question that today as Pentagon leaders consider future efforts to expand opportunities for women in the military, they are not doing so with an 8-to-1 ratio of men to women. And they sure are not doing so with quite the same level of ignorance that we labored under.

Eighty-one women entered Annapolis that first year, joining a military that was less than 5 percent female. I have watched many of them blaze trails and do extraordinary things, opening the way for so many to follow since that telegram 35 years ago. Today, women are rising through our ranks and expanding their influence at an ever-increasing rate, serving magnificently all over the world in all sorts of ways. Each time we open new doors in women’s professional lives—as with former Defense Secretary Leon Panetta’s decision in January 2013 to eliminate the ground combat exclusion rule for women—we end up wondering why it took us so long.

Every Bit as Capable—With an Advantage

You do not have to look hard to see that women have served and sacrificed and led every bit as much—and every bit as capably—as any man. Hundreds of thousands of women have served in Iraq and Afghanistan over the course of the last 12 years, demonstrating tremendous resilience, adaptability, and capacity for innovation. Indeed, they have given us an advantage. For instance, in 2005, when the enemy was using Iraqi women to subvert our security checkpoints, female U.S. Marines began the Lioness Program to counter this threat and conduct broader outreach to the women of Iraq. In Afghanistan, female Marines learned the language and worked with the Afghan people, and often went where male troops could not go. One Afghan elder who opened his home so female Marines could visit with his wife told a Washington Post reporter, “Your men come to fight, but we know the women are here to help.” Of course, all our deployed troops, men and women alike, have the same mission: to fight for and help the local populations. But the different perception matters. Because of it, these women have been able to build relationships and trust with Afghan women, to see things through their eyes, and to gain valuable insight that our operations would not have gained without them.
And U.S. military women are not just exercising soft power. They are courageous fighters as we know from numerous examples. Consider the exploits of Sergeant Leigh Ann Hester, USA. While deployed to Iraq in 2005, Sergeant Hester’s Military Police squad came under withering enemy fire as it tried to protect a 30-vehicle convoy near Salman Pak. Without flinching, she began laying down fire against the insurgents. With another member of her squad, she then charged enemy positions in an irrigation ditch, killing several. Sergeant Hester was awarded the Silver Star for her bravery that day. She became the first woman since World War II so honored, and the first ever cited for close-in combat. She summed up her feelings about those who say women do not belong in combat: “It kind of makes me mad,” she told the Washington Post. “Women can basically do any job that men can.”

Indeed. Time and again, women show us that courage and leadership know no gender. Those who would dismiss the contributions of one gender would sacrifice half the talent, half the resources, half the potential of the population.

Educate a Girl, Enrich a Community

Of course, the importance of women in peace and security goes beyond serving in the military. As noted in our own National Security Strategy, “countries are more peaceful and prosperous when women are afforded full and equal rights and opportunity. When those rights and opportunities are denied, countries often lag behind.” This is an eternal, if not essential, truth found in the old African proverb, “When you educate a boy, you educate an individual. When you educate a girl, you educate a community.” When these young women grow up, they are the ones who promote the value of education in the community. Infant mortality is reduced. Populations grow at a more manageable rate. The overall quality of health improves. When women are educated, they are less likely to condone or encourage their sons to live outside the norms of peaceful society.

Ultimately, until young people—mostly boys—face better options than strapping on a suicide vest or joining a gang, conflict will persist. So our efforts to educate these communities, to educate women, are more than just the right thing to do; they are essential to our security and to the security of nations and people with whom we partner. Having our own soldiers model the reality of a fully inclusive society helps set the example for the countries we aid.

“If we want to make progress towards settling the world’s most intractable conflicts,” stated former Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, “let’s enlist
women.” I could not agree more. I would only add that the time to act is now, so we do not have to ask, yet again, why did this take so long.

Caring for Our Female Veterans
But even as we recognize how far we have come, we must also consider how far we still have to go—especially in caring for our female veterans, who have served just as ably as their male colleagues. This decade-plus of persistent conflict has had an impact that we are only just beginning to understand, with as-yet-unmeasured costs and undetermined toll. We have sent our Servicemembers into wars that have no clear delineation between the frontlines and the sidelines, where war can come from any direction. As a result, this will be the first generation of veterans in which large numbers of women will have been exposed to some form of combat. And so, just as with their male counterparts, they are returning with wounds visible and invisible. That brings consequences for our healthcare system, our national employment rate, and even homelessness. For instance, women veterans are estimated to make up a relatively small, but growing, proportion of the homeless veteran population. According to Veteran Homelessness: A Supplemental Report to the 2010 Annual Homeless Assessment Report to Congress, homeless women veterans represented 8 percent of veterans living in shelters. Many of these women have young children, who have already been through so much. And many female veterans have been the victims of sexual assault and rape, even at the hands of their fellow troops, which adds an additional burden from which to recover, requiring particular sensitivity and services to treat.

Resources for these women are improving. But so far our offerings for female veterans do not yet match those for their male counterparts. For instance, few homeless programs for veterans have the facilities or the resources to provide separate accommodations for women and women with children. So as we celebrate the doors that have been opened to our women in uniform and honor the impact they have made around the world, we must also look hard at the remaining challenges.

Growing Female Leaders
We do not bring people into the military as senior leaders. It takes generations to grow them. That is why, when it comes to diversity and opportunity, we cannot go fast enough. When we think about diversity in the military, we need to be thinking two generations ahead. In 2040, when my granddaughter turns 30, we will need a military
leadership that is truly reflective of—and connected to—the American people. When that day comes and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of 2040 looks at her leadership team, those of us who are still around will not want to have to answer the question, “What took you so long back in 2013?”

right: Staff Sergeant Renata Gaddis of the 2nd Cavalry Regiment with Afghan National Police members at Joint Regional Afghan National Police Center, Kandahar, Afghanistan, December 2013 (U.S. Army/ Mariah Best)
2. Looking through the Gender Lens: More Stable Peace through Empowering Women

By Donald Steinberg

If I have learned anything from more than three decades working in international conflict resolution and postconflict reconstruction, it is that women must be fully engaged if peace is to succeed. Half of all peace agreements fail within a decade of signature. That tells us that involving women is not just about fairness or rights. Our national security interest in peace, justice, and stability abroad depends on dismantling dangerous past patterns of gendered exclusion and empowering women to contribute to their societies.

Including Women in Every Decision

When I speak at orientation programs for United Nations officials who will lead peacekeeping operations as Special Representatives and Force Commanders, I remind them that, even in regions where women are excluded from formal leadership, they will get some of their best ideas and most reliable ground truths from the community's women. If they want to know where the next rebel attack is going to occur, they should not just talk to regional governors or military commanders; they should ask women in the marketplace, whose families' safety depends on having the latest information. If they want to know whether reforms of the justice and security sectors are working, they should not just talk to the judges or the generals; they should ask women in the community who are seeking justice or who are asking the police and army for protection and safety. If they want to know whether their programs to reintegrate ex-combatants are effective, they should not just talk to the camp managers or demobilization organizers; they should ask the women who are the eyes, ears, and conscience of the communities where these fighters are being returned.

left: Afghan National Police recruits with their instructors at Joint Regional Afghan National Police Center, Kandahar, Afghanistan, December 2013 (U.S. Army/Mariah Best)
And they should not just ask for information; they should involve these women in all programs as planners, implementers, and beneficiaries under the watch phrase, “Nothing about them without them.”

The Lusaka Protocol: Gender Neutrality—or Gender Blindness?
I learned this lesson the hard way. In summer 1994, during the period of the Rwandan genocide and the chaos in Somalia, one of the few hopeful developments in Africa came from Lusaka, Zambia. There the Angolan government, the rebel National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA) movement, and international mediators were negotiating an end to two decades of Angola’s civil war. As President Bill Clinton’s special assistant for African affairs, I supported these negotiations, which bore fruit in November 1994 with the signing of the Lusaka Protocol. Addressing an audience of African scholars on the protocol in late 1994, I was asked about the role of women in its negotiation and implementation. I responded that not a single provision in the agreement discriminated against women. “The agreement is gender-neutral,” I proclaimed, a little too proudly.

President Clinton then named me U.S. Ambassador to Angola and a member of the Joint Commission charged with implementing the peace accords. It took only a few weeks after my arrival in Luanda to realize that a peace agreement that calls itself “gender-neutral” is actually gender-blind. Failing to consider women and gender as we negotiated and attempted to implement the peace process was a key reason that we failed to implement the protocol—and Angola went back to war in 1998.

Consider the evidence—beginning with the fact that we had no women or representatives from other marginalized groups on the joint commission itself. At each meeting of this body, 40 men and no women—not one—represented the Angolan government, UNITA, the United Nations, Portugal, Russia, and the United States. Not only did this mean we heard no women’s voices on the hard issues of war and peace, but it also meant that we had no women to advocate for resolving such issues as internal displacement, sexual violence, abuses by government and rebel security forces, or rebuilding such social services as maternal healthcare and girls’ education. We were, essentially, half-blind.

Without women there to speak about their experiences, wrongdoings against women were either ignored or treated as irrelevant. The peace accord was based on 13 separate amnesties that ruled out prosecution for atrocities committed during
the conflict. One amnesty even excused actions that might take place in the future. Sexual abuse and gendered exploitation, including rape as a weapon of war, had been widespread during the conflict. As a result, these amnesties meant that men with guns forgave other men with guns for crimes committed against women. Angolan civil society recognized this flaw and was cynical about the protocol’s promise of a return to the rule of law and accountability. How then could we credibly rebuild and reform their justice and security institutions?

Furthermore, our gender-blind commission could not foresee that the end of the Angolan civil war would unleash a new era of violence against women. As we launched programs to disarm, demobilize, and reintegrate ex-combatants into their communities, we gave these men a little money and demobilization kits, consisting mostly of seeds and farm tools. We then transported them back to communities where they had no clear roles. They lacked marketable skills. Their former communities had learned to live without them during the decades of conflict. And so, as has been true around the world, the soldiers’ return brought a dramatic increase in alcoholism, drug abuse, divorce, and domestic violence. It broke down coping mechanisms that had given women some protection during the conflict. Thus, as men were resettled, women and children suffered.

Even clearing major roads of landmines—an effort to help more than two million refugees and internally displaced persons safely return home—backfired against women in ways they might have foreseen had they been involved in the process of this effort. A dozen separate military forces had boobytrapped Angola with up to a million landmines. Clearing these was an obvious priority. But focusing first on clearing roads meant waiting to clear local fields, wells, and forests. So as newly resettled women went out to plant the fields, fetch water, and collect firewood, they were the ones maimed and killed.

**Involve Women in Crafting the Agreements, or Peace Fails**

The Lusaka Protocol was largely silent on a wide variety of other issues, including trafficking in persons, rebuilding women’s healthcare, a spike in HIV/AIDS in displaced and mobile populations, the spread of small arms and light weapons into civilian hands, and offering psychosocial assistance to survivors of rape and sexual violence. Gender neutrality when practiced by men turned out to be blindness to half the population. As these realities emerged, we brought out gender advisors and
human rights officers to guide efforts to protect and promote women. We supported
women’s nongovernmental organizations, and our Embassy launched programs in
maternal healthcare, girls’ education, humanitarian demining, transitional justice, and
microenterprise.

But it was too little, too late. The peace process was already viewed as serving the
interests of the warring parties rather than the Angolan people. Thus, when the peace
process faltered in mid-1998 because of insufficient commitment from both the
government and especially UNITA leader Jonas Savimbi, civil society stayed on the
sidelines and did not press the leaders to prevent a return to conflict. The country went
back to war. Another 3 years of fighting ended only with Savimbi’s death in 2002.

Lusaka illustrates the destructive cycle that can result when women are left out
of efforts to resolve conflict and rebuild societies. But this example is not unique. In
the past 20 years, hundreds of peace treaties have been signed and more than half
have failed—noting that fewer than 8 percent of their negotiators and 3 percent
of their signatories have been women. Clear evidence shows that involving women
expands the agreements’ scopes and improves the prospects for durable peace. Often,
women have a greater capacity to work across divisions; they bring different skills and
negotiating styles to the table, thereby expanding our array of approaches. Women are
also likely to raise critical issues that could, if left unaddressed, threaten the peace—
issues such as accountability for past abuses, support for survivors of violence, and
redress for social and economic inequalities that contribute to fragility.

Ask: Where Are the Women?
The opposite of gender-blindness is to always be conscious of gender and asking:
“Where are the women?” That is our policy at the U.S. Agency for International
Development (USAID), whose goal is to promote global development, prosperity,
peace, and security—all of which require gender equality and women’s empowerment.
We are determined to make gender equality and women’s empowerment a part of our
organization’s DNA. Toward that end, in 2012, USAID adopted a suite of mutually
reinforcing policies and strategies to close gender gaps, combat gender-based violence
and human trafficking, and enable women and girls to realize their rights, influence
decisionmaking, and become powerful change agents in their societies.

We now require gender analysis in strategic planning and project design;
track what we are spending on gender equity and empowerment; make targeted
investments to train and assist women peace-builders, parliamentarians, democracy activists, farmers, and entrepreneurs; and more. For instance, in countries affected by crisis and conflict, USAID is investing in the protection and empowerment of women and girls to foster peaceful, more resilient communities—communities that can better cope with crisis, manage conflict without violence, and stay on a path of development. The U.S. National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security, adopted in 2011, serves as a clear roadmap for our efforts:

- Involve women where decisions are made, with the support they need to be effective. For example, in 2011, USAID announced our new Global Women’s Leadership Fund (GWLF) to help women participate in peace negotiations, political transition dialogues, and donor conferences. The fund offers practical support for things such as transportation and childcare as well as strategic support, such as training and capacity-building, to help women leaders create cohesive networks and platforms for action. Since one of the most dangerous professions in the world is that of a female peace-builder, the fund can also pay for physical protection. GWLF supports women in Côte d’Ivoire, Libya, Burma, Afghanistan, Syria, and Pakistan to ensure women’s meaningful participation in conflict resolution, reconciliation, and transition planning. USAID is also connecting local women with national-level dialogues in Mindanao and Yemen and district-level peace committees in Uganda.

- Protect women and girls from violence and exploitation, which not only harm individuals and devastate families, but also undermine the recovery of entire communities. USAID programs help survivors access appropriate medical, psychosocial, legal, and economic services. Where possible, we support models that allow women to access comprehensive services under one roof, such as the innovative 24-hour court being put into place in Guatemala under the leadership of its remarkable attorney general, Claudia Paz y Paz.

- Prevent gender-based violence. Research has given us clear evidence of how to intervene effectively to change men’s attitudes and behaviors—and we are supporting such interventions in countries such as the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Pakistan, Haiti, Uganda, and Ethiopia. Furthermore, we are working to help women and girls use innovative technologies to make them
U.S. national security depends on stable, prosperous, and democratic societies abroad. Countries that protect and empower women do not tend to traffic in illegal drugs, people, or weapons. They do not send off large numbers of refugees across borders and oceans. They do not transmit pandemic diseases. They do not harbor terrorists or pirates. And they do not require American and other international military forces on the ground.

The supposed line between “hard” issues of national security and “soft” issues of human security has vanished forever. There is nothing soft about going after traffickers who turn women and girls into commodities. There is nothing soft about preventing armed thugs from abusing women in refugee camps or holding warlords and other human rights violators accountable for their actions against women. There is nothing soft about forcing demobilized soldiers to refrain from domestic violence or insisting that women have a seat at the table in peace negotiations and a prominent role in peace operations. These are among the hardest responsibilities on our national security agenda, and we ignore them at our peril.
Women and Conflict Prevention

Measured in lives and livelihoods, stopping cycles of conflict and preventing wars before they occur is the most important way to ensure stability and prosperity around the world. Socio-economic and cultural analyses must inform any effort to forecast and counteract emerging drivers of conflict; examining how risk factors for conflict affect men and women differently improves our understanding of the root causes and consequences of conflict, including vulnerability to mass atrocity. From Kosovo to Rwanda, societies have witnessed rising discrimination and violence against women as early indicators of impending conflict. Tracking and better understanding how these indicators relate to the potential for instability should inform the international community’s best practices in preventing conflict before it begins.

—United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security

By Rick Barton and Cindy Y. Huang

I define peace and security in my country as a free Syria, without the regime, without shelling, without extremists, without sectarian [violence]. I want a Syria where women and men are equal inside free Syria. Women will be a part of negotiations, will be a part of transitional justice, women will play an essential role in the first steps towards democracy. . . . Syrian women will play [an] essential role in this.

—Razan Shalab Al Sham, Syrian Emergency Task Force, from an interview conducted as part of the Profiles in Peace Oral Histories Project of the Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace and Security, 2013

As you read this book, gender equality—in society at large and in formal and informal political, judicial, and security institutions—is critical to successfully preventing violent conflict and responding to crises. Failing to include women in peace and security efforts results in a shaky, unstable, and partial peace that leaves in place a society’s root causes of violence. In the past two decades, women’s representation in major peace negotiation delegations averaged only 9 percent. Only 4 percent of signatories in these peace processes were women. Today, women still hold fewer than 20 percent of seats in national legislatures and comprise less than one-fifth of cabinet positions worldwide. These facts make it our mission to ask: Where are the women?

In December 2011, President Barack Obama signed an executive order launching the U.S. National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security (NAP), a comprehensive roadmap for accelerating and institutionalizing efforts across the
Federal Government to advance women's participation in making and keeping peace in accordance with United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1325. The NAP's goal "is as simple as it is profound: to empower half the world's population as equal partners in preventing conflict and building peace in countries threatened and affected by war, violence, and insecurity." One of the major innovations of UNSCR 1325 and resulting action plans is to take a holistic view of women's roles. Too often, women are viewed solely as victims of war and conflict rather than agents for peace and security.

The U.S. Department of State's Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations (CSO) takes a leading role in preventing and minimizing conflicts through the inclusion of women at the onset of conflict. We recognize the link between the status of women and girls and a society's stability. The CSO mission—to break cycles of violent conflict and mitigate crises—is closely linked with the women, peace, and security agenda. Gender inequalities exacerbate conflict and reduce the potential for peace. Because gender inequalities have historically disadvantaged women and girls, especially in conflict situations, CSO emphasizes advancing their status at all levels of peace and security decisionmaking. By doing so, we are more effective in preventing conflict and responding to crises. At the same time, we recognize that men and boys have specific roles and vulnerabilities in conflict that must be taken into account.

CSO is committed to implementing best practices for gender equality and gender mainstreaming, and although each country engagement has different goals, objectives, and challenges, CSO teams are deployed to countries in crises and are charged with examining each case through a gender lens to recognize and consider particular dynamics in the country and region, promote equality, and advance the status of women and girls where they can. Gender, in contrast to biological sex, refers to socially constructed roles, attributes, behaviors, activities, and opportunities a society assigns to men and women. Gender is context- and time-specific, and is mutable. A gender lens requires looking at a situation from two angles: through one lens, we view the realities, needs, perspectives, interests, status, and behaviors of men and boys, and through the other, we view those of women and girls. Combined, they help us understand gender dynamics and provide a more comprehensive view of a situation or society. Such an analysis shapes our understanding of the underlying causes of destabilizing violence and of how to build resilience that can help prevent and mitigate conflict.
We are working to apply this gender lens to our conflict prevention and mitigation work, both at home and in the field. CSO was the first Department of State bureau to establish a Bureau Gender Equality Policy to institutionalize our commitment to the U.S. National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security, making every part of CSO responsible for advancing gender equality and female empowerment, from budget planning to designing in-country engagements. We are still working to fully implement our policy and integrate gender analysis into all CSO operations. As we work toward that goal, we are discovering both the benefits and challenges of making it a priority. We believe the best contribution CSO can make to promoting women’s involvement in peace and security is to give examples of some of our recent efforts, and to offer the lessons learned along the way.

Case 1: Mobilizing Women to Prevent Electoral Violence in Sierra Leone

From 1991 to 2002, Sierra Leone suffered a brutal civil war. It claimed 50,000 lives and displaced 2 million people. Countless women and girls were raped, forcibly "married," or taken into sexual servitude. While Sierra Leone has made notable progress since the end of the war, the country remains fragile. As the November 2012 elections were approaching, many were concerned that presidential, parliamentary, and local elections could reignite violence. Women were especially vulnerable; fear of violence had deterred many from seeking office or even voting, which undermined progress toward a stable democracy.

In August 2012, the Department of State wanted to take creative action to help Sierra Leone conduct free, fair, and peaceful elections. Embarking on CSO’s first women-focused engagement, we worked closely with the U.S. Embassy, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and Secretary of State’s Office of Global Women’s Issues (S/GWI) to develop, fund, and carry out several initiatives. “In devising a strategy, we thought we could adapt lessons from recent elections in Senegal and Liberia,” explained the CSO officer leading the engagement. “Women in both countries had been successful ambassadors for peace during their elections, so we decided that engaging Sierra Leone’s women in similar efforts had great potential.”

The women-focused plan had two main components: help women advocate nonviolence, both locally and nationally; and help women and election authorities build cooperation.
Locally, we funded work in two high-risk districts by a local organization, Fambul Tok (“family talk” in Sierra Leone’s Krio language). This nongovernmental organization had established the Peace Mothers program, a collection of community-level groups that address women’s unique postwar needs. With support from S/GWI and CSO, Fambul Tok hosted brainstorming sessions with 16 civil society organizations to develop conflict-prevention messages. Fambul Tok used these messages to train 52 female community peace ambassadors to advocate nonviolence, mediate conflict, and enlist electoral and state authorities in efforts to prevent any local conflicts from escalating. These peace ambassadors directly engaged their communities by hosting 38 radio shows and leading 28 football games to promote peace.

Nationally, CSO provided diplomatic support to UN Women’s investment in a Women’s Situation Room (WSR) in Freetown. This early warning and rapid response effort was first launched by women leaders in West Africa in 2011 and was implemented successfully, first in Liberia and then in Senegal. The goal was to work with women and young people to mobilize in order to prevent electoral violence, promote nonviolent commitment, observe elections, gather and analyze information about conflict, and respond rapidly and informally to deescalate any threats or to urge the appropriate authorities to take action. Using the theme “peace is in our hands,” the Sierra Leone WSR deployed more than 300 observers across 14 districts, including in Fambul Tok’s focus areas of Kono and Kailahun. Diplomatic support through visits by the U.S. Ambassador and a statement of support by then–Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton increased national media attention and shined a spotlight on the women’s advocacy of nonviolence.

Also, CSO partnered with a USAID police advisor to help women and police build relationships before the election to ensure that early warning and response mechanisms would work effectively. For instance, Fambul Tok invited police to their community dialogues and sponsored open discussions on how the police could better respond to the needs of women in their communities. In some cases, this was the first positive contact rural women had with police. To strengthen women’s relationships with police, Fambul Tok also partnered with the Office of National Security. As a community member told the program manager, Fambul Tok did so to “make sure that the police know it is not just about supporting elections. If the community is peaceful, the district will be peaceful, as will the nation. Women are the linchpin.”
On November 17, 2012, Sierra Leone held its most peaceful election since the end of the civil war in 2002. Nearly 90 percent of the country’s 2.7 million registered voters participated. While the political party that lost raised issues about the balloting, violence was limited. Though CSO was only one of many actors, our engagement review found evidence that our partners effectively spread peace messaging and mediated conflicts that were at risk of escalation.

CSO learned in Sierra Leone that a relatively small-scale undertaking can have a significant impact by working through existing local networks. Traditionally, host country partners tend to be urban but well known. CSO is finding that, beyond the nation’s capital, there is a treasure trove of undiscovered and nontraditional leaders and volunteers, many of whom are women.

Case 2: Engaging Women and Men in Ending Gang Violence in Honduras

In Honduras, CSO is helping counter a gang-driven homicide crisis. In May 2013, as part of that effort, we helped launch Mujeres Unidas (Women Together), a group of women who have lost loved ones to violence. The goal is to raise awareness among women that they have a voice, their loved ones are not forgotten, and the government needs to bring justice to each case.

This group was not created, however, until CSO engagement in Honduras was nearly a year old. In trying to mobilize citizen action, the initial photos, video, and strategic messaging we used proved too graphic. “That may work for men, but women do not tend to be motivated by the sight of dead men on pavement,” we were told by a local Honduran woman in response to an initial “Stop the Violence” campaign ad that portrayed a slain young man lying in the street. Through structured interviews, surveys, and focus groups with locals, we learned that women tended to recoil from the original poster, envisioning their husbands and sons as the ones slain. Interestingly, we also found that men distanced themselves from the image through feelings that the victim must have done something to deserve it.

With that insight, we worked with our partners to change the strategic messaging to a photo that emphasized “No more insecurity” on public transportation. The purpose of the campaign was to build trust between the community and police in a positive and empowering manner. The focus groups and interviews conducted to gauge the campaign’s effectiveness revealed that the tone and presentation of images and language had significant bearing on how content was received. Focus group
participants gave higher credibility ratings to softer tones and female voices and persons. The new poster was widely popular and accepted in the Stop the Violence campaign, which ran from March to June 2013. At the same time, through focus groups and work with partners, CSO observed a sense of powerlessness and lack of agency experienced by families and friends who had lost a loved one to violence. Public discourse was more focused on the death of the individual and the violent act rather than on what survivors could do to heal and honor the memory of the loved one. From our communications research we knew that women would be considered effective messengers and that victims of violence were feeling isolated. CSO supported local activists to form Mujeres Unidas to respond to this need.

At the event announcing the launch of Mujeres Unidas, more than 100 women arrived carrying photos of their deceased loved ones and with banners demanding government action. The media came out in force; there were about 10 television cameras, including some from Mexico and Costa Rica.

Supporting this campaign taught us that information and analysis for engagement design must pay close attention to gender differences. While the initial messaging was found less effective among both men and women, the impetus to investigate more deeply came from a pattern more pronounced among women’s responses. A gender-sensitive analysis would have given CSO’s Honduras team an early indication of how messages and images would affect female and male audiences, which ones would best mobilize women and men to get involved, and what would benefit the entire community the most.

Case 3: Building Networks of Syrian Women to Bring about and Lead a Peaceful Transition

Responding to the crisis in Syria has been one of CSO’s top priorities. Among other activities, CSO helped produce a variety of workshops on topics including governance, communications, and reducing sectarian strife. In August 2012, soon after the CSO gender policy was released, CSO supported the Center for Civil Society and Democracy in Syria (CCSDS) in holding a workshop in Gaziantep, Turkey, for 20 women as part of the CCSDS “Women for the Future of Syria” initiative. Two Syrian female trainers engaged the participants in discussions about their visions for Syria’s future in the areas of health, education, economic development, and civil society. The women planned projects that they could begin
implementing in these fields. One proposal was a march with the theme “Yes to Peace, No to Revenge.”

CSO also supported a series of Planning for Civil Administration and Transition (PCAT) courses for mixed groups of women and men, focused on building the capacity of members of local councils, professional groups, and civil society to plan and coordinate local governance and security. The lead trainer was an Arab woman who encouraged the active participation of Syrian female trainees, most of whom led humanitarian aid and local service delivery in their communities in exercises that included gender-sensitive budgeting and inclusive decision making processes.

During a trip to Istanbul in November 2012, CSO leadership had the opportunity to participate in a roundtable with a diverse group of Syrians, including Sunni Arab, Christian, and Kurdish women. Their main concern was that they would be under-represented in the post-transition political process. Recognizing a significant opportunity to support Syrian women, in May 2013, CSO and its implementing partners held the first women’s four-day PCAT course, in Gaziantep, Turkey. The training enabled women to safely express their key security concerns within their communities, including but not limited to rape, kidnapping, psychosocial and physical trauma, food insecurity, security of female detainees, early and forced marriages, and military strikes. Our experience and findings from this course have informed broader policy discussions, as well as the curriculum for other mixed-gender trainings. In addition, CSO has partnered with the Syrian Emergency Task Force and its field director, a remarkable Syrian woman, to provide training and equipment to dozens of local councils in liberated parts of northern Syria. With this support, the field director has made dozens of trips into Syria, where she has met with civilian and military leaders to advocate for participatory governance and a rule of law system that respects women’s and minority rights.

Finally, CSO is actively involved in supporting independent Syrian media to promote balanced coverage and accountability of all parties. As part of this effort, we funded a professional mentor for Radio Nasaem, a women-owned and -operated independent radio station inside Syria. One of the first programs produced under the mentor’s guidance was a 30-minute interview with a well-known Syrian nurse and mother who spoke of her experiences as a leading opposition activist, caring for the wounded, and serving two periods of detention.
While much more needs to be done to build the capacity of Syrian women to play leading roles in Syria’s transition, CSO’s activities helped catalyze and have contributed to the broader U.S. Government strategy to elevate Syrian women and promote gender equality. The training opportunities have given women from inside Syria a voice in determining local priorities and articulating their vision for a future Syria and building momentum for a more inclusive peace process and transition. Recognizing the gravity of the crisis and the reality that rebuilding Syria’s social fabric and political future will require women’s active participation, CSO will continue to work with our interagency and international partners to help ensure that Syrian women are not ignored or marginalized. Syrian women have articulated a compelling vision of a peaceful and united Syria. With the support of international actors, they are actively mobilizing—locally, nationally, and internationally—to realize that vision.

In the initial phases of CSO’s Syria engagement, we paid too little attention to the importance of women’s participation and the different obstacles they faced. We had not yet fully recognized that it is more difficult for women to travel to Turkey to participate in trainings, both because they often have families to care for and because they are more at risk of sexual violence. As a result, the percentage of women in the initial workshops was low. The women’s PCAT showed us it was possible to support the training of Syrian women outside of Syria through targeted efforts. However, given the increasingly violent and chaotic situation inside Syria, CSO has begun to pursue train-the-trainer options to enable those Syrian women we can reach to train others inside Syria. More broadly, we have learned that despite the dissemination of best practices, promoting the inclusion of women requires consistent leadership within the U.S. Government and constant attention to evolving conflict dynamics.

Case 4: Training Belizean Mediators to Combat Gang Violence

In 2012, CSO was asked to help address gang-fueled homicides in Belize. Our conflict analysis indicated the most promising approach was a combination of mediation and community dialogue. We strived for a diverse group of participants, considering both gender and age. CSO supported three conflict-resolution/mediation courses, which trained 36 mediators, 47 percent of whom were women, and 20 trainers, 75 percent of whom were women, who went on to train many more mediators. Mediations took place with gangs, prisoners, at-risk youth, and community members.
We saw firsthand how gender dynamics make a difference in mediation. In some cases, female mediators are more effective than men in gang mediations dealing with male violence. “Two participants who are female gang mediators said that when gang mediations are really tense, the female mediators can calm down the situation,” recounted a CSO mediation expert who worked in Belize. “The middle-aged females can deescalate more effectively and are able to work through the mediation process because the gang members do not see them as a threat; they respect them as they would a grandmother.”

In January 2013, CSO led a 2-day course on starting, leading, and sustaining community dialogues, which empower citizens to identify and address root causes of violence and instability in their neighborhoods. Most participants were from gang-ridden and impoverished neighborhoods in Southside Belize City, and they have committed to starting dialogues to help build resilience in their communities. Twenty-one of 26 course participants were female, and 9 of the 12 dialogues that have started since the course ended are led by women.

One dialogue brought together women living in poverty with women who found jobs as a result of training programs. They discussed the root causes that keep some women from improving their lives. Another dialogue brought a group of community members together who facilitated an annual “Day of Healing” in gang-ridden neighborhoods to create a new sense of community. A male-led dialogue focused on mentoring young men on “rites of passage” issues specific to men, including male-on-male violence and gang involvement. Addressing this often-neglected “other side” of gender and conflict—hyper-masculinity and men’s roles—is a critical component of supporting women in building peace, and an equally important part of understanding gender dynamics to resolve conflict.

A CSO evaluation team found that mediation was judged by both disputants and mediators as highly effective. Eighty percent of the cases the mediations resolved involved threatened or actual violence, and agreements appear to be holding. Prime Minister Dean Barrow called for extending conflict mediation to every high school in Southside Belize City. The locally driven mediation program will continue to facilitate the training as government agencies, nongovernmental organizations, and Belize City’s high schools build their internal mediation programs. Building on the skills developed and momentum created in the dialogue training, local leaders are working with diverse groups to improve safety in their communities.

addressing this often-neglected “other side” of gender and conflict—hyper-masculinity and men’s roles—is a critical component of supporting women in building peace
CSO’s Belize engagement highlights the imperative to include men and women from many groups to address gang violence and reach at-risk youth. Law enforcement, communities, and social service providers must work together to reduce violence. Our efforts helped increase cooperation and coordination among these groups, which have not always been linked effectively. In addition, our experience emphasized the unique and complementary roles of male and female participants, including the urgent need for more female and male role models for youth.

Integrating Objectives into Strategies and Responses
Gender analysis is “a tool for examining the differences between the roles that women and men play in communities and societies, the different levels of power they hold, their differing needs, constraints, and opportunities, and the impact of these differences on their lives.” For effective conflict prevention and crisis response, a gender analysis should be conducted at the start of strategy development and streamlined throughout the design, implementation, and evaluation phases of conflict and postconflict operations. The importance of conducting an analysis at the start, even a rapid one, was one of CSO’s most important lessons learned from these engagements. One year since the launch of the CSO Gender Equality Policy, we have identified the five areas in need of improvement to effectively integrate women, peace, and security objectives in our work.

Gender Analysis and Assessment Planning. CSO will increase support for rigorous gender analysis when designing country engagements. We plan to systematically provide all teams with simple, concrete questions that can be tailored to the local context and conflict dynamics. These questions are not meant to be exhaustive, but should offer a baseline understanding of community norms and behaviors. Our questions include, for example: “What roles do men and women typically play in a community?” “How does the history and culture of the country contribute to defining these primary roles?” “Who has access to resources and control in the community and why?” “In what way are men, women, and children vulnerable?” In addition, we need to consider assessment team composition and interview design, as well as scheduling to ensure that our approaches generate candid information about gender and facilitate the safe and productive participation of women and men.

Research, Data, and Evaluation. In addition to conducting our own analyses, surveys, and studies, CSO needs to draw quickly on available research and expertise
on gender differences and inequalities, as well as sex-disaggregated quantitative and qualitative data, to understand underlying gender dynamics for both strategy and program formulation. We must also devote resources to quality metrics and evaluation, including creating realistic gender-specific targets and goals, gender-specific evaluation questions, and accountability and learning mechanisms at all levels of the organization.

**Conflict and Gender-Sensitive Programming.** CSO will continue to work with partners, especially local organizations, to design programs that recognize the unique opportunities and constraints men and women face in settings affected by conflict. We must relentlessly ask: “Who will really benefit, and who will be excluded?” In doing so, we need to consider women not only as victims, but also as agents and producers of peace and security.

**Leveraging the Role of Local Partners to Integrate Gender Perspectives.** CSO firmly believes in transforming conflict and sustaining peace through local ownership and partnership. We have selected host-country partners who are trusted, respected voices of their communities. Leveraging their roles, learning from them, and improving their ability to consider gender dynamics give us better results. We must create an organizational culture where it is our habit and default to look to local partners in the search for effective solutions.

**Policy and Program Development.** Interagency policy and program development brings its own challenges. In crisis-driven situations calling for rapid response, the gender lens is often forgotten. We focus on getting the equipment to activists in the field quickly, launching a strategic messaging campaign as soon as possible, and holding training sessions on the ground—all before understanding the gender dynamics at play. In doing so, we miss opportunities to be as effective as we could be. If we ask gender-sensitive questions from the beginning, and focus the gender lens before we make policy, we more effectively prevent conflict and respond to crisis. It takes consistent leadership and learning at all levels to ensure that gender-responsive approaches are implemented for increased impact.

Gender integration can be difficult to implement, even with high-level commitment. At the foundation is gender analysis. It takes continued leadership and hard work for policymakers and practitioners to fully appreciate that gender analysis entails more than targeting women; it requires understanding their points of view, considering their different constraints and opportunities, knowing the strength of their informal and formal networks, analyzing the gendered responses
their involvement could bring, and asking how gender roles constrain and shape men’s behavior as well. Gender analysis is essential to understanding the conflict, looking at conflict and violence holistically, and getting the response right.

Perhaps the greatest lesson that CSO has learned in a year of implementing our gender policy is that nothing replaces a culture and spirit of learning together through study of best practices, training, and, most important, learning through experience. This combination of commitment and action from all levels of the organization is at the heart of gender mainstreaming and institutional change.

From Policy to Practice: Advancing Objectives on the Ground
CSO remains fully committed to advancing gender equality and women’s participation in efforts to break cycles of violence and mitigate crises. We will continue to proactively engage women and girls in our engagements, including promoting the participation of women in host government conflict prevention and security policymaking, supporting women’s coalitions and local and national women leaders, and conducting gender-sensitive conflict analyses.

In the future, we must do a better job reframing the narrative and strategic approach of those we identify as leaders and key actors. Women are too often viewed as victims, not as the powerful agents of change that they are. Women are also sometimes combatants and peace spoilers. It is critical that their roles in and perspectives on conflict are recognized and addressed. Most important, failing to fully consider half the population leads to partial and unsustainable peace that does not address the root causes of violence. Successful conflict prevention, management, resolution, and political transformation strategies must not only include women, but also recognize the ways in which conflict affects women and men differently.

The authors would like to extend their gratitude to CSO Gender Team Leads and contributing authors Jennifer Hawkins and Cynthia Parmley, to Ben Beach for editorial assistance, and to CSO Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary and Senior Gender Advisor Ambassador Pat Haslach for her vision and leadership.

Note
Peace is not just ceasefire in the country. Peace is having all kinds of security and trust. Security is very much related to freedom [including] economic freedom.

—Ela Bhatt, Founder of the Self-Employed Women’s Association of India, from an interview conducted as part of the Profiles in Peace Oral Histories Project of the Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace and Security, 2012

Winston Churchill once stated, “The problems of victory are more agreeable than the problems of defeat, but they are no less difficult.” If we could add to Mr. Churchill’s comment, we should state that preventing conflict may be the most challenging—and important—of all our endeavors. The heavy cost of failing to prevent conflict in Europe during the 20th century—millions of lives destroyed and cities ruined—cannot be borne again by any country or alliance. Conflict brings other challenges as well: displaced populations, shortages of basic food items or even starvation, increased instances of sexual and gender-based violence, destruction of infrastructure, and weak rule of law.

Today, U.S. European Command (USEUCOM) is working to support enduring stability and peace in Europe and Eurasia by engaging in areas that have been affected by conflict or that live under the threat of its reemergence. Preventing conflict is best accomplished through a “comprehensive approach”1 to social, economic, and security development within communities, and ultimately within nations. By combining the
resources and expertise resident within governmental, private, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), we are best able to promote stability. Communities succeed when they have adequate education and healthcare, when employment opportunities are available, and when the government is able to provide security and legal systems. A lasting and sustainable peace starts with these elements. Preventing conflict is as important a mission as prevailing in conflict and, by the way, vastly less expensive.

A fundamental objective of our security policy is to develop a culture of respect for human rights that will facilitate these systems. Such respect, however, has not always existed. Historically, the military commander’s sole concern had been to vanquish the enemy militarily and to impose political will. But in the 19th century, the concerns and legal obligations for military commanders began to change. The Geneva Conventions and the founding of the Red Cross were some of the earliest steps taken by nation states to limit suffering, acknowledge the plight of innocent civilians in conflict, and address what is morally acceptable in warfare.

Henri Dunant, a Swiss businessman and social activist, witnessed the Battle of Solferino (in modern-day Italy) in June of 1859. He saw the death of some 40,000 people amid a near-complete lack of medical care. Dunant was so moved by the sight of such suffering that he wrote and published A Memory of Solferino—at his own cost—recounting what he saw that day. He proposed establishing a relief agency for humanitarian aid in times of war that would remain neutral during the course of any conflict. His efforts were the inspiration for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent. The Geneva Conventions were established to insist upon respect for human life and rights during war. These initiatives began to change how commanders waged war, and they broadened the way society views the causes of and solutions to conflict.

Upon this foundation, we have the ability to address causes of conflict and prevent the outbreak of hostilities. We have numerous inter governmental and non organizations that strive to limit suffering in conflict and protect human rights. The challenge is to effectively coordinate efforts as we work together to address and prevent circumstances that lead to conflict.

Building Basic Human Well-Being

Our work at U.S. European Command is regionally focused on Europe and Eurasia. The inherent geopolitical density of this region makes it a challenge to address the myriad issues that cross borders. The solution we have adopted is an inclusive model
for our operations. To inform our perspective on the security needs within the region, USEUCOM actively cooperates with international organizations, NGOs, private companies, think tanks, and the local populace to address the conditions that can lead to conflict. For instance, USEUCOM hosted François Bellon, the Head of Delegation of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), to both the European Union and North Atlantic Treaty Organization. He commented that we are in the same river, but in different boats. Our organizations face the same reality, even as we see it from differing perspectives. USEUCOM is designed to address problems from a military aspect, whereas the ICRC addresses problems from a humanitarian one. Thus, creating and maintaining a functional relationship are essential.

USEUCOM recognizes the importance of maintaining and strengthening relationships—not only individually but also military-to-military, between governments, and among affiliated organizations. Our decisionmaking process is informed by that far-reaching network of relationships, touching on the best ideas and experiences of the full range of academia, private industry, and governmental organizations. Much of this is done through the USEUCOM Interagency Partnering Directorate, which facilitates our interactions with the numerous U.S. Government agencies that are focused on providing security and preventing conflict. We consider these relationships so important that we have placed agency liaisons within USEUCOM headquarters. Every day, headquarters staff members work side by side with representatives from the Departments of State, Energy, Treasury, Justice, the Drug Enforcement Administration, Customs and Border Patrol, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Working with these organizations—and more importantly, working in close contact with their people daily—allows us to forge our friendships and build relationships. As a result, when we face challenges and crises, we are able to execute more effectively as a team that has already trained together. We have found that the diverse perspectives that these organizations bring to USEUCOM’s operations allow us to make decisions and policies that are more inclusive and to consider probable second- and third-order effects.

When conducting military operations, a well-known saying is to “know your limits”—in other words, to know what is achievable and what is not. The Department of Defense is very good at many tasks, but it does have its limits. To increase our ability to manage complex problems, and to broaden the limits of what is achievable
while trying to solve problems, we have found it best to partner with organizations that can help us create security and stability in a comprehensive way. To do this, we support organizations that are best suited to provide access to healthcare facilities, schools, critical infrastructure, and economic opportunities to our partner nations. By taking a whole-of-government approach, we seek to solidify regional security.

USEUCOM draws from the experience of those living in the communities in which we operate. We seek out and rely on myriad perspectives in the communities affected by conflict. Women in these areas offer unique and valuable viewpoints. Hearing their stories, their needs, and their ideas has allowed us to focus on issues that are most important to them. Pursuing the underlying issues within the community, which may not be obvious to the newly arrived military member, will allow us to more quickly provide a stabilizing presence while respecting human rights. By expanding our perspectives and striving to create an inclusive planning environment, we find solutions that best fit the challenges facing communities and are able to address them before they become destructive.

If our planning fails to provide opportunities and solutions for inclusive security, communities face a situation that invites criminal and terrorist activities. If the government cannot or will not provide security, these organizations can take root and become extremely difficult to remove. Poverty, ethnic divisions, frustration with the failings of the government to provide critical infrastructure—all are reasons criminal networks can flourish and thus destroy whatever security a community had known.

USEUCOM helps build stability within the region by combining efforts to develop education, healthcare, and security systems for conflict-affected communities—all of which are particularly important to girls and women.

Universal Education and Economic Growth
Ensuring access to education is an important part of building regional stability and, ultimately, security. In Azerbaijan, for example, USEUCOM is partnering with the Taghiyev Initiative Young Women’s Entrepreneurship Center to establish a school to teach job skills for several hundred girls, thereby offering education and economic opportunities for the community’s women.

Hillary Rodham Clinton has stated, “Whether it’s ending conflict, managing a transition, or rebuilding a country, the world cannot afford to continue ignoring half the population.” Her comments point out our need to use the intellect and
energy of women to improve societies. As we educate and empower these women, who until now had not been able to enter the workforce, the community’s pool of talented, productive individuals will effectively double and allow for marked economic growth. The investments we make in education and employment opportunities will pay off with stability in communities—and then regions—as economic growth and development take hold.

Similarly, our investments in the region’s children will have a lasting legacy. In Macedonia, for instance, in collaboration with that government and USAID, we are supporting a 4-year, $300,000 project to incorporate teaching about ethnic tolerance and respect for others into classroom instruction. Schools are recommended for renovation projects based on their performance with the curriculum. This interagency approach to advancing human rights and tolerance to children should bolster the region’s security for years to come.

Healthy and Stable Communities
Our integrated strategy in the pursuit of regional stability is based on a shared goal: to develop our partners’ abilities to independently prepare for, prevent, and, when needed, respond to challenges. That includes helping offer access to healthcare providers and facilities throughout the region. USEUCOM strives to provide the expertise, capacity, and relationships to meet this challenge through our comprehensive approach. By coordinating our efforts with our partner nations, other U.S. Government agencies, and NGOs, we train and empower communities to meet their healthcare needs.

Another initiative that has produced tangible results for more than 20 years is USEUCOM’s State Partnership Program. Today, 22 European nations are linked with U.S. military units. The varied expertise and resources provided by the individual units are an effective “force multiplier” for USEUCOM. This robust array of capabilities provides more engagement options as we manage our partnerships. Its efforts go beyond what most people ordinarily think of as military endeavors. For example, the state of North Carolina and the Republic of Moldova have enjoyed an ongoing partnership under this program since 1995. Recently, a team of dentists from the North Carolina National Guard and University of North Carolina traveled to Moldova to provide free dental care to more than 300 children. Access to this vital care serves to increase the health of the communities and provides a source of stability.
As part of a recent USEUCOM healthcare engagement event, U.S. Navy corpsmen and medical experts trained host nation medical providers as they performed preventive health screenings and medical examinations to Romanian women. Providing prenatal care and reducing maternal mortality increases the life expectancy of a community and ensures family vitality. In addition to checking vital signs and conducting breast exams, pelvic exams, and Pap smears, these medical professionals discussed basic wellness measures to educate and prevent further medical issues within the community. By training the local care providers, USEUCOM has helped establish a lasting knowledge base that will benefit future patients—and the community.

Preparing for Disasters and Offering Humanitarian Support
Another way USEUCOM helps stabilize the region’s communities is through the command’s humanitarian assistance and disaster relief programs. These programs not only provide security but are also designed to build partnerships while increasing the capacity of partners to handle disasters. The USEUCOM role is most often that of facilitator between the host nation and the participating agencies and organizations, which helps empower partner nations, so they can better handle emergencies and enhance their civil response force and critical infrastructure. In this supporting role, we provide onsite experts, training, transportation, rehabilitation and construction, and donations of excess equipment to communities in most need. By assisting in the development of critical infrastructure, emergency plans, and preparations, we are helping communities and local governments to more rapidly and effectively respond to disaster. These efforts ensure local crises are contained and do not affect regional security. USEUCOM’s humanitarian efforts are funded through overseas humanitarian disaster assistance, civic appropriations, and our own operation and maintenance funds.

As the United States enters a time of fiscal constraint, it is important to realize the high impact that such relatively small investments have in our region. Our humanitarian assistance and disaster relief projects provide some excellent examples. USEUCOM funded 77 projects in 19 countries in 2011, which totaled $14 million. These projects varied from providing flood relief in Serbia, Albania, Moldova, and other Eastern European nations to renovating 44 schools and 28 hospitals and clinics throughout Eurasia. Working with our intergovernmental organizations, NGOs,
and agency partners, we performed equipment upgrades to 33 emergency services locations (including, but not limited to, fire stations, ambulances, hospitals, and clinics) and to water infrastructure. By ensuring that areas have essential services that work both during peacetime and during crises, we will be better able to mitigate disaster impact and assist in efforts to help affected areas return to normalcy.

The benefits of such support can extend beyond normal operations as well. Latvia was able to send firefighters and equipment to fight forest fires in Russia and assist Poland and Moldova during severe flooding. This new capability resulted from a USEUCOM project that assisted Latvia in modernizing eight fire and rescue stations. Enhancing their essential service capabilities allowed Latvia to become a provider of help when it was needed—thereby lessening the burden on neighboring countries. USEUCOM efforts support diplomacy and development, thus helping create security.

Clearly, none of these is our main effort. We remain focused on our principal and traditional role in ensuring U.S. military security forward. But we do help support the American effort to wield smart power.

**Criminal Threats**

When a nation has a healthy and functioning infrastructure, a variety of NGOs can rapidly cross borders to lend aid. But so can criminal networks, which are similarly able to work across many jurisdictions. As our world becomes more connected, we face a greater variety of threats. That is why, in addition to facing traditional military challenges, USEUCOM helps the region address complex threats from both state and nonstate actors. In parts of the region that are especially troubled by narcotics and human trafficking, USEUCOM’s interagency and international partnering has helped boost security.

Human trafficking destroys communities, harming women and children disproportionately. When an area lacks economic and educational opportunities, trafficking is more likely to flourish, feeding the world’s insatiable demand for cheap labor and the continuing market for sexual exploitation. Intercepting traffickers and their victims is made more difficult as borders are easily transited and as corrupt officials at checkpoints can render useless the laws that exist. These crimes produce substantial profits for the offenders, who can then dispense some of those profits, thus wielding undue influence and undermining those who wish to enforce legislation.
Such illicit funds—from both narcotics and trafficking—can support terrorism and can undermine fragile democracies and governments, creating insecurity and threats.

Many organizations and laws exist to fight trafficking, including the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime; Office of the Special Representative for Combating the Traffic of Human Beings; Convention against Transnational Organized Crime; Protocol to Prevent, Suppress, and Punish Trafficking in Persons; and Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea, and Air. Coordinating efforts among the units, organizations, and countries fighting this crime is doctrinally and logistically challenging, and linking their efforts and expertise has not been easy. In an effort to help overcome these obstacles, and to more effectively counter this transnational threat, USEUCOM created the Joint Interagency Counter Trafficking Center in 2011 by leveraging existing counternarcotics authorities and personnel. The center coordinates across the organizations involved in preventing and prosecuting this crime while building partner nation capacity to detect, monitor, and disrupt trafficking events. Combating drug and weapons trafficking allows us to combat human trafficking because so many of the same people and routes are involved.

Our prevention efforts help keep the number of trafficking victims to a minimum. But USEUCOM also helps those who were victims of trafficking by supporting and advocating for their rights to help stabilize the affected communities and normalize victims’ lives. For instance, in 2011, USEUCOM partnered with the Missing Persons’ Families Support Center in Vilnius, Lithuania. This center is an NGO that provides assistance for victims of human-trafficking and forced prostitution, as well as for relatives of missing persons. USEUCOM donated excess property from bases that were closing and performed renovation projects for the center. Similarly, the command is renovating the Centers for Victims of Domestic Violence in Bulgaria and Kosovo. Because of these projects, trafficking victims and victims of domestic violence have support as they come back to their communities and their lives.

**Furthering the Rule of Law**

To be fully effective in our pursuit of security, we must support transparency in public institutions, especially judicial systems, and we must find and prosecute human rights abusers. USEUCOM does this through our Legal Engagement Program, in partnership with the U.S. Defense Institute of International Legal Studies, George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies, a joint effort between the United
States and Germany, and each nation’s own programs. USEUCOM, its legal staff, and partner force providers are working with European Ministry of Defense policy and legal experts to promote the rule of law in Europe and to support the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan and United Nations Peacekeeping Operations during deployments. Our interaction during the USEUCOM International Legal Conference and other regional events has significantly sharpened our partners’ ability to work with other European nations. This has raised the level of awareness and expertise on human rights concerns, rules on the use of force, detainee affairs, operations law, and the importance of civilian control of the armed forces. Additionally, USEUCOM is closely partnered with the Department of Justice and USAID on their judicial/prosecutorial training, counter-corruption programs, and rule of law initiatives to maximize our impact on our partners’ governments. These engagements ensure that the U.S. Government speaks with a consistent voice to civilian and military authorities on these critical priorities as we help provide stability in our region.

**Stronger Together**

U.S. European Command cannot achieve regional stability and security on its own, or even with the assistance of the Department of Defense and Department of State. Only through our combined efforts and in close coordination with our allies, international partners, private entities, and governmental and nongovernmental organizations can we meet the 21st century’s complex challenges. USEUCOM has taken a comprehensive approach to the social, economic, and security development within this region’s communities, which is the key post–World War II trend in the 51 nations of the European region. Our combined initiatives support the U.S. interagency approach. They help provide education and healthcare, make employment opportunities available, and ensure security and legal systems function fairly in this region. These efforts are aiding in the prevention of conflict in an area that has known many wars. Continued engagement with at-risk communities is essential to securing a peaceful future. As our command motto sums it up, we are truly *stronger together*. 
Notes

1 Comprehensive approach is a term used by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to indicate that all elements of an organization’s influence are brought together. These include diplomatic, information, military, and economic power. Government agencies work alongside private, business, and nongovernmental organizations to combine resources as they work on the most challenging issues. See NATO, “A ‘Comprehensive Approach’ to Crisis Management,” available at <www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_51633.htm>.

5. NATO’s Commitment to Women, Peace, and Security

By Mari Skårø

United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 is a powerful appeal to protect those who are most vulnerable in conflicts and their aftermath, and to enhance the participation of women in building peace and security. I very much value the strong commitment by the U.S. Government to implementing this landmark resolution.

—Anders Fogh Rasmussen, 12th NATO Secretary General

It has been more than 12 years since the adoption of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 (UNSCR 1325), and we are still far from reaching its objectives of full inclusion of women in conflict prevention, management, and resolution. We need to continue to educate and raise awareness on how conflict often affects women and men in different ways. Women continue to be vulnerable in conflict, and we are still witnessing sexual violence used as means of war.

Ensuring implementation of UNSCR 1325 and related resolutions requires continued leadership. First and foremost, nations need to step forward; the responsibility for implementing these resolutions rests with national governments. At the same time, international organizations need to make a strong and sustained effort. The United Nations is in the lead when it comes to setting norms and principles, developing overall policies, assisting nations, and keeping them accountable. But as a security organization strongly anchored in common values—freedom, democracy, human rights, and the rule of law—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) also has a critical role. NATO’s 28 member nations have expressed
their strong commitment to protecting and promoting women’s rights, roles, and participation in preventing and ending conflict. While states and intergovernmental organizations must show leadership in advancing this agenda, civil society plays an important role in leading opinion, contributing information, and holding us accountable.

The Alliance recognizes the important role women play in enhancing security and preventing and ending conflicts. We will do our part promoting the inclusion of women as well as integrating a gender perspective in policies and activities. My mandate, as the NATO Secretary General’s first Special Representative for Women, Peace, and Security, includes coordinating and raising awareness of our policies and activities in these areas within NATO and with partners and other stakeholders.

Developing Policy
NATO’s wider policy objective is to build and maintain sustainable peace and security, and our approach to UNSCR 1325 and related resolutions has been developed with that in mind. We want to prevent armed conflicts, but where a conflict does occur, we need to have a complete understanding of the conflict and of its gender dimensions. We need to ensure that a conflict does not have disproportionate impacts on women and children; therefore, we need to facilitate women’s participation.

When developing its overall approach on the agenda, the Alliance has looked at the role of women in peace and security in a comprehensive way, asking what we can do on our own, what we can do to help others, and what others can do to help us. NATO’s engagement in implementing UNSCR 1325 and related resolutions has emerged from our consultations with partners in the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) where our overarching policy on UNSCR 1325 and related resolutions has been developed. This policy was adopted in 2007 and has since been revised biannually.1 The policy’s key points are 1) conflicts affect men and women differently, and 2) we need to involve women more in conflict prevention, management, and resolution. By actively supporting more participation from women at the highest levels, both within and outside the Alliance, we can give them a greater role in building security, resolving current crises, and preventing future instability. We are also keen to see more women participate in NATO operations and missions at all levels of command in our armed forces.
At subsequent NATO summit meetings, we approved a number of NATO statements and communiqués that aim to further define Alliance policy and outline responsibilities. For example, at our NATO Summit in Lisbon in November 2010, we agreed on the first NATO Action Plan aimed at mainstreaming the provisions of UNSCR 1325 and related resolutions into NATO-led operations and missions, Alliance training and doctrine, and all relevant aspects of NATO’s tasks. Since 2010, the action plan has been updated, and a strategic progress report on implementation was delivered at our NATO Summit in Chicago in May 2012. On the same occasion, heads of states and governments took a strong stance on the need to ensure continued implementation and integration of gender perspectives into Alliance activities. These official, unanimously agreed texts represent an important body of NATO policy on the role of women in peace and security.

We continue working together with our 22 partner countries in the EAPC as well as with many other partner nations that contribute to our missions and operations. At the same time, we also engage with other international organizations, including the United Nations, Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), and European Union (EU), as well as with civil society and the community of nongovernmental organizations, to see how we can complement and reinforce each other’s efforts.

Training and Education
Experience has shown that training and education are strategic tools to help security forces better integrate a gender perspective as well as to reform national defense and security sectors. We cooperate with partner countries and other international organizations to refine and enhance training. Allied Command Transformation (ACT), NATO’s strategic command in Norfolk, Virginia, helps NATO develop and implement training and education tools. ACT works to ensure that a gender perspective is integrated throughout the curricula of NATO Training Centres and Centres of Excellence, and throughout the trainings offered to all personnel, men and women, before they deploy on NATO-led operations and missions. To enhance gender training, the Nordic Centre for Gender in Military Operations, based in Stockholm, Sweden, has been designated Department Head for gender education and training for NATO-led curricula. It provides recommendations to member nations on how to integrate a gender perspective into education, training, and exercises.
Although the Alliance has no direct authority over measures agreed at national levels, we do require that personnel deployed on NATO-led operations and missions and serving within our structures are appropriately trained and meet certain standards of behavior, as stated in a directive issued by the Supreme Allied Commander Europe and Supreme Allied Commander Transformation on August 8, 2012. The directive ensures that UNSCR 1325 and related resolutions are implemented in all operations. It calls on NATO forces to have proper training before deploying and to ensure that proper expertise on gender is deployed in the field. According to the directive, NATO forces must uphold and adhere to high moral and human standards; therefore, any form of abuse, exploitation, or harassment should never be accepted. Several allied nations have initiated gender-related training for subject matter experts and for their armed forces to raise general awareness of UNSCR 1325 and related resolutions ahead of national force deployments.

Engagement in Afghanistan
NATO’s engagements in Afghanistan in particular, as well as in Kosovo, have been transformative experiences for the Alliance in many ways, including in our understanding of the role that women can play in conflict resolution and peace-building. Alongside the rest of the international community, NATO has attached the highest importance to protecting and empowering the Afghan population, including women and girls. The Alliance has emphasized the need for Afghanistan to fulfill its own commitments in protecting human rights and particularly women’s rights. In helping Afghanistan stand on its own feet and making sure that it will never again be a safe haven for terrorists threatening our nations and populations, we have steadily kept respect for women’s rights an integrated part of our activities.

For several years, gender advisers have been deployed with the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF). To quote former ISAF Commander General John Allen, “Advancing women’s rights in Afghanistan is key to preventing the Taliban from reimposing a radical form of Islam once most foreign troops leave by the end of 2014.” In 2012, General Allen established a gender adviser position with the rank of general, showing the increased commitment and recognition for this role. Drawn from the military forces of several ISAF countries, these gender advisers are key in helping commanders at all levels take gender perspectives into account when formulating their operational strategies.
A large number of the Provincial Reconstruction Teams across Afghanistan employ gender field advisers as well. These dedicated people provide additional ways for communicating with local communities. They help build trust and confidence in ISAF and advise commanders to the specific needs and role of women and girls in local communities, such as ensured access to basic services, healthcare, and education. Integrating a gender perspective in operations is a matter of leadership and competencies.

A number of countries taking part in the ISAF mission have made a point of deploying female soldiers and officers. Experience has shown that all-female teams, or female soldiers who are part of mixed teams, are well suited for certain security roles, such as house inspections and searches of women. They are also better able to engage Afghan women in discussing security and other concerns.

In the spring of 2013, NATO and its ISAF partners gradually handed over the lead responsibility for security to the Afghan people. Afghans will assume full responsibility for the security of their entire country by the end of 2014. At that point, the ISAF mission will end, but NATO’s commitment to Afghanistan will continue. Together with several of our partners, we are planning a follow-on mission to train, advise, and assist Afghan security forces beyond 2014. As part of this work, we will continue to deploy female soldiers, gender advisers, and gender focal points in operations and promote the importance of including gender perspectives and human rights as we assist in training Afghan security institutions. We are also supporting the recruitment, training, and retention of women to the Afghan National Security Force. These women are role models and deserve our deepest respect and recognition.

NATO’s Way Ahead
Many organizations have a stake in the women, peace, and security agenda and bring important assets and expertise. We all have an interest in avoiding unnecessary duplication, enhancing best practices, and identifying synergies, thereby achieving results. To that end, NATO has been working in close concert with the United Nations, partner countries, and other international organizations to learn, share experiences and best practices, and raise awareness of the importance of integrating a gender perspective in daily activities. NATO attaches particular importance to deepening its partnership with the United Nations in implementing UNSCR 1325 and related resolutions, as the UN is the custodian of the resolutions on women,
peace, and security. Respect for women’s rights and the inclusion of women will require a broad set of reforms that actors other than NATO are better suited to support.

Greater openness and transparency will be essential. Thus, we are conducting a mapping exercise on gender-related education and training activities in NATO, EU, OSCE, UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations, and UN Women, which is the UN entity for gender equality and the empowerment of women. The results of this exercise, and our continuing commitment to share other relevant information, are important for the success of our common endeavors.

The Alliance has partners on five continents, and we are keen to continue to deepen and broaden the agenda on women, peace, and security with this vast network. As we continue to engage partners, we encourage the inclusion of women, peace, and security–related goals in our cooperation programs.

Through its operations and missions, NATO has already learned that fully engaging women and paying attention to both men’s and women’s social roles can improve our understanding and awareness of any conflict or its aftermath, thereby increasing our operations’ effectiveness.

Together with our operational partner nations, we attach great importance to incorporating a gender perspective at every stage of operation and mission planning, exercise, and conduct. To this end, a gender perspective is now included in a growing number of NATO planning directives and related documents, including handbooks, codes of conduct, standard operating procedures, exercise scenarios, and tactical manuals. For example, we are beginning to integrate a gender perspective in exercises for understanding how a conflict can manifest itself differently for men and women due to their social roles, and what this means for planning and executing a crisis management operation. The next Crisis Management Exercise includes—for the first time—considering a gender perspective as one of its objectives. We will continue to strengthen this approach.

To assess what has been done to date, we have undertaken a review of the practical implications of mainstreaming UNSCR 1325 and related resolutions into NATO-led operations and missions, led by the Nordic Centre for Gender in Military Operations, with contributions from several operational partners. Focused on our engagement in Kosovo and Afghanistan, this review, when complete, should help us refine future policies, action plans, and military guidelines. It should also assist
in developing a more accurate, NATO-wide process of reporting, monitoring, and evaluating the effects of operations and missions.

As individual nations are best placed to put UNSCR 1325 into action, national planning instruments (action plans or strategies) have become key tools in the women, peace, and security agenda. Such plans help nations set targets and ensure a systematic approach in reaching those targets. I encourage Allies and partner nations to continue to share information on their national action plans and other national initiatives, as well as to share best practices. This kind of transparency should allow us to learn from each other and complement and reinforce each others’ efforts.

To meet the complex global security challenges of the 21st century, we need to take advantage of the competencies, experiences, and abilities of women and men. Today, the number of women employed in NATO member nations’ armed forces varies greatly. In some NATO forces, the percentage is close to 20 percent, while in others it is much less. By facilitating the exchange of information and best practices among Allies on recruiting and retaining women, NATO will continue to help advance the implementation of UNSCR 1325 and related resolutions.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization has already made significant progress in implementing the goals articulated in UNSCR 1325 and related resolutions. The Alliance continues to advance the women, peace, and security agenda at every level, including through policies and activities, by making greater use of the potential that women offer in political and military ranks, and by improving cooperation with partner countries and other international organizations.

Notes


9 See NATO, "Chicago Summit Declaration on Afghanistan," particularly para. 6.


6. Women, Terrorism, and Counterterrorism: Crafting Effective Security Policies

By Jane Mosbacher Morris

The turn of the 21st century was marked by a heartbreaking and unexpected tragedy: the attacks of September 11, 2001. The barbaric acts of the perpetrators not only changed the lives of thousands, but also solidified terrorism as the preeminent threat to the United States. Many around the world, including American government officials, previously thought the Nation enjoyed the strongest defense in the world. How could a ragtag group have succeeded in planning and executing this plot? The 9/11 Commission, formed to help answer this question, concluded that a contributing factor was that "institutions charged with protecting our borders, civil aviation, and national security did not understand how grave this threat could be, and did not adjust their policies, plans, and practices to deter it." In other words, our national security policies and programs had not sufficiently evolved.

It is within this continual refining of U.S. national security policies that this book arises. No contributor to this work, including myself, advocates for women, peace, and security purely for the sake of empowering women. Instead, we do so to maximize the number of lives saved and improved. This chapter aims to highlight the tangible advantages of considering both women’s roles within terrorist organizations and women’s potential in countering terrorism in the hopes of contributing to more comprehensive security policies and programs.

Women and Terrorism
Too often, we presume that women lack the agency to use their brains and brawn to advance malevolent causes. While the number of women and men involved in terrorist

left: U.S. Customs and Border Protection agricultural specialists inspect millions of Valentine’s Day flowers annually for pests at Port of Miami’s cargo terminal (U.S. Customs and Border Patrol/James Tourtellotte)
organizations pales in comparison to the vast majority of those who strive to maintain peace, ignoring these bad actors, regardless of gender, has dangerous consequences.

Female terrorists, for example, have taken hostages, hijacked airplanes, planted bombs, conducted high-level assassinations, driven explosive-laden vehicles, and committed suicide attacks. A statistical snapshot reveals that women perpetrated an estimated 15 percent of all suicide attacks between 1980 and 2003. In certain organizations, such as the Kurdistan Workers’ Party (Partiya Karkerên Kurdistan) and the Chechen separatists, women were responsible for the majority of suicide attacks. Behind the scenes, women have contributed to terrorist organizations by marrying members, cooking and cleaning for them, gathering intelligence, and providing moral support.

Still, some in the security sector assume that because certain violent extremists advocate for restrictive roles for women in society, these organizations would ban women from carrying out terrorist activities. Violent extremists exploit this assumption, however, and instead use women to tactical advantage. Security officers may perceive women as less suspicious and allow them to evade male-dominated checkpoints, for example, particularly in conservative environments. When wearing abayas, the loose caftan-like garments that cover women’s entire bodies, women may be able to hide bulky explosives, presenting a unique security threat for even the most observant officers. Terrorist organizations also strategically leverage women to appeal to the male egos, arguing that if a woman is willing to sacrifice her life or time for the cause, so too should a man.

Some organizations even make special efforts to recruit female participants. Al Qaeda, for instance, produced a glossy magazine, Al-Shamikha, specifically designed for women; the wife of al Qaeda leader Ayman al-Zawahiri appealed to mothers “to raise [their] children in the cult of jihad and martyrdom and to instill in them a love for religion and death.” Furthermore, mothers pressure their husbands and sons to take up arms for the honor of their families, nations, or religion—and do so more commonly than many outsiders believe.

In other words, it is unrealistic to operate under the premise that all women are inherently more peaceful than all men and therefore unwilling to choose violence for political ends. The relative peacefulness of women versus men is not an unfounded argument, but should not evolve into the mistaken belief that no women are involved
in violent extremism. Some women actively lobby against terrorism, some remain silent on the issue, and others actively propagate its use.

Recognizing the unique threats that female violent extremists pose can save lives. Fully acknowledging the various roles that women play within terrorism is just as essential as considering how women can help prevent and resolve conflict.4

Women and Counterterrorism
After the September 11 attacks, the U.S. Government sought to expand its counterterrorism programming, which largely consisted of the Nation and its allies conducting law enforcement or military capacity-building. Improving the abilities of other security actors to detect and disrupt terrorism within their communities ensures that the United States and its allies are not forced to police the world alone. However, as is true within America, the vast majority of people in foreign law enforcement and military units are men. Putting aside the tactical disadvantages of having a limited number of women in the security force, the fact is that if the United States is only engaging men on the issue of terrorism and counterterrorism, we are failing to pursue half the population as potential allies. If we are willing to think about the use of terrorism as a norm—a behavior that is expected or accepted by a group—then it would be to our advantage to engage a primary conveyor of norms: women.

Women in Civil Society
Terrorist organizations, comprised of mostly non-state actors, recruit from and operate within communities. Why, then, would we not similarly want to help non-state actors counter violent extremism in their communities? Helping women outside governments prevent terrorism can include offering training on how to discuss terrorism with family, friends, and the broader community; how to recognize signs of radicalization and proclivities for violence; and resources to turn to if women suspect that individuals or groups are planning terrorist attacks. Let's look at each of these in turn.

Empowering Women to Discuss Terrorism. As mothers, wives, and daughters, women have unique access and influence within their families. Unfortunately, in certain circumstances, religious and cultural constraints have kept women from developing leadership and advocacy skills. Encouraging women and girls to recognize that their opinions matter and providing training on how to speak with family and friends about rejecting terrorism—in the same way that women might discuss
other norms, such as underage drinking, smoking, or drug use—can help enable more effective conversations. In the public arena, offering social or traditional media training can help women amplify their voices and counter terrorists’ pervasive and aggressive public messaging efforts.

**Recognizing Signs of Radicalization and Proclivities for Violence.** There is no exact science of identifying warning signs for a person who might cause harm to self or others, including through terrorism. But there’s enough research and literature available to allow us to offer basic training on potential indicators of violent radicalization. Offering opportunities for women and men to learn these indicators may increase the likelihood of intervention.

**Reporting Possible Terrorism or Seeking Help.** Just as we might not turn first to the police if we realized that a son or daughter was using drugs or considering hurting him- or herself or others, so those who are concerned that family members or friends might have been radicalized might want to intervene using some other strategy before contacting law enforcement. Making available resources both inside and outside of law enforcement (think of the American “If You See Something, Say Something” campaign) allows women and men to reach out to a support network for help in confronting potentially violent extremism in their homes or communities.

**Women in the Security Sector**
Effectively training and equipping more women to serve in the security sector could expand opportunities to combat terrorism. Women serving in both law enforcement and the military can help build trust between a security organization and the community, more effectively screen women at checkpoints, and respond more effectively when women and/or children are hurt in terrorist attacks. To expand these opportunities, women must be included in counterterrorism training and formal dialogues, as well as be asked their opinions regarding counterterrorism programs.

**Building Trust.** During conflict and times of insurgency, many women are trying to preserve the peace by focusing on normalcy and societal resilience, feeding families, educating children, and caring for the sick and most vulnerable. Women are often monitoring the pulse of the community and therefore can offer unique insights into the core contributors to violence and instability. For example, U.S. Army and Marine Female Engagement Teams discovered that in Afghanistan and Iraq, female soldiers were able to gain valuable feedback on community dynamics by speaking with women
(men were often already being engaged), leading to tangible improvements in troop-community relations and ultimately saving lives.5

**Screening Women.** Violent extremists have leveraged cultural or religious dynamics that frown upon allowing male law enforcement officers or military members to inspect women at checkpoints. Terrorist organizations turn this to their advantage by deploying female suicide bombers or even having men dress as women to avoid detection.6 Training women to serve at checkpoints makes it possible to thwart this terrorist tactic.

**Serving as First Responders.** In particularly conservative cultures where women are not supposed to talk with or be seen by men outside the family, women as paramedics, police, and other first responders may be better equipped than men to aid women or children who are victims of terrorist attacks. Ideally, we want to combat violent extremism by disrupting terrorism before incidents take place. But when attacks do occur, minimizing casualties helps both to save innocent lives and diminish the terrorist “success.”

**Including Women in Counterterrorism Training.** Perhaps now more than ever, the United States and its allies support counterterrorism capacity-building programs for the security sector and civil society all over the world. However, that does not guarantee that women are included in these programs. To ensure that a meaningful number of women are involved, program implementers often need to explicitly recruit women, considering barriers that might hinder their involvement (such as travel or family responsibilities). Or the implementers may need to design programs specifically targeting women. If an implementer chooses to rely on a host nation to nominate participants for a program, as both the U.S. Departments of State and Defense often do, the implementer may need to make clear that a significant effort to ensure women’s inclusion is specifically requested.

Others have discussed in depth the importance of including women in formal and informal state and multilateral security dialogues. Several authors in this book highlight the positive correlation between women’s participation and the success of the negotiations. That correlation is just as important for peace processes that involve states or ethnic parties affected by terrorism. For example, some argue that women’s rights were bargained away to make peace in Pakistan’s Swat Valley, but few (if any) women agreed with that decision; the resulting lack of peace in the Swat today should come as no surprise.7 To meaningfully participate in these dialogues, however, women
and men, especially from civil society, need sufficient training. Failing to provide training on basic national security frameworks or key counterterrorism terms simply confirms unfounded biases that women are not capable of handling issues of security.

Soliciting Women’s Opinions in Developing and Measuring Counterterrorism Programs. The United States and its partners often assess communities to identify potential sources of radicalization, thus allowing us to develop an effective targeted program or policy in order to counter violent extremism. Perhaps in an effort to be culturally sensitive, however, these assessment teams have at times avoided speaking with the community’s women. Refusing to engage women not only reinforces potential biases that women’s opinions are less valuable, but also leaves holes in the assessment—and hence in the resulting counterterrorism program or policy—because the assessment lacks the input of half the population. In areas that have experienced extended conflict, women may well be the vast majority of the population; not including them while developing a counterterrorism program is like developing a maternity and paternity leave policy by only talking to fathers. Both men and women are affected, so both men and women must be involved.

This is also true when it comes to measuring counterterrorism programs and policy effectiveness. If an implementing partner gauges only one sliver of the population to measure the success of a counterterrorism program, the conclusion will surely be biased. A statistician would reject the findings.

Mainstreaming

There is compelling evidence that considering the unique role women play within terrorist organizations is extremely valuable. But some in the security sector and in the broader policy community still have doubts. Some dismiss issues of women, peace, and security as simply part of a broader “women’s agenda,” but the actual agenda is looking squarely at reality. Refusing to seriously consider these findings smacks of a false confidence, as if our counterterrorism or national security agendas could not be any more effective or evolved. History shows us that this is simply not the case.

For the U.S. Government and its allies to be as responsible as possible in protecting the lives of our military members, our civilians, and the rest of the world, we must examine whatever evidence points to more effective security policies and programs, keeping our minds open to learning and changing. Implementing many
of the recommendations discussed in this book, including in relation to terrorism and counterterrorism, will add minimal burden, if any. Yet doing so has the potential to have an enormous impact around the world. For example, the U.S. Department of State already has a Women and Counterterrorism Strategy. Moreover, security alliances such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization have developed strong and public policies about the value of women in countering terrorism. Until these concepts become mainstream and are not considered to be supplemental or bonus, however, America will continue to shortchange both our protectors and the ones we are protecting.

Notes


7. Unleashing Women’s Economic Potential to Build Social Stability and Prevent Conflict

By Melanne Verveer

The benefits of women’s integration in economic recovery will not be reaped by their households, their communities and the women themselves until their roles are specifically recognised in post-conflict policy and programming and until interventions are explicitly implemented to support more meaningful participation of women in labour markets and social and political organisations once the war is over.¹

As we know from research and experience, women are essential stakeholders in the peace, security, and stability of any nation, especially in countries affected by conflict and political upheaval. Women are also central actors in the economic sector; they grow, make, buy, and sell in ways that affect the whole of a nation’s economy. As a result, without women’s full economic participation, prospects for postconflict recovery and a better future for all of society are limited.

Yet the issues articulated by female entrepreneurs are rarely on the agenda in postconflict nations—despite the fact that female-owned businesses are essential to preventing the return of conflict. As the United Nations (UN) (small and medium enterprises) International Labor Organization has succinctly described the situation, “In post-conflict situations, employment is a major contributing factor to achieve short-term stability, reintegration, socio-economic progress and sustainable peace. Job creation provides communities and individuals the means for survival and recovery, and offers a constructive and positive alternative to social unrest.”² Women’s economic issues should be taken into account not only in the design of economic policies and
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left: Swati stitch embellishers use exotic colors and patterns in combination with meticulous stitch counting and age-old ingenuity, Swat, Pakistan, October 2012 (USAID)
programs, but also in peace agreements themselves. Such economic policies targeted at women should be designed to create effective economic outcomes.

An Economy’s Untapped Resource

According to an abundance of economic research, women have tremendous potential to grow the global economy, but that potential is still largely untapped. Many economies are failing to take full advantage of their human capital, even though human creativity, effort, and insight are known to drive economic competitiveness. The resulting loss is measurable. If women could more freely enter the labor force, we could see a 14 percent rise in per capita incomes by 2020 in countries such as China, Russia, Indonesia, the Philippines, Vietnam, and South Korea.3 If female farmers had the same access to productive resources as their male counterparts, their farms could increase yields by 20 to 30 percent—and reduce the number of hungry people by 100 to 150 million.4 As many experts have noted, when women have the chance to participate fully in the economic and political lives of their communities, not only do their lives improve, but the lives of their families do as well. Commerce flourishes, instability declines, and societies are more prosperous.

Here is what that means for regions emerging from conflict. Two courses are possible, one harmful and the other helpful. Those coming to power can clamp down on social progress, tightening the controls on women’s behavior and roles, which have slipped during conflict. But it is more advantageous to take a hopeful and constructive path that will lead to greater economic growth, undergirding stability and guarding against conflict. The second path includes opening doors that were once closed to women. Governments and the private sector alike have a role in promoting women as entrepreneurs, employees, senior managers, leaders, and members of civil society. This path requires seating women at the table where progress and policies are designed and developed and the economic agenda is set for a new postconflict world that creates the prospect of a better future for all. Those involved in brokering peace and setting up new structures and policies must pay close attention to removing the laws and changing customs that discriminate against women and to reaching out to ensure that women know about and can access the resources they need to power a more prosperous future.

Getting there will not be simple. According to the World Bank, more than 100 countries have laws that restrict women’s economic activity, whether opening a bank
account on their own, signing a contract, owning land, or pursuing the profession of their choice. Millions of women are trapped in the informal economy, laboring in fields and factories for low wages with few protections. Women are often victims of forced labor, forced prostitution, or other forms of modern-day slavery. Under such conditions, women are unable to help their nations build prosperous and peaceful societies. At the same time, research by UN Women indicates that during conflict women become more involved in their economies, with stabilizing effects:

Against all odds, increases in the labour participation of women in conflict-affected areas seem to be associated in some circumstances with increases in overall household and community-level welfare. This finding holds even though women on average take on low-status jobs and earn less than men.

Despite these findings, women’s contribution to household economic security is overlooked in the post-conflict period: women tend to lose their jobs once the war is over and face pressures to return to traditional roles. . . . The benefits of women’s integration in economic recovery will not be reaped by their households, their communities and the women themselves until their roles are specifically recognised in post-conflict policy and programming and until interventions are explicitly implemented to support more meaningful participation of women in labour markets and social and political organisations once the war is over.5

To achieve this goal, and thereby improve women’s overall ability to rebuild the economy, efforts are needed in four main arenas: access to markets, skills and capacity-building, access to capital, and women’s leadership.

**Access to Markets.** Women can better expand their markets, both domestically and internationally, when mentoring and technical assistance help them improve their business acumen, and when they no longer face trade and commercial barriers that keep them out, such as corruption and targeted harassment at checkpoints or lack of knowledge of licensing or tariffs. Women emerging from formerly restrictive societies often need more information about market opportunities, regulations, and market requirements such as customs, permits, contracts, and certifications. Matchmaking and technical assistance programs can help. Such women also need more opportunities to participate in government procurement programs and corporate
contracts, opportunities that can be improved through supplier diversity initiatives and affirmative action programs. Female entrepreneurs need to be fully included in programs focused on regional economic opportunities.

**Skills and Capacity-building.** Too often, women have been barred (by law or custom) from education and training that could prepare them for success in the workforce. Studies show that after training, women get better jobs and more effectively grow their businesses and create jobs for others. However, women need access to information about economic opportunities. Women who have lived under restrictive customs tend to have smaller social and professional networks, which limits their awareness of and access to labor markets, employment and business opportunities, and related information on how to handle challenges in operating their businesses. This includes training and information on how to grow a business, and knowledge of labor market and business processes and procedures. Laws and other restrictions on women's ability to be hired for decent jobs must be removed. Moreover, there must be a determined and conscious push to reduce discrimination, sexual harassment, dangers to personal safety, and gender-based violence, all of which sharply limit women's economic opportunities.

**Access to Capital.** Women are unable to start and grow their businesses and contribute to the economy if they are blocked by discriminatory legal and regulatory banking systems and practices. According to data, female-owned businesses tend to be smaller, more recently established, and less profitable than male-owned businesses because they are constrained by such things as lack of access to markets or key industry networks. Furthermore, women tend to lack information about lending requirements and practices. Those three factors—discriminatory systems and practices, smaller businesses, lack of information about lending—mean women have a harder time getting access to capital. This contributes to a cycle that keeps their businesses small. Those rebuilding an economy after conflict must remove gendered barriers to property, small claims courts and institutions, banking, and credit. It must be a priority to put an end to laws and customs limiting women's ability to own, manage, control, and inherit property, enabling them to use all the necessities for farming, business, and entrepreneurship, such as land, human resources, technology, transportation, facilities, and machinery. They must be educated about and be able to use financial products and services, starting with personal bank accounts for themselves or on behalf of their children but continuing into insurance, credit, and so
forth. Economic programs put in place to support postconflict recovery must include support for women entrepreneurs. This should not be limited solely to microcredit funds, but include capital power to start and grow small and medium enterprises.

**Leadership.** Economies emerging from conflict must provide women with greater opportunities for leadership both in public and private sectors, where they are generally underrepresented. Whether on corporate boards, in senior-level management positions, or other important economic decisionmaking roles, women occupy a far smaller percentage of leadership positions than they are qualified for by their economic contributions, levels of education, and business successes. Studies have identified four major barriers to women's rise to leadership positions. First are organizational obstacles, including a lack of role models and exclusion from informal networks. Next there are work-family challenges, including long work schedules and travel that take women away from families, without help to support their caregiving and other family obligations. Third are institutional mindsets, meaning that women are evaluated differently than men with hidden biases against their accomplishments. A final and critical barrier lies in individual mindsets, with women internalizing this expectation of exclusion because they lack role models, positive reinforcement, or peer and senior-level support.

All of these barriers are problems not only for women's personal achievements, but they are also barriers to their organizations' growth and success, as businesses are unable to take full advantage of half their human capital. Efforts to promote women's economic success and leadership should come from all levels—within women's families where their successes are more likely to be reinvested into the family's well-being, to the community at large, to the business or organization, and to society at large—all of which benefit from the greater economic productivity and social stability that comes from enabling women to succeed. And a more broadly economically successful society leads to a more sustainable peace.

**Notes**


3 Kevin Daly, Gender Inequality, Growth and Global Aging, Global Economics Paper No. 154 (New York: Goldman Sachs Economic Research Group, 2007).


5 Justino et al., 15.

Women as Equal Participants in Conflict Resolution

Evidence from around the world and across cultures shows that integrating women and gender considerations into peace-building processes helps promote democratic governance and long-term stability. In order to achieve these goals, women need to be able to play a role in building and participating in the full range of decision-making institutions in their countries. These institutions, from civil society to the judicial and security sectors, must also be responsive to and informed by women’s demands.

—United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security
8. Women’s Role in Bringing Peace to Sudan and South Sudan

By Princeton N. Lyman

[Women] are part of the society and the mistake we do more often than not is we want to look at a woman’s issue in isolation. . . . It has to be done as part of the society, and the society is together with men, and youth.

—from an interview of Merekaje Lorna Najia, Secretary General of the Sudan Democratic Election Monitoring and Observation Program, conducted as part of the Profiles in Peace Oral Histories Project of the Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace and Security, 2013

Women have not played the role they should—indeed, must—in the ongoing Sudan–South Sudan peace process. Women have worked actively for peace in Sudan, both throughout the decades of civil war and in the various peace processes that ended the war in 2005. Strong women’s caucuses and organizations in both countries continue to work for the people’s betterment and for resolving internal conflicts within their countries (for example, Darfur in Sudan and Jonglei Province in South Sudan). But in the long, drawn-out negotiations between what has become two countries under the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) from 2005 to 2011, women—in groups and as individuals—have been largely shut out along with most of civil society. The result, as Ambassador Donald Steinberg predicted in his chapter in this book, is that far less priority has been paid in these negotiations to matters of people’s welfare. Thus, the peace has not been secured, and both countries are roiled by economic turmoil and distress.
As of June 2013, the National Congress Party of Sudan and the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement of South Sudan have carried out negotiations following the CPA. Even for those who follow the discussions, the state of the negotiations has not been altogether clear nor have the results been coherent. When major agreements and pledges of future peace and cooperation are announced by the two presidents, as happened in September 2012 and again in March 2013, they are followed in just a few months by recriminations, a breakdown of talks, and threats of war or economic retaliation. The whole process has dwelled heavily on political and security matters, sidelining equally urgent economic and social issues that affect the population at large: men, women, children, and families. The two governments remain stuck most of all in disputes over security, borders, and charges that each supports rebels in the other’s country. Economic issues of value to the population at large, such as the predictable and stable flow of oil exports, open borders and trade, and banking cooperation, are all used more as weapons in political and security disputes than as priority objectives to be achieved.

As a result, Sudan remains isolated from international investment and badly needed debt relief. Extraordinary rates of inflation, at 40 percent or more, are dealing heavy blows to the people. Poverty outside Khartoum, hidden from view of those in the capital, rivals that in the far more undeveloped South Sudan. War along the border has threatened starvation for hundreds of thousands. More than 200,000 have become refugees since 2011. In South Sudan, more than one-third of the population is dependent on international food aid. Closed borders make food too expensive to buy, while lack of investment in infrastructure inhibits domestic food production. Only 15 percent of South Sudan’s people are literate, and the country has one of the world’s highest rates of maternal mortality. When oil exports were shut down during 2012, clinics ran out of vital pharmaceuticals and teachers went unpaid. Without new sources of livelihood, ethnic tensions are becoming endemic, causing not only armed clashes but also serious human rights violations. Surely this is not what South Sudanese fought for over more than four decades.

Indeed, the parties to these negotiations have faced tremendously complex tasks from 2005 onward. First, they had to create a government of national unity covering the entire territory—while simultaneously creating an autonomous government in South Sudan. As they negotiated, they did so without knowing whether the country would remain unified or whether, in the 2011 referendum, the South Sudanese
population would vote to secede. It was hard to make a final decision on almost any matter until that issue was resolved. Moreover, after decades of civil war, security has remained vitally important. Each side continues to harbor suspicions of the other, and for good reason: There is plenty of evidence that each side is supporting rebels inside the other’s territory. In such a tense and mistrustful atmosphere, a dispute over a border can set off new violence and a return to conflict, as happened in 2012 when South Sudan attacked the Heglig oilfield of Sudan, and when Sudan bombed areas claimed by South Sudan. Moreover, men and women grow passionate when territory to which they have long been attached is threatened with becoming part of a foreign country or divided, as well as when their ancestral rights to property are at risk. Women and men have rioted in South Sudan over these matters when it appeared that the government might have compromised those rights in the negotiations; they have urged confrontation and even military action to protect their property and access to familiar territory.

So neither the negotiators nor those in the international community who largely accepted the way the peace process has been conducted should be blamed. But priorities have become misplaced. The ongoing disputes today reflect internal politics and jockeying among each country’s rival elements as much as they reflect substantive and objective differences. The people’s primary needs have been sacrificed for too long. Too many are paying too high a price. It is time to change.

At a September 2012 summit meeting between President Omar al-Bashir of Sudan and President Salva Kiir Mayardit of South Sudan, the two leaders signed nine cooperation agreements. These agreements covered security, nationality issues, oil sector arrangements, border openings, trade, and other matters that together provided the first full basis for the two countries to live in peace and cooperation. It was promising. But as of this writing, the agreements are in danger of being jettisoned as renewed arguments arise over security issues. Armed clashes on the border are once again being threatened, Sudan is again calling for an end to South Sudan’s oil exports, conflict continues within Sudan’s states of Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile, and tensions are again high. Both countries’ people are still waiting for the dividends of peace, and if women cannot help bring those dividends home, then perhaps no one can.
Shaping Peace

Fortunately, groups of women in both countries are demanding more access, more influence, and more direct participation in the relations between the two countries. When there was one Sudan, the women from both north and south were active together in women’s organizations. Even after South Sudan’s independence, these women remained in contact and came together in various internationally supported training sessions and for dialogue. In Sudan, members of the women’s organization come from government and civil society, from various political parties and academic and professional affiliations, and from different ethnic and tribal groups and geographic parts of the country. Most found themselves frustrated by their lack of entrée to the peace negotiations. Since 2011, they have focused particularly on defending women’s rights as the country prepares a new constitution and debates the role of sharia in its future.

In South Sudan, with far less institutional development and fewer strong parties, members of women’s organizations are largely supporters of the ruling party and are mostly professionals but do represent a broad range of ethnic groups. After 2011, these women showed prominent patriotic support of the new government. Rather than pressing to engage in the negotiations, they made it a priority to take strong roles in mitigating the growing ethnic violence within South Sudan and in facilitating its internal political and economic development.

All that changed in early 2013 when the women from both countries came together to argue to their leaders and to the international community that it was time for peace and development and to demand a role in the negotiations for themselves. At the 20th African Union Summit held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in January 2013, a Coalition of Women Leaders from Sudan and South Sudan issued a communiqué titled “Women Shaping Peace in Sudan and South Sudan.” In the communiqué, they stated that they had as “delegates of the Coalition of Women Leaders from Sudan and South Sudan” gathered at the summit to “define our common priorities for the future and peaceful coexistence of our countries.” Coalition members had done their homework. They had examined in detail the nine cooperation agreements signed by the two countries’ presidents on September 27, 2012. The communiqué acknowledged the progress that had been made—but nevertheless went on to make a powerful statement:
However, we express our despair and grave concern about ongoing violence in both countries. We emphasize the desperate nature of our shared humanitarian crisis that takes lives on a daily basis. We fear a return to war if the issues of Abyei and border demarcation are not peacefully resolved and the Cooperation Agreements not successfully implemented. We express frustration at the increased conditionalities imposed on and continued lack of implementation of already signed accords. We call upon our leaders . . . to honor their commitments . . .

We . . . affirm our rights as women to be included, consulted, and informed of decision-making processes that impact our lives. We decry the exclusive nature of the negotiations and especially the absence of women. We are frustrated by the lack of information about the process, for it only increase[s] the divisions in our fragile social fabric.¹

The coalition did not shy away from the contentious issues that have preoccupied the negotiators. They proposed concrete entry points on security agreements, border issues, and nationality. They also laid down a series of recommendations on how women could be brought more centrally into the peace process. The recommendations were quite specific, including asking for guarantees that women would be on the boards, bodies, and task forces responsible for implementing the peace agreements; discussing women’s particular security needs; explaining how training of military and police forces needed to be sensitive to women’s safety; and calling for specific inclusion of women not only in the negotiations but also at the table with the international mediators in a process directed by the African Union.

If Women Can’t Do It, Who Can?
It is too soon to know if this initiative will bear fruit. It comes late in the process when positions have hardened on both sides and when the negotiating process has been well established. The leader of the African Union mediation, former South African President Thabo Mbeki, has asked the coalition for a more specific proposal for how they would plan to participate. So far, nothing has changed in the structure of the mediation.

Perhaps most significant, while women are now speaking out and organizing on these issues, there has been no public popular mobilization by women on behalf of
peace in either country as there was in Sierra Leone, Liberia, and Guinea. No one yet knows how far these women are willing to go in Sudan and South Sudan to challenge their leaders, demand a change in priorities, and risk political or social retaliation for doing so. Without that, they are at risk of being ignored. Nor have women demanded more seats at the table from their own governments; party loyalties and competing interests have blunted those demands.

In retrospect, a formal role for women and other representatives of civil society should have been built into the negotiating processes of the CPA from 2005. Women’s voices have been raised only intermittently, divided by national loyalties. As a result, they have not had nearly the influence that the issues warrant. But it is not too late. The coalition that was formed to lobby at the African Union Summit represents a step forward and deserves the continued support of the international community. Any continued failure of the leaders to achieve true peace and address the needs of their peoples will open the door for further strong criticisms from their populations—surely including women.

The international community can help keep women’s roles and recommendations on the table through further support and training for the women’s organizations that make up the Coalition, and by demanding attention to the Coalition’s demands in the mediation. If the mediation does not provide a place for women and civil society at the negotiations, then donors could sponsor parallel meetings of those groups at the same site, as is now common practice at major United Nations conferences. Without those voices and more, without those women and other like-minded citizens organizing actively for peace, the prospect for true peace will remain uncertain. It is late, but not too late.

Note
9. Women as Agents of Peace and Stability: Measuring the Results

By Michelle Bachelet

We had been activists for decades. We felt we'd been politicians “with a small p”—informal politics—but this opportunity came to get engaged in formal politics because you had to get elected as a party to get to the peace table and so literally within the space of six weeks we founded a party, we produced manifestos, we developed policies, we went out and canvassed all over the country. . . . In the [Belfast Peace Agreement] talks . . . if [the women’s coalition] had not been at the table, there may not have been a chapter on reconciliation. It was the women’s coalition that put those words in [the agreement] and talked about paying attention to young people and resources for our youth in the future.

—from an interview with Monica McWilliams, co-founder of the Northern Ireland Women’s Coalition and participant in the Multi-Party Peace Negotiations that led to the Belfast (Good Friday) Peace Agreement, conducted as part of the Profiles in Peace Oral Histories Project of the Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace and Security, 2013

The women, peace, and security agenda first gained a foothold in 1995 at the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing. The goal of ensuring that women are part of making and keeping the peace was reinforced 5 years later with the unanimous adoption of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 (UNSCR 1325) in 2000. This emphasis on protecting and empowering women, both in and after conflict, grows from several sources. One is the global women’s peace movement, which helped reveal systematic use of sexual violence in Bosnia and Rwanda; another is women’s prominent role as peace activists and combatants in Central America.
UNSCR 1325 has many goals, but focuses on two points: addressing the problems women face as victims or survivors of war, and promoting women as agents of peace. More attention has been directed toward protecting women and girls than toward promoting their role in conflict prevention, conflict resolution, and postconflict recovery and peace-building. Ordinary people are now more familiar with the plight of women and girls in conflict zones, specifically widespread and sometimes organized sexual violence. More decisive action is needed, but at least after decades of discussing violence against women as a weapon of war, such violence provokes moral revulsion, and most agree that something must be done to address it.

But protection from violence had long been discussed before UNSCR 1325. The resolution emphasized the importance of women’s participation in peacemaking, peacekeeping, and peace-building. While this has been validated and endorsed many times since the adoption of UNSCR 1325, relatively few people actually know what it entails, why it is important, and what evidence connects it with more durable and stable peace and security. Why do we need quotas for women in parliaments and legislatures? Why do we need women at the peace table?

**Why Resist Involving Women in Peace and Security?**

I was the first leader of UN Women, the full-fledged UN entity devoted to the empowerment of women and the promotion of gender equality. UNSCR 1325 articulates a vision for women in the security field and posits a corollary, for which there is increasing evidence, to the salutary effects that women’s engagement and gender equality have on development, economic growth, good governance, and public health, among others. Gender equality and women’s participation in the workforce have been linked to higher gross domestic product per capita.¹ Women’s equal access to land and other agricultural inputs can increase productivity by 2.5 to 4 percent and reduce the number of people suffering from hunger.² Companies with more women on their boards were found to outperform their rivals with a 42 percent higher return in sales, 66 percent higher return on invested capital, and 53 percent higher return on equity.³ Women’s involvement can have similarly positive effects in peace and security. In 2006, former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan noted, “The world is starting to
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*right: Zulia Mena, mayor of Quibdó, Chocó Department, in western Colombia, talks to girls about the importance of education at the city’s first gender equity public policy launch (ACDI/Katalina Morales)*
grasp that there is no policy more effective [in promoting development, health, and education] than the empowerment of women and girls. And I would venture that no policy is more important in preventing conflict or in achieving reconciliation after a conflict has ended."

During Ban Ki-moon’s first term as Secretary-General, the United Nations adopted four new resolutions on women, peace, and security; articulated a seven-point action plan on women’s participation in peace-building; and appointed an unprecedented number of women to senior peace and security positions, both at headquarters and in the field. The number of women serving as Special Representatives of the Secretary-General, overseeing complex peace operations, continues to grow, albeit slowly.

Yet in the field, women’s participation in peace and security is not yet prioritized or understood. In fact, it is still often dismissed or actively rejected and resisted. This reveals a troubling gap between the aspirations of global and regional commitments and the reality of peace processes and post-conflict peace-building. Conflict prevention and resolution, as practiced today, focus on neutralizing potential spoilers and perpetrators of violence rather than investing in resources for peace. That is a lost opportunity and is precisely what UNSCR 1325 attempts to redress by including a neglected category of peacemakers and social rebuilders: women.

UNSCR 1325 is an attempt to illuminate the often invisible, informal, and unrecognized role that women and girls play in preventing and resolving conflict from peace activism to day-to-day interfamily and intercommunity mediation and reconciliation. It is an attempt to seize the opportunity and empower women at the moment in which crises and transitions have thrust them into new, unconventional roles, to bring women’s voices forward, and to reap the benefits of inclusiveness and diversity in settings and processes that are almost exclusively male dominated.

Women do urgently need to be included at the peace table and in the halls of government. Women’s engagement is also crucial in far more contexts, including peacekeeping missions, donor roundtables and other postconflict planning processes, rebuilding the security and justice sectors, designing and implementing conflict-related programs that range from community-led prevention to disarmament and reintegration, and all kinds of institutions of postconflict governance, including temporary institutions to implementing peace agreements.
Measuring What Is Lost When Women Are Missing

Only recently have we begun to quantify what is lost when women are excluded from these processes. In general, data have not been widely collected and analyzed on the effects of women’s social and political empowerment globally, although what data we do have show that empowering women is urgently important. But the data gap is especially broad in conflict contexts. Data are missing on such crucial aspects of women’s lives as property ownership rates, levels of participation in local government, economic engagement, types of market access, and maternal mortality. Conflict-triggered population flight and displacement make gathering data still more complicated; some of the women most affected by conflict simply disappear from official view. Surprisingly little is known about what proportion of postconflict spending targets gender equality and women’s empowerment, what proportion of demobilized combatants and people associated with fighting forces are women, what proportion of reparations target women and offer redress for crimes they have suffered, what numbers of women are hired after conflict to deliver public services, or what numbers of women are involved in peace negotiations and postconflict planning.

That is why UN Women sampled 31 major peace processes between 1992 and 2011 and analyzed them for gender participation. We found that women made up only 4 percent of signatories, 2.4 percent of chief mediators, 3.7 percent of witnesses to peace agreement signings, and 9 percent of negotiators. These figures indicate that women are markedly underrepresented at the peace table, far more than they are in other public decisionmaking professions and positions where the gap has been steadily narrowing—including in those that typically dominate peace talks, such as politicians, lawyers, diplomats, and members of armed groups. Nor are the numbers of women involved in peace processes improving. In 2011, only 4 of 14 UN-supported mediation processes included any women as members of the negotiating parties. In the first half of 2012, women’s civil society representatives had participated in only one-third of donor conferences. No female leaders of nongovernmental organizations—none—participated in any of the eight meetings held in 2011 and 2012 by Contact Groups, comprised of countries that support or sponsor a particular crisis or peace process.

Women’s exclusion from peacemaking and conflict resolution can be seen wherever we look. Women routinely constitute a minority of beneficiaries of postconflict employment programs in spite of UN guidelines encouraging gender parity. At the
end of 2011, women comprised only 3 percent of peacekeeping missions’ military staffs and only 10 percent of UN police. Since June 2010, women’s share of senior UN positions has actually dropped slightly—to 18 percent in special political missions and 21 percent in peacekeeping missions. In 2011, women represented about 20 percent of participants in UN-supported disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration programs, including socioeconomic reintegration and employment support and vocational and microenterprise training. Women involved in postconflict countries’ elections face more dangers than men tackling comparable tasks. For instance, consider that Afghan women comprised less than a quarter of all candidates in the 2010 elections and generally ran more security-conscious campaigns than did their male counterparts. Yet 6 of the 11 campaign workers killed during that campaign season worked for women’s campaigns; 9 in 10 threats against candidates were against women. In transition countries, female voters are four times as likely to be targets of intimidation than male voters. Women are attacked verbally and physically more often than men during voter registration or other civic activities taking place in public spaces.

Perhaps one of the better known indicators of gender equality is the percentage of seats won by women in parliaments. As of March 31, 2012, women made up 20 percent of parliamentarians globally, and 18 percent in countries affected by conflict. Clear evidence shows that, particularly in war’s aftermath, electoral quotas and other types of temporary special measures are by far the fastest means of bringing women’s parliamentary representation to the critical mass participation point of 30 percent, at which point having women in the legislature becomes normalized and spontaneously increases—which is why 30 percent was the target set by the Beijing Platform for Action in 1995.

UN Women’s research into postconflict parliamentary representation found that when quota-based systems were present, women were 34 percent of those elected—whereas in countries without electoral quotas, women made up just 12 percent of parliamentarians. In 2011, postconflict countries that had elections with no electoral gender quota elected women, on average, as only 7 percent of their parliaments; in countries with a quota, women were, on average, 30 percent. In 26 postconflict countries’ recent elections, women’s political representation leaped after gender quotas were used, achieving and even exceeding quota levels in elections afterward. But in postconflict countries that never have electoral quotas, women’s participation stayed
flat (see figure). Yet the international community has not consistently explained to postconflict national authorities how important it is to use quota systems to increase the proportion of women in elected bodies, or pressured them to put such systems into place.

Where Is the Evidence?

So what does all of this have to do with keeping the peace? After all, those who advocate for the goals of UNSCR 1325 do not simply argue that women have a right to participate in much greater numbers in preventing conflict or in rebuilding once peace is restored. They do not merely claim that women should be more democratically represented because they are 51 percent of the total population. Rather, advocates say that women’s participation leads to a more secure, sustained, and stable peace. This point is often openly questioned or implicitly doubted. So where is the evidence?

Several types of answers are supported by evidence. First, research shows that more inclusive peace processes lead to higher quality peace agreements that are sustained longer. Social exclusion can drive conflict according to many of the national and international peace-builders. An inclusive approach to rebuilding means that more stakeholders have an investment in the new system of governance—which is thus more stable. Recent research has found a correlation between more inclusive and open models of negotiations and a higher likelihood that the resulting agreements will hold, preventing a relapse into conflict.14 That is an important finding given that more than half of all peace agreements fail within the first 5 years.

Some people argue that women are more likely to work to build consensus in public debate, an approach that is of particular value to peace talks. Whether we accept this theory, women do indisputably insist that their own priorities and concerns should be addressed in a peace agreement’s approach to governance, justice, security, and recovery aspects. Women’s concerns generally include an insistence on quotas for women in postconflict elections, an insistence that land and property rights be extended to women, and demands for justice and redress for sexual and gender-based violence committed during the conflict. When these concerns are addressed and half the population can rest more securely, what results is a more robust and sustainable peace, a more rapid return to the rule of law, and increased trust in the new state and its government.
At the least, when women have had their say at the peace table and are part of the institutions and processes that implement the peace—from disarmament to constitutional reform, land reform, and transitional justice—then peace is built on a more representative diversity of views. Broadening the peace process by including women means the postconflict order is built on what matters to more constituencies than merely the fighting parties and the potential spoilers. The peace deal thus involves those people who can ensure broad social acceptance and commitment to its terms. All that makes peace stronger, more widely rooted, and more deeply supported.

Some argue that women’s participation can hurt the peace process—but those arguments do not stand up to scrutiny. For instance, some argue that the parties might object to a female mediator. Certainly, they might. But for years now, negotiations have faltered over disagreements about the mediator or mediation team. Indeed, it has been one of the leading causes of negotiation failure. Those mediators have invariably been male. Yet no one ever assumes that those objections to particular (male) mediators should be extended to their entire sex, as happens often with female mediators.

Others argue that parties might object to including women’s civil society groups because it could bring scrutiny toward atrocities those parties might have committed against women. But parties to peace negotiations generally do not object to involving civil society in general. Rather, parties tend to oppose including specific civil society groups whose point of view they oppose or that they perceive as biased against them. Women’s groups are generally perceived as comparatively more neutral than other civil society groups, especially when they have a broad base and are representative. As a result, the parties are less likely to object to women’s inclusion.

Finally, we are often told that women’s demands could be at odds with the demands of one or both parties to the negotiations, and thus risk jeopardizing the agreement. However, nothing indicates that women would be less amenable to discussing and negotiating their demands than would other parties, or that their demands would be harder to discuss than many other provisions routinely included in peace agreements.

In sum, we can find countless examples in which peace processes have broken down over a wide variety of factors: disagreement over the choice of mediator, internal dissension within armed groups, ceasefire violations, implementation delays, and irreconcilable differences over substantive topics like self-government, but a case in which peace negotiations were derailed by women’s demands has yet to be discovered.

[102]
More and more people are aware that women’s participation strengthens peacebuilding. By placing women at the center of security, justice, economic recovery, and good governance, everyone involved receives peace dividends that include faster job creation and better public services. Communities more rapidly receive the payoffs of peace. The massive challenge of building back better is more likely to be met. Meanwhile, if women are not included, the opposite occurs. For example, as the percentage of female-headed households surges during and after conflict, unless women find livelihoods and economic empowerment, they and their daughters are pushed into low-reward, high-risk work such as survival sex, slowing community recovery and normalization and deepening children’s poverty and resentment. But if women can generate income and gain some economic security, they are faster than men to invest in child welfare and education, faster to build food security, and faster to rebuild rural economies. When women are explicitly included in the peace and recovery, the consequences for human development are more immediate: more children in school, children better fed, houses repaired, and healthier families.

Recruiting women for jobs delivering public services in postconflict settings helps ensure greater access to and higher quality of such services for the overall population. That helps mitigate conflict by reducing tension and grievances over key basic services—not only security, water, food, and health services, but also education, employment, and registration services.

What is the evidence? While much more research is needed, and while there is a shortage of comprehensive and reliable data from conflict and postconflict settings, the number of empirical findings that support the positive role of women’s participation in securing peace and stability continues to grow. For instance, a recent study in three conflict-affected settings showed that countries that adopted electoral quotas for under-represented groups, including gender quotas, in proportional representation systems with closed lists have experienced more stability.15

Or consider the evidence that having women delivering public services—as polling agents, police officers, registration officials, judges, court clerks, teachers, medical attendants, or agricultural extension agents—results in higher quality services for both men and women, improves women’s access to services, and offers important role models for women’s public engagement in public spaces.16 In most conflict-affected settings, between 30 and 40 percent of families are headed by women; in some cases,
more than half are. Ensuring that these women have an equitable proportion of public service jobs is critical to improving their well-being and that of their families. When more women are in police forces, both men and women are more likely to report sexual violence.\textsuperscript{17} Citizens respond positively to women in other areas of public service as well. For example, using female agricultural extension workers seems to increase the use of the service by both female and male farmers.\textsuperscript{18} Having women community members involved in water and sanitation planning decisions improves the performance of water services, according to a 15-country study, because women tend to have an intimate, hands-on knowledge both of the water and sewer services and of the community’s needs.\textsuperscript{19}

Studies also show that when more women are in the labor force, prospects are better for peace and security. Countries with only 10 percent of women in the labor force are nearly 30 times more likely to experience internal conflict than states with 40 percent of women in the labor force.\textsuperscript{20} Recently, the first comprehensive examination of women’s employment-seeking patterns in conflict and postconflict situations revealed that women’s participation in the labor force rises during and after conflict, often in low-wage and dangerous occupations; that even when earning much less than men, their contribution to family well-being was considerably larger; and that these spending patterns could contribute to postconflict family and community stability.\textsuperscript{21}

Another body of evidence found that when states have more gender equality, they are less likely to rely on military force to settle disputes;\textsuperscript{22} that having more female leaders is strongly correlated with lower levels of violence in a crisis;\textsuperscript{23} that states with high fertility rates are nearly twice as likely to experience internal conflict as states with low fertility rates;\textsuperscript{24} and that gender equality is significantly associated with improved respect for human rights\textsuperscript{25} and lower corruption.\textsuperscript{26} Levels of sexual and gender-based violence remain at higher than usual levels in certain conflict-affected settings, especially when sexual violence was a prominent feature of the fighting and a culture of impunity is still pervasive. But this may be reduced if, post conflict, more women are involved in governing, in delivering key frontline services, and in generating income. Studies have shown that when a society has high levels of violence against women as individuals, it is more likely to resort to violence to settle larger societal disputes. A recent study found that there is a strong and statistically significant relationship between women’s individual physical security and states’ relative peacefulness as measured along three different lines. This finding held when
gender equality and women’s empowerment improve economic growth and lead to better governance—effects that are especially important immediately after conflicts.

According to a wide variety of studies, gender equality and women’s empowerment improve economic growth and lead to better governance—effects that are especially important immediately after conflicts. For instance, a cross-country analysis showed that the conflict-affected communities that experienced the fastest economic recovery and the quickest drop in poverty were those in which more women reported higher levels of empowerment.\(^{28}\) That makes sense coming atop a large body of research correlating the presence of women in power with a host of positive outcomes. For instance, when indexes of women’s social and economic rights were low, indexes of corruption were high, according to a 1998 World Bank study of 80 countries.\(^{29}\) Women’s presence in politics increases the amount of attention given to social welfare, legal protection, and transparency, and helps restore trust in government, according to a 2000 Inter-Parliamentary Union survey.\(^{30}\) A series of studies from India have revealed that children in villages headed by female leaders experience higher rates of immunization and school attendance; that women’s high participation in local councils leads to greater investment in potable water, roads, and antenatal care, which drives down neonatal mortality; and that women in power serve as positive role models for girls and young women, raising their academic performance and career aspirations and making their parents more likely to invest in continued schooling for their girls.\(^{31}\)

Beyond the academic literature, of course, there are the powerful stories of female peace activists. Some have begun to be better known and recognized at the highest levels, including as recipients of the Nobel Peace prize. In Liberia, women played a key role in advocating for peace and an end to that country’s long and devastating civil war; they staged a dramatic showdown at the Accra peace negotiations, refusing to let the negotiators leave the room until they signed a deal. In Northern Ireland, women activists may have made the Belfast (Good Friday) Peace Agreement more durable and relevant to people’s lives by including commitments to accelerate the release and reintegration of political prisoners, ensure integrated education and mixed housing, and involve youth and victims of violence in reconciliation. Afghan women participating in successive rounds of negotiations stood up for the rights of under-represented minorities such as the Uzbeks. (That is just one example of how women routinely speak on behalf of other marginalized groups and across cultural
Somali women have contributed greatly to building interclan alliances in a country that had been violently divided by clans. Women continue to play a prominent and courageous role in the wave of transitions and crises that have engulfed the Arab world since 2011. We suspect that the participation of women will be key to determining whether those revolutions bring about freedom and democracy.

As UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon stated in his report on women’s participation in peace-building, ensuring women’s participation is critical “in shoring up three pillars of lasting peace: economic recovery, social cohesion, and political legitimacy.”

Of course, all women are not by nature or custom attached to peace, nor are they necessarily better connected to grassroots communities. Just like men, women are exposed to and influenced by political, ethnic, or religious tensions. Like men, women may contribute to violence and participate in armed groups. But more than men, women often bear the extra burden of a vastly lower social and economic status, which puts them at a great disadvantage when situations are insecure. As the first victims of sexual and gender-based violence, women often see more clearly how conflict stretches from the beating at home to the rapes and killings on the streets and the battlefield. As such, they are critical in bringing peace back to their communities.

As one of its core priorities, UN Women spares no effort in advocating for women’s engagement in peacemaking and peace-building. We support women’s peace coalitions and participation in politics, lobby other actors at peace tables for the inclusion of women in all roles, and promote the political voice and institutional capacity of autonomous women’s organizations, often severely damaged and lacking functional capacity, so they can mobilize and build constituencies and bridges across communities and develop common platforms. UN Women is a strong advocate for temporary special measures, such as quotas, the waiver of nomination fees, and women’s access to public resources for political campaigns. We support female candidates’ engagement with media and political parties; the registration of female voters, especially those living in rural and remote areas that need identity cards to be able to vote or access other services; and the monitoring of female candidates, voters, and election officials to ensure their safety.

Women’s voices need to be heard and acted upon to build sustainable peace. This means that their voices need to be heard before, during, and after peace is consolidated. To ensure that the benefits of peace are broadly enjoyed by society and
that communities do not relapse back into conflict, women must participate equally—in their societies, governments, and other bodies—in times of peace, conflict, and transition. Promoting the full participation of women in peacemaking and peace-building requires a paradigm change. We must focus not only on the disruptive role of potential spoilers, but also on women's constructive potential for building a broad and inclusive social constituency for peace, justice, and democracy.
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By Carter F. Ham

I think the women who decided they were going to use methods that had never been tried before . . . women from all walks of life, including women from the informal sector (market women), who would sit all day in the sun and rain just advocating for peace and calling upon the leaders of West Africa [to] do something to change. So they went to the Accra peace talks and at one point, they locked the doors so that the warring faction leaders who were determining the new government would not come out. They even threatened to disrobe themselves if they didn’t get a response! And I think all of those unconventional methods proved to be too much and so they began to respond. I do believe that because their actions were so different and so sacrificial, it got the attention of not only the West African leaders but of the international community at large and they put a much greater effort to bring the war to an end.

—from an interview with Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, President of Liberia and Nobel Peace Prize Laureate, conducted as part of the Profiles in Peace Oral Histories Project of the Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace and Security, 2012

In December 2011, President Barack Obama issued the United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security (NAP) to inform U.S. foreign policy around a simple but profound idea: women matter to the peace, stability, and security of the world. “To empower half the world’s population as equal partners in preventing conflict and building peace in countries threatened and affected by war, violence and insecurity . . . is critical to our national and global security.” As a
contributor to the development of the NAP, the Department of Defense (DOD) recognizes the vital role that women can and should play in peace and security around the world. Nowhere is this idea more important than in Africa—a continent with a population of more than one billion, including more than 800 ethnic groups, 1,000 languages, and an array of diverse cultural and religious contexts and histories.

A safe, secure, stable, and prosperous Africa is in the U.S. national security interest, yet almost half of all African countries are in an active conflict or recovering from a recently ended one. In Africa’s contemporary conflicts, more than 90 percent of all casualties are women and children, who also are more likely to be targets of sexual and gender-based violence. In some of the most egregious cases, combatants use such violence as a deliberate tool for humiliation, terror, and control. Refugees and internally displaced persons of both sexes face violence and sexual exploitation, making it increasingly important for militaries and peacekeeping forces to understand the unique security needs of women and children. Of the 16 active United Nations (UN) peacekeeping missions worldwide, 7 are in Africa, and 6 of those explicitly mandate the protection of civilians under the threat of violence. The majority of peacekeepers in Africa are, in fact, provided by other African states, to include those in support of the African Union Mission in Somalia.

As one of DOD’s geographic unified combatant commands, U.S. Africa Command (USAFRICOM) is devoted to and responsible for U.S. military relations with 54 African countries. The command recognizes that Africans are best suited to address their own security challenges, a concept that undergirds its engagements with partner nations and organizations. By working to help strengthen African defense capabilities so they are capable, sustainable, subordinate to civilian authority, respectful of the rule of law, and committed to the well-being of their fellow citizens, USAFRICOM also advances key U.S. foreign policy priorities to strengthen democratic institutions; spur economic growth, trade, and investment; advance peace and security; and promote opportunity and investment. Former Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton has stated that societies are strengthened when women are engaged as equal partners in all aspects of peace-building and conflict prevention, a sentiment that mirrors the NAP: “Deadly conflicts can be more effectively avoided, and peace can be best forged and sustained, when women become equal partners in all aspects of peace-building and conflict prevention, when their lives are protected, their experiences considered, and their voices heard.” With more than 500 million women
in Africa, female voices are vital, so USAFRICOM supports the NAP by engaging partner countries’ national security leadership to incorporate a gender perspective and women, peace, and security (WPS) initiatives in their planning and activities, while it promotes, supports, and encourages African partners to integrate women into their defense forces.

**Command Support for WPS Initiatives and the NAP**

The U.S. Government’s focus on WPS is not new. As the 2010 National Security Strategy (NSS) recognizes, “Countries are more peaceful and prosperous when women are accorded full and equal rights and opportunity. When those rights and opportunities are denied, countries lag behind.” Built on the NSS, the NAP was developed “as a comprehensive roadmap for accelerating and institutionalizing efforts across the United States government to advance women’s participation in making and keeping peace.” When Secretary Clinton announced that President Obama had signed an executive order to launch the NAP, she noted that women have too much to offer to be ignored when it comes to peace and security: “Excluding women means excluding [their] entire wealth of knowledge and experience.”

On April 5, 2012, U.S. Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta signed a memorandum directing DOD to incorporate WPS concepts into its programs and policies. USAFRICOM already had begun including these initiatives into its planning and activities, but the DOD directive further reinforced the U.S. Government’s political resolve on the issue and marked a turning point in driving a broad and systematic approach to advance agency progress.

The U.S. Strategy for Sub-Saharan Africa (Presidential Policy Directive [PPD] 16), released in June 2012, builds on the NSS and NAP to articulate a forward-looking, innovative strategy for advancing a common vision to help promote and encourage democracy, economic prosperity, peace and security, and human dignity with African partner nations. PPD-16 outlines the interrelationship between these elements, stating, “Sustainable, inclusive economic growth is a key ingredient to security, political stability, and development, and it underpins efforts to alleviate poverty, creating the resources that will bolster opportunity and allow individuals to reach their full potential.” As part of the command’s implementation of PPD-16, and as an important element in addressing security challenges in Africa, USAFRICOM works with its partners to advance women’s access and full participation in
institutional decisionmaking related to conflict prevention, conflict management, and conflict resolution/humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.

The NAP complements and reinforces existing U.S. Government initiatives to advance gender equality and women’s empowerment, a perspective that USAFRICOM fully supports. It has at its core “the goal of gender integration (or ‘mainstreaming’) to promote gender equality and improve programming and policy outcomes,” but most importantly, it recognizes the importance of women’s views and perspectives “as agents of peace, reconciliation, development, growth, and stability.” The NAP identifies five focus areas that are central to U.S. efforts to promote security, prevent, respond to, and resolve conflict, and rebuild societies: national integration and institutionalization, participation, protection from violence, conflict prevention, and access to relief and recovery. The NAP highlights the U.S. Government’s commitment to prioritize gender issues and to integrate and institutionalize gender in U.S. policies, including a gender-sensitive approach in conflict-afflicted environments.

National Integration and Institutionalization. In 2010, USAFRICOM formed the Women, Peace, and Security Working Group (WG)—prior to the development of the NAP—to serve as the principal advisory body for guiding the command’s endeavors on gender issues. The WG worked with the National Security Staff on the formulation of the NAP itself and also worked with the Office of the Secretary of Defense to help shape the DOD Implementation Plan of the NAP. The WG continues to guide USAFRICOM efforts to integrate gender perspectives across the full range of its operations, exercises, and security cooperation activities through a focus on awareness, education, implementation, and assessment.

USAFRICOM’s activities to prioritize gender issues both within the command and through external engagement with African, international, and interagency partners include a gender mainstreaming approach focused on leading and integrating efforts. To raise awareness of gender issues among the staff at USAFRICOM, the WG sponsors movie screenings that highlight WPS initiatives. The documentary Pray the Devil Back to Hell (2008) illustrates the harrowing story of Leymah Gbowee, the woman who launched a movement called the Women of Liberia Mass Action for Peace to help put an end to civil war in Liberia and influence the ensuing peace agreement. A screening of Weapon of War (2009), about the use of rape as a weapon over two decades of conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, provides command staff with insight into sexual violence, its impact on victims and society, and the motivation behind
perpetrators’ actions. A question-and-answer session with the film’s directors after
gave staff the opportunity to learn more about the devastating effect of gender-based
brutality. The group has also hosted staff events to address the importance of female
participation in peacekeeping operations and in civil affairs engagement teams.

USAFRICOM has partnered with African nations that have expressed the desire
to achieve WPS objectives, recognizing that the political commitment made by
African leaders at the national and regional policymaking echelons plays a pivotal
role in driving change and transformation at the strategic, operational, and tactical
levels in African national militaries. Working bilaterally with several African partners,
USAFRICOM has helped nations address gender within the broader context of
security sector reform that is designed to help develop institutions operating under
democratic norms, subordinate to civilian control, and have sufficient human and
material capacity to provide for the security of their state and respective populations.

USAFRICOM’s security force assistance activities are an essential component of
security sector reform and are commonly organized in four principal categories:
strengthening civilian control and oversight of the military, professionalization of
military forces, demilitarization and peacekeeping, and strengthening the rule of
law.12 USAFRICOM promotes the inclusion of gender-sensitive policies, along with
traditional elements such as democratic accountability, human rights, and technical
training as part of all security force assistance to increase the professionalism of
African military forces.

USAFRICOM also assists its African partner nations with gender
mainstreaming—that is, efforts to recruit, train, and retain women to build more
representative military forces. Integrating women into national militaries offers
a wider array of tools and optimizes skill sets for these entities to interact more
effectively with the populace and to address needs for security across gender lines.
Furthermore, military gender integration demonstrates and reinforces democratic
core values such as equality and citizenship as a part of a strong, functioning national
institution. Gender-based security sector reform includes training how women can be
integrated successfully into a state’s military forces, tailored to the state’s sociocultural
dynamics and religious traditions. One success of USAFRICOM’s engagements to
help expand opportunities for women in the armed forces can be found in Liberia,
which has set a goal to have 20 percent of its military be female.
USAFRICOM continues to refine its understanding of gender concepts in African peace and security through commissioned academic studies on gender issues to identify best practices about how to incorporate gender as an integrated part of its engagements with African partners.

**Participation.** USAFRICOM advances gender participation in African militaries through regional conferences and bilateral engagements with African partner nations. The command has responded to requests made by its African partners for assistance in advancing efforts to integrate women and their perspectives into African militaries. One example is the recent Annual Joint Warrant Officer/Senior Noncommissioned Officer Symposium, which included a one-day seminar dedicated to female attendees to share how we might assist African partners as they work to integrate WPS considerations. At the request of senior military and civilian officials from the Republic of Botswana, USAFRICOM is helping the Batswana government determine how it can expand the roles of women in the Botswana Defense Force. Other African militaries have requested assistance in improving gender integration within their forces as well.

USAFRICOM remains committed to listening to its African partners. In September 2012, a conference entitled “Leaning Forward: Gender Mainstreaming in African Armed Forces” brought together more than two dozen experts and practitioners from 14 African countries, the African Union, and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development to examine and highlight the progress made, challenges experienced, and opportunities available to enhance gender mainstreaming in African security forces. USAFRICOM cohosted the event with the Africa Center for Strategic Studies. Participants discussed the potential role USAFRICOM could play in support of African efforts. A meeting with then–Secretary of State Clinton was among the highlights. “We’re incredibly proud to be sponsoring this program . . . and to be working with all of you on the greater integration of women into the security and military forces,” Clinton stated while meeting workshop participants who visited her State Department offices.13

The participants brought with them a broad range of experiences, expertise, and diversity that enabled rich discussions on several aspects of gender mainstreaming in the African security sector and armed forces. Experts at the workshop stressed the importance of militaries integrating gender perspectives into recruitment, training, and personnel management strategies. “In many ways the kind of training that has
gone on with peacekeepers and in your militaries to better integrate women’s talents, experiences, perspectives makes us all that much more effective. . . . We are all in this together,” stated Melanne Verveer, then–U.S. Ambassador-at-Large for Global Women’s Issues.14

Protection from Violence. USAFRICOM takes seriously its objective to help African militaries understand, support, and adhere to civilian protection responsibilities, particularly those related to women and children. As the command’s support for African partners’ initiatives on gender mainstreaming leads to the creation of more representative military forces, it is critical that those forces know how to interact with and protect all segments of its population effectively. For example, USAFRICOM has designed specific mechanisms to combat abuse, exploitation, discrimination, and violence against women both within the military and by defense forces. The command raises awareness about and provides training and assistance to African militaries about sexual and gender-based violence, recognizing that female victims are more likely to report incidents and provide information to other women.

USAFRICOM supports the objectives of the U.S. Department of State’s Global Peace Operations Initiative to further refine gender awareness and prioritization through engagement with peacekeepers charged with protecting civilians in humanitarian and UN peacekeeping missions. Through training courses that directly address issues about human rights, codes of conduct, discipline, and sexual exploitation, USAFRICOM regularly reiterates the importance of WPS considerations. In one such endeavor, USAFRICOM developed training materials and lessons to increase sexual and gender-based violence awareness of 700 Congolese soldiers as part of Operation Olympic Chase, a 6-month USAFRICOM training initiative focused on building the basic infantry skills of soldiers likely to deploy in rapid-response situations.

In August 2012, USAFRICOM hosted a conference entitled “Women, Peace, and Security Lessons Learned in Peacekeeping” at the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Center, in collaboration with the center’s Women, Peace, and Security Institute. This conference facilitated a dynamic dialogue between international subject matter experts across all areas of peacekeeping operations and gender issues. Military and civilian participants from 15 countries engaged in lively discussions about the opportunities and challenges of integrating gender into peacekeeping activities. All agreed that gender-integrated peacekeeping forces are
more effective. Describing his observations while in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Patrick Cammaert, a retired Dutch general who has a chapter in this volume, stated that “it has probably become more dangerous to be a woman than a soldier in armed conflict”—a sobering thought that resonated with conference participants.

**Conflict Prevention.** Governments must be able to protect their own citizens from threat or use of force by internal and external forces. Violence against women and children is frequently noted as a symptom of a dysfunctional state. The State Department and U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) continue to spearhead efforts to address the root causes for the vulnerability of women and girls, such as poverty, poor health, and lack of education and unemployment. Studies have shown that nations with gender equality norms are more stable and prosperous.

Presidential Study Directive–10 established that “preventing mass atrocities and genocide is a core national security interest and a core moral responsibility of the United States.”15 There is a nascent interagency effort to prevent conflict, mass atrocities, and violence against vulnerable populations through the establishment of early warning systems. Just as women and children are disproportionately affected by conflict, increases in violence against women and children often serve as early indicators of potential conflict within society writ large. In fact, recognizing that women are often the first group to see the dynamic of violence shift within the population—shifts that often result in conflict—USAFRICOM addresses conflict prevention through its work with an African initiative to develop early warning and response systems that incorporate gender-specific data in monitoring indicators for violence and mass atrocities against vulnerable populations.

USAFRICOM continues to look for ways it can assist partner nation defense forces to identify instances when the possibility of increasing violence may lead to mass atrocities and to stem the spread of violence before it results in mass atrocities. Through its relationships with African partner nations, U.S. Embassies on the continent, and access to civil society through a variety of mechanisms, USAFRICOM is in some ways uniquely positioned to support African authorities to prevent mass atrocities and mitigate the consequences of catastrophic events, helping its partners to recognize indicators for mass atrocities, which can entail either real or perceived threats against vulnerable populations. The command will continue to work with its interagency partners to develop coordinated engagement opportunities that draw on mutual strengths.

just as women and children are disproportionately affected by conflict, increases in violence against women and children often serve as early indicators of potential conflict within society writ large
Access to Relief and Recovery. USAID leads U.S. Government efforts on humanitarian disaster management and response. In response to USAID and partner nation requests for assistance, USAFRICOM supports disaster relief and associated efforts to address the security needs of women and children in conflict-affected crises and disaster. Additionally, USAFRICOM is working with partners to provide relief and recovery for victims of sexual and gender-based violence and, in one example, has funded construction, renovation, and repair of facilities that provide services to victims in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Beyond direct support through USAID efforts, USAFRICOM enhances the knowledge and capacity of militaries that deploy to areas of crisis. The command works to support the realization of the Africa Standby Force and its vision of regional rapid deployment capabilities and raises awareness of the WPS agenda in support of these capacity-building efforts via military-to-military engagements, training and mentorship, and conferences.

African Success
African states and regional organizations have also made great strides in prioritizing gender concerns and advancing gender perspectives in policies, protocols, and programs. In 2004, the UN Security Council encouraged its member states to develop NAPs in support of the WPS agenda. Currently, 43 UN member states have WPS NAPs, 12 of which are African. The African Union has worked to institutionalize women’s rights and gender equality and has urged its member states to do the same. In 2003, the African Union developed a Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights on the Rights of Women in Africa; in 2005, it completed a Solemn Declaration on Gender Equality in Africa. Similarly, Africa’s regional economic communities have made notable steps in prioritizing gender through their organizations and planning. For instance, the South African Development Community has a Gender and Development Protocol and completed a plan for integrating women into their member states’ national militaries. USAFRICOM continues to engage these organizations to expand their regional capacity to address gender issues and advance WPS initiatives in Africa.

In many ways, Africa has been at the forefront of advancing a gender perspective in ending armed conflict and laying the foundations for sustainable peace. Women’s advocacy groups in Liberia have played a tireless, consistent role over the course of
two civil wars and in postconflict reconstruction to end violence against women and children. Women organized the Women in Peacebuilding Network (WIPNET) in 1991, taking to the streets during the early part of Liberia’s first civil war to advocate for peace negotiations. When the tenuous 1996–1997 peace agreement fell through, women reinvigorated the WIPNET to bring together Charles Taylor and warring opposition leaders to move peace talks forward. Their work was instrumental in advancing the disarmament process. Female advocacy networks played a proactive role as watchdogs, ensuring that each task laid out in the resulting Comprehensive Peace Agreement was implemented without fail. Groups such as the Mano River Women’s Peace Network carry on the legacy of WIPNET as an active advocacy network, providing assistance from skills-based training to women for economic development to legal representation in cases of rape and other sexual and gender-based violence. Today, the improved security Liberia enjoys is owed in large part to the brave women of these grassroots efforts.

As USAFRICOM collaborates with African partner nations on WPS initiatives, there is a common recognition that local customs and traditions, dynamics, and power relations play a role in affecting how successful these efforts can be. The roles of individuals of both genders are influenced by sociocultural dynamics, power structures, history, and religious backgrounds that contribute to the perceptions of individuals in all societies. As USAFRICOM works with its partners to promote gender-sensitive policies and approaches, it is important to recognize how societies differ in their identification and perceptions of gender roles. For example, because many African languages do not have a word for “gender,” there can be an added challenge to support African partners as they develop WPS initiatives.

Looking to the Future
U.S. Africa Command is formulating a comprehensive plan to address WPS and related gender issues in its operations, exercises, and security cooperation activities in such a way that they are culturally sensitive, supportive of partner nation efforts, and contribute to African capacity at the national and regional levels. The WPS Working Group continues its internal discussions with command leadership and planners to determine how best to consolidate and institutionalize WPS initiatives. In partnership with African nations, USAFRICOM will continue to develop professional training modules on gender perspectives and sexual and gender-based
violence awareness, prevention, and response. USAFRICOM will also continue to improve coordination and support for interagency and international partners on women, peace, and security initiatives.

Heather Bush, Jennifer Duval, Caterina Dutto Fox, and Ann Stieglitz contributed to the development of this chapter.
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By William H. McRaven

Now more than ever—with increasingly agile enemies and complex problem sets—the U.S. special operations forces (SOF) community must diversify its strategies and the tactics it uses to execute them. Effectively using SOF in achieving national security objectives requires using an indirect approach to promote peace and security in hostile environments. Indirect actions are arguably more important than direct actions. These nonlethal activities can encourage and sustain second- and third-order effects, which over time engender long-term peace and security.

Women are invaluable contributors to special operations, especially in indirect action. I have spent considerable time in Afghanistan every year since 2003, traveling across the entire rugged country several times over. Due to both direct and indirect actions by U.S. SOF and partner nations, today’s Afghanistan is the safest in 10 years.

SOF teams that include women in their cultural support teams provide greater access and action to the local population than all-male units do. Including women allows tailored, culturally sensitive engagement, opening up possibilities for interactions with local populations that would otherwise be closed to all-male teams. Increased interaction simultaneously boosts both traditional military information support and medical and civil affairs activities. These contributions increase the effectiveness of the overall mission as women positively shape the wartime environment and, in some instances, prevent conflict from occurring in the first place.

Doctrine defines special operations as special because success depends on long-term relationships with indigenous forces and populations as well as knowledge of
the cultural, societal, economic, and political environments where these relationships occur. The greater our environmental knowledge and extent of our relationships, the more likely we are to be successful. Broad knowledge of the human domain, more than any other single factor, defines special operations.

Capital within the human domain is obtained through developing an understanding of and nurturing influence among critical populations. U.S. SOF are intentionally recruited to be a capable and diverse force, comprised of teams and components uniquely trained and exceptionally skilled. We will never fully understand the human domain when we have access to only half of the people who live within it, which means that women are and will continue to be a critical means to this end.

Past: Women and the OSS
Women have always played a significant role in U.S. development, diplomacy, and defense actions. For instance, the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) was the first organized effort by the Nation to implement a centralized system of strategic intelligence. It was the predecessor to the Central Intelligence Agency and U.S. Special Operations Command—and one in five of its members were women.

Few Americans could identify the names of special operations legends Virginia Hall, Barbara Lauwers, or Elizabeth McIntosh. But not all these heroes are consigned to history’s shadows. Fans of Julia Child and Marlene Dietrich might recall their off-camera roles as members of the OSS. Child, for example, notably contributed to creating a workable shark repellent for downed flight crews that was used on U.S. space missions with water landings.

Little is known about the quiet female professionals who served with General William “Wild Bill” Donovan in World War II. Donovan, historically considered the grandfather of special operations, described these women as “vital to an organization which touched every theater of the war.” Along with establishing the OSS administrative offices, mail routing, and recruiting, these women worked in research and analysis, special operations, maritime units, counterintelligence, morale operations (comparable to today’s information operations or military information support to operations), and even secret intelligence groups.

right: Specialist Courtney Wade, USA, a combat medic with the 176th Engineer Brigade, listens to Afghan girls during first woman’s shura at Urgun District hospital, April 2011 (U.S. Air Forces Central Command/Stacia Zachary)
Present: Rise of Cultural Support Teams

But women took a leap forward within SOF more recently. Throughout the 1990s, special operations forces routinely employed women in support positions. Women were useful in assisting and running Medical Civil Action Programs and Medical Readiness Training exercises, especially where demographic studies revealed large numbers of women and children in the population. This practice was carried over to Afghanistan and Iraq. There, centrally based teams of male medical experts, augmented with female specialists or assistants, routinely rotated to distant military bases to assist operational units in engaging populaces. This improved effectiveness by giving the otherwise all-male operational units greater access and wider opportunities for placement with the population. As a result, demand for these women’s capabilities outstripped available numbers.

In 2005, as the Iraq conflict evolved, insurgents began using women as contraband smugglers and suicide bombers. Because of cultural sensitivities, male Marines could not effectively evaluate whether individual Iraqi women were security threats. To counter this situation, the Marine Corps began employing women at security checkpoints. Recognizing its usefulness, the Marines evolved the Lioness Program from a single mission to help secure checkpoints into a larger mission that increased engagement with Iraq’s women at large. The program made possible engagements that could otherwise have further alienated an already skeptical Iraqi populace.

This concept spread to Afghanistan. A Marine patrol team searching for two men suspected in an improvised explosive device attack in Farah Province used its attached female engagement team (FET) to gain village elders’ permission to search homes. The team found local women receptive to dialogue and seized this opportunity to distribute basic supplies, thus building long-term trust and rapport. The commander’s after action report recommended actively integrating FETs into the ongoing allied counterinsurgency campaigns throughout Afghanistan.

The word was out. In 2009, two official requests asked for female screeners as well as medical and linguistic support personnel. In response, Special Operations Task Force–81 (SOTF-81) sent a small group of female Marines and Sailors (already stationed and working in Afghanistan) to augment teams in the field and support village stability operations. In June 2010, SOTF-82 deployed with a group of five female Marines attached. Those five formed the SOTF-82 FET.
Momentum increased. A cultural support team training program was quickly set up at U.S. Army Special Operations Command (USASOC) to respond to the growing demand for female special operators in current theaters. These women, volunteers from across the Services, were carefully selected and trained for face-to-face engagement with otherwise relatively inaccessible elements of the Afghan population, primarily women, children, adolescents, and the elderly.

This training program formally recognized these teams’ abilities to bridge a cultural gap that before was insurmountable for the all-male U.S. SOF. In most Afghan local cultures, the values and norms of Pashtunwali and the principle of purdah keep the sexes segregated, except within family units. As a result, American and allied male soldiers were entirely cut off from Afghan women, who are statistically half the Afghan population. Yet reaching women is crucial to the long-term success of any political, military, or security strategy. Ignoring half (or more) of an engaged population throughout an enduring presence exponentially increases risk. Knowledge from and an understanding of Afghan women were needed to operate effectively within the country, pursue enemies, coordinate with partner forces, and build lasting trust with allies.

Continuing this trend, USASOC sent its first group of cultural support teams into Afghanistan in January 2011. These teams were tasked with two distinct types of missions: locate contraband and support humanitarian assistance and civil military operations. In addition to supporting tactical objectives, a unique group of women—female teams comprised of coalition medics—routinely partnered with local physicians and Afghan commandos to provide medical and humanitarian assistance for Afghanistan’s women and children.

These examples demonstrate why cultural support teams composed of SOF women are essential to mission success in any operation where the population is to be engaged. They enable access otherwise impossible or culturally counterproductive and yield richer, fuller, more accurate understandings of an operating environment that would be unachievable using traditional all-male SOF teams alone. Not surprisingly, demand for female cultural support teams has tripled since 2011.

Angel of Death
Major Allison Black, USAF, the first female AC-130H Spectre navigator to employ the lethal aircraft’s weapons systems in combat and the first female Air Force Combat Action Medal recipient, gave an account of how she earned the moniker the “Angel of Death” in support of Operation Enduring Freedom in 2001.

While on a combat mission in Afghanistan, Major Black’s AC-130 crew unleashed more than 400 40 millimeter (mm) and 100 105mm rounds onto enemy positions in the target area. Impressed with the power and potency of her team’s assault, a Northern Alliance general working alongside the U.S. team openly declared the AC-130 gunship’s infrared laser a “death ray.” This general called the enemy by radio, taunting that there were American women coming to thwart al Qaeda. “The ‘Angel of Death’ is raining destruction, so surrender now,” he mocked. Not only did these insurgents quickly succumb, the Northern Alliance general later recalled the success of Major Black’s mission as a teaching point to Afghan women by stating, “Look what America allows their women to do. One day our country will have similar freedoms.”
Looking Forward

Women’s participation in special operations forces, both past and present, has resulted in increased access and capability. SOF teams featuring women can gain access to nearly every demographic within a population. When women are included in SOF interactions with local populations, atmospherics change and different topics of conversation are introduced. Most significantly, adding women to a small team can reduce the negative effects presented when local women and children are approached and engaged by foreign males. Addressing these effects can be the difference between short- and long-term peace and security.

U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) takes a strategic approach to counterinsurgency that involves building trust and rapport among populations. SOF teams must be in touch with the female populace for practical and functional purposes; these individuals can administer medical and health care, assist with basic community coordination, complete security screenings, and conduct debriefings and related tactical questioning. The absence of women from cultural support teams can render these tasks nearly impossible. As evidenced in Afghanistan, close and collaborative contact between foreign men and women can often be taboo. Depending on location, forced engagement between sexes can instantly destroy months of gained and invaluable trust.

Through environmental understanding, persistent engagement, and working through and with others, SOF can play a key role in protecting women and children from violence. Adding women to SOF units increases the team’s ability to assess the cultural climate and understand the local environment. Diversity begets diverse perceptions and observations; situational awareness is enhanced and the SOF operators become more effective. Women in the cultural support teams may view the battlespace differently, and in doing so may have the potential to observe nuances overlooked by all-male SOF teams. Just as important, as mentioned previously, having a woman present might stop preventable cultural conflicts from escalating into actual ones.

But we must be careful and deliberate in when and where we insert this capability. We must respect the culture, mores, and attitudes of those we work with, and we must carefully consider the potential impacts of instilling our own cultural beliefs on others. Simply put, past achievements in Afghanistan and Iraq are no guarantee of future success in asymmetric environments in other corners of the world.
Conclusion
In the fall of 2012, USSOCOM took a hard look at the current cultural support team program. The command conducted a comprehensive review of lessons learned, operational analyses, and personal interviews from team members. Following this review and as a preparation for future command needs, USSOCOM proposed advancing cultural support teams into a more forward thinking, globally focused effort.

In January 2013, assignment rules restricting women from combat positions were lifted. This decision effectively opens up all Department of Defense positions to women, pending approved exceptions and congressional notification as of 2016. As a result, several SOF career paths and support opportunities are available to women, including all Air Force Special Operations Command aviation positions, civil affairs, military information support operations, signals intelligence, female engagement teams, and most recently, the cultural support teams.

I support these ongoing explorations. Women should have opportunities to test new ground. As we have seen in recent and past conflicts, women broaden strategic and operational capabilities. While their contributions are evident and notable, U.S. Special Operations Command admittedly remains in the neophyte stages of testing the boundaries of what female support to SOF can provide in modern warfare. As opportunities for women in the military expand, the SOF community will provide a rich environment for women to further grow their already proud legacy as key contributors to operational success in all phases of U.S. military operations.
No society can restore peace or stability when its population lives in daily fear of rape or other sexual assault—or when the perpetrators of such crimes are not held accountable for their actions. We must take strong, unified action to ensure that victims have access to justice, that those responsible for these crimes are held accountable, and that those who contemplate violence against civilians understand that their actions will carry consequences. Sexual violence in conflict is a security issue that must receive the same level of attention as other threats to individuals in conflict situations. The safety of women and their families must be a top priority for security efforts around the world.

—United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security
12. Protecting Civilians from Conflict-Related Sexual Violence

By Patrick Cammaert

Protecting civilians from conflict-related sexual violence is complex, but peacekeepers can make a difference—provided they are trained and willing to implement their mandate. Peacekeepers operate in demanding environments. The strategic context for United Nations (UN) peacekeeping changed dramatically with the end of the Cold War when the Security Council began to more actively promote the containment and peaceful resolution of conflicts within nation states. Many of these conflicts take place in the world’s poorest countries where state capacity may be weak and belligerents may be motivated by ideology, past grievances, hope of economic gain, involvement in criminal activities, or some combination thereof. That shift—from concerns about interstate conflict to concerns about intrastate conflict—has given rise to multidimensional UN peacekeeping operations. These operations are typically deployed in the aftermath of a violent internal conflict, and they may employ a mix of military, police, and civilian capabilities to support the implementation of a comprehensive peace agreement.

When Is Force Authorized?
Since the failure of UN missions in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Rwanda, and Somalia, most peacekeeping missions have been deployed with a Security Council mandate to act under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. Chapter VII authorizes peacekeeping missions to use all necessary means, including the preemptive use of deadly force, to carry out the tasks in line with the rules of engagement (ROE). The missions in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Rwanda were Chapter VI missions: Their mandates were limited to self-defense and defense of installations. Most UN peacekeeping
missions established since the mid-1990s, starting with the mission in Sierra Leone in 1999, have been mandated under Chapter VII, and many of the missions were specifically tasked “to protect civilians from imminent threat of physical violence . . . including from sexual violence” and authorized to use all necessary means.

Under Chapter VII, peacekeepers are to prevent and address atrocities against civilian populations in general and to protect against sexual violence in particular. This is a complex endeavor. In part because of a lack of guidance and training, peacekeepers have struggled to carry out this task since it was first assigned to the Sierra Leone mission.

Over the past years, protecting civilians, particularly from sexual and gender-based violence, has increasingly been on the agenda at high-level conferences and seminars. This has prompted the United Nations to develop doctrine and guidance, which now includes the three-tier protection strategy of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations’ Office of Coordination for Humanitarian Affairs (DPKO-OCHA) study on the protection of civilians. Many UN policy papers have been published on protecting civilians (including protection from sexual violence), strategic frameworks on sexual and gender-based violence, and a UN infantry battalion manual. These are important advances. Multidimensional peacekeeping is a critical tool to support postconflict countries in achieving lasting peace and stability. The guiding principle in all missions should be concurrent actions to protect civilians through all three DPKO tiers: protection through the political process, physical protection, and establishment of a safe and secure environment.

But challenges face UN peacekeepers, both military and civilian, who operate in demanding environments. Peacekeepers are deployed in vast areas that lack infrastructure. Political and reconciliation processes are slow, state authority is limited, state capacity is weak, and there are many potential spoilers of the peace, including dissident host government soldiers, mercenaries, and militias. Local conflicts over land and intercommunity violence are frequent. Populations have limited access to social services. Religious or ethnic intolerance causes violence and destruction, and there is impunity for many perpetrators of serious violations of human rights and international humanitarian law, including government actors. Sexual violence is epidemic and used not only against women and girls but also against men and boys, often as a weapon of war.

right: Internally displaced persons ride bus to return from camp in Aramba to their home in Sehjanna, near Kutum, North Darfur (United Nations)
Peacekeepers often face hostile armed individuals and groups who wish to spoil the peace processes, postconflict efforts at stabilization, and peace-building. These spoilers target the local population and UN personnel. In spite of the guidance that has been developed over the years, various incidents in UN missions have shown that many times peacekeepers are not sufficiently prepared for such a hostile environment. There seems to be a gap between the organization’s policy and the reality on the ground. Many peacekeepers and many countries that contribute troops to the effort appear to prioritize self-defense over protecting civilians, in part because peacekeepers lack training and in part because they lack willingness to take robust preventive action.

What Is Missing?
The decade’s surge in peacekeeping has brought to light the scope and nature of sexual violence. As a result, the Security Council has paid increased attention to the issue. Resolutions 1820 (2008) and 1888 (2009) highlight the link between ending sexual violence and restoring peace and security. The international recognition of sexual violence as a tactic of war and a direct threat to international peace and security was an important milestone. However, new studies in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) reveal that sexual violence, while sometimes implemented as a weapon of war, can also reflect widespread acceptance of patriarchal norms and of rape myths that justify and normalize rape, the everyday subordination of women, and men’s sense of entitlement to women’s bodies.¹

Some peacekeeping forces show hesitation or are reluctant to act unilaterally to protect civilians, stating that they can only use force beyond self-defense in support of host government forces, as was the case in Goma, DRC, in November and December 2012. Even if a peacekeeping operation is mandated to support the host government forces, however, protecting civilians is its key priority. If government forces are not capable of or willing to protect their civilians, the United Nations has to take action—regardless of the perpetrators’ affiliation. If government forces are the perpetrators of human rights abuses, UN forces should take action directly or indirectly via the leadership of the host government forces. All the mandates of the seven missions currently operating under Chapter VII are strong enough for peacekeepers to take robust action, but in several UN peacekeeping missions, the military lacks a proactive attitude about protecting the civilian population and...
preventing sexual violence. This has led to serious criticism following incidents in Côte d’Ivoire, Darfur, and the DRC. Most important, when the city of Goma fell in November 2012 to an armed group (M23), the result was widespread violence, including sexual violence, against the local population, followed by massive displacement. Many member states, frustrated over the peacekeepers’ ineffectiveness, have called for the revision of the mission mandate.

But the mandate is not the problem. Any mandate is only as strong as the willingness of the mission’s leadership and of the troop-contributing countries to implement it.

Conservative, risk-averse UN officials or commanders (often with the support of their governments and even UN officials themselves) will interpret the mandate as a ceiling. They will be reluctant to take any action that the resolution does not explicitly name and authorize. By contrast, creative and decisive commanders will read the mandate as a floor, breaking the mandate down into operational goals and using all their own capabilities to implement the mandate’s intent.

Any UN presence comes with obligations. It creates certain expectations among the host population and the wider international community—expectations that need to be managed. In assessing the nature of a peacekeeping operation and the capabilities required to implement its mandate, police and troop contributors should seriously take on the tasks that are outlined in the resolution, the accompanying ROEs, and other directives about the use of force. Read them carefully. Take them seriously. These offer accurate and useful guidance.

While the mandate enables peacekeepers to use force legitimately, the ROEs explain exactly how force is to be used, delineating limitations. Peacekeeping leaders need to recognize that even when operating under a mandate that allows the use of force only in self-defense, peacekeepers can still stop sexual violence effectively by deploying in force, deterring by their presence and robust posture, and verbally confronting perpetrators. If in response peacekeepers are threatened, they may then use force in self-defense.
Struggling to Protect Civilians

As explained in the DPKO three-tier protection process, any peacekeeping mission must aim to protect civilians from violence, first and foremost, through the political process and the establishment of a protective environment. But establishing this environment takes time and depends in part on the host government’s political willingness and authority and in part on spoilers’ capacity to disrupt the peace. The host government’s consent to allow a UN mission to operate—which is not always guaranteed and has lately become more difficult to secure—is another factor in whether a mission can serve as an effective policing force. The first challenge lies in securing the power and political will of the host government to implement peace.

Second, there is confusion at the strategic level since there is no political consensus between the Security Council, DPKO and/or Department of Field Support, and the major troop-contributing countries on what robust peacekeeping means and what the use of force beyond self-defense means. That leads to the third challenge for the mission on the ground.

The third challenge lies in the mission’s projected willingness to use force to protect civilians from physical violence. A peacekeeping operation’s robust and confident posture can be most effective in deterring violence. Conversely, spoilers will notice—and exploit—a unit’s weak or indecisive posture. Many peacekeeping contingents struggle to adopt a robust posture because they lack training, guidance, and leadership. Commanders must make it clear to themselves, their troops, and others that they are prepared to use force as required and appropriate. With that willingness made clear, commanders can focus on maximizing results rather than minimizing risks. Good training, appropriate equipment, and strong leadership will help mitigate risks.

Fourth, the global financial crisis has also put a strain on peacekeeping. The United Nations is required to do more with less. Missions lack urgently needed equipment, such as military helicopters, intelligence assets, engineers, and surveillance equipment. The lack of military helicopters is particularly challenging. UN troops must be mobile in order to quickly respond to incidents, including those in remote areas; quick response is critical to preventing atrocities and reacting swiftly when called for help. The lack of transport seriously constrains any mission’s ability to protect civilians and to prevent sexual violence.
Fifth, peacekeepers will never be in a position to be everywhere and protect everybody. Managing expectations is therefore essential, including managing them through a public information campaign. Peacekeepers deploy with a mandate that provides the mission with many tasks. The international community’s and the local populations’ expectations that the United Nations will bring peace and solve all the security problems are high and difficult to manage.

Sixth, troops deployed under the UN flag often lack military capabilities. Protecting civilians requires peacekeeping units that possess the required predeployment training, are willing to act, and have the skills to use force as required. Achieving this requires leadership. Leadership at all levels—including at the UN Headquarters—to take decisive action is vital for success.

Seventh, peacekeepers can only be effective if they closely cooperate with the civilian mission components, which include the police.

Eighth, UN peacekeeping missions lack specialized female personnel, who are desperately needed. Women play very important roles—as peacekeepers, military, police, and civilians—in protecting civilians and preventing sexual violence. Perpetrators of sexual violence are often men in uniform. Survivors of sexual violence therefore often prefer interacting with female peacekeepers, who are for that reason in a better position to reach out to the local population.

**More Effectively Protecting Civilians**

Over the past 3 years, a great deal of work has been done to enhance the protection of civilians and to better prevent sexual and gender-based violence. On the ground, peacekeeping operations have stepped up efforts to protect civilians and address sexual violence. Assessments were conducted, data collected and examined, strategies developed, and authorities sensitized. An inventory of best practices and scenario training on sexual violence for UN peacekeepers at the strategic, operational, and tactical levels is available on the Web.²

These efforts notwithstanding, missions continue to struggle with implementing this mandate. Policy progress is significant and commendable—but it is not sufficient, as policies alone do not save lives. Peacekeeping missions need to act vigorously to protect civilians and prevent sexual violence. More needs to be done to ensure more effective implementation, including the following.
**Build Local Political Institutions that Keep the Peace.** Added emphasis should be put on protecting the civilian population by strengthening institutional capacity and ensuring that systems are in place to prevent and manage any form of sexual violence. The mission must impress upon the host country’s political leaders that sexual violence is a national security threat that needs to be addressed in order to establish lasting peace and security. Peacekeepers should fight impunity whenever possible to ensure all perpetrators of violence against civilians are brought to justice, whatever their political affiliations. According to recent studies, children and men in postconflict countries who were exposed to violence are more likely to perpetrate violence themselves. The mission must help avert this violence by promoting and protecting women’s rights—by educating men and boys to treat girls and women equally, changing social norms that fuel violence, ending impunity for sexual violence, and providing psychosocial treatment services to the women, men, and children who have been affected by violence. These efforts should go along with activities aimed at supporting the host government in promoting women’s rights and improving gender relations (see Michelle Bachelet’s chapter in this book).

**Better Prepare and Train Peacekeepers.** If civilians are to be effectively protected from physical threats, including from sexual violence, peacekeeping troops must be prepared and their commanders must be willing to take forceful and effective action. That requires better predeployment training for troop and police contingents, especially of junior and senior commanders. They should be properly briefed on and trained in their mandate, ROEs, the specifics of sexual and gender-based violence, presence and posture of the troops, and successful use of force in addressing or responding to difficult situations.

However, predeployment training is the responsibility of the countries that contribute troops and police. Many lack the resources to provide this training and need help. UN Contingent Commanders courses, developed and implemented by Global Peace Operations Initiative/Center for Civil Military Relations in the Asia-Pacific region, have been successful and could also be implemented on the African continent where an increasing number of peacekeepers are deployed. All peacekeeping training centers responsible for training military personnel should include scenario training on sexual violence in predeployment training curricula.

**Increase Female Personnel.** More specialized female peacekeepers are needed, both as military and as police. We need women who have been trained to reach out to
survivors of sexual violence in order to enhance the UN response to sexual violence where peacekeeping operations are deployed. Many Western countries already have this expertise in their national security forces. The United States, for example, has experience with female engagement teams in Afghanistan and could make a difference by deploying some of these officers to UN peacekeeping operations. A training course for female military and police officers on sexual violence and child protection should be developed to prepare both military observers and joint protection teams.

**Ensure Troop Mobility.** A swift response to calls for help remains critical, especially when peacekeepers are attempting to prevent sexual violence. Countries that may not be in a position to deploy infantry units but have military utility helicopters in their armed forces should be approached and asked whether those helicopters could be made available for UN peacekeeping.

**Provide Leadership.** UN peacekeeping missions require competent, experienced, decisive, and courageous military and civilian leaders to ensure effective mandate implementation both at headquarters and in the field. The continued support from the Security Council, member states, and troop-contributing countries remains equally important to effectively implement a mandate and ensure that a mission has the necessary means.

**Conclusion**
UN peacekeepers have shown that they can protect civilians and prevent sexual violence when required in spite of setbacks of insufficient military action. They also have significantly increased women’s freedom of movement and decreased the number of rapes through such concrete actions as preventive deployments to potential hotspots in the DRC, firewood patrols in Darfur, escorts for women fetching water in South Sudan, and market patrols. In Liberia, the presence of female police improved reporting and response on sexual violence.

The UN peacekeeping missions can do more and can do better with the means at their disposal on the ground, as long as member states continue to support the efforts and as long as the Security Council, troop-contributing countries, and DPKO/Department of Field Support have political consensus on what robust peacekeeping means. Ultimately, however, more needs to be done to fight impunity and create conditions in which armed groups see sexual violence as a liability rather than as a tool in the struggle for power or as a cheap weapon of war. The cost of committing
atrocities will need to be raised to the point where atrocities harm perpetrators even more than these crimes harm victims. In the meantime, peacekeepers have not only the mandate but also a moral obligation to do everything possible to protect civilians and combat sexual violence wherever peacekeepers are deployed. We owe this to the survivors of sexual violence who still live with the shame of the crimes committed against them. We should honor them by paying attention and demonstrating that we do not and will not accept such violence ever again.

Notes
3 "Sexual Violence Is More Than Just a Weapon of War.”
13. Gender and Accountability in Conflict, Crisis, and Transition

By Navanethem Pillay

Public policies regarding victims’ rights . . . have to be built with [input from] victims. This is something that you don’t do for victims, you do with victims. . . . We have 30 people who are directors of different regional projects and regional offices, and half of those people are women. We believe that women have a different approach towards suffering.

—from an interview with Paula Gaviria, Director of the Colombian Special Administrative Unit for Victims’ Care and Reparations, conducted as part of the Profiles in Peace Oral Histories Project of the Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace and Security, 2013

Violence against women during wartime “involves horrendous crimes that must shock the conscience of humanity.” Conflict, political strife, and other unstable situations affect women and girls, men and boys in different ways. While all civilians undergo unimaginable suffering in modern conflicts and crises, women and girls continue to be disproportionately affected and experience all forms of physical, sexual, and psychological violence perpetrated by both state and nonstate actors.

Findings by the United Nations (UN) Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and other international bodies and mechanisms have provided overwhelming evidence that conflicts exacerbate preexisting patterns of gender discrimination and put women and girls at heightened risk of violence. Sexual violence as a weapon of war has been used systematically in many recent and past conflicts. It takes such varied forms as rape, forced pregnancy, forced sterilization, forced abortion, forced prostitution, trafficking, sexual enslavement, and forced nudity.

left: Women in Darfur’s Zam Zam camp for internally displaced persons work on recommendations during forum organized to raise awareness of issues related to gender-based violence, December 2012 (United Nations/Sojoud Elgarrai)
Violence against women and girls too often continues or even spikes in postconflict societies due to the general breakdown in the rule of law, availability of small arms, collapse of social and family structures, and the “normalization” of violence. All this adds to preexisting gender-based discrimination.

This chapter focuses on promoting accountability for violence that women and girls have suffered during conflict, political strife, and instability. We must demand accountability in a broad sense as encompassing processes, norms, and structures to hold individuals and entities responsible for their actions, impose adequate sanctions, ensure remedies for survivors, address impunity for past crimes, and avoid repetitions of violations in the future. Such processes, norms, and structures must be built on fundamental principles of equality and nondiscrimination. Postconflict institutions and approaches must fully take into account women’s and girls’ experience of conflict and instability. Without accountability, human rights will be denied, crime will flourish, and impunity for past conflict-related crimes will persist, undermining legitimacy and prospects for reconciliation.

The following sections outline some of the substantive and procedural implications and challenges of a gender-sensitive approach to some elements of accountability, including criminal prosecution, reparations, efforts to uncover the truth for past violations, security sector reforms and demobilization efforts, and other institutional reforms.

Criminal Prosecution
Both treaty and customary international law impose a duty to prosecute serious violations of international humanitarian law or human rights. To satisfy such obligations, states should undertake prompt, rigorous, and impartial investigations and whenever possible undertake judicial and other appropriate responses. Pursuing accountability at all levels is crucial to restore survivors’ sense of dignity and justice and to send the message that violence against women will not be tolerated.

Yet for far too many women who have been victims of serious wartime crimes, prospects of having the perpetrators brought to justice are remote. Estimates of the number of women raped during the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina range from 20,000 to 50,000. Yet by 2009, fewer than 40 perpetrators had been convicted by the local courts and the International Criminal Court for the former Yugoslavia. Even in the absence of accurate data, estimates suggest that between 10,000 and 20,000...
women and girls suffered sexual violence during the war in Kosovo. However, few
charges of wartime rape and other crimes against women have been brought against
perpetrators, and not a single person has been convicted. The 2012 UN Secretary-
General’s report on sexual violence in conflict highlights the low or insufficient
level of convictions in Colombia, Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo
(DRC), Nepal, and Liberia.

The obstacles that women and girls face to judicial accountability are many and
vary from country to country. Among these are inadequate legal frameworks that
treat sexual and gender-based violence as violations of morality, public decency, and
honor rather than as violations of an individual’s bodily integrity. This approach treats
women as objects of protection rather than as autonomous beings with individual
rights. Sometimes inadequate definitions for sexual and gender-based crimes leave
out certain grave forms of violence, such as penetration with objects, or exclude
groups of victims, such as male victims of rape. More generally, amnesty laws are an
obstacle to prosecution, especially when they cover crimes that disproportionally
affect women, such as sexual violence. Other obstacles include:

* large geographic distances from courts or other judicial accountability
  mechanisms, which can be difficult for women who lack their own
  transportation and who are burdened with childcare responsibilities

* costs to file complaints, which can be more difficult for women to pay when
  they lack access to economic resources

* legal assistance, which may not exist in a form that is effective, free of charge,
  and gender-sensitive

* adequate protection for victims and witnesses, which may not exist

* stigma, which may be associated with being identified as victims of certain
  crimes, especially sexual violence.

Many of these obstacles were noted by survivors of sexual violence when interviewed
by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights’ High Level Panel on the
Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Furthermore, law enforcement and judicial institutions may be permeated
with bias, stereotypes, and prejudice against women, leading them to respond
negligently and inadequately. For example, investigators and prosecutors still tend to address cases of sexual violence that occurred during the conflict exclusively by using testimonial or physical evidence, ignoring alternative forms of evidence, such as anthropological expert reports. Investigations are often not centered on victims and do not take into account victims’ concerns about their security. For example, some investigators may require displaced victims to return to the place where the violence took place. That not only imposes an additional financial burden, but it may also make the victims more vulnerable to reprisals, threats, or intimidation by perpetrators. Traditional justice mechanisms, which often are the only accessible dispute resolution mechanisms accessible to women, sometimes replicate societal patterns of discrimination by having inadequate sanctions against sexual and gender-based violence or by being procedurally biased against women and girls.8

Some national judicial systems have made serious efforts to end impunity for crimes against women and girls and have had significant results. Under the comprehensive strategy to combat sexual violence in the DRC,9 the Joint Human Rights Office (JHRO) in the UN Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO) supports legal clinics that represent victims of sexual violence. The JHRO also trains police, prosecutors, and magistrates to better handle sexual violence investigations and trials. As a result of these and other efforts, such as innovative mobile gender courts,10 more convictions have been registered as noted in the UN Secretary-General’s report on conflict-related sexual violence:

Between December 2010 and August 2011, more than 250 trials of elements of national security forces were held with the assistance of MONUSCO and other United Nations entities, including through holding mobile hearings. As a result, more than 150 [Armed Forces of the Democratic Republic of Congo] and Congolese National Police elements were sentenced for rape and other acts of sexual violence. In addition, on 16 August 2011, in a landmark trial, the Bukavu military tribunal convicted two Rwandan [Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Rwanda] combatants charged with crimes against humanity, including rape, committed against the population of Kalonge and Bumyakiri from June 2006 to January 2007.11
Many obstacles, however, continue to impede progress toward effective prosecution, including insecurity, absence of appropriate financial resources, piecemeal interventions, and a lack of political will to make comprehensive structural reforms a priority. In Colombia, for instance, the attorney general’s office took important steps to address conflict-related sexual violence attributed to members of security forces, such as offering prosecutors specialized training on gender issues, creating a gender committee to facilitate inter-institutional cooperation, establishing dedicated centers throughout the country to support the victims, investigate crimes, and assist with these prosecutions, and elaborating a protocol for investigating such cases. In October 2012, the attorney general’s office established a Context and Analysis Unit to analyze where gross human rights violations occurred and to identify command responsibility. Cases of conflict-related sexual violence are among its priorities. Yet the attorney general’s office has not been able to complete the prosecutions of 183 cases of sexual violence against women and girls that the Constitutional Court of Colombia ordered it to investigate without delay in 2008. Similarly, in the DRC, in spite of reported progress, much more commitment is needed to ensure that the judicial institutions tasked with prosecuting sexual violence have enough capacity, resources, and authority to do so. (As discussed later, increasing the number of female judges, lawyers, prosecutors, and police officers may help address some of the obstacles outlined above.)

The tribunals have played an immensely useful role in advancing international recognition for gender-based crimes. Both the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) have recognized sexual violence, including rape, as acts of torture and crimes against humanity. One landmark case involved the prosecution of Jean-Paul Akayesu, who had been mayor of Taba during the Rwandan genocide in 1994. Akayesu was accused of not only failing to stop the killings while he was responsible for maintaining order, but also of personally supervising the murder of various Tutsis and of ordering house-to-house searches to locate Tutsis. He stood trial for 15 counts of genocide, crimes against humanity, and violations of the Geneva Convention and was found guilty of nine counts of genocide and crimes against humanity. In his case, the ICTR judgment recognized that sexual violence is not limited to physical invasion of the human body, sexual violence may include acts that do not involve penetration or even physical contact, and found that rape and sexual assault “constitute acts of genocide
insofar as they were committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a targeted group." The judgment further stated that the rapes perpetrated against Tutsi women, for which Akayesu was tried, "resulted in physical and psychological destruction of Tutsi women, their families and their communities. Sexual violence was an integral part of the process of destruction."  

The International Criminal Court (ICC) is the world’s first permanent body able to hold individuals criminally responsible for genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes. The 1998 Rome Statute, the international treaty that established the ICC, recognizes serious crimes of violence against women such as rape, sexual slavery, enforced prostitution, forced pregnancy, enforced sterilization, gender-based persecutions, trafficking, and other forms of sexual and gender-based violence as war crimes, crimes against humanity, and in some instances as acts of genocide. As a result, each case brought before the ICC can include gender-based crimes. Notably, as of February 2013, charges for gender-based crimes have been brought in six of the seven situations that are under consideration of the ICC: Uganda, the DRC, the Central African Republic, Darfur, Kenya, and Côte d’Ivoire. No charges for gender-based crimes have yet been brought in the Libya situation, although the ICC’s Office of the Prosecutor has indicated that investigations into sexual violence in Libya are ongoing. Of the 29 individual suspects and accused who have been charged by the ICC, 16 have been charged with crimes of gender-based violence, a proportion of just over 55 percent. This indicates a positive trend toward a greater recognition of women’s experience of conflict and repression.

Reparations

Most victims’ primary desire is to see the perpetrators apprehended and brought to justice. However, victims have reported that this will not be enough unless they can live free from fear of violence’s recurrence—free of the breakdown of law and order that put them in harm’s way in the first place—and unless they are offered the medical, social, psychological, and material support they need to face the consequences of the harms they have suffered.

The concept of remedies encompasses the right to equal and effective access to justice and to adequate, effective, and prompt reparation for the harm suffered. Reparations are a recognized right. However, survivors and their families have often unintentionally been neglected. A number of resources are invested to equip states
with the means and capacities to apprehend and try perpetrators, but this is not balanced with efforts to ensure appropriate and adequate reparations for the victims. While this is true for all victims, it has a particular bearing on women and girls given that the harms they have suffered and the consequences of those harms grow from structural discrimination and disempowerment.

Ensuring that reparations are just and adequate requires a full understanding of the gendered nature and consequences of the harm suffered, as well as of how gender must come to bear in operationalizing reparations in a way that does not exclude, marginalize, or penalize women. Regardless of whether reparations are ordered by courts or are part of an administrative program, a number of general principles and programmatic guidelines should be kept in mind to this end.

First, women’s genuine and informed participation in designing and delivering reparations is crucial. Only victims can determine what forms of reparation are best suited to their situations, what is culturally appropriate and does not expose them to further harm and victimization, what can lead to reconciliation, and what has the potential to address the underlying causes that made them vulnerable in the first place. Ensuring meaningful participation requires an investment of time and resources to reach out to victims and overcome obstacles such as risks of exposure and related stigma or retaliation, poverty, and the physical and mental health consequences of the violence suffered.

Second, reparations should be guided by the imperative to ensure an adequate and gender-sensitive assessment of the harm suffered. For instance, in the DRC, women interviewed by the High Level Panel noted that apart from the physical and psychological consequences of sexual violence, they had also been stigmatized and ostracized from their families and communities, had lost access to their livelihoods, had become the sole breadwinner, and faced enormous difficulties in providing for themselves and their children.

Third, reparations should be guided by the aspiration to transform the structural conditions within society that allowed the violence to happen. Priority should therefore be given to reparations and material benefits that could help enhance women’s autonomy and create opportunities traditionally denied to them, such as meaningful employment, education, skill training, and access to land titles. Guarantees of non-repetition—a legal term that refers to a form of reparation—offer great potential for transforming gender relations. Doing so may require legislative and
institutional reforms to prevent, for example, the army or police from engaging in sexual violence, including better vetting, oversight, and training.

For reparations to be gender-sensitive and transformative, complex programs are required, providing for a combination and interplay of different forms of reparation (restitution, compensation, rehabilitation, satisfaction, and guarantees of non-repetition), as well as of material and symbolic, and individual and collective reparations. In contemplating the forms of reparations, deciding bodies must take into account existing obstacles and challenges women may face in owning land or receiving and managing money. Symbolic reparations, such as measures of satisfaction, should pay attention not to reinforce negative stereotypes (see sidebar).

Finally, reparation processes should be inclusive and involve conscious efforts to avoid directly or indirectly marginalizing women. The process should allow women and girls to come forward when they are ready. Eligibility standards should ensure inclusiveness and avoid revictimization. For example, documentation required for restitution should take into account greater difficulties faced by women in proving property titles. General rules of evidence should include mechanisms to balance the rigidity of the burden and standard of proof with suitable presumptions.

In practice, reparation programs have not been funded fully enough to transform victims' lives. Court-ordered reparations are too often at least partly ignored. Since 2006, for instance, military courts and tribunals in the DRC have awarded damages to perhaps hundreds of victims of sexual violence, but no victims have yet received compensation. States often argue that they lack adequate resources for comprehensive reparation programs or that the states themselves should not be held responsible for the actions of individuals in other states or armed groups. But they must fulfill their duty under international law.

Truth and Reconciliation Commissions

Efforts to uncover the truth about past human rights violations have not always been sensitive to gender issues. This is in part due to truth and reconciliation commissions and similar bodies' mandates, compositions, and methods of operation. In recent years, however, recognition has been growing that these bodies must take specific measures to ensure they fully take into account women's and girls' experiences. For instance, reports from the truth and reconciliation commissions in Sierra Leone,
Timor Leste, Peru, and Guatemala have explicitly acknowledged the serious harm that women and girls suffered from conflict-related sexual violence.

But considerable challenges remain. In the 10 such commissions opened between 2000 and 2003, on average only 23 percent of the commissioners were women. In the 12 opened since 2004, women made up 28 percent. From 2004 to 2012, 12 truth commissions were established. Of those, only explicitly included provisions on sexual and gender-based crimes in their mandates. One called for dedicated gender and children’s experts to be part of the commission (Liberia) and another for a special services unit to include gender issues (Kenya). Of the 7 commissions among the 12 with publicly available outcome reports, 5 (71 percent) included gender-specific recommendations.

As with reparations, truth and reconciliation commissions must make specific efforts to encourage and facilitate women’s full and meaningful participation. Such measures must take into account all procedural factors that may hinder or discourage participation, such as lack of measures to ensure confidentiality, poverty, illiteracy, mobility limitations, and relevant cultural and societal norms. For instance, the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission found that women downplayed or remained silent about their own suffering, particularly sexual violence. It then decided to take special steps to encourage women to testify, including holding three special women’s hearings. In its final report, the commission discussed how these hearings brought to light the particularly gendered ways in which women experienced human rights violations and furthered the process by which the “commissioners distinguished less and less between what were originally perceived as ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ victims.”

**Institutional Reforms**

After conflict, as states and international actors are reforming the security sector, they should take the opportunity to strengthen the transparency, accountability, and professionalism of the security apparatus and to make it more aware of gender. Doing so enables women to have greater access to justice and strengthens accountability for gender-based crimes. Security sector reform should include efforts to strengthen the capacity of security sector agents to understand how sex and other factors can influence security threats and to help remove gender biases. Women, girls, men, and boys have different security experiences and priorities. Reforms should involve
building the needed skills within security sector institutions to respond to these varied experiences as they investigate, gather intelligence, and treat witnesses, victims, and suspects. As necessary, new structures may be needed to address and prevent gender-based violence. Internal and external oversight may be needed to increase institutional accountability on gender. Security sector reform can be an opportunity to ensure there are enough women in the security forces, which in turn encourages higher rates of reporting of incidents of gender-based violence and improves gender-sensitive treatment of female witnesses, victims, and suspects.

The disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration of former armed combatants, which often follows a peace agreement, are closely linked to security sector reform. Former combatants are often encouraged to transition into security forces. Vetting ex-combatants applying for security jobs should include appropriate checks to disqualify known perpetrators of sexual and gender-based violence. This alone can offer some satisfaction to victims who cannot achieve a prosecution or a conviction. If this is not done, and if these perpetrators are placed in positions of authority, victims are not only humiliated, but it also sends the message that violence against women is socially acceptable, discourages victims from coming forward, and possibly exposes other women and girls to violence.

Women must participate fully in reforming laws and institutions and must be adequately represented in legislative assemblies and governments. This helps ensure full recognition of women’s rights and gender equality. The public and international community often pay attention to whether women will be in positions of power and able to make decisions in the future political systems—parliaments, ministries, security sector institutions, and the like—of countries emerging from conflict. But there has been less discussion about how discrimination in other spheres of life prevents women’s effective participation in public life. Affirmative action measures, such as quotas, to correct imbalances in gender representation as provided for in the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women will be important in achieving gender equality, but will not suffice unless measures are taken to eliminate negative stereotypes about women’s role in society and to promote women’s substantive equality in fields such as education and access to property and productive resources. Strategies to expand women’s participation must be grounded in recognition of women’s right to participate in public affairs on an equal footing.
with men and of the state's obligation to dismantle obstacles to such full and equal participation, including illiteracy, poverty, discrimination, and violence.

International, regional, and national human rights protection systems, especially mechanisms to advance women's rights and eliminate discrimination, are crucial to guide states and the international community in their efforts to build just and equitable societies and to hold states accountable to their obligations toward women and girls.

**Conclusion**

Accountability for wartime actions includes a broad range of actions, including measures to overcome perpetrators' impunity and promote women's access to justice, adequate recognition and consideration of women's and girls' experiences in efforts to uncover the truth, gender-sensitive reparation programs, and institutional and legal reforms to avoid future violations of the rights of women and girls.

If impunity is to be tackled, coherent, comprehensive, and sustained efforts and resources are needed to reform discriminatory legal frameworks and ensure gender-responsive and unbiased law enforcement and judicial institutions and processes. If reparations for women and girls are to be just, legal and institutional frameworks and processes must be put in place and must be adequately financed so as to guarantee that women can access them and that the harm inflicted on them is fairly assessed. Preventing recurrence of violations against women and girls requires seizing the opportunity that societies emerging from conflict and instability present to develop and institutionalize legislative, policy, and other measures to advance human rights and to overcome deeply rooted patriarchal customs and norms. A genuine commitment by the state to tackle all the above should be the measure of accountability.

Women and girls should be seen not only as those to whom accountability is due, but also as those who help create and carry out the accountability processes. Women's agency, including that of victims of gender-based crimes, should be acknowledged and actively promoted. The best accountability measures for women and girls affected by conflict, political strife, and instability will be designed and implemented with their active participation.
Notes


7 See UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, “Report of the Panel on Remedies and Reparations for Victims of Sexual Violence in the Democratic


By Luis CdeBaca

Today, I want to discuss an issue that . . . ought to concern every person, because it is a debasement of our common humanity. It ought to concern every community, because it tears at our social fabric. It ought to concern every business, because it distorts markets. It ought to concern every nation, because it endangers public health and fuels violence and organized crime. I’m talking about the injustice, the outrage, of human trafficking, which must be called by its true name—modern slavery.

—President Barack Obama

In his speech to the Clinton Global Initiative in September 2012, President Barack Obama called trafficking in persons “one of the great human rights causes of our time.” Like many other human rights issues, this form of modern slavery weighs heavily on vulnerable and marginalized communities, especially women, who become more vulnerable in times of upheaval, scarcity, and conflict. As with so many other challenges—from promoting broad economic opportunity to spreading peace and stability to finding sustainable sources of food and energy—women are a critical part of the solution.

A major challenge to American diplomacy in the struggle to combat modern slavery—what we call trafficking in persons—has been persuading governments to look at this issue for what it is first and foremost: a crime. According to the standards established in the United Nations Protocol to Prevent, Suppress, and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children (the Palermo Protocol),

left: Girl stands on outskirts of camp for internally displaced persons outside of Belet Weyne, Somalia (United Nations/Tobin Jones)
trafficking in persons should be regarded as a serious crime, meriting punishment commensurate with those of other serious crimes such as rape or kidnapping. Because it is a crime by international standards, governments are on the hook. Only governments can arrest and prosecute suspected criminals. Only governments can incarcerate convicts. Only governments can provide legal recourse for victims.

Through its Trafficking Victims Protection Act, the United States is committed to meeting this challenge according to the international framework established in Palermo. Around the world, we are pushing the idea that, as Secretary of State John Kerry stated during the release of the 2012 Trafficking in Persons Report, “every government is responsible for dealing with it, and no government is yet doing enough.”

Normalizing this idea has taken time. As with domestic violence or sexual abuse, many governments, when confronted with this issue a decade ago, took the position that trafficking in persons simply was not a problem in their countries. It simply did not exist, and the absence of an antitrafficking law or support structures for victims merely reflected the absence of the problem in the first place—despite the fact that research dating to the beginning of the antitrafficking movement has verified that modern slavery affects every country. Women abused in factories, brothels, and private homes were classified as anything other than trafficking victims to avoid calling what was happening to them slavery.

Fortunately, we have made a great deal of progress on this front. Since the Palermo Protocol was written 13 years ago, more than 150 countries have become party. Nearly as many have adopted modern, comprehensive antitrafficking laws that treat modern slavery with the gravity it deserves. Only in a few outlying places do our ongoing diplomatic efforts still require us to start with the baseline idea that trafficking is a crime that affects all countries and that all governments are responsible for responding to it. Governments around the world have built the legal framework necessary for addressing this problem, and we are seeing more victims identified and more convictions year after year.

These successes are modest; data from governments tell us that roughly 46,000 victims were brought to light last year for a crime that victimizes 27 million, according to estimates from leading social scientists. Yet any measure of success is meaningful. Each victim identified can become another survivor free to move ahead with the life she or he chooses. More broadly, as legal structures around the world...
gain momentum driven by the political will of committed governments, it enables the rest of the antitrafficking movement to focus on other aspects of modern slavery.

Targeting Victims in Vulnerable Circumstances
While trafficking in persons is first and foremost a crime, it is many other things as well. Traffickers target vulnerable populations and operate in zones of impunity where the light of the law does not shine. Wherever we find vulnerable populations—people whose communities struggle under the weight of poverty or whose countries have been ravaged by war, a migrant group crossing borders in desperate search for stable employment, or agricultural workers in a country where labor protections are weak—we find areas where trafficking is likely to occur. So we need to view trafficking as cross-cutting: a migration issue and a labor issue, a development issue and a health issue, a peace and security issue, and certainly a women's issue.

The little hard data we have about trafficking in persons tell us that this crime disproportionately victimizes women. Sectors in which trafficking is a major problem, whether domestic work or commercial sex, are sectors overwhelmingly made up of women. In recent years, we have seen a trend called the “feminization of migration.” The composition of massive migrant populations—particularly in southeast Asia—has been shifting, becoming overwhelmingly women and girls.

But we do not even need the data to tell us why trafficking in persons and women’s issues are so closely linked. Many of the most brutal practices women face in conflict situations are, in fact, cases of modern slavery. Even as the Rome Statute and the Palermo Protocol were being negotiated, prosecutors at the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia were bringing the first mass sexual slavery prosecution in an international court. Today, we hear of the use of rape as a weapon of war in the eastern Congo, a brutal form of slavery in which village women and their children are kidnapped en masse to serve as porters and to cook, clean, and submit to their captors’ sexual demands.

What is happening in Congo is hardly new. During the Sudan conflict, Dinka women and girls were captured and used as domestic slaves in Khartoum and elsewhere. During the conflicts in Rwanda, Sierra Leone, and South Sudan, various combatant groups kidnapped and enslaved children as cooks, porters, concubines, and combatants, and forcibly prostituted girls and women or sold them to people in wealthier countries for use as domestic slaves.

many of the most brutal practices women face in conflict situations are cases of modern slavery
Second-Class Citizens

Of course, human trafficking affects civilian security even outside war zones. Too many women and girls around the world continue to live in a state of official limbo, dependent on their husbands or fathers for legal status, reduced to chattel who can be easily sold for profit or given in satisfaction for a family debt. In far too many places, even when they do have legal rights, women and girls remain second-class citizens, cast to the margins of society with no education, no economic opportunity, no voice in government. Those are the vulnerabilities that traffickers prey on. So long as women still struggle for equality and opportunity, so long as women and girls still leave home in search of a better life for themselves and their families, so long as regions are thrown into upheaval in times of conflict, modern slavery will remain a threat, whether it manifests in the sex industry or in otherwise valid forms of labor.

On the other hand, when women are able to live as full participants in their societies—contributing to their economies and playing a role in open and responsive governments—their actions create ripple effects that strike at the root causes of modern slavery and the conditions that allow it to thrive: poverty, inequality, and lack of opportunity.

Trafficking Linked to Status

Two broad areas illustrate why our efforts to eradicate modern slavery and our efforts to advance the lives of women and girls, including in securing peace, should be closely coordinated.

First, by grappling with modern slavery where it already victimizes women and girls, we are taking an initial step toward all the other ways we want to help them lead fuller, more productive lives. If women are involved in helping to define the terms of peace and prosperity, they are more likely to help set terms that protect girls and women from the circumstances that leave them vulnerable to trafficking.

We know that education and economic opportunity are key to helping women and girls. When women can act as full participants in their economy—whether starting up a business or getting simple equipment to irrigate a farm year-round—they will be better able to provide for themselves and their families. They will also make bigger contributions to their countries’ economies, spreading prosperity and helping to lift entire populations.
We also know that when women are able to participate in government and have a voice in choosing their leaders, governments will become more transparent, accountable, and responsive. Full participation of women and girls in their societies is an important aim of our work on this issue, and we want all women to enjoy that freedom—to choose for themselves the lives they want to lead.

When modern slavery victimizes women, however, those choices are out of reach for them, even in countries where there are no legal obstacles to going to school or opening a shop or casting a ballot. As we work to promote all the other freedoms women and girls should enjoy and be allowed to exercise, freedom from enslavement must be the baseline.

The “3Ps” of Fighting Modern Slavery
Antitrafficking efforts around the world are guided by what we call the victim-centered approach following the “3Ps” of fighting modern slavery: prosecution, protection, and prevention. Fighting modern slavery requires us to bring traffickers to justice—prosecution. Just as important is getting victims out of harm’s way, providing them the support and services they need, and helping them get their lives back on track—protection. For women and girls who are exploited in modern slavery, this process, if done well, puts them back in a position to choose their own paths forward.

From that point—recovery and rehabilitation—many other elements of our agenda for women and girls come into play. Once a woman has recovered from her experience, will she be able to find a job? Once a girl escapes the horrors she has endured, will there be a classroom and a community where she will feel at home? Once a victim becomes a survivor, will there be a transparent and responsive government where she can advocate for the rights of other victims? All this is more likely when women are full participants in creating the peace, building civil society, and taking part in legislatures and governments.

These questions help illustrate a second connection between antitrafficking efforts and women’s postconflict issues more broadly. While it is clear that prosecution and protection are critical to strengthening the basic rights of women and girls, it is when our other priorities for women and girls are succeeding that we will also see progress on the third P—prevention.

Targeted trafficking prevention measures have been effective in warning men and women around the world about the risks of modern slavery—like the so-called
Wilberforce Pamphlet that the U.S. Department of State gives to all work visa applicants, which explains their rights when they come to our country and what to do if they find themselves in a situation of exploitation. Such efforts to change the power dynamic between sponsor and guest worker are important especially when focused on populations that are disproportionately exploited, such as migrant domestic workers or women in prostitution.

But those efforts can only do so much in stopping a crime that has persisted for millennia. As we know from history, conflict has long been a source of slavery, with conquered peoples being enslaved. However illegal, this still continues. At the end of the day, slavery will find its way into any vulnerable group—especially those who live amid danger and upheaval because of conflict, who are willing to take a risk to pursue an opportunity, who have no choice but to leave home in search of a better life, or who believe the promises of a charismatic recruiter.

When women and girls are given a chance to succeed, it strikes at a root cause of modern slavery. When governments stand up for all their citizens and support the rule of law, it sends a message that this type of exploitation will not be tolerated. The more progress we make on educational, economic, and political opportunities for women and girls in and out of conflict situations, the more the vulnerabilities—the imbalance of power and information and status—that create the risk of trafficking will fall away.

Ending Modern Slavery
That outcome—prevention of trafficking in persons—shows how raising the status of women and girls within their societies has ripple effects far and wide. Women’s issues are inextricably tied to modern slavery and also to the host of other complex challenges that shape the global landscape of the 21st century: peace and security, yes, but also the environment and climate change, sustainable food and energy sources, maternal health and infant mortality. These issues are interconnected, so when we grapple with one of them, we are grappling with all of them.

These issues demand our focus because it is the right thing to do. The United States believes in the fundamental rights and dignity of all people—freedom and opportunity for men and women to choose their own paths and live up to their potential. A world in which women are treated equally and slavery is a thing of the past is a world that is more inclusive, vibrant, and just for everyone.
As former Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton often stated, dealing with these issues is the smart thing to do. Because when we do, we are helping project peace and stability across regions and around the world. We are building stronger partners on the world stage and helping men and women live fuller, healthier, and more productive lives. We are strengthening our own security, and advancing our country’s interests.

At the Clinton Global Initiative, President Obama recognized survivor Ima Matul. Once enslaved as a domestic servant in California, wondering if anyone knew or cared about what happened to her, she is now a strong voice demanding that we hold a light to this issue, that we come to the aid of those who are exploited and punish those responsible. There are many others like Ima—victims who have become survivors, insistent that no one else endure what they have endured. In that speech, and through the policies and commitments of the Obama administration, we are sending a message that we have heard Ima’s voice and the voices of so many others—that we will keep pushing forward until we build a world in which every girl believes in her own worth and is free to pursue her own dreams. For them, we can—we must—imagine a world free from slavery.

Notes

2 Department of State, “U.S. Laws on Trafficking in Persons,” available at <www.state.gov/j/tip/laws>.


Women’s Equal Access to the Means for Recovery

Women and girls’ vulnerabilities are often exacerbated in crisis contexts. While participating in activities such as food distribution, firewood collection, and travel to and from latrines and water points, for example, they may be separated from protective family structures and face increased risks of trafficking...sexual exploitation and abuse, or other harm. Rape in conflict situations can increase the incidence of HIV/AIDS, affecting not only women but also their families. Conflict also increases the incidence of disability, and women with disabilities can face particular risks including social stigma and isolation, difficulty accessing humanitarian assistance, unmet health care needs, and higher rates of [sexual and gender-based violence] and other forms of violence during and after conflict.

—United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security
Humanitarian workers are the first responders when disaster strikes. They deliver the most urgent, lifesaving aid in crises caused by natural disasters and those that arise from conflict, as we have seen in Syria, Afghanistan, and Somalia. In all these countries, humanitarian agencies and their local partners on the ground work to get food, water, shelter, and healthcare to people who have fled their homes because of violence. Our job is to try to reach everyone in need, regardless of who or where they are.

How we accomplish this mission makes the difference between saving a greater or smaller number of lives, between helping people back on their feet or leaving them at the mercy of another crisis down the line. But our response can be either effective or wasteful. People are not all the same; they do not have the same needs even in emergency situations. The cultural and other norms that overlay the way men and women are seen and treated in ordinary situations apply, sometimes in an amplified way, during crises.

Disasters are discriminatory. They generally affect women and girls in significantly different ways from men and boys. One of the best examples comes from the Indian Ocean tsunami of 2004. Two-thirds of those who died in Indonesia’s Aceh Province were girls and women. In some parts of India and Sri Lanka, four women were killed for every one man. Why? Because many women in coastal villages were at home while their husbands and sons were out fishing, many women put their children’s safety before their own, many women had never learned to swim, and even those who had were impeded by their clothing.
In emergencies triggered by conflict, the use of sexual violence as a weapon of war and the general breakdown of social norms mean women and girls can suffer disproportionately. It is often women and children who flee their villages, leaving men and sometimes the elderly behind to guard property. Between 70 and 80 percent of refugees around the world are women and children. Women face particular risks associated with their sex. The statistics are incomplete, but we know that women refugees are more affected by gender-based violence than any other group of women in the world.

Recent reports from Syrian refugees in Lebanon and Jordan illustrate the terrible plight of women during wartime. As of February 2013, one in five families in these camps is headed by a woman. Their stories of attack and rape in public and at home, primarily by armed men, are heartbreaking. Those who do survive fear retribution by their assailants or being killed by family members who believe they have been dishonored. Many mothers marry off their daughters far too young in the hope of keeping them safe from abuse. For those who manage to flee, there is a shortage of medical and counseling services to help them recover.

Studies show that girls in refugee camps are less likely than boys to attend school and learn to read, which can affect their economic prospects and those of their community for a generation. Girls and women who are sexually assaulted may be cast out from their communities, rendering them unable to look after their children, which in turn dramatically increases the likelihood of health and nutrition problems for the whole family far into the future.

Humanitarian agencies are proud of the impartiality they show in the way they deal with people. They do not discriminate against aid recipients depending on religious or political affiliations, locations, or sex. However, a failure to take the disproportionate effects of crises on women and girls into account means that, in reality, discrimination is a fact of life.

Take something that seems straightforward, such as the construction of latrines in a refugee camp. Studies show that unless toilet cubicles are segregated by sex, located close to where people are living, and have adequate lighting and lockable doors, they will not be used by women and girls. Up to one-third of the latrines constructed after the Haiti earthquake were not used because women and girls feared that by using them, they would be exposed to abuse. Or consider the provision of medical care in Afghanistan. National figures show that across the country, there is one health worker
per 7,000 Afghans. But a breakdown of this figure by sex shows that there is one male health worker per 4,000 men, and one female health worker per 23,000 women, in a country where many women cannot be treated by a male doctor or nurse for cultural reasons. The consequences of failing to take gender differences into account are tragic; more women will die from lack of care.

Why It Is Essential to Gather Sex and Age Data
Humanitarian aid is based on programs designed using information about people in need. This is where we must distinguish between men, women, boys, and girls. This means collecting and analyzing data divided by sex and age, which is known as SADD (sex and age disaggregated data). Collecting SADD may seem like a trivial change to working practices, but it is a proven way to save lives and prevent suffering, and its importance is widely recognized and recommended.4

But there are still huge disparities in collection and use of SADD in designing humanitarian programs. Sectors such as health and education register and track the people they are helping, and they have a strong record of distinguishing between girls, boys, men, and women. In Afghanistan, for example, figures showed that girls’ education was falling far behind boys’ because of disruption during the Taliban era and a lack of schools in rural areas. This evidence was used by the Afghan Ministry of Rural Development and Reconstruction and by development agencies to target the building of schools and increase the enrollment of girls. Today, Afghan girls make up between one-third and one-half of all students enrolled in primary and secondary education—a higher proportion than ever before.

However, sectors such as food and sanitation are less successful at targeting women and girls through efficient data collection. Research in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in 2009 showed that less than a quarter of internally displaced women and 8 percent of returnee women were registered for food rations, despite the United Nations (UN) World Food Programme’s goal of ensuring that 80 percent of targeted households received rations through women. In agriculture, the situation was even worse, with more than 95 percent of all agricultural kits distributed to men in a country where women produce 75 percent of the food.5

The reasons for these situations are complex. Agencies sometimes subcontract construction projects and food distribution, so humanitarian workers may not have regular contact with beneficiaries. Donor support for food distributions also tends to
be unconditional, meaning that there is less outside pressure on agencies to change. The agenda for big international donors to respond to an emergency is often set during the first few days and weeks, so it is particularly important to ensure that women's voices are heard and perspectives understood right from the start. However, this is also the time when chaos is at its height, and it is difficult to collect and transmit reliable information.

Another problem is that humanitarian data tend to be simplified several times after collection and before programs are designed, so that even if detailed information on the sex and age of beneficiaries is gathered in the initial stage, it may be lost by the time it is transmitted to a regional office or agency headquarters.

The message here is simple. It is more time-consuming and difficult to gather and analyze larger amounts of more detailed data. But it is vital if we are to meet the needs of the people we are trying to help as effectively as possible.

Recent Progress
We are now tackling the issue of women's representation on several different fronts and are making some progress. One of the most important tools is the Gender Marker, which scores humanitarian projects on whether they meet the distinct needs of different groups of people. It works not only by assessing project design, but also by promoting greater reflection on gender issues and on what makes a good project. A pilot study showed that simply including it in project assessments resulted in a significant increase in the provision of information about gender issues, which in turn means that programs are more likely to meet women's needs.

The introduction of the Gender Marker tool was supported by the assignment of gender experts to the Sahel region of West Africa, in Sudan, South Sudan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Niger, Kenya, Somalia, Liberia, and Afghanistan to train, advise, and encourage staff in gender analysis. This has generally been recognized as a success, and there are many more requests for deployment waiting to be filled.

Other recent signs of progress include greater interest from donors in funding projects based on disaggregated data. The British government is currently funding a research study on recovery from conflict in seven countries, which requires information on gender. The United States, Australia, and the Nordic countries are also pushing for greater use of disaggregated data in project design and evaluation.
The moves toward better use of evidence throughout the humanitarian system, from strategic planning to monitoring, will also provide new ways for women’s perspectives to be included and prioritized. For example, new tools that assess the needs of people in emergencies will include ways of systematizing the collection of sex and age disaggregated data, ensuring that the distinct needs of women and men are considered from the start.

Combating Gender-Based Violence
A greater focus on combating gender-based violence is another key area in which we are seeing progress, although not enough. Gender-based violence has not historically been seen as a priority lifesaving activity even though physical attacks are a leading cause of death for women between the ages of 15 and 44. Gender-based violence can have a devastating and lasting impact on health, from acute and chronic physical injuries and disabilities to mental health problems, both for the women affected and for children born as a result of this abuse. Gender-based violence not only affects women and girls and their families, but it can also hold back their communities and societies. It is also increasingly recognized as an economic and development issue. Violence against women has enormous direct and indirect costs for survivors, employers, and the public sector. It is a fact of life for women in many countries in times of peace, and it becomes even more prevalent and damaging in times of crisis.

Increasing awareness of the prevalence, injustice, and costs of gender-based violence is driving new campaigns to reduce and eliminate it. Humanitarian agencies are playing their part by involving women and girls in designing programs that reduce risks, give them greater protection and control, and provide treatment in emergency situations. Temporary shelters with lockable doors are replacing tents at camps for displaced people in Somalia. Trauma counseling for women is part of the basic healthcare provision in refugee camps. We also need to design and implement programs that promote gender equality and target men and boys as the main perpetrators of gender-based violence.

Better collection and analysis of basic data are also helping to raise awareness of gender-based violence, prevent it, and deal with its effects. Cultural taboos mean that such violence is often underreported, and humanitarian agencies are finding ways to build confidence in data collection and storage systems so that women and girls can have confidence that their identities will be protected.
What Donor Countries Must Do
Recognizing women’s distinct needs in crises and emergencies can no longer be portrayed as a luxury or an add-on; it is the only way in which we can fulfill the obligations placed on us by the UN General Assembly and Security Council and the expectations of the global public.

Donors, including the U.S. Government, have an important role to play in pressing humanitarian agencies to meet the distinct needs of women and girls in crises. They have an influential role both in their interactions with humanitarian agencies and on the Security Council where they decide on the subjects under discussion and on the mandates given to peacekeeping and political missions. Donor governments can improve women’s and girls’ access to humanitarian aid in the following ways:

- Refuse to fund projects that do not address the different needs of all segments of society and increase funding to those that do.
- Combat gender-based violence by supporting projects that improve the security and safety of women and girls in camps and affected communities.
- Demand that humanitarian actors collect, analyze, and use SADD to inform humanitarian programming.
- Work with the boards of UN agencies to ensure that they prioritize SADD and are fully gender-sensitive.
- In the Security Council, ensure that reporting clearly indicates how men and women are affected by crises and emergencies and that statements and resolutions take the needs and experiences of all sectors of society into account.
- Stress the fundamental importance of international law and use all means available to prevent and sanction the use of sexual violence as a weapon of war.

I encourage all in the donor and humanitarian system to work harder to build on the progress we have made in recent years. We know what we need to do; now we just have to do it.
Notes


5 Ibid., 48. “According to Delphine Brun, [Gender Consolidated Appeal Process] Advisor who worked in the Demographic Republic of Congo (DRC), it is very likely that in DRC the numbers set by policy makers were not reflected in the reality on the ground. While [UN World Food Programme] policy recommended that 80 percent of the targeted households receive their food rations through adult female members, in North Kivu only 23 percent of the IDP [internally displaced persons] women and 8 percent of returnee women were registered for ration cards. Similarly, in South Kivu, while 80 percent of IDP women were reached, figures were as low as 20 percent
among returnee women. For agriculture the situation was even worse, as 96 percent of the agricultural kits were given to men, in a country where women produce 75 percent of the food.”


right: Hmong women and child in Mae Salong, Thailand, where women’s labor accounts for two-thirds of subsistence agriculture, yet they often have no rights over land, June 2011 (United Nations/ Kibae Park)
16. Promoting Women’s Participation in Disaster Management and Building Resilient Communities: A View from U.S. Pacific Command

By Mienie Winn Byrd

U.S. PACIFIC COMMAND (USPACOM) is charged with helping our partner nations prepare for and respond to disasters through such efforts as education, planning, preparation, assessing preparedness, coordinating operating procedures, conducting training exercises, and on-the-ground assistance. Like the rest of the world, we rely on the United Nations Hyogo Framework for Action, 1 the fundamental planning document that describes and details the work required from all different sectors to reduce disaster losses. The Hyogo Framework was developed and agreed on with a wide range of partner governments, agencies, and disaster experts. Among other things, the Hyogo Framework identified a gender perspective as one of the four cross-cutting issues that must be kept in mind when planning for and responding to disaster in order to reduce risk, keep losses low, and build resilience.

All human relations and social organizations vary somewhat by gender. Cultural attitudes toward gender shape each individual’s behavior—and, as a result, when, where, and how she or he might be vulnerable. More particularly, gender inequalities—limits on women’s abilities to access information, control money and resources, and make decisions about their own lives and behavior—can put women and girls at additional risk in disasters.

When women and girls are at higher risk, entire communities are put in danger because women tend to be responsible for caring for the young, the elderly, the sick, and those living with disabilities. If the family loses the male breadwinner or head of household, she becomes additionally responsible for the well-being of the family.

left: Staff Sergeant Amber Goedde, USAF, gets into bomb suit during operations check of protective wear at Forward Operating Base Azizullah, Afghanistan, May 2011 (U.S. Air Force/Stephen Schester)
Any gender inequality is therefore magnified in a disaster and must be considered in planning. Discriminatory laws and sociocultural attitudes and habits thus can hold back a community’s disaster recovery.

To help protect women, experts now advocate ensuring that women are involved in planning and preparing for disasters. Simply having women participate is not enough, however. Women must have the power to influence and make decisions and to allocate resources. Here are two critical recommendations as USPACOM moves forward with integrating gender analysis in its disaster preparedness assistance:

✦ Ensure nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) that focus on women and girls are at the table. When working with NGOs in disaster education, training, planning, assessment, and all other efforts, be sure to involve NGOs that advocate for women and other culturally marginal populations (such as the Rohingya in Burma/Myanmar, undocumented migrant workers in Thailand, and so on). Consider these populations specifically, not generically. Each group will be vulnerable in a particular pattern that differs from others.

✦ Include NGOs that focus on sex workers and trafficking in girls and women. Among both women and migrant workers, sex workers (voluntary and involuntary) are a particularly vulnerable group.

Women are often in different places at different times than men. Their behavior is confined by different strictures. Disaster plans must take all those differences into account—lest not only women but also entire communities end up more vulnerable.

Note
Contributors

Baroness Valerie Amos is the United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator. Baroness Amos brings extensive knowledge and experience to the position. She was most recently the United Kingdom's High Commissioner to Australia. She has been a long-time campaigner and advocate on human rights, social justice, and equality issues. She is a former Secretary of State for International Development in the British government and was also president of the Privy Council and leader of the House of Lords. Born in Guyana, Baroness Amos holds a Bachelor of Arts in sociology and a Master of Arts in cultural studies as well as honorary doctorates from 11 British universities and 1 American university. She was awarded the Order of the Volta by the government of Ghana and has been honored by the government of Benin. She was also recognized by the Smithsonian Museum for African Art for her work on the continent.

Michelle Bachelet is the president of Chile. From 2002 to 2004, she held the position of defense minister, making her the first woman to hold this position in Chile and Latin America. Under her direction, important changes were made to compulsory military service; the role of the ministry and the military staff was strengthened; rights for women in the armed forces, police, and investigatory police were improved; and more Chilean peacekeeping forces were deployed across the world. In March 2006, Ms. Bachelet became the first female president of the republic, marking the beginning of a period where the government focused on achieving greater equality and social inclusion in Chile. In 2010, after finishing a presidential term marked by record citizen support and approval, she created the Fundación Dialoga (Dialogue Foundation) to continue contributing to the renewal of ideas from center-leftists and to serve as a motivational space for new leadership to form. In 2010, she became the president of the Social Protection Floor Advisory Group, a joint initiative with
the International Labor Organization and World Health Organization that works to promote social policies that stimulate economic growth and social cohesion. Under her leadership in 2011, the group published a report titled *Social Protection Floor for a Fair and Inclusive Globalization*, which currently serves as a guide for the United Nations (UN) regarding a universal standard of social protection. In September 2011, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon named Ms. Bachelet the first executive director of UN Women, an organization dedicated to fighting for the rights of women and girls internationally. In March 2013, after 2½ years of service dedicated to increasing women’s political participation and economic empowerment and fighting to end violence against women, she resigned from the organization. Ms. Bachelet then returned to Chile and again became a presidential candidate, winning a second term in December 2013.

Ambassador *Rick Barton* is the Assistant Secretary of State for the Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations (CSO) and the Secretary of State’s senior advisor on conflict and stabilization. The bureau is responsible for driving the State Department’s efforts to improve U.S. Government effectiveness in preventing cycles of violent conflict and addressing crises. Ambassador Barton leads a 160-member team that focuses on a few countries of special importance or where catalytic initiatives can further locally driven solutions. CSO has become known for its agility, innovative strategies, broad partnerships, local initiatives, and advanced analytics and mass communications. Since the bureau’s first years, the highest priority countries have been Syria, Burma, Honduras, Bangladesh, Kenya, and Nigeria. Previously, Ambassador Barton served in New York as the U.S. Representative to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations (UN), working on development, peace-building, climate change, and human rights. During that time, he was actively engaged in the creation of UN Women, as well as the advancement of the UN Peacebuilding Commission, Millennium Development Goals summit, and Democracy Fund initiatives; suspension of Libya’s voting rights on the UN Human Rights Commission; reconstruction of Haiti post-earthquake; and alignment of U.S. and UN development country programs. Ambassador Barton has worked to improve U.S. and international responses to conflict in more than 40 of the world’s most unstable places. He led independent reviews of Iraq reconstruction; developed civilian strategies for Iraq, Sudan, and Sri Lanka; created new measurements of progress in
Iraq and Afghanistan; and initiated path-breaking approaches to conflict reduction in Pakistan and Nigeria. Ambassador Barton has a Bachelor of Arts from Harvard College and a Master of Business Administration from Boston University. He was honored with a doctorate from Wheaton College of Massachusetts.

Dr. Miemie Winn Byrd is an associate professor in the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies. Her areas of specialty are U.S.-Burma relations, Asia-Pacific economics, organizational development/innovation, and adult learning/education. Her functional areas of focus are civil-military operations, interagency collaboration, and corporate financial accounting standards. Dr. Byrd is also a civil affairs officer in the U.S. Army Reserves. She was mobilized in support of Operation Enduring Freedom in 2003. While on Active duty from 2003 to 2007, she served as the deputy economic advisor, civil-military operations plans officer, and interagency operations officer at U.S. Pacific Command. She had also served as a linguist and cultural advisor to the U.S. delegations attending the Association of Southeast Asian Nations Regional Forum, POW/MIA recovery negotiations in Burma, and Operation Caring Response to cyclone Nargis. Dr. Byrd is currently serving on the boards of the Pacific Gateway Center and the Keck Center for International and Strategic Studies at Claremont McKenna College. She holds a Bachelor of Arts in economics and accounting from Claremont McKenna College and a Master of Business Administration with an emphasis in Asia-Pacific economics and business from the University of Hawaii. She earned her doctorate in education leadership from the University of Southern California.

Major General (Ret.) Patrick Cammaert had a distinguished military career in both the Netherlands, with the Royal Netherlands Marine Corps, and the United Nations (UN), where he served as sector commander in Cambodia, assistant chief of staff in Bosnia-Herzegovina, force commander in Ethiopia and Eritrea, military advisor to the Department of Peace Keeping Operations, and general officer commanding the Eastern Division in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Since his retirement in 2007, he has been an expert advocate regarding issues such as leadership in crisis circumstances, international peace and security, civil-military cooperation in peace support operations, peacekeeping, and security sector reform. Major General Cammaert has advised the senior management of the UN Department of Peace Keeping Operations, UN Development Programme, and UN Development Fund
for Women on strategic planning issues such as integrated training development, protection of civilians under immediate threat of physical violence, and sexual gender–based violence in armed conflict. He is regularly a mentor at senior UN Mission Leadership courses. In 2008, Major General Cammaert was awarded the Dutch Carnegie Foundation’s Wateler Peace Prize. He is a member of the advisory board of the Mukomeze Foundation, which helps women and girls who survived rape and other forms of sexual violence in Rwanda.

Ambassador Luis CdeBaca was appointed by President Barack Obama in May 2009 to coordinate U.S. Government activities in the global fight against contemporary forms of slavery. He serves as senior advisor to the Secretary of State and directs the State Department’s Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, which assesses global trends, provides training and technical assistance, and advocates for an end to modern slavery. Ambassador CdeBaca formerly served as counsel to the House Committee on the Judiciary, where his portfolio for Chairman John Conyers, Jr., included national security, intelligence, immigration, civil rights, and modern slavery issues. At the Department of Justice, Ambassador CdeBaca was one of the country’s most decorated Federal prosecutors, leading the investigation and prosecution of cases involving money laundering, organized crime, alien smuggling, official misconduct, hate crimes, and human trafficking. He was honored with the Attorney General’s Distinguished Service Award for his service as lead trial counsel in the largest slavery prosecution in U.S. history, which involved the enslavement of over 300 Vietnamese and Chinese workers in a garment factory in American Samoa. He has received the leading honor given by the national trafficking victim service provider community, the Freedom Network’s Paul and Sheila Wellstone Award, and has been named the Michigan Law School’s Distinguished Latino Alumnus. He has convicted dozens of abusive pimps and employers and helped to liberate hundreds of victims from servitude. Ambassador CdeBaca holds a Bachelor of Arts from Iowa State University and a Juris Doctor from the Michigan Law School, where he was an editor of the Michigan Law Review.

General Carter F. Ham, USA (Ret.), was the second commander of U.S. Africa Command from 2011 to 2013. He started his career as an enlisted infantryman in the 82nd Airborne Division before attending John Carroll University in Cleveland, Ohio. He was commissioned in the infantry as a Distinguished Military Graduate
in 1976. His military service included assignments in Kentucky, Ohio, California, Georgia, Italy, Germany, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Macedonia, and Iraq. He held a variety of positions to include recruiting area commander; battalion executive officer at the National Training Center; advisor to the Saudi Arabian National Guard; commander, 1st Battalion, 6th Infantry; chief of staff, 1st Infantry Division; commander, 29th Infantry Regiment; commander, Multi-National Brigade, Mosul, Iraq; commander, 1st Infantry Division; and director for operations, Joint Staff J3. His previous assignment was commanding general of U.S. Army Europe and Seventh Army. His military education includes the Armor Officers Advanced Course, Naval College of Command and Staff (graduating with distinction), and the Air War College. General Ham’s awards and decorations include the Army Distinguished Service Medal, Defense Superior Service Medal with three oak leaf clusters, Legion of Merit with two oak leaf clusters, Bronze Star, and Joint Service Commendation Medal.

Dr. Cindy Y. Huang is the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) deputy vice president for Sector Operations in the Department of Compact Operations, where she is in charge of policies, standards, and processes in key programmatic and operational areas. Dr. Huang manages teams responsible for MCC’s investments in agriculture, land, education, health, and community-driven development. She also oversees fiscal accountability, procurement and contracts support, and ensures that social inclusion and gender equality principles are integrated into the design and implementation of MCC’s programs. Dr. Huang has a Bachelor of Arts in ethics, politics, and economics from Yale University and a Master of Public Administration in development studies from Princeton. She also holds a Ph.D. in cultural anthropology from the University of California at Berkeley.

Ambassador Princeton N. Lyman served as the U.S. special envoy for Sudan and South Sudan from March 2011 to March 2013. As special envoy, he led U.S. policy in helping in the implementation of the 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement. Ambassador Lyman previously held the position of Ralph Bunche Fellow for African Affairs at the Council on Foreign Relations. He was also an adjunct professor at Georgetown University and at the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies. From 1999 to 2003, he was executive director of the Global Interdependence Initiative at the Aspen Institute. Ambassador Lyman’s previous career in government included assignments as deputy assistant secretary of state for

Admiral William H. McRaven, USN (Ret.), was the ninth commander of U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) from 2011 to 2014. He also served from 2008 to 2011 as the 11th commander of Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC), which is charged to study special operations requirements and techniques, ensure interoperability and equipment standardization, plan and conduct special operations exercises and training, and develop joint special operations tactics. Admiral McRaven served from 2006 to 2008 as commander, Special Operations Command Europe. In addition to his duties as commander, he was designated as the first director of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Special Operations Forces Coordination Centre where he was charged with enhancing the capabilities and interoperability of all NATO Special Operations Forces. Admiral McRaven has commanded at every level within the special operations community, including assignments as deputy commanding general for operations at JSOC; commodore of Naval Special Warfare Group One; commander of SEAL Team Three; task group commander in the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility; task unit commander during Operations Desert Storm and Desert Shield; squadron commander at Naval Special Warfare Development Group; and SEAL platoon commander at Underwater Demolition Team 21/SEAL Team Four. His diverse staff and interagency experience includes assignments as the director for strategic planning in the Office of Combating Terrorism on the National Security Council Staff;
assessment director at USSOCOM; staff member of the Chief of Naval Operations; and the chief of staff at Naval Special Warfare Group One. Admiral McRaven’s professional education includes an assignment to the Naval Postgraduate School, where he helped establish, and was the first graduate from, the Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict curriculum.

**Jane Mosbacher Morris** is the founder and chief executive officer of TO THE MARKET | Survivor-made Goods, which focuses on economic empowerment for survivors of abuse, conflict, and disease. She previously served as the director of humanitarian action for the McCain Institute for International Leadership, where she managed the institute’s efforts against human trafficking. Prior to joining the institute, she worked in the Department of State in the Bureau of Counterterrorism and in the Secretary’s Office of Global Women’s Issues. Ms. Morris drafted the State Department’s first Women and Counterterrorism Strategy and helped to develop the department’s implementation of the U.S. National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security, a Presidential interagency initiative. She has worked at the Millennium Challenge Corporation and the Center for Strategic and International Studies, and has served as an investment advisor to Barbara Corcoran of ABC’s *Shark Tank*. She loves to travel, speak, and write on issues of women, human security, and the power of the private sector to do good. Ms. Morris has received numerous awards from the State Department and was been named one of the “Top 99 Under 33 Most Influential Young Professionals” by the *Diplomatic Courier*. She serves on the boards of LEAD, USA Cares, wh20: The *Journal of Gender and Water*, ONE Campaign’s Women and Girls Initiative, ARZU Studio of Hope, and 360 Degrees Vanishing. She holds a Bachelor of Science in foreign service from Georgetown University and a Master of Business Administration from Columbia Business School.

Admiral **Michael Mullen**, USN (Ret.), was the 17th Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. As such, he served as the principal military advisor to the President, Secretary of Defense, National Security Council, and Homeland Security Council. A native of Los Angeles, California, he graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1968. He commanded three ships: the gasoline tanker USS *Noxubee* (AOG-56), the guided-missile destroyer USS *Goldsborough* (DDG-20), and the guided-missile cruiser USS *Yorktown* (CG-48). As a flag officer, Admiral Mullen commanded Cruiser Destroyer Group 2, the USS *George Washington* battle group, and the U.S. Second Fleet/
North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Striking Fleet Atlantic. Ashore, he served in leadership positions at the U.S. Naval Academy, in the Navy's Bureau of Personnel, in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and on the Navy staff. He was the 32nd Vice Chief of Naval Operations from August 2003 to October 2004. His last operational assignment was as commander of NATO Joint Force Command Naples/commander, U.S. Naval Forces Europe. Admiral Mullen is a graduate of the Advanced Management Program at the Harvard Business School and earned a Master of Science in operations research from the Naval Postgraduate School. Prior to becoming Chairman, Admiral Mullen served as the 28th Chief of Naval Operations.

Captain Scott T. Mulvehill is currently serving as the special assistant and speechwriter for the commander of U.S. European Command and Supreme Allied Commander, Europe. He advises the commander on a full range of U.S. and international issues. He develops strategic thought pieces and messaging for a broad international audience and articulates the commander's vision and priorities. A 22-year naval aviator, he has served at sea during multiple combat deployments. While he was the commanding officer of Strike Fighter Squadron 147 (VFA 147), the squadron achieved Navy-wide awards for outstanding combat readiness and retention excellence. Captain Mulvehill holds a Bachelor of Arts from Michigan State University and a Master of Arts in National Security and Strategic Studies from the Naval War College.

Navanethem Pillay served as the United Nations (UN) High Commissioner for Human Rights from 2008 to 2014. Ms. Pillay, a South African national, was the first woman to start a law practice in her home province of Natal in 1967. Over the next few years, she acted as a defense attorney for anti-apartheid activists, exposing torture and helping establish key rights for prisoners on Robben Island. She also worked as a lecturer at the University of KwaZulu-Natal and later was appointed vice president of the Council of the University of Durban Westville. In 1995, after the end of apartheid, Ms. Pillay was appointed as acting judge on the South African High Court, and in the same year was elected by the UN General Assembly to be a judge on the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR), where she served a total of 8 years, the last four (1999–2003) as president. She played a critical role in the ICTR's groundbreaking jurisprudence on rape as genocide, as well as on issues of freedom of speech and hate propaganda. In 2003, she was appointed as a judge
on the International Criminal Court in The Hague where she served on the appeals chamber until August 2008. In South Africa, as a member of the Women’s National Coalition, she contributed to the inclusion of the equality clause in the country’s constitution that prohibits discrimination on grounds of race, gender, religion, and sexual orientation. She co-founded Equality Now, an international women’s rights organization, and has been involved with other organizations working on issues relating to children, detainees, victims of torture and domestic violence, and a range of economic, social, and cultural rights. Ms. Pillay received a Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Laws from KwaZulu-Natal University. She also holds a Master of Law and Doctorate of Juridical Science from Harvard University.

Ms. Mari Skåre is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Special Representative for Women, Peace, and Security. She has extensive experience from the Norwegian Foreign Service. Prior to her nomination as special representative, she served as minister counselor and deputy permanent representative at the Norwegian Delegation to NATO. She also served as minister counselor and deputy head of mission at the Norwegian embassy in Kabul and previously as counselor and legal adviser at the Norwegian Mission to the United Nations (UN). Ms. Skåre joined the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1991. Her first assignment was as legal adviser in the Secretariat of the Minister of International Development. Since then, she has held a number of positions and has extensive knowledge of the UN and NATO. Throughout her career, she has worked with issues relating to women and security, particularly through her positions as minister counselor at the Norwegian embassy in Kabul and the Norwegian Delegation to NATO. In these positions, she was instrumental in formulating Norwegian policies. Ms. Skåre holds a Master of Law degree from the University of Oslo.

Admiral James G. Stavridis, USN (Ret.), is the 12th dean of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University. He led the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in global operations from 2009 to 2013 as Supreme Allied Commander, Europe. He also served as commander of U.S. Southern Command, with responsibility for all military operations in Latin America from 2006 to 2009. Admiral Stavridis holds a Ph.D. from the Fletcher School and won the Gullion Prize as outstanding student. He has published 5 books and over 100 articles. He primarily
focuses on innovation, strategic communication and planning, and creating security through international, interagency, and public/private partnerships.

Ambassador *Donald Steinberg* is president and chief executive officer of World Learning, Inc., an international nonprofit organization that provides education, exchange, and development programs in more than 60 countries. Previously, he served as deputy administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), providing overall direction and management for the agency. His areas of focus include the Middle East and Africa; reforms under USAID Forward, and the Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review; integration and mainstreaming of gender and disabilities into agency programming; and enhanced dialogue with development partners, including civil society, business, foreign donors, international institutions, Congress, and other U.S. Government agencies. Ambassador Steinberg previously served as deputy president for policy at the International Crisis Group, a nonprofit seeking to prevent, contain, and resolve deadly conflict. He also served as a Randolph Jennings Senior Fellow at the U.S. Institute of Peace where he advocated for the world's 25 million internally displaced persons. On Capitol Hill, Ambassador Steinberg served as senior adviser for defense and foreign policy to House Majority Leader Richard Gephardt (D-MO) and as director of the House Task Force on Trade and Competitiveness. He has also worked with the Women's Refugee Commission, United Nations Development Fund for Women, and Institute for Inclusive Security. Ambassador Steinberg has published more than 100 articles on foreign policy, African developments, gender issues, postconflict reconstruction, children and armed conflict, and disarmament. He holds a Bachelor of Arts from Reed College, a Master of Arts in journalism from Columbia University, and a Master of Arts in political economy from the University of Toronto. His honors include the Presidential Meritorious Honor Award, Frasure Award for International Peace, Hunt Award for Women in Policy Formulation, Pulitzer Traveling Fellowship, State Department Distinguished Service Award, and six State Department Superior Honor Awards.

Ambassador *Melanne Verveer* is executive director of the Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace and Security. Previously, she served as the first U.S. Ambassador for Global Women's Issues, a position to which President Barack Obama nominated her in 2009. She coordinated foreign policy issues and activities relating to the political, economic, and social advancement of women and traveled to nearly 60 countries.
Ambassador Verveer worked to ensure that women’s participation and rights are fully integrated into U.S. foreign policy, and she played a leadership role in the administration’s development of the U.S. National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security. President Obama also appointed her to serve as the U.S. Representative to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women. From 2000 to 2008, she was the chair and co–chief executive officer of Vital Voices Global Partnership, an international nongovernmental organization that she co-founded to invest in emerging women leaders. During the Bill Clinton administration, she served as assistant to the President and chief of staff to the First Lady. She also led the effort to establish the President’s Interagency Council on Women and was instrumental in the adoption of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000. Ambassador Verveer holds a Bachelor of Science and Master of Science from Georgetown University. In 2013, she was the Humanitas Visiting Professor at Cambridge University. She is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and the World Bank Advisory Council on Gender and Development. She holds several honorary degrees and is the recipient of numerous awards, including the U.S. Secretary of State’s Award for Distinguished Service.
Supporting women and girls isn't just right; it's also strategic. It's security. It's stability. When women and girls live free from
the threat of violence—when they are able to pursue their
ambitions and realize their full potential—economies thrive,
stability spreads, and the entire world is stronger and more
secure. That's why empowering women around the world isn't
something extra for the State Department. It is foreign policy.

—John Kerry
68th U.S. Secretary of State

Around the world, every day, women are on the frontlines
for peace and protecting our security. They play an essential
role in our armed forces. Women are critical to helping stop
violence where conflict has broken out and in achieving justice
and reconciliation in war's aftermath. We need women to
continue playing leading roles in world affairs, protecting
America, and promoting peace.

—Chuck Hagel
24th U.S. Secretary of Defense