

New Focus, New Lens:
Ethical Contributions to Feminist Security Studies

by

Jillian A. Terry

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Political Science

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario

© 2011
Jillian A. Terry



Library and Archives
Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*
ISBN: 978-0-494-83103-8
Our file *Notre référence*
ISBN: 978-0-494-83103-8

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.


Canada

ABSTRACT

This thesis argues that the theoretical commitments held by approaches to feminist ethics are valuable contributions to the development of feminist security studies (FSS) in International Relations (IR). Specifically, a feminist perspective of international security grounded in feminist ethics highlights the gendered power relations at work in discourses of contemporary security concerns such as terrorism and torture. Through an examination of recent Afghan detainee transfer torture allegations, this thesis contends that ethical notions of relationality, responsibility, and care are of central importance to post-9/11 security processes, revealing the morally complex realities of the War on Terror that have been obscured by mainstream security scholarship. Moreover, this thesis suggests that the contributions of feminist ethicists to methodological and epistemological debates within FSS highlight the importance of ethics in the practice of research and the production of knowledge. Finally, this thesis identifies theoretical areas for increased engagement with ethical analysis as a way forward for the future of FSS scholarship.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this thesis would not have been possible without the continued support of many individuals. I would like to sincerely acknowledge the encouragement and advice I have received during my time as a graduate student in the Department of Political Science at Carleton University. The faculty, staff, and fellow students of the department have provided me with a stimulating intellectual environment for the last two years where I have grown in tremendous ways, both personally and academically.

In particular, I wish to express my genuine gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Fiona Robinson, for her guidance through this ambitious research project from its initial stages through to its completion. Her commitment to critical feminist inquiry has inspired me to continue interrogating the gendered nature of international security and uncovering the hidden realities of security processes through a feminist ethical lens.

I must also acknowledge the encouraging words and academic advice I have received from Professor Christina Gabriel as a graduate student in Political Science, as well as the helpful comments and feedback from my colleagues in Political Science 5506: Gender and Politics, where I presented an early version of this research project. In addition, I wish to thank all of the students for whom I acted as a teaching assistant over the last two years – your curiosity and willingness to learn reminded me of my passion for academic pursuits, and your astute political observations gave me new perspectives on the discipline each week.

The financial support I have received from Carleton University, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, and the Ontario Graduate Scholarship Program has allowed me to focus my energy on the daily research, writing, and teaching responsibilities of a graduate student, an opportunity for which I am truly grateful.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the love and encouragement of my family and friends for giving me the determination and strength needed to complete this thesis. To my parents, Rick and Elaine, and my younger sister, Amanda: your unconditional support and helpful words of encouragement have been invaluable to me, and have allowed me to successfully walk down this path with few missteps along the way. Lastly, to David: thank you for your love, for coming with me on this journey, and for reminding me of the beauty and value in sharing your successes with someone else.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Chapter Two: Studying Feminist Security	20
Chapter Three: Feminist Ethics in International Security	41
Chapter Four: Feminist Ethics and Torture Allegations	64
Chapter Five: Rethinking Feminist Ethics and Security	86
References	97

CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION

From its inception as a field of inquiry, feminist International Relations (IR) scholars have focused on issues of security, in both direct and indirect analyses. Beginning with examinations of masculinities in nuclear warfare decision-making processes (Cohn 1987) and the role of myths in the sustained positioning of women as non-combatants and men as warriors (Elshtain 1987), and continuing with analysis of the gendered nature of military projects (Enloe 1989) and a call for a redefining of hegemonic conceptions of security in global politics (Tickner 1992), feminist contributions to our understandings of international security have been a key aspect of feminist theorizing in International Relations for over two decades.

Feminist IR scholarship also has engaged in the search for innovative methodologies that can be used to inform and transform the practice of global security, particularly as it relates to the use of gender as a key tool for analysis. Acknowledging the experiences of (in)security of women as distinct from those of men and asserting the importance of women's voices in discussions of security studies has been fundamental to the approach taken by feminist IR scholars. This is the case despite the challenges that arise when using a feminist theoretical framework in a discipline whose mainstream perspectives have largely ignored questions of gender (Stern 2006: 175). As Ackerly and Zhang (2010) helpfully point out, the feminist contribution to International Relations has been not simply to alter the study of questions of international politics, but to transform the ways in which we understand the discipline of IR itself (para. 2).

However, despite the evidence of significant theoretical and methodological contributions made by feminist scholars to the study of security in recent years, there

remains a lack of engagement and productive conversation between the field known as feminist security studies (FSS) and mainstream IR scholarship concerned with international security issues. The increasing number of publications which analyze security from a feminist perspective remain largely relegated to journals of gender studies, while most high-ranking security journals neglect examinations of security issues undertaken by those engaging with gender-based perspectives (Sjoberg and Martin 2010).¹ There seems to be an unwillingness on the part of non-feminist scholars to more wholeheartedly engage with feminist redefinitions of what are seen as the core tenets of the field. The importance of this apparent academic impasse should not be underestimated, as it speaks to the ability of feminist scholarship in security to more fully permeate International Relations as a discipline, and thus to provide new and meaningful understandings of a wide variety of security phenomena affecting both women and men in the twenty-first century. It is therefore central to the future of FSS that more attempts be made – by both feminist and mainstream IR theorists – to carve out a significant space within the field where gender-based perspectives on international security are given credibility as another important way for understanding the types of security concerns currently facing global society.

Key Arguments

This thesis asks how feminist security theorizing should develop in order to achieve increased engagement with the field of security studies and advance gender-based perspectives as significant additions to our overall understandings of contemporary security phenomena. By identifying sites of distinctiveness in feminist approaches to

¹ One notable exception to this trend – a 2009 issue of *Security Studies* (18 2) edited by Laura Sjoberg was dedicated entirely to feminist contributions to the field of international security studies.

security and acknowledging areas of concern where mainstream and critical scholarship in international security have not yet been able to provide sufficient or complete analyses, the significance of FSS in IR becomes increasingly evident. Non-feminist scholarship has already begun to realize the extent to which the experiences of women and the importance of gender dramatically alters what is meant by security, and how traditional security studies in any form cannot therefore offer a complete analysis (Smith 2005: 48). In order to move beyond recognition alone, it is necessary for FSS as a research programme to clearly articulate its offerings, both in terms of theoretical frameworks and methodologies, so there are increased opportunities for engagement with the field at large through areas of both commonality and contestation.

First, this thesis argues that feminist approaches to security offer unique and distinctive understandings of contemporary security phenomena that are not currently available through existing perspectives. Beyond simply outlining the assumptions of feminist security scholarship as they have been examined in the literature, this thesis attempts to invigorate the debate surrounding *what* those assumptions are and *how* they may be better articulated in order to engender engagement with non-feminist scholars of security. Given the preoccupation and discomfort felt by many feminists regarding an apparent need for specificity in feminist security theorizing, it is important to note, as Zalewski (2003) does, that “questions calculated to reify an inhibiting structural position hinge on a certain precision regarding the character of contemporary feminism. Failure to secure this position occasions a tendency to impose it” (291). Therefore, it is important to consider the development of FSS and the articulation of its key assumptions as fluid, rather than static, in order to preserve the theoretical, epistemological, and

methodological richness of the approach while allowing for increased dialogue with those outside its (porous) borders.

Second, this thesis argues that it is through a deeper understanding and commitment to feminist ethics that FSS as an approach to examining international security concerns can be seen as more relevant to the conversations of security theorists generally. As Hutchings (2007) points out, in order for feminists to incorporate ethics into our understandings of world politics, there must be reflection on the role of gender in how we distinguish between ethical and unethical in principle and in practice (91). Such a focus on ethics in practice is central to the argument being made in this thesis, particularly in the way that we understand security phenomena in the twenty-first century. As will be discussed further in subsequent chapters, it is through an inclusion of feminist ethics into the analysis of security by feminist scholars that new understandings of contemporary security concerns such as terrorism and torture are brought to light. The various approaches to feminist ethics in international security studies do not simply advocate a set of ethics for women as individuals seeking security; they instead ask how ethics may be done in highly securitized contexts around the world, with one possible response being the interrogation of how and why ethical judgements themselves are reached (Hutchings 2000). This thesis specifically examines feminist ethical perspectives concerned with notions of care, pacifism, and discourse to identify some of the existing scholarship's most important contributions to the realm of international security.

An examination of recent allegations against Canadian forces of knowingly transferring Afghan detainees to facilities where they would be tortured will provide additional support for my argument regarding the significant contribution of a feminist

ethical analysis of international security. The usefulness of this case comes from the many questions surrounding the Canadian government's response to the allegations and allows for a detailed examination of the discourse through a feminist ethical lens. The commitments of feminist approaches to ethics and international security, including a concern for epistemology, responsibility, and compassion shed light on the complex nature of the allegations. Through a feminist ethical analysis, this thesis highlights the problematic traditions of Western rationalist bias and hierarchy that dominate military decision-making processes, and argues that the Canadian government's response should have been more focused on the particular contextual experiences of the detainees themselves. The case of Afghan detainee torture allegations in Canada is therefore an effective backdrop on which the practical usefulness of approaches to feminist ethics in international security can be analyzed.

Contributions to the Field

Despite the significant achievements of feminist security scholarship to date, there remain important areas of the field deserving of further analysis. As Sjoberg and Martin (2010) point out, the orientation and boundaries of FSS, along with its conflicted relationship with other theories of security, are among the most important unresolved issues in the field. This thesis attempts to contribute to the existing literature by providing possible avenues of exploration as well as identifying potential tools for feminist scholars of security to use in their attempts to engage more seriously with non-feminist contributions.

This thesis also contributes to feminist analyses of contemporary security phenomena such as terrorism and torture. The number of gendered war stories

surrounding the War on Terror continues to increase as the complex conflict prepares to enter its second decade and, as Hunt and Rygiel (2006) argue, such stories “demand a feminist re-telling” (17). While feminist scholars have provided many useful insights into the justification for the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks (Thobani 2001; Enloe 2004; Shepherd 2006), questions remain surrounding events that continue to unfold, particularly the issue of detainee transfer. This thesis answers some of these questions through the use of a feminist framework of ethics in security, providing an alternative analysis than that of mainstream security scholarship and shedding new light on our understandings of terrorism and torture as they exist in the twenty-first century.

It is important to link FSS and feminist ethics together in a substantive and explicit manner. Feminist scholarship has long been concerned with ethical considerations in international security – take, for example, the work of Peterson and Runyan (1999), who examine rape as an institutionalized weapon of war and its implications for collective security, or Tickner’s (1997) earlier assertion that the security of people is often compromised in the quest for state security. Similarly, feminist ethicists have written extensively on issues surrounding international relations, most notably the concept of just war as seen through responsibility (Robinson 2006), just cause, and proportionality (Hutchings 2000). However, it remains the case that little academic research has been undertaken that attempts to integrate the existing work on feminist ethics with theorizing in feminist security, whereby both literatures are seen as co-constitutive and intrinsically interconnected. Sara Ruddick’s early examination of peace and feminist ethics (1989; 1993) is an important part of the existing literature linking the

two areas, and some relevant recent work in the field examines feminist ethics and human security (Robinson 2008) and feminist reformulations of just war theory (Sjoberg 2006). The aim of this research project is to continue with this type of synthesis in order to make a key contribution to the existing FSS literature and differentiate it from theoretical interrogations that have already been completed by feminist security scholarship.

Gender, Feminisms, and Challenges to IR

Prior to the substantive discussions of FSS, feminist ethics, and the Afghan detainee transfer case in this thesis, it is necessary to acknowledge the positioning of FSS scholarship within the broader field of feminist IR. To do this, we must consider what is meant by gender as a tool for analysis in the examination of international politics, the varying perspectives presented by feminists to perform these analyses, and the extent to which feminist IR challenges what we know about International Relations as a discipline. The decisions of feminist IR scholars to focus on particular areas and methods of inquiry are central to the development of the field, and the subsequent formation of FSS as a distinct area of feminist IR scholarship. As Enloe (2007) suggests, the existence of a “feminist curiosity” (1) in international politics has led to discoveries and examinations on the part of feminist IR that shape not only what the field looks like at present, but also map its future research directions.

Feminist scholarship in IR has said much regarding the distinction between sex and gender. Some have emphasized the importance of theorizing gender as a series of representations or performances in the way international politics is produced and reproduced. As Sylvester (1994) has argued, the ways in which men and women are traditionally conceived of in International Relations are simply groups of representations

that have been provided by society *about* men and women, and that these stories are retold as populations behave according to them (4). From this perspective of representation, understanding the roles of women and men in global politics requires careful examination of these stories, not simply the sex binaries used by mainstream IR theorists. Other feminists understand gender from a constructivist perspective, seeing it more generally as a social or cultural phenomenon where gendered behaviours are largely the product of socialization and are highly dependent on social and historical context (Shepherd 2010: 8).

Related to these conceptual understandings of gender is the importance of examining masculinities and femininities in the study of IR. As Carver (1996) and other masculinity studies scholars helpfully point out, “gender is not a synonym for women” (6). This focus on masculinities allows feminist scholarship to come to more complete understandings about the nature of international political practices and institutions, particularly when examining notions of security. Feminists have written at length on the complex relationship between militarization and masculinities (Enloe 2000, 2004; Cockburn 2004; Whitworth 2005), and asserted that ignoring masculinity as a key conceptual element of gender results in an impoverished analysis of the ways in which gendering impacts all aspects of international politics, and thus, the lives of women and men around the world.

The early work of Carol Cohn (1987) examining the impact of gender in nuclear strategic culture is one particularly relevant example of how including gender as a key tool for analysis in security studies can result in new understandings about the way in which international security is practiced. Cohn (1987) argues that the language used by

nuclear defense intellectuals is constructed using a highly gendered framework of “technostrategic” discourse (690). As Shepherd (2010) has recently highlighted, this seminal research project “draws attention to the ways in which gender functions in security by not only interrogating the actions of physical bodies but also by asking what work gender is doing to organize and make sense of security discourses” (11). Such an organization of discourses is essential to the way in which actors participate in practices of security, demonstrating the usefulness of thinking about and deconstructing gender in international security scholarship. Moreover, Cohn’s early work remains one of the most significant accounts of gender in the security practices of global politics and her focus on gendered bodies, language, and positioning continues to orient feminist work in IR as scholars look to further analyse the importance of embodiment and gendered discourse in the production of particular security concerns and responses (see, for example: Shepherd 2008; Wright 2009).

Stemming from various traditions in feminist theorizing, the varied approaches that make up feminist IR theory centre themselves around differing ontological and epistemological orientations, resulting in an intellectually rich diversity of perspectives. While all feminist analysis in IR seeks to engage with gender as a key tool for understanding world politics, there remains no consensus among feminist scholarship on the particulars of theorizing gender in the discipline. It is indeed the case that much feminist work in IR falls within what can be broadly considered critical paradigms; however, as Sjoberg (2009) points out, it has been suggested by several feminist scholars, including early work in the field by Sandra Whitworth (1989), that there are possibilities for engagement between feminist theories and traditionally mainstream approaches to IR

such as realism. This type of feminist work takes cues from realist IR analysis, and focuses on the ways in which gender impacts state power and strategies of state actors (Sjoberg 2009: 3). In contrast, liberal feminist perspectives are primarily interested in the inclusion of women into the existing structures and practices of global politics in order to solve the problem of gender oppression and women's subordinate position in the international political system. For example, Mary Caprioli's (2005) analysis of the relationship between internal conflict and gender inequality in states can be seen as a liberal feminist analysis of IR. This type of work is often accused by more critical feminist IR scholarship of ignoring the gendered nature of international politics as a whole, and focusing too heavily on the addition of women to what are already deeply gendered (and highly masculinized) structures and practices.

Feminist poststructuralism represents a significant shift from the rationalist scholarship of realist and liberal feminist analyses. Poststructural feminists place emphasis, both ontologically and epistemologically, on discourse, and argue that discourses silence and legitimate particular practices in global politics (Hansen 2010: 24). As Sjoberg (2009) suggests, feminists who work in poststructural theorizing assert the importance of meaning in linguistic manifestations, and examine dichotomies of the public/private, rational/emotional, and strong/weak that constitute global politics in order to reveal the dominance of masculine empowerment and feminine marginalization (3). Feminist post-structuralism is particularly useful for FSS scholarship, as the discourse surrounding international security practices can be deconstructed and revealed as highly gendered, thus marginalizing women as security actors in global society. Further, poststructuralist feminist analysis provides a critical lens through which state security

policies can be viewed, creating the ability for feminist security scholars to ask the important question: security for *whom*?

Similarly, the work of postcolonial feminism provides opportunities for the critical analysis of international security concerns. Feminist theorizing from a postcolonial perspective emphasizes the domination and subordination practices of colonial interactions under imperial rule, and examines the relationship between these practices and gender relations (Sjoberg 2009: 3). As Wibben (2011) highlights, postcolonial feminists are sceptical of seeing any value in a traditional view of world politics, as it was “designed to support a Eurocentric colonial enterprise and [is] based largely on the ideas of White males whose experience is taken as the ideal to be imposed on all others” (18). Postcolonial feminism also provides useful areas for contribution to feminist security scholarship, particularly in analyses of intervention, ethnic conflicts, and post-conflict reconstruction, as it sheds light on the lasting effects of colonialism on security practices in contemporary international politics.

The richness of FSS as a subfield of IR is due at least in part to its theoretically diverse makeup, which offers many considerations as to how and why international security practices are gendered. Moreover, an understanding of multiple feminisms allows for continued debate among feminist security scholars and results in a wide range of examinations of the many complex security concerns seen in the post-9/11 world. As will be discussed further in the following chapter, many of the key claims and principles of FSS are informed by these multiple understandings of what feminism is, and how gender affects IR in theory and practice.

Feminist International Relations has challenged the way in which IR, as a discipline, is understood. Acknowledging IR itself as gendered has been at the core of the feminist research project since its early development. As Wibben (2011) points out, the traditionally male-dominated discipline of IR has tended to focus on research questions that are of interest to the overwhelmingly male community of IR scholars (17). She points to classical realist examinations of soldiers and diplomats as evidence for a male-bias in IR that covers not only the ideas and concepts used to explain international politics – such as the masculine notions of sovereignty, anarchy, and power – but also the structures, practices, and institutions that are chosen to be studied (Wibben 2011: 66-7). Feminist IR explicitly disrupts this type of study, and asks about the relationship between researcher and research question in understanding the selection of particular events or institutions for analysis.

As Carver (2010) suggests, feminist work in IR has also challenged the way the discipline is taught and learned. Despite its continued location near the end of most textbooks of international politics, feminist analysis has gained some visibility and priority as an approach to studying IR. Sjoberg (2010) has emphasized that feminist perspectives have transformed knowledge of the field in ways that go beyond simply the addition of women to the scholarship (5). Failure to recognize this presents a substantive problem for IR as a discipline, and prevents the study of global politics from achieving its full and emancipatory potential. As the discipline begins to make this recognition, the ways in which security is practiced around the world may also be transformed. This transformation would truly mark the acceptance of gender as an integral aspect of how security is understood by both academics and policymakers internationally. While

feminist IR scholarship continues to challenge mainstream understandings of world politics that ignore gender, its accomplishments have begun to shift the way in which international relations is explored. These accomplishments have particular impacts for the future of FSS, as will be explored further in the following chapter.

Methodological Considerations

As in other areas of feminist scholarship in IR, a significant methodological debate exists in FSS. While this thesis does not aim to provide definite solutions to this tension, it nevertheless employs what have been identified as feminist methodologies of International Relations in its attempts to demonstrate the usefulness of feminist security theorizing informed by feminist ethics. The following discussion outlines these methodologies and attempts to provide justification for their use along with possible concerns surrounding their employment in feminist research.

It has been argued that the feminist nature of scholarship in IR is determined by the research question being interrogated rather than the particular method used (Ackerly, Stern and True 2006: 5). This claim is important as it highlights an ontological commitment of IR feminists to asking research questions that take gender as a key tool of analysis, rather than employing a particular methodological approach to examine gender. Despite this assertion, it is nevertheless significant to acknowledge the multiple methodological commitments held by feminist scholars of IR. In security studies, feminists have been instrumental in the implementation and application of what Ann Tickner (1998) describes as “hermeneutic, historically contingent, sociological, or ethnically based” methods (205). These preferences toward methodologies that acknowledge the multiple identities of individuals and the impacts of those identities on

their position in international security practices is a key element of FSS and constitutes one of its integral strengths as a subfield of International Relations.

In order to reflect more fully on the methodological considerations surrounding a project seeking to bring together feminist ethics and FSS, it is also important to recognize the divergences existing between feminist and non-feminist normative theory in International Relations. As Robinson (2006) points out, non-feminist normative theorists have aimed to produce overarching and universal moral theoretical frameworks, and then apply them to some of the grand questions and issues facing the discipline. The work of some scholars of feminist ethics, however, contrasts with this project, as they “seek to understand, reflect on, and possibly transform the patterns of moral relations as they exist in a variety of everyday contexts” (Robinson 2006: 231). Despite the challenges evident in tackling such an ambitious approach to feminist ethics, it is commitment to critical moral inquiry that drives this sort of feminist ethical research and provides us with understandings of morality and ethical judgements that are cognizant of history, politics, culture, and positionality in global society.

As Hutchings (2000) argues, it is integral to feminist international ethics that the institutions and practices of global politics, as well as the values embedded in them, are critically analyzed and deconstructed in order to achieve the feminist ethical goal of transformation. This research project examines the gendered and ethical values embedded in practices and institutions of international security, focusing particularly on the case of Afghan detainee transfer by Canadian forces, in order to elucidate the role of feminist ethics in a feminist approach to security studies. Such an examination not only demonstrates the highly masculinized, securitized, and militarized practices evident in

state responses to terrorism and torture, but offers ways in which such practices can be rethought in order to create possibilities for transformation.

In order to deconstruct and critically analyze the state, military, and civilian responses to Afghan detainee transfer, this thesis engages with discourse analysis to examine the ways in which international security is practiced post 9-11, and what the ethical implications are of such practices from a feminist perspective. As noted by MacKenzie (2009), unpacking security discourses allows us to better understand “the relationship between notions of stability, peace, victim, and violent, threatening, conflict to presumptions about femininity and masculinity” (260). Further, she argues that feminist scholarship can make significant contributions to the field of security studies by discovering new mechanisms for disrupting conventional security discourses (MacKenzie 2009: 260). Examining the statements made by military officials and politicians as well as the investigations of national news media through a critical feminist discourse analysis brings to light new ethical considerations regarding the War on Terror and its impacts on populations, and demonstrates the relevance of feminist ethics to the study of security from feminist perspectives.

Thesis Structure

The remainder of this thesis is divided into four substantive sections. Chapter 2 provides a comprehensive overview of FSS as it has been articulated in the literature of the past two decades. The early developments of the subfield will be examined in detail to provide a backdrop on which the theoretical framework in subsequent chapters will be built. In addition, this chapter will interrogate some of the key assumptions and principles that feminist scholars of security have contributed to the field in recent years. To this end,

a discussion of militarization and masculinities is included, as well as an examination of how feminist security scholarship seeks to reconceptualize some of the core concepts of mainstream security studies such as war, peace, violence, and the military. While the focus of the chapter is theoretical in nature, methodological contributions of feminist security scholars are also briefly discussed, as feminists' commitment to innovative methodological approaches is an important aspect of the subfield's development. The chapter also identifies some of the convergences and divergences between feminist and other (mainstream and critical) theories of security, and examines particular instances whereby dominant strands of security studies have failed to understand or engage with feminist perspectives, regardless of their perceived usefulness. This identification of specific sites suffering from a dearth of dialogue among scholars of varied approaches allows for discussion in subsequent chapters of the opportunities for increased engagement between feminist and non-feminist security theorists despite differing theoretical commitments.

Chapter 3 analyzes the work of feminist ethics and its connection to International Relations generally, and security studies specifically. The chapter examines contributions made by feminist moral theorists and scholars of applied feminist ethics from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds to our understandings of world politics, and provides a comprehensive outline of the many debates and insights brought to academic discourse by feminist ethics. In an attempt to destabilize constructions of disciplinary boundaries within feminist academic research, this chapter also concerns itself with the ethical contributions of a range of feminist scholarship that may not be explicitly presented as "feminist ethics" (Ackerly and Zhang 2010: para. 4). Additionally, this section explores

the diversity of approaches surrounding *how* feminist ethics should be included in discussions of international relations, and expands on varying notions of post-modern, postcolonial, and post-structural feminist perspectives on ethics in world politics. While there remains no consensus among feminists regarding the concepts or phenomena that should be understood as “ethical” within the world of IR, it is still possible to identify concerns that international feminist ethics have analysed and examined in the existing literature. This chapter also attempts to link these concerns to what feminist security theorists have discussed with relation to the gendered nature of IR, both as a discipline and as a practice. As pointed out by Parpart and Zalewski (2008), the goal of examining these gendered assumptions is intimately connected to the production of “morally responsible and politically effective knowledge” (8). This relationship between feminist IR scholarship and moral responsibility lies at the centre of the discussion in this thesis of ethics and security studies from feminist perspectives, and this chapter illustrates the complexities surrounding that relationship and the ways in which the work of feminist ethicists has contributed to the study of security through a feminist lens.

After having examined the theoretical underpinnings of FSS and feminist ethics, Chapter 4 provides empirical evidence to support the central argument of this thesis that feminist perspectives on international security, when grounded in feminist ethics, can provide important new understandings of contemporary security phenomena. The case used is the recent allegation against Canadian forces that Afghan detainees were knowingly transferred to facilities where they would be tortured by Afghan authorities. Government documents pertaining to the case are critically examined along with the testimony of senior diplomat and former high-ranking official of the mission in

Afghanistan Richard Colvin, as is the investigation into the allegations by The Globe and Mail. Public discourse surrounding the case is also analysed using Canadian media coverage of the allegations, testimony, and political backlash. The many ethical implications of this case are then outlined using the theoretical framework provided by feminist ethics and FSS. While this particular case does not directly involve women, the gendered nature of the Canadian military and international diplomacy are evidenced through an analysis of the treatment of Richard Colvin by military and government officials after the initial allegations. This chapter also reveals connections between international security concerns and notions of responsibility that are integral to our understandings of feminist ethics. Although the Afghan detainee transfer case is but one example, this chapter demonstrates its relevance to the ways in which feminist analysis uncovers new insights surrounding issues of torture and terrorism, particularly with reference to the importance of feminist ethics.

The final chapter attempts to draw some conclusions from the theoretical and empirical discussions provided throughout this analysis, as well as offer future directions for further research in FSS and possibilities for increased dialogue and conversation with non-feminist security scholarship. The multiple linkages existing between the research of feminist ethicists and security theorists are discussed in relation to the intellectual richness of a feminist perspective on security that lies on a nexus with feminist ethical research. Chapter 5 reiterates the key claim of this thesis that this intellectual richness results in new and improved understandings of contemporary security phenomena such as terrorism and torture, as evidenced by the empirical contribution of the Afghan detainee case and Richard Colvin's role in the presentation of allegations. Moreover, the final

chapter poses additional questions concerning the future of feminist security theorizing, asking how it might best move forward as a cohesive research programme in twenty-first century IR and whether possible allies might exist within or outside the confines of existing disciplinary boundaries. Emphasis in Chapter 5 is also placed on what Sylvester (2002) has referred to as the “unfinished journey” of FSS, and the need for increased further research, education, and collaboration among feminist and non-feminist scholars in order to more fully permeate the discipline and understand its usefulness as a distinctive approach to studying international security.

CHAPTER TWO – STUDYING FEMINIST SECURITY

This chapter traces the development of feminist analyses of international security. While subsequent chapters of this thesis argue in support of a synthesis between feminist security scholarship and the research done by feminist ethicists, the following analysis lays the groundwork for our understandings of how feminist security has positioned itself within the field. As with most feminist work in Political Science, the use of definitive disciplinary boundaries – which feminists perceive as static and disciplining – is eschewed. It is therefore important to remain cognizant throughout discussions of FSS that it is multiple and varied, rather than a singular intellectual entity or theoretical position.

Issues of security have been at the forefront of discussions of international relations (IR) since its inception as a discipline. There is an extensive existing literature surrounding concepts of war and peace, violence, militarization, and various other mechanisms of state security whereby competing perspectives in the study of international politics have theorized about how states are to best achieve peace, resolve interstate conflict, and protect themselves from external threats. It has been the case that until recently, however, these discussions have been debated primarily among mainstream approaches in the discipline, with much of the resulting scholarship coming from conventional IR scholars in the vein of more realist conceptions of security. In recent decades, the field of security studies has begun to see a shift, with critical theorists challenging the existing notions held by those in mainstream approaches and articulating “broader definitions of security” (Tickner and Sjoberg 2007: 193).

It is important to recognize just how underrepresented feminist security

scholarship has been in the relevant academic literature. Sjoberg and Martin (2010) analyzed over 5000 articles spanning twenty years of publication of the top five security studies journals, and found that less than forty articles discussed issues of gender in an explicit and substantial thematic manner (2).² This absence is an important missing piece of the security puzzle. In order to fully understand issues of security, war, and international conflict – and how to prevent it – scholars of international relations must take feminist security scholarship seriously. Theorists from feminist as well as other critical and mainstream perspectives to engage in meaningful discussion *with* - as opposed to talking *at* - each other as has been suggested to be the case by Sjoberg and Martin (2010: para 53).

This chapter consists of three main sections. The first substantive section examines the contributions to date of feminist security scholarship in order to expose its divergences from conventional perspectives of security studies along with its convergences with other critical perspectives on security. Specific analytical tools shared by feminist and other critical approaches are also examined, in particular their respective usages of an emancipatory framework when attempting to understand security. This section also deals with understandings of peace, war, and violence, and analyzes how critical and feminist scholars often have a shared understanding of militarism with respect to contemporary international security. The chapter's second main section examines (hyper)masculinities and militarization as some of the key concepts used by feminists in order to explain issues relating to contemporary security phenomena in the post-9/11 world. Both concepts, as conceived by feminist security scholars, provide for more

² The five journals analyzed by Sjoberg and Martin (2010) were *International Theory, Security Studies, International Security Review, Issues in International Security*, and *Security Dialogue*.

accurate understandings of, for example, terrorism as a contemporary means of war. This section also introduces notions of empathy and ethics, as they have been understood by feminist scholars producing analyses of security, concepts that will be more fully explored in subsequent chapters. Finally, the closing portion of this examination is normative in nature and discusses the possibilities for further development of feminist security studies as a subfield of IR.

Contributions of Feminist Security Studies

As in most disciplines, it has become common practice in International Relations for scholars to define theories in part by explaining how they differ from other approaches. Just as liberalism is seen as the response to realist thought, feminist theories of world politics, like other critical perspectives in the discipline, are viewed as a shift away from more generalized rational approaches of explaining state behaviour in a system of international anarchy to a focus on a more social and relational set of tools for analysis, in terms of feminism particularly, there is a focus on gender relations (Tickner and Sjoberg 2007: 187). As discussed in more detail in the preceding chapter, and as Stern and Zalewski (2009) usefully point out, feminist theory in IR allows scholars to “glimpse something different than the familiar contours of international politics and the subjects and harms it – as both field of study and realm of practice – reproduces” (629). It is therefore important to outline the major divergences existing between the theoretical and methodological tools used by feminists to understand security and the ‘familiar contours’ of its mainstream theoretical counterparts.

New Divergences

In his piece on the development of feminist security theory in recent years, Eric Blanchard (2003) makes particular reference to the fact that feminist security scholars have reconceptualized core concepts in their field, citing security, the state, violence, and peace/war as major areas of redefinition. He contends that feminists tend to reject the ‘levels-of-analysis’ approach typically used by realists and other conventional IR scholars in studying explanations of war, preferring instead an interrelated approach between the international, domestic, and individual and family levels (Blanchard 2003: 1296-7). Such an approach suggests that these divisions have been reified by conventional IR scholars, and feminist analysis shows how and why intra-state relations matter in the discipline. This contention is confirmed by Tickner’s earlier work (1992), which argues that the realist approach stresses factors of independence, autonomy, strength, power, and rationality when dealing with military and foreign policy issues, and that these are “all typically associated with men and masculinity” (3). While she admits that there is no consensus among feminists about what one new singular definition of security should be, Tickner (1992) clearly states that all feminist definitions of security, focusing largely on the “absence of war, violence and hostilities at the national and international levels [and] also the enjoyment of economic and social justice” (55), are in opposition with the zero-sum view of security by realists, where a state’s security hinges on the insecurity of another.

More recently, Jill Steans (2006) has posited a more global perspective on security that distinguishes itself even further from conventional understandings of the field, encompassing not only justice but also more attention towards women’s security

and gender equality specifically (72-74). She uses the HIV/AIDS pandemic in Africa as an example of how gender inequality in that part of the world – the fact that African women are culturally, politically, and economically disadvantaged – has led to insecurity in the region due to the high levels of HIV/AIDS transmission (Steans 2006: 74). In *Gender and International Relations*, Steans (2006) argues for this sort of global rethinking of security in large part due to realist and neorealist imaginings where “the primacy of the state was rather taken for granted” (65).

The reconceptualization of security by feminist scholars is one of the most evident and commonly cited areas of divergence between their perspectives and those of more conventional approaches to examining international security issues. However, issues relating to the understanding of war and violence are also significant evidence that there exist fundamental differences between the two theoretical strands of security analysis. Steans (1998) argues that “the study of violence in international relations has been largely confined to the study of war as an instance of state-sanctioned violence” (99). This explanation of war is rooted in realist notions of ‘the other’, whereby boundaries are drawn so that the state can attempt to protect itself from the violence of the excluded. Both Steans (1998) and Enloe (2004, 2007) represent the feminist view that this perspective is problematic as it relies too heavily on the distinction between ‘protector’ and ‘protected’, a distinction which is gendered in the sense that it blurs notions of women’s involvement in war as well as ignores the unique suffering – such as being displaced by war and burdened with carework duties for the injured, elderly, and very young – that women often face in times of violent conflict (Steans 1998: 100).

Therefore, it logically follows that a feminist analysis of war challenges notions of the protector/protected relationship as making women more vulnerable to violence, as the protectors usually exert some sort of control over the protected (Steans 1998 100-1) Enloe (2007) adds to this argument, highlighting the fact that realist accounts of security have emphasized that those who are “most capable of thinking in a certain way more ‘strategically’, more ‘rationally’” (61) are the ‘natural’ protectors in the international system

In reconceptualizing these two key concepts in security studies, significant evidence of divergences between feminist scholars and more mainstream security theorists are revealed. However, equally significant divergences and some convergences exist between feminist security scholarship and other strands of critical security studies

Newer Convergences and Divergences

As Tickner (2004) notes, “most IR feminists are closer to what in IR is called “critical security studies (CSS)” than they are to more conventional IR security scholarship” (43). Acknowledging that this is by no means an exhaustive account of such connections, this chapter addresses the emancipatory framework shared as a key commitment by feminist and some critical approaches, as well as the common perspectives often held by critical and feminist scholars with respect to militarism. The chapter then identifies some important divergences that remain between FSS and CSS, acknowledging that the two literatures are by no means identical in their understandings of international security.

Despite its ambiguous nature and contested definition, human security can be generally described as a focus on the security of the individual that emphasizes the well-

being of ordinary citizens and rejects realist, state-based approaches to security (Robinson 2008: 172). This approach has influenced critical scholars of security (including feminists) in their usage of an emancipatory framework as a tool for better understandings international security concerns. Elisabeth Porter (2008) identifies human security as a peacebuilding tool that has particular appeal for feminists as it “provides an emancipatory framework within which to judge whether concrete goals further just peace with security” (1). Meanwhile, influential critical security theorist Ken Booth (1991) also engages with the notion of emancipation in his discussions of security and the need to rethink terminology within international relations; he argues that in order to be truly emancipatory, individuals, rather than states, must be considered the referent objects for the theory and practice of security. Tickner (2004) provides insightful recent comments on this convergence, arguing that “claiming...that gender hierarchies are socially constructed allows feminists, like critical security scholars, to pursue an emancipatory agenda and postulate a world that could be otherwise” (47). These examples demonstrate the connections between feminist scholarship on security and that produced by critical theorists espousing an emancipatory approach; however, it remains necessary to include a caveat to this notion of convergence as the field of critical security studies itself is highly disparate where concepts such as emancipation remain contested.

For example, some feminists have identified the individual focus of human security as problematic (Hudson 2005; Robinson 2008). In particular, feminist critiques of human security “highlight the dangers of masking differences under the rubric of the term ‘human’” and argue that the inclusive nature of the human security approach actually serves to discredit the gendered dimension of international security (Hudson

2005: 157). In addition, Robinson (2008) suggests that the human rights-based approach to security espoused by human security scholarship is also problematic, as notions of human rights articulate “a set of universalized ‘principled norms’...[that] tend to focus on international law and the macro-picture of global governance” (175). This focus leads to a neglecting of the particular contexts of power and governance that exist at the level of communities and families, and fails to provide an alternative discourse to challenge dominant ideologies (Robinson 2008: 175-6).

Another area of connection between feminist and critical security theorists lies in their often-shared conceptualization of militarism. While a more detailed analysis of militarization appears in the following section of this chapter, it remains useful to note here that both approaches understand that a state-centric notion of militarism whereby individuals do not factor into the equation is impoverished and no longer correlates with the realities of contemporary warfare, particularly in ethno-national conflicts. Critical security scholars such as the c.a.s.e. collective (2006) question the nature of militaristic action and engage in a more nuanced reading of how speech, policy, and practice are all relevant when considering militarized societies. Similarly, feminist scholarship such as that of Cynthia Enloe (1989, 2000, 2007) examines the expansive and global nature of militarization, where societies themselves are becoming increasingly militarized in myriad ways – that is to say, militarism is no longer to be understood as occurring exclusively on the battlefield. This shared understanding between critical and feminist scholars of the wide range of impacts held by militarism in contemporary society is particularly important when considering security and, as will be evidenced in the next section, when considering contemporary warfare and terrorism.

These convergences seen between feminist security scholarship and CSS exist alongside other important divergences between the two fields. Securitization theory, also known as the Copenhagen School, has been one of the most successful fields of inquiry in critical security scholarship. CSS scholars Buzan, Waever and De Wilde (1998) popularized the notion of securitization, which emphasizes the study of discourse and the declaration of an issue as an *existential threat* to a *referent object*, the entity being threatened (36). Despite the successes of securitization theory in “widening as well as deepening ‘security’ without opening it up to an unlimited expansion” (Hansen 2000: 288), some feminist security scholars including Lene Hansen (2000) have criticized the approach for ignoring gender as a fundamental aspect of international security (294). Hansen (2000) suggests that an over-emphasis on the verbal speech acts fails to recognize situations “where the potential subject of security has no, or limited possibility of speaking its security problem” (294). Further, Hansen (2000) adds that the necessity of a referent object with particular characteristics – namely that it is clearly separable from other referent objects – does not take into account notions of collective gender security (299-300). Hansen’s (2000) feminist critique demonstrates additional divergences between FSS and the work of critical security scholars, particularly as they relate to practices of security.

Similarly, feminist criticism has been leveled at Foucauldian approaches to international security, also known as the Paris School. Influenced by the theoretical contributions of Michel Foucault, the Paris School also examines the construction of (in)security, but does so through a political-sociological lens. Didier Bigo (1996), a key thinker of Paris School security studies, suggests that we should analyse the construction

of security through the actions of bureaucratic actors and examine “their routine practices of categorization and definition” (Bigo 1996, in Van Munster 2007: 236). This understanding of Foucault’s governmentality is problematic for some feminists as it emphasizes the public sphere of bureaucracy and government decision-making. As Stern (2006) suggests, it is problematic to “reduce...(in)security to the familiar category of, for example, ‘individual in state’”, and such a reduction “can be read as complicit in the violence” that affects the lives of insecure individuals around the world (195). A focus by Foucauldian security studies scholarship on the actions of elite actors rather than the everyday security experiences of marginalized groups is troubling to many feminists examining international security. Similarly, Sylvester (2007) warns of the dangers of silencing particular participants and relegating them to the realm of ‘other’ in critical analyses of security studies, including Paris school approaches, noting that “if those subjected to a securitizing move, such as being designated ‘other participants’, attempt to speak up, they find themselves walled off from the communication options necessary to appeal their relegation” (552). As these silences, reductions, and limitations suggest, the divergences seen between feminist analysis and these two influential schools of thought in CSS demonstrate the unique positioning of FSS as a subfield of international security studies and its ability to examine such perspectives through a critical gender lens.

Given the multiple directions present in the divergences and convergences of the voices of feminist security, the trajectory of feminist security scholarship to date can be described as varied and broad. As Wibben (2011) points out, “women’s involvement in matters of international security is much broader than assumed” (21) by those examining issues of security in International Relations as a discipline and a practice. While the

involvement of women does not equate to the use of feminist approaches, her argument suggests that notions of gender have become increasingly salient in various areas of security analyses in IR. Feminist scholars have produced insightful analyses of security issues from realms other than those traditionally occupied by IR theorists, and have been particularly successful in examining such issues with the use of case studies and ethnographies. Moreover, as the early work of Enloe (1989) has emphasized, feminist efforts in security move far beyond the rigid borders of academia, as feminist activism around the world seeks to make populations more secure while recognizing the importance of considering gender when examining international security concerns.

The diversity seen throughout the early development of the field is one of the most valuable aspects of this body of security scholarship, and constitutes one of its major strengths when compared to mainstream and other critical analyses of international security. The subsequent sections of this chapter outline more specifically several of the core tenets of the field in order to provide a more complete portrait of what feminist security scholars offer in their many examinations of security in global politics.

Masculinities, Militarization, and Post-9/11 Security Concerns

One of the areas where the analysis of feminist security scholarship is most needed is in the study of terrorism, particularly as mainstream understandings of security have failed to adequately explain how and why security threats are handled post-9/11. As Sylvester (2009) succinctly points out, “we desperately need new ways of looking at the world and of overturning the fear in security” (26). She argues that feminist perspectives on security offer a new lens through which we can understand terrorism and the responses it provokes as not simply the actions of states or ‘other’ actors, but as actions

requiring an acknowledgement of sense and experience (Sylvester 2009: 35). In this understanding of ‘sense’ comes a knowledge of the gendered nature of contemporary discourse surrounding terrorism and the combat against it that continues to marginalize women. While the importance of gender is certainly at the heart of feminist security theory, its unique viewpoints as outlined by Sylvester (2009) and others offers a new perspective for a novel kind of security in the 21st century.

In the decade since the terrorist attacks of September 11th, feminist security theorists have identified multiple sites of gendered knowledge constructions resulting from terrorism and its responses, from Ferguson’s (2007) analysis of Bush-era security rhetoric and feminism to Tickner’s (2004) assertion that hegemonic masculinities tied to globalization and capitalist restructuring may have been compromised since September of 2001, instead suggesting a return to the hegemonic masculinity of the warrior hero and militarization. Cristina Masters (2008) is among a growing number of academics in the field who argue that the increasingly technological nature of war due to terrorist warfare, as can be seen in the current war in Iraq, has left war itself “almost entirely devoid of human presence” (102). Each of these assertions points to ways in which feminist security scholars have contributed to the discussion within academia regarding terrorism and its effects on international security.

While these perspectives have been useful in their exposure of complex and gendered power relationships as well as in providing evidence for the changing nature of warfare in recent decades, there remains little consensus among feminist security theorists with regard to the identification of key theoretical tools for analyzing and explaining terrorism and state responses to terrorist attacks. In an attempt to further

develop feminist security theory and its potential use as an approach to world politics that is able to unpack one of the most relevant international security issues today, the remainder of this section identifies two key areas where feminist scholarship is most useful to the discussion of terrorism (hyper)masculinities and militarization, as well as empathy and ethics. By concentrating theoretical analyses on these areas, it is possible that feminist scholars of security may be able to provide substantive answers to some of the field's newest and most complex questions, and create the possibility of filling what remains a noticeable gap in the realm of security studies as discussions of terrorism and the responses it provokes continue to be contested areas of study for both mainstream and critical scholars in the field.

(Hyper)masculinities and Militarization

War, violence and the military are among the most salient aspects of contemporary international security as defined by conventional IR perspectives, particularly with concern to current conflicts and the construction of threats related to the 'war on terror'. The notions of masculinity, hypermasculinity, militarization and militarism as identified by feminist security scholars are thus central to both the development of a distinct feminist security theory and its usefulness in explaining novel security phenomena such as terrorism. As Enloe (2007) and others have pointed out, patriarchy and militarism are intrinsically linked, particularly with respect to how the international community in an age of globalization has engaged in and responded to violent conflict. Similarly, Enloe (2007) has interrogated the ways in which military recruiters use notions of masculinity to enlist men into armed forces, suggesting that there exists a fundamental relationship between the militarization of security and conceptions

of the masculine/feminine.

Sjoberg's study (2007) of militarized femininity in Iraq through the examination of the Abu Ghraib prison scandal also suggests a similar relationship between what is accepted as conventional wartime behaviour – that is, the distinctly masculine – and more feminist interpretations of how military should act. In the case of Abu Ghraib, Sjoberg (2007) argues that “the current type of militarized femininity allows women to participate in war-making and war-fighting, but denies them agency in unwomanly decisions” (98). This investigation from a feminist security perspective sheds new light on the role of women in modern warfare, and the way in which gender plays a decisive part in understanding the actions of those in military decision-making positions. Both of these analyses also point to larger questions surrounding the nature of militarization in the post-9/11 period and how that militarization is translated into practice. As Sjoberg's (2007) study of Abu Ghraib demonstrates, the existence of terrorism transforms not only who is seen as threat or threatened, but also what (gendered) responses or actions are deemed permissible in the context of war. Similarly, as Kirk (2008) has recently argued, recognizing the importance of militarization allows us to acknowledge the impoverished state of security in the current era, resulting in destruction, cultures of violence, and the diversion of resources away from the needs of everyday security (42-3).

Notions of masculinity and hypermasculinity have been further included into discussions of security by feminist scholars with respect to the gendered nature of states themselves. Charlotte Hooper (2001), and more recently Jennifer Maruska (2009), have investigated the construction of hegemonic masculinity (in Western elites) by states and its impact on security practices, including behaviours and attitudes that can be seen as

aggressive and adhering to the masculine attributes of rationality, autonomy, and power. As Maruska (2009) outlines, “American hegemonic masculinity – or a significant subsection of it – became hypermasculine in the days, months, and years following September 11, 2001” that consequently led to “popular support for the March 2003 invasion of Iraq” (235). In this context, hypermasculinity can be understood as an extreme presentation of traditionally masculine behaviours, usually as the result of a threat (Maruska 2009: 239). While hypermasculinity typically appears temporarily, such as exhibiting increased aggressiveness when angry, “recent feminist IR theorizing suggests that in states, as in individuals, hypermasculinity is a transient condition; one possible component of a larger identity” (Maruska 2009: 239). Such a discussion of hypermasculinity highlights the particular gender constructions that are informing our current understandings of security – from masculine to hypermasculine, the prevalence of terrorism as a technique of modern warfare and the ways in which states attempt to combat it have shifted what it means to be ‘masculine’ versus ‘feminine’. Understanding the effects of these masculinities and femininities is essential not only to understanding how and why security decisions are made by states, but also how women in the realm of international security often adopt such masculine attitudes in an attempt to become active in the security decision-making process.

In addition, some recent scholarship has been completed regarding the role of women as active participants in contemporary warfare, and these constructions of hypermasculinity and femininity are intimately related to the gendered performances and actions of those participants. Recent research by Megan MacKenzie (2009) as well as Laura Sjoberg and Caron Gentry (2007) focuses on the role of women as violent

aggressors in both military and terrorist organizations and works to dispel the popular construction in security discussions of women as helpless, innocent, peace-loving victims of war and terrorism. Such constructions fail to recognize the multiple identities felt by women in conflict or post-conflict situations, and ignore the often-violent action taken by women around the world in recent years both to aid and to combat terrorist organizations since September 11th. Whether as a suicide bomber or at the helm of a fighter jet, women are increasingly becoming participants in the violent aggression of contemporary warfare, a role that reconfigures how notions of (hyper)masculinity and femininity are understood, and how such new understandings impact international security. However, it is impossible to isolate masculinities and femininities alone when examining the contributions of feminist scholarship to the study of security in international relations. As evidenced by the following discussion, and in more detail in the following chapter, feminist perspectives also shed new light on notions of empathy and ethics in security analyses.

Empathetic and Ethical Understandings of Security

A second key theme that can be identified and acknowledged as pivotal to understanding feminist approaches to terrorism revolves around notions of empathy, feminist reformulations of just war, and ethical analysis. As previously mentioned, it is through an emphasis on individual and human security, responsibility, and care that feminist perspectives differ most dramatically from conventional and most critical approaches to security. As Laura Sjoberg (2009) adeptly points out, “feminists reject the dominance of the strong over the weak as a mechanism of control in favour of empathy and connectedness” (92). This shift in focus from state-centred to human-centred security

typifies the way in which feminists place emphasis on areas of security studies that have not been interrogated or exposed by mainstream perspectives, which proves particularly useful when dealing with novel security phenomena such as terrorism.

Related to this are Sjoberg's (2008) recent comments on just war theory and her acknowledgement of the reemergence in recent years of notions of good and evil as reasoning to initiate violence against external threats. She posits that feminist perspectives have both normative and explanatory benefits to existing interpretations of just war theory, and notes that feminists add notions of empathy and care to the current theory of just war, which has previously been criticized for its lack of conceptual clarity and practical usage (Sjoberg 2008: 1). For Sjoberg (2008), the war on terror initiated by the United States in Afghanistan and Iraq demonstrated a lack of just cause due to an unknown terrorist enemy – she argues that from a feminist perspective, it would have been more effective to initiate a framework of care for the people of these two countries who had long been disadvantaged by the existence of terrorist organizations within their borders instead of entrenching the existing inequality seen in both Afghanistan and Iraq through invasion (11). Using Sjoberg (2008) as an example, it is evident that examining terrorism and its responses through a lens of empathy and care sheds new light on both the causes of and alternatives to particular actions and practices.

Along with these conceptions of empathy comes the inclusion of ethical approaches into the academic discourse on security by feminist theorists. Fiona Robinson (2009) has argued for a feminist ethics within the realm of international security and its governance, seeing a particular benefit to the ontological lens offered by feminist ethics for understanding processes of global governance. While other critical scholars have

recognized the importance of ethics in understanding international security, feminists have acknowledged the particular patterns of power that create and sustain forms of inequality, including those related to gender. Clearly, terrorism and its responses are directly related to notions of global security governance, making Robinson's (2009) claims highly relevant for feminist security scholars wishing to learn more about this new post-9/11 era of security. Notions of empathy, reformulations of just war, and feminist approaches to ethics are therefore integral aspects of feminist perspectives on security, especially as they relate to twenty-first century security issues.

While there remains contestation among feminist security scholars with respect to explanations and understandings of terrorism and the actions of those who attempt to fight against it, focusing on notions of (hyper)masculinity, militarization, empathy, and ethics undoubtedly offers an enriched theoretical perspective on what is becoming the new normal in contemporary warfare. In a search for new directions and lenses through which to understand the rapidly changing post-9/11 realm of security, mainstream perspectives as well as other strands of critical security studies may well look to feminist security studies due to these unique conceptions that allow for a newly opened space of critical engagement with terrorism and its responses.

Feminists Theorizing the Future: Prospects for Feminist Security Studies

The vision of an interconnected and interdependent system of security analysis in International Relations is a key area where feminist security scholars have attempted to make inroads. Breaking down conventional notions of key concepts in security studies, feminist scholarship thus far has allowed for challenges to the "overly parsimonious levels-of-analysis approaches" that have dominated the study of security in international

politics for an overwhelming majority of its history (Blanchard 2003: 1305). Feminist security theorizing highlights aspects of the international system that have been largely ignored by dominant security scholars, including the existence of women in international security politics and the details of state protection received by women during times of war.

As Enloe (1989) points out, studying security and international politics from a feminist perspective allows us to “discover that international politics is more complicated than non-feminist analysts would have us believe” (197). The aforementioned necessity for the abandonment of a levels-of-analysis approach to studying security means that there are a multitude of actors and factors that come into play in issues of war, violence, and international conflict – concepts that cannot be simplistically boiled down to traditional realist analysis based on rationality and strategy.

It is generally agreed upon that in order for feminist security theory to reach its full explanatory and normative potential, it must more fully permeate security studies in international relations as its own approach to examining issues of war, violence, and interstate conflict “rather than a supplement to dominant security theory” (Sjoberg and Martin 2008: 33). Perhaps, as Lois West (1999) suggests, more conferences and meetings between feminist IR scholars would foster meaningful thought and develop an “international consensus” between the often-competing viewpoints of feminists studying security (193). Another way in which feminist security theory may be able to even more fully benefit those studying security in international relations is by advocating for a more holistic theory of security that is applicable to all of humanity, both women and men (Byron and Thorburn 1998: 215).

Feminist security scholars now have an opportunity to further their research and advance feminist theories of security so that they are elevated to at least an equal level with more traditionally dominant theories of security in international relations, and with their distinct perspectives on terrorism and the responses it provokes may be newly identified as a theory capable of explaining what other approaches have continued to question. As Blanchard (2003) has suggested, the multifaceted approach brought to security studies by feminist offers an excellent way to study newly formed issue areas within discussions of international conflict. The war on terror, technological military development, and issues of peace and conflict resolution would all benefit from the interconnected approach used by feminist scholars when discussing security (Blanchard 2003: 1307).

Viewing gender as exerting an influence over the international system, and thus over each security decision being made therein, is a common element that bridges the various methodologies and variants of feminist viewpoints on security that exist in the current scholarship. It is now time for feminist security scholars to take this common element and use it to explain modern security phenomena such as terrorism that have remained at least partially misunderstood by conventional students of security theory. By doing this, it becomes more likely that dominant social science will recognize gender as a key element of international security and acknowledge the value attached to its uniqueness and ability to bring new understandings to foundational elements in the study of security. If realized to its fullest potential, feminist security studies would allow for an opening up of the field and a fuller awareness of what security represents in the 21st century.

From this discussion of feminist security scholarship and its contributions to date, it is now necessary to examine the particular conversations occurring amongst feminist scholars with respect to international ethics. This will provide evidence for the key claim of this thesis that a substantive engagement with ethics by feminist security scholars will enrich the analyses brought by feminists to the wider discipline of security in international politics.

CHAPTER THREE – FEMINIST ETHICS IN INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Having examined the origins and development of feminist analyses of international security, this chapter turns its attention towards the integration of ethics and ethical considerations in feminist IR broadly, and security studies specifically. While connections between the existing literatures of feminist ethics and feminist security studies have not been regularly made explicit by scholars working in the respective fields, the relationship between feminist understandings of international ethics and the burgeoning work of feminist security scholarship is integral to the way in which feminists understand how and why security processes are enacted and, importantly, the impacts of these processes on individuals.

However, feminists' interest in ethics in the study of security and international relations moves beyond simply understanding the ethics of events themselves. As Ackerly and Zhang (2010) have suggested, "in feminist IR, ethics is not only a question surrounding the research subject, but also a question of how we do our research" (para. 1). There exists an important link between the normative and methodological aspects of ethics as a primary concern of feminist IR scholars, and this link is explored in this chapter's first section. This chapter then explores several ethical dimensions within the frame of examining international security from a feminist perspective and suggests that many of the core assumptions of feminist ethics, including ethical notions of care (Tronto 1993; Robinson 1999; Ben-Porath 2008) and pacifism (Ruddick 1989, 1993) along with ethical understandings of discourse (Jaggar 1998; Robinson 2011), are significant to our understandings of contemporary international security concerns. Moreover, this chapter demonstrates the usefulness of including ethics in discussions of feminist security studies

and its development, particularly as it relates to the War on Terror, in order to prepare for the subsequent examination of the role of Canadian military personnel in the allegations of abuse against Afghan detainees to follow from this chapter. A focus on ethical analysis allows feminists to unpack the complex moral questions of post-9/11 security processes and assess the impacts of such processes on the contextual relations of individuals.

The study of ethics by feminist IR scholars makes important contributions to central ethical concepts in international politics. Feminist ethicists “rethink these concepts from the perspective of their impact on women, deconstruct the dichotomies of the concepts – such as just war, security, and international ethics itself – and their constituent parts” (Ackerly and Zhang 2010: para. 5). As Hutchings (2000) suggests, feminist ethics interrogates the ethical consequences of existing boundaries between dichotomies of violence, war, peace, and (in)security (124). More recent work by Kimberly Hutchings (2007a) sees feminist ethics as the “ongoing, contested negotiation of tensions between the ethical feminism and the conditions of possibility of the realization of those goals in the world” (91). Her emphasis on the practical terms within which feminist ethics must be understood demonstrates the importance of real-world events and actual experiences that shape and orient the ethical principles espoused by feminists. Rather than seeing feminist ethics exclusively as a theoretical set of moral principles, Hutchings (2007a) argues that the experience of violence itself shapes the way ethics is understood, including its fundamental values as well as its effects (99). This conception of feminist ethics is particularly salient when examining the realm of international security, as the observations made by feminist ethicists on particular

security experiences – for example, war – are a useful and necessary addition to the existing literature on security.

Elizabeth Porter's (1999) recent contribution to the field also provides a useful discussion of several key tenets in the definition of feminist ethics. She broadly proposes three central features of any ethics claiming to be feminist: it must have a starting point in the multiple and rich variety of experiences in women's lives; it must assess traditional ethics and identify its implications for women as well as its gendered exclusions; and it must propose alternatives to the existing framework of ethics (Porter 1999, qtd. in Aaron 2004: 202). While Porter's (1999) examination of feminist perspectives in ethics does not explicitly outline the features of the field with respect to international relations and security, these considerations are integral to the orientation of feminist ethics within IR scholarship. As Porter (1999) suggests, the responsibility of feminist ethicists to challenge traditional ethical norms and principles is of utmost importance in security analyses, as feminist security scholars seek to challenge similar traditional understandings of security, war, violence, and peace, all while specifically examining the implications of such understandings on the lives of individuals – particularly women. Feminist critiques of traditional ethical principles “premised on masculinist conceptions of moral subjectivity and the historical subordination of women” (Franceschet 2001: 348) are highly relevant in the realm of security, and these challenges are often paired in conjunction with similar critiques against traditional IR security theories. In addition, Porter's (1999) assertion that those wishing to enact a feminist ethic must propose an alternative to the conventional is intimately connected to the unconventional insights brought to light by feminist security scholarship. Inherent within such alternatives,

though not always explicitly discussed, are notions of feminist ethics – for example, feminist work on just war theory has aimed to reconceive some of its key theoretical underpinnings, including just cause, proportionality, and responsibility (Ackerly and Zhang 2010; Hutchings 2000; Robinson 2006), exposing ethical questions surrounding the construction of the just war narrative in conventional IR theory and proposing new boundaries on traditional binaries in the discipline.

From these key principles and defining characteristics of feminist ethics scholarship, it is evident that there exist already many connections between the field and its counterpart in critical security studies, as well as openings for further academic interrogation into how the substantial work being done by feminist ethicists can be used more explicitly in feminist security scholarship. As feminists rethink the key concepts of international ethics, security is inevitably one of the largest topics to be reconsidered.

As Wibben (2011) suggests, feminist security scholars have and continue to draw on central feminist theorizing while attempting to further it and “move...beyond a broadening and deepening of security studies towards an opening” (113-4). This opening leaves intellectual space for the further inclusion of feminist ethics into a feminist security research programme, to the benefit of both segments of academic feminist inquiry. Despite the existing literature in feminist ethics on notions of care, compassion, empathy, and peace, that would lend themselves well to discussions of global politics, it has been observed by Porter (2006) and others that “there is a minimal application of these themes to...political issues of international relations” (98). While feminist security scholarship has long concerned itself with notions that are intimately tied up in ethical questions, this chapter argues that the connection should be made more explicit – so that

ethics becomes a central and primary concern of analyses of international security from a feminist perspective. The remainder of this chapter examines the contributions of feminist ethics to the research practice of feminist IR before assessing three key areas of feminist ethics scholarship in more detail in order to see precisely how the field can provide useful contribution to the future work of feminist security scholars. Care ethics, pacifism, and discourse ethics will all be discussed through a lens of international relations, making clear how closely the two literatures map onto each other in a productive manner. As per Enloe's (2004) well-known suggestion, exploring the connection between feminist ethics and security studies makes use of feminist curiosities that seek to more accurately understand the gendered implications of international relations, both in theory and in practice. While the work of feminist scholars in global politics is never complete, a better comprehension of how ethics serves as an integral element of feminist IR theorizing can lead us to a more holistic research programme and open further avenues for feminist analyses of international security that highlight the many ethical concerns involved.

Ethics in Feminist IR Research Practice

Feminists acknowledge the importance of ethics in international relations in myriad ways, and have identified multiple theoretical approaches to understanding ethical concerns in the context of global politics. Not surprisingly, then, ethics is also a central concern of feminist IR scholars within the practice of their discipline. Ethical reflections about the particular methodologies employed by feminist IR scholarship have been one of the most important connections between feminists and ethics in IR, and as Ackerly and True (2008) have suggested, have led to a distinct feminist research ethic (693).

Ackerly and Zhang's (2010) discussion of feminist ethics in the practice of IR research notes that as feminists have asked different questions about ethical judgement and significance in IR than their mainstream counterparts, so too have they employed unconventional methodologies to investigate and analyze issues of ethical concern, such as discourse analysis, case studies, content analysis, and ethnography (para. 38). Moreover, Ackerly and Zhang (2010) highlight the interdisciplinary nature of feminist IR methodologies, noting that the varied methodological commitments of feminist IR scholars have drawn on multiple areas of the social sciences and humanities, including anthropology and sociology (para. 39).

These distinct features of feminist IR theorizing significantly impact the ways in which scholars practice ethical research in their work. As Ackerly, Stern, and True (2006) point out in their seminal book *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*, "ethical issues are part of methodological reflection. They compel us to ask how our own subjectivities, that of our research subjects, and the power relations between us affect the research process" (7). For feminist IR scholarship, methodology is a critical lens through which interactions in global politics are observed. It is therefore essential that ethics be taken into consideration both in the analysis of the interactions and in the analysis of the lens itself. Feminists are constantly reflecting on the various relationships and assumptions affecting her research, and the same is true for feminist security scholars. While mainstream examinations of international security often ignore the privileged position of the researcher in analysing vulnerable populations, particularly in contexts of warfare, feminist analyses are intimately aware of the ongoing methodological self-reflection that is necessary in order to address the personal aspect of

undertaking research on humans. The acknowledgement that the subjects of academic inquiry are not autonomous entities in a static world, but are instead relational beings in a world that is constantly changing, is of particular concern to feminists considering the ethics of IR research practice.

The particular methods used to study ethics in feminist IR can be especially complex, as feminists examining ethics in global politics “seek to understand, reflect on, and possibly transform the patterns of moral relations as they exist in a variety of everyday contexts” (Robinson 2006: 231). Such an analysis requires detailed examination of the attitudes, principles, assumptions, and actions occurring in such contexts – that is, a critical moral ethnography (Robinson 2006: 231). And as Robinson (2006) suggests, “this is an ambitious task; one could be forgiven for thinking that this approach to moral inquiry sounds unwieldy, amorphous, and virtually impossible” (232). Nevertheless, such a methodological commitment is of particular value to feminists studying IR generally, and international security specifically, as it acknowledges the deeply contextual nature of behaviour in global politics that can be dramatically impacted by social, political, and cultural norms. In addition, using a critical moral ethnography allows feminist ethicists in IR to propose alternatives and seek transformation, a key goal of feminist inquiry in the discipline. For feminist security scholars, this is of utmost importance as the field attempts to construct an unconventional understanding of international security concerns that deviates from existing literatures from mainstream and critical security scholarship. Therefore, Robinson’s (2006) proposal of a critical moral geography as a distinctly feminist method for understanding ethics in IR is highly useful to the study of ethics in

contemporary international security contexts, as it highlights both the theoretical and emancipatory goals of feminist security studies.

Care Ethics

One area of consideration in the field of ethics in which feminist IR scholarship has played a primary developmental role is the ethics of care approach. For many feminist IR scholars, this perspective is seen as useful in delineating the particular nature of ethical judgement in the practice of international politics. While feminists often view the ethics of care differently, two key ontological claims are central to the approach that 1) see the self as relational, with morality stemming from contextual relations with others; and 2) see relations of responsibility and care as essential to understanding moral principles (Robinson 2008: 170; Hutchings 2000: 123). Early work highlighting the importance of care in feminist ethics (Ruddick 1989) identifies connectedness and the unique contextual nature of experiences in global politics as key features of the perspective, while Tronto (1993) usefully points out that despite its commonplace status in society at large, notions of care have remained largely ignored by intellectuals and academics when considering issues of politics. Ruddick's (1989) association of mothering with care has been seen as problematic for many feminist scholars of ethics, and feminist scholarship has critiqued Ruddick's work for essentializing notions of gender and providing a gynocentric theoretical and epistemological standpoint (Hoglund 2003: 349). Among those advocating for a revised feminist ethics of care is Robinson (1999), who emphasizes the relational aspect of care in international relations and argues that morality is embedded into the interactions of everyday social and political life. As Hoglund (2003) highlights, Robinson's (1999) focus on social relationships also

acknowledges the many existing power differentials in personal and social relations, and promotes caring principles, “such as attentiveness, responsiveness and responsibility” (Hoglund 2003: 349) in order to participate ethically in the relationships of international politics. In recent years, feminist scholarship in care ethics has greatly expanded to include discussions of citizenship (Sevenhuijsen 1998), just war theory (Ben-Porath 2008), and rape as a weapon of war (Hoglund 2003) among others. Each of these cases demonstrates the capability of care ethics to assist in the unpacking of some of IR’s most complex questions, particularly when considering the unique position of women in debates surrounding contemporary global politics.

An important aspect of care ethics as it relates to the realm of international security is its insistence on applicability outside the private sphere. Despite the traditionally held view that notions of comfort, empathy, care, and compassion are permanently relegated to the maternal, feminist care ethics scholars argue that “care ethics is not a woman’s domain or a feminine ‘voice’ but it is a perspective that was developed by feminist scholars, and is driven by women’s lives” (Ben-Porath 2008: 64). This broadening of the domain affected by care ethics advocates for the attention of both women and men in the international community, and acknowledges that the experiences of global politics in the contemporary age justify the use of care as an orienting notion of ethical judgement. Thus, while specific types of caring relationships are developed in the private sphere, such as in families, education, and health care (Ben-Porath 2008: 65), individuals, governmental and non-governmental organizations, and states themselves can all use the content of these relationships and apply it as guiding principles for ethical practices in the realm of international security. This approach therefore stands in stark

contrast to existing perspectives on international relations that favour notions of sovereignty and the state as a single and primary actor in global politics, but retains commonalities with other IR scholars advocating for a sense of international community in an age of globalization. While feminist care ethics remains underrepresented in its use by the international political community, it undoubtedly allows us to shed new light on existing relationships between citizens and states as it creates the possibility for moral and ethical interaction based on key tenets of responsibility and care.

Feminists have advocated for the reformulation of just war theory since their first forays into IR theorizing. While the just war tradition has been identified in a large and varied number of ways by mainstream IR scholarship, its roots generally lie in notions of just cause and non-combatant immunity, as well as a decision made to begin or enter a conflict based on a particular set of motivating moralities. As Sjoberg has argued in *Gender, Justice, and the Wars in Iraq* (2006) traditional just war theory can be made “more relevant and compelling to actors making war decisions” (21) by using feminist IR theory to elucidate what is truly meant by just cause and morality. She proposes “feminist thought as a new, common ‘motivating morality’ for just war theories with the hope that its contribution will unify the just war tradition without silencing the diverse voices in global politics” (Sjoberg 2006: 29). Sjoberg’s use of feminist IR theory as a new framework for thinking about just war is demonstrative of some of the ways in which feminists have attempted to revitalize just war as a useful concept of the discipline.

However, other scholars have infused this reconstruction with feminist care ethics thinking in order to further shift the theory away from its confused roots of justice and morality. Ben-Porath’s (2008) recent work on care ethics and the principles espoused by

just war theory that concern post-conflict conduct (*jus post bellum*) is particularly relevant to a discussion of international security in the globalized world, where security concerns do not disappear immediately at the end of a combat mission and continue long after direct violence has ceased. Ben-Porath (2008) argues firstly, based on Tronto's early writing on the ethics of care, that just war theory should be expanded to include a post-conflict component, then specifies that "dependence, as distinct from helplessness, should be structured as an acceptable part of international relations" (66). Unlike Tronto who, like many IR scholars, advocates for the end of dependence through the strengthening of the international community, Ben-Porath (2008) sees dependence not as an evil but rather as a natural aspect of state relationships, particularly in the context of peacekeeping missions and post-conflict reconstruction. Specifically, she argues for the practical and ethical management of dependence and interdependence between people and states through an incorporation of care ethics into post-war considerations (62). Such a perspective seeks to reconfigure just war theory through feminist thinking, like Sjoberg (2006) and others, but adds the additional element of care ethics to demonstrate the usefulness of notions such as responsibility and sensitivity in the realm of international politics. As is evident throughout the remainder of this chapter, the particular ethical principles offered to security studies by feminist ethics scholarship - such as notions of accepting dependence in post-conflict situations - can serve to reorient the field away from its conventional assumptions and assist feminist security scholars in demonstrating how international security is not only deeply gendered, but is also in dire need of an ethical component.

Another important consideration in discussions of feminist care ethics, particularly when applied to issues of international security, is the relationship existing between the caregiver and the individual receiving the care. Elisabeth Porter's (2006) work on the politics of compassion suggests that while "care ethics is usually directed toward a specific known person, a politics of compassion extends the political domain in which compassion might operate to include examples where we do not personally know the people requiring care" (99). This distinction is significant as it allows care ethics theorizing to be broadened and used in situations where the individuals receiving care are not directly known by the individuals, groups, or states providing the much-needed compassion and empathy, such as refugees, victims of rape as a weapon of war, detainees, and as Porter (2006) herself suggests, asylum seekers. The politics of compassion as suggested by Porter (2006) is useful in analyses of international security as it connects the *universal* notions of care espoused by feminist theorists to the *particular* contexts and experiences of individuals who are deeply impacted by security processes in global politics. The approach highlights the shared humanity of interconnected people in the globalized world, and suggests that the vulnerabilities of those affected by war and conflict necessitate particular responses and emotions from others, despite a lack of a previous history and everyday relationship (Porter 2006: 99). More recently, Robinson (2009) also advocates for such responses from a ethics of care approach, suggesting that "rather than encouraging us to only save distant strangers, a feminist ethics of care encourages continuous solidarity with, and care for, people across the globe" (104). This expansion of care ethics to include care compassion towards those not directly known by the care-giving parties will be examined in further detail in the

subsequent chapter, where the case of allegations against abuse towards Afghan detainees is analysed through a lens of feminist ethics.

Notions of justice are also central to many feminists' understandings of care ethics. As Hoglund (2003) asserts, "care easily becomes paternalistic so that women or other marginalized groups risk losing their autonomy and rights as they are assumed to care for others" (350), pointing out one of the primary risks of emphasising care as an ethical concern. Working from Robinson's (1999) critical feminist care ethics perspective, Hoglund (2003) revises an ethics of care that instead focuses on a feminist ethic of justice, acknowledging the importance and value of care in social practice but aims to move beyond the public/private dichotomy relegating care to the private and justice to the public sphere. In order to do this, the guiding principles of care, "such as attentiveness, responsiveness and mutual responsibility" are integrated with "values associated to the ethics of justice, such as rationality, rights and autonomy" (Hoglund 2003: 350). Hoglund (2003) uses a narrative approach to examine the stories and experiences of individuals' injustices – in particular, the experiences of women who have been raped in wartime - which form the basis for her theoretical model of ethics and justice. While some feminists see care and justice as fundamentally different and separate views of ethics, the interconnection between care and justice as expressed by Hoglund (2003) remains particularly significant in the field of international security. As many IR scholars studying security concerns focus heavily on notions of human rights, humanitarian law, and autonomy, the integration of care ethics into such analyses allows for a more nuanced understanding of justice that takes into account the importance of empathy and responsibility when making moral and ethical judgements about what is

just. The work of feminist scholarship to continue the expansion of care ethics is central not only to feminist ethics literature, but also to the realm of IR and international security studies, as it suggests a wider spectrum of attitudes and practices that can be applied to everyday actions in global politics.

Pacifism in Feminist Ethics

Intimately related to discussions of care ethics is the concern of many feminist ethicists regarding peace and non-violence. Like an ethics of care approach, feminist understandings of pacifism are often contested. One key claim of feminists' commitment to peace stems from motherhood. As Sara Ruddick (2004) suggests, "the ethics of peace derives from the maternal thinking per se...There is peacefulness latent in maternal practice and a transformed maternal thinking could make a distinctive contribution to the politics of peace" (166). While many feminists question this assertion of a 'natural' biological link between women and peace, Ruddick's (1989, 2004) claims remain important aspects of feminist pacifism. Critiques have also been levelled against understandings of feminist peace based in essentialist notions of women as mythical peacekeepers. Elizabeth Porter's (2007) work on the need for women's presence at peacebuilding forums in order to positively transform international security (39) is representative of this selective and essentialist tradition. As Shepherd (2008) suggests, this view of women and peace as intrinsically linked is highly problematic, and requires a rethinking of the contexts, practices, and discourses of international security (126).

Ruddick's *Maternal Thinking: Towards a Politics of Peace* (1989) exemplifies some of the tensions surrounding peace studies within feminist IR theorizing. As Hutchings (2007b) suggests, Ruddick's "analysis is geared towards the condemnation of

violence as a political instrument, [but] her argument stops short of absolute pacifism” (114). This resistance illustrates the complexities of IR feminists’ feelings towards political violence, but doesn’t resolve the inherent dilemmas faced when making ethical feminist judgements towards violence in the international community (Hutchings 2007b: 114). Ruddick’s (1989) work is critiqued for this lack of resolution, and is seen by some feminists, including Hutchings (2007b), as evading the question of political violence altogether. Using the work of Simone de Beauvoir, Hutchings (2007b) suggests that the attempts by feminist scholarship to move beyond Ruddick’s (1989) arguments and towards a settlement of the question of political violence “underestimates the ethical significance of the ambiguity” (115) that exists in the question itself. For Hutchings (2007b), this ambiguity is a significant aspect of both pacifist and nonpacifist feminists’ views towards political violence and should be better understood and examined, rather than completely erased. Hutchings’ (2007b) discussion of ambiguity in political violence demonstrates the pervasive nature of the debate in feminist ethics literature surrounding peace and non-violence in international relations. However, other feminist ethicists have argued strongly in favour of approaches to international ethics that prioritize lasting peace and nonviolence.

Danielle Poe’s (2008) work on the ethics of sexual difference seeks to replace just war theory with ethical commitments that create conditions of peace. She places particular emphasis on compassion and kindness as guiding principles of the ethics of sexual difference, which she argues comes from the sexual differences existing between women and men that remind us of our limited experience in the world. Compassion, she argues, “is the balance between autonomy and ‘the two’” (Poe 2008: 41), whereby the

connections existing between two people of different sexes allow for “a compassion in which the subject’s concern for and action on behalf of the other arise from the original experience of breath and cultivated experience of breath” (42) In practice, Poe (2008) argues, this compassion evidences itself in situations whereby individuals or groups in conflict resist in a nonviolent manner in order to produce beneficial results for both sides, as was the case in Cesar Chavez’s fast of penance in support of the American labor movement Kindness is also central to Poe’s (2008) understanding of an ethics of sexual difference, and “many peace activists’ strategies for nonviolent resistance incorporate kindness For these activists, kindness is not naive, it secures a strategy for long-term peace” (43) For Poe (2008), kindness focuses on the construction of meaningful relationships and forwarding the interests of others without regard for self-gain With respect to international security, Poe (2008) sees those objecting to military deployment on the basis of justice – for example, soldiers who refused to serve in Iraq because they saw the war as unjust and had a moral obligation not to participate – as instances of kindness in IR, since the soldiers risk imprisonment for desertion by refusing to deploy (43) This notion of kindness, coupled with compassion, as a way to resist in a nonviolent manner in order to achieve long-term peace, is an important consideration in pacifist feminist ethics

Feminist activist organizations have also played a significant role in the development of pacifism and peace studies in international feminist ethics Sutton, Morgen, and Novkov’s edited volume *Security Disarmed: Critical Perspectives on Gender, Race, and Militarism* (2008) examines statements from feminist activist groups including the Gender and Human Security Network (GHSN) and the International

Congress of Women at the Hague (ICWH) The GHSN advocates a “security [that] involves an ongoing commitment to staying connected to each other, to nurturing bonds of trust and caring, and to constructive forms of contention and conflict” (Sutton, Morgen, and Novkov 2008 71) that build a culture of peace This echoes many of the guiding principles espoused by feminist ethicists working towards peace in international politics, and demonstrates the practical influence of such an approach on the work being performed on the ground by activist organizations around the world In the same volume, Sharoni (2008) also sheds light on the practice of pacifist feminist ethics She reflects on pedagogical commitments to pacifism from a perspective of feminist ethics, and advocates for instructors to introduce emotion and compassion into discussions of militarization in the classroom, particularly in the wake of September 11th (Sharoni 2008 267-8) Her work, as well as the statements of activist organizations, illustrates the everyday practice of pacifism by feminists in political and educational spheres, and sheds light on the use of feminist ethics in particular situations in international security While there remains significant debate among feminists regarding the benefits of pacifism for an approach to ethics in international relations, pacifist feminists have nevertheless made important contributions to the ethics literature that have both theoretical and practical impacts in the study of international security concerns

Discourse Ethics

Habermasian discourse ethics has come to play a significant role in the development of feminist perspectives of international ethical theory Habermas suggests that in order to critique the principles guiding society’s judgements about what is true, just, and good in the world, it is necessary “to reconstruct the assumptions underlying our

everyday practices of communication” (Hutchings 2005: 158). By examining the discourse itself, Habermas argues, it is possible to gain answers about these ethical queries stemming from the norms and values that are evident in the way we communicate. As Hutchings (2005) suggests, this analysis of discourse in the study of ethics has been appealing to some feminist scholars as it allows for both universal emancipatory politics and the recognition of the particular pluralities of positions held by women around the world (158), despite the approach’s lack of concern regarding gender and its Western bias with respect to norms of communication. Feminist scholarship has, to varying extents, taken Habermas’s notion of discourse ethics and revised it to more accurately reflect the gendered nature of discourse, the impact of power inequalities on communication, and the multiple understandings of ethics and morality that feminist writing on ethics has described.

The work of Seyla Benhabib (2002) uses foundations of Habermasian discourse ethics to examine global ethics and politics from a feminist perspective. As noted by Hutchings (2005), Benhabib remains largely sympathetic to Habermas’s understandings of discourse ethics, but argues that he “draws the boundaries of the content of moral discourse too narrowly to accommodate feminist concerns with the distribution of power within the private sphere” (Hutchings 2005: 159). She addresses the universal nature of Habermas’s notion of morality and suggests that there may be space for a transnational feminist moral discourse that acknowledges the multiple feminist perspectives on what is moral and what is political (Benhabib 2002). However, as Hutchings (2005) points out, Benhabib has been critiqued regarding her willingness to identify these differences (161). Ultimately, Hutchings (2005) uses the example of Benhabib’s feminist discourse ethics to

conclude that “for feminist theorists looking for an ethical theory with international scope...Habermas’s work reinforces familiar dilemmas between universalist and pluralist moral thinking, rather than offering resources through which those dilemmas may be transcended” (165). However, despite the reluctance among some feminist IR scholars such as Benhabib to radically transform discourse ethics from Habermas’s original formulation, others have undertaken analyses of feminist discourse ethics that significantly shift the focus of the approach from liberal modernity and Western communication bias to an acknowledgement of women, gender, and feminist ethical principles.

Iris Marion Young (2000) is one feminist scholar who extends the critique of Habermasian discourse ethics in a substantial manner. As Pajnik (2006) suggests, Young’s (2000) notion of inclusive communicative action is “an attempt to extend the Habermasian concept of communicative action to a theorization of responsibility of the individual towards others and an openness in the sense of publicity” (392) and aims to include notions of emotion and expressiveness in discussions of discourse ethics. Pajnik (2006) also highlights the work of Carol Gould (1996) in rethinking discourse ethics in a similar way, as Gould (1996) identifies the restrictive nature of Habermas’s communicative action: “although Habermas asserts that everyone is free to enter into the discourse of the public sphere and to be heard, there are voices that are mute in this discussion” (175, qtd. in Pajnik (2006): 392). Both Young (2000) and Gould (1996) acknowledge the overly narrow conception of discourse and communicative action provided by Habermas and seek to expand it in order to increase the characteristics of responsibility and inclusivity seen in discourse ethics analysis. An additional critique

often drawn against Habermasian discourse ethics by feminist ethicists revolves around notions of linguistics and speech in practice. While Pajnik (2006) refutes such critiques and provides evidence of Habermas's own belief that discourse is based "not solely on rationality in the sense of speech acts, but also on symbolic expressions" (398), she points out that some feminists have interpreted Habermas's *Sprache* literally and critique its limitation on non-verbal forms of action (Meehan 2000).

Recently, the relationship existing between feminist care ethics and discourse ethics has been examined as a way to expose alternatives to a purely Habermasian approach to discourse ethics. As Robinson (2011) suggests, and as has been discussed earlier in this chapter, "care ethics remains a key area of feminist moral and political philosophy" (850). Specifically, Robinson (2011) argues that care ethics provides significant objections to traditional discourse ethics, both in its procedures and goals (850). She notes that the ethics of care claims that "we are always already embedded in relationships with others, and that the attentive caring for those others is a crucial and fundamental aspect of morality" (Robinson 2011: 851). This alternative conception of morality focused on caring and responsibility, Robinson argues, has significant impacts on how dialogue occurs in global politics, as notions of dependency and vulnerability help to teach us how to act as an effective listener in particular contexts. Such a lesson is particularly useful in situations where the results of the dialogue will affect parties differently due to power inequalities, barriers to participation, and unequal distribution of responsibilities, as is so often the place in the context of globalized international politics. Thus, Robinson's (2011) analysis of the linkages between feminist care ethics and discourse ethics demonstrate how caring, as a central feature of morality, affects the ways

in which we speak, listen, and understand others. The relationship between care and dialogue in IR is complex and deserving of further analysis – contexts of discourse and dialogue in the realm of international security are of particular interest when examined through a lens of care ethics, as will be seen in more detail in the following chapter.

Work in feminist discourse ethics continues to rethink Habermas's approach to theorizing about communicative action, and feminist understandings of discourse have become central concerns to those writing about ethics from a feminist perspective. While the existing literature is varied and multi-directional, Pajnik (2006) has identified five main alternatives that feminist critiques have suggested in order to move discourse ethics into a realm of greater openness and inclusivity:

“1) a principle of complementarity of communicative and strategic action; 2) a theory of communicative thinking together with intersubjectivity as a corrective; 3) a feminist discourse of ethics of care instead of a Habermasian ethics of justice; 4) expressive, political narrative as a supplement to rational expression; 5) the theory of communicative experience combined with the corrective of rationality as a purely linguistic action” (401-2).

These alternatives remain contested, and as previously mentioned, much debate continues to exist in the field regarding the extent to which Habermas's notions of the public, political, and moral can be usefully employed by feminist scholarship. Nevertheless, feminist discourse ethics acts as a significant concern in the field, and has particular implications for the application of feminist ethics in international security studies. As the subsequent chapter demonstrates, the way in which feminists understand discourse ethics

is central to our examinations of *how* states speak about and act on national security measures, *who* is being made secure, as well as *why* security operations are publicly discussed in particular ways. Through an analysis of the Canadian government discourse surrounding the recent allegations against Canadian military forces of knowingly transferring Afghan detainees to facilities where they were being tortured, many of the key concerns of feminist discourse ethics – including care, expressive narratives, and non-linguistic actions – will be evidenced as important aspects of ethics in feminist security scholarship.

Conclusions

Everyday security concerns being faced by the international community in an age of globalization, technology, and terrorism are challenging feminists to expand their theoretical toolbox and push feminist IR scholarship past its boundaries and into new territory. While many IR feminists have been engaging with notions of feminist ethics in their work for some time, this chapter attempted to highlight some of the directions in which feminist security scholarship can move forward to more explicitly include ethics as a central concern of their theorizing. Care ethics, pacifism, and discourse ethics all make significant contributions to the ways in which feminists understand global problems, and offer approaches to notions of responsibility, caring, dialogue, and peace that are particularly relevant to the realm of international security. It is the aim of this chapter to incite further examination of the complex relationship between feminist ethics and feminist security studies with the goal of enriching both literatures with a more interconnected approach to studying ethics and security from a feminist perspective.

Having outlined several of the key components of feminist ethics as they relate specifically to the realm of international security, it is now necessary to put these theoretical considerations to practical use with an examination of the Afghan detainee transfer case and its ethical implications. As will be shown in the following chapter, a feminist approach to security that involves careful consideration of notions of feminist ethics is able to provide unique insights into the decisions of the Canadian government and military surrounding the case, and offers new understandings about ethics, responsibility, and care that are not exposed by mainstream and other critical approaches to terrorism and security studies.

CHAPTER FOUR – FEMINIST ETHICS AND TORTURE ALLEGATIONS

The War on Terror, as initiated by the United States after the attacks of September 11th, 2001 and subsequently supported by Canada and the United Kingdom, among others, has demonstrated the need for international security scholars to reconsider their understandings of fundamental concepts in the field. The combat missions in Afghanistan and Iraq along with the anti-terrorism security measures implemented around the world have shown the international community that the security threats of the 21st century are new, varied, and difficult to predict or effectively eradicate. But as Bellamy and Bleiker (2007) suggest, “while security threats have changed significantly, our means of understanding and responding to them have remained largely unchanged” (3). Citing the American response to the 9/11 attacks, Bellamy and Bleiker (2007) and others have argued that a return to traditional, militaristic strategies and realist conceptions of security are inadequate mechanisms for understanding this new world of insecurity, and present real political and moral dangers with respect to how states and international organizations respond to security threats.

As has been described in previous chapters, feminist security scholarship has attempted to move beyond these conventional understandings of security, war, and terrorism towards a more critical approach that allows us to see previously hidden realities of international security post-9/11. By rejecting realist notions of state-centric security that rely heavily on militarism, feminists have focused on the deeply gendered nature of war stories, the imperialist and Western-biased approach taken to the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the biopolitical implications of measures meant to make us more secure and protect us from an unknown enemy (Hunt and Rygiel 2006). Moreover,

feminists have advocated for the importance of understanding the particular contexts and experiences felt by individuals – especially women - affected by the so-called War on Terror in order to develop responses that are more sensitive to the myriad ways in which war affects everyday lives. For example, feminists argue that the official war stories of the War on Terror constructed around ‘freedom’ and human rights “serve to camouflage other forms of terrorism made possible in the post-9/11 environment, such as intimidation...and control over the movement of certain groups of people already marginalized based on differences of class, gender, race, religion, immigration status and nationality” (Hunt and Rygiel 2006: 14). As Christine Sylvester (2011) has recently suggested, feminist scholarship on contemporary warfare consists of “an intellectual-emotional leap towards appreciating that war is commonplace in many people’s lives as well as exceptional. It is about the ordinary as well as the extraordinary” (126). Acknowledging the importance of these unique experiences is essential to developing a more complete awareness of how the US-led fight against terrorism has created victims of various circumstances, as it sheds light on the atrocities of contemporary warfare and the power inequalities existing therein.

This chapter argues that a feminist approach to international security that is grounded in feminist ethics is a new and useful way of examining some of the particular contexts in which the War on Terror is being fought. In order to provide evidence for this claim, this chapter focuses on an instance of Canada’s involvement in Afghanistan that has resulted in both domestic political controversy and increased international scrutiny of Canada’s commitment to human rights and the Geneva Convention. Beginning in 2007, allegations surfaced against Canadian military forces of knowingly transferring Afghan

detainees to facilities where they were being tortured. While the investigation into the validity of the allegations continues at present, the discourse surrounding the allegations themselves is worthy of further academic examination. Feminist analyses of international security seek to question “the current masculinist discourse on militancy and political violence, especially in the post-9/11 context” (Parashar 2010: 183). This questioning extends to the use and knowledge of torture, particularly in the current international community whereby the responsibilities of states as important actors in contexts of war and conflict are inscribed in agreements such as the Geneva Convention. By situating itself in a feminist approach to theorizing about terrorism and contemporary security concerns as well as using the lenses of feminist ethics as outlined in the previous chapter, this examination of detainee transfer reveals the gendered and unequal power relations that function in and through discourse surrounding terrorism and torture. Such revelations have not been previously seen in the field of critical security studies, and demonstrate the usefulness of a distinctly feminist and ethical approach to international security.

Following a brief background overview of Canada’s involvement in Afghanistan and the allegations against its military forces of knowingly handing over Afghan detainees suspected of terrorism to Afghan-run facilities where they were being tortured, this chapter examines three main areas related to the case as seen through a feminist ethical approach to security. The first section investigates the implications of knowledge, awareness, and response in the detainee transfer case, and asks whether knowledge of torture without a response constitutes an ethical problem for military forces. A discussion of discourse ethics and the importance of listening, understanding, and dialogue is

relevant here, as is an examination of the non-speech acts that constituted part of the Canadian government's response – or non-response – to the allegations of torture. This chapter's second section moves on to an analysis of notions of responsibility and obligation as they pertain to this case. Canada's role as a signatory of the Geneva Convention is discussed in this section, and the case demonstrates some of feminist ethicists' contributions to security literature with respect to the relational aspect of international security concerns. Finally, this chapter analyses the allegations against Canada's military by using a feminist ethics of care approach in order to argue for the inclusion of compassion and empathy as guiding principles for the treatment of detainees of the War on Terror. Such notions allow for a more sincere acknowledgement of the dependence of detainees on their captors due to existing power relations in terrorism discourse, and show that such practices improve the ways in which the war on terrorism is experienced and understood, both by military personnel and civilians. While mainstream and other critical perspectives on security continue to focus on the state-level interaction between Afghanistan, Iraq, and the countries fighting against them, a feminist approach to security that is concerned with ethics uncovers new understandings about the individuals being impacted by war and the gendered responses given by states and their militaries. Such responses are imbued with unequal power relationships and Western rationalist bias, and feminist analysis exposes these problematic assumptions while advocating for an ethical approach grounded in notions of relationality and care.

Afghan Detainee Transfer Allegations

Canada's involvement in Afghanistan began in the months following the September 11th, 2001 attacks in the United States as part of a NATO-led

counterinsurgency effort against the Taliban and al-Qaeda terrorist networks. Initially, Afghan detainees captured by Canadian forces during the mission were handed to American authorities in the country for processing and interrogation; however, in December of 2005, Canada reached an agreement with the newly formed Afghanistan government and began transferring its prisoners directly to Afghan security forces (CBC News 2007b). While there was considerable domestic concern about the treatment of detainees by American forces during the time that they were responsible for them, questions remained about the possible mistreatment of Afghan detainees after Canada made the decision to transfer them to Afghan prisons and in February of 2007 Amir Attaran, a Canadian law professor, alleged that prisoners had been mistreated based on government documents he obtained through the Access to Information Act (CBC News 2007a). These initial allegations instigated an investigation by Canada's Department of National Defence, and in April of 2007 "a new arrangement was struck with Afghanistan that gives Canadian officials full access to Kandahar jails" (CBC News 2007b).

More serious evidence of the torture of Afghan detainees surfaced in late April 2007, when *The Globe and Mail* published an investigation that included 30 interviews with detainees who had been captured by Canadian forces in Kandahar province and allegedly tortured by Afghan authorities (Smith 2007). According to the interviews, many of the detainees spoke of being "beaten, whipped, starved, frozen, choked and subjected to electric shocks during interrogation" by members of the National Directorate of Security (NDS), the intelligence police force in charge of prisons in the country (Smith 2007). While none of the interviewees accused Canadian forces of any acts of torture, many implied that as their original captors and regular visitors to the Afghan-run prison

facilities, Canadian military personnel in Afghanistan must have been aware of the abuses occurring at the hands of NDS officials. This investigation marked the first time where first-hand evidence was collected from detainees, and signalled a shift in the debate surrounding the allegations in Canada as more substantial evidence was revealed. An additional article published by The Globe and Mail during the same week added to this accumulation of evidence, detailing a heavily redacted government report that “eradicated every single reference to torture and abuse in prison” (Koring 2007). Many of the report’s redactions make reference to Afghanistan’s history of human rights violations and corruption within its central police force, further supporting the suspicions of Attaran, The Globe and Mail, and many Canadian politicians that serious instances of abuse and torture were taking place.

The role of watchdog agencies in Afghanistan has also played an important part in the allegations against Canadian forces. The Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission (AIHRC) and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) both monitor detention facilities in Afghanistan for human rights violations, but have resisted providing substantial information regarding the abuse allegations from Canadian-transferred detainees. The ICRC does not disclose information to anyone except the institutions being inspected, and while an agreement exists between the Canadian government and the AIHRC stipulating that the agency immediately inform Canadian officials if a detainee transferred by Canadian authorities is mistreated, an official at the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) told The Globe and Mail reporter Graeme Smith in 2007 that they had not received any such information (Smith 2007). However, Smith (2007) made contact with the AIHRC for his April report, who

were able to confirm the accounts of particular detainees being handed over from Canadian forces to the NDS and subsequently tortured. In sum, the effectiveness of monitoring agencies in Afghanistan can be described as questionable at best. While information may be collected, it has not been used to adequately address abuse allegations and inform the relevant parties – including Canadian officials – of what has been occurring inside Afghan prisons.

In January of 2008, it was revealed that the Canadian government had stopped transferring those detained in Afghanistan to local authorities late in 2007, after a prisoner alleged that he had been abused by Afghan security forces (Woods 2008). Woods (2008) quotes a government report stating that “Canada will resume transferring detainees when it believes it can do so in accordance with its international legal obligations” (Government of Canada, qtd. in Woods 2008). While domestic criticism remained high regarding whether or not the government provided sufficient and accurate information to the Canadian public about the detainee transfer issue in Afghanistan, the letter suggested that the Canadian military had officially acknowledged the occurrences of abuse. However, the letter was not released until months after the handing over of detainees had been halted, and was brought to light just before a court date where the government was defending itself against a lawsuit from two human rights groups regarding the abuse allegations. This raised questions about the truthfulness and sincerity of the government’s decision to release the letter from the human rights organizations involved, Amnesty International and the British Columbia Civil Liberties Association (Woods 2008).

The testimony of Richard Colvin in November of 2009 provided additional evidence supporting the allegations of detainee abuse by Afghan authorities after prisoners were transferred by Canadian military officials. Colvin worked in Afghanistan as a senior diplomat in 2006 and 2007, and was second-in-command at the Canadian Embassy in Kabul. In his role as a diplomat, Colvin visited Afghan prisons where detainees who had been transferred by Canadian soldiers after capture were being held (CBC News 2009). Testifying before the House of Commons Special Committee on the Canadian Mission in Afghanistan on November 18th, 2009, Colvin suggested, “the likelihood is that all the Afghans we handed over were tortured. For interrogators in Kandahar, it was a standard operating procedure” (Canada 2009). Such a strong statement from a high-ranking official demonstrated the true seriousness of the abuse allegations, and provoked much negative response from Canadian politicians, many of whom questioned the credibility of Colvin’s statement (CBC News 2009). While some applauded his bravery and courage for speaking out regarding the allegations, his statements reignited the debate surrounding the abuse itself as well as the release of documents detailing the torture that allegedly occurred at Afghan prisons despite being known of by Canadian military officials in Kandahar.

The debate amongst Canadian politicians, military officials, and human rights groups regarding the Afghan detainee torture allegations continues at present, some four years after initial allegations were made public. In June of 2011, a multi-partisan investigation meant to uncover and agree on the public release of documents related to the case concluded and over 4,000 pages of material was released, much of it heavily censored (Chase and Curry 2011). It remains unknown how many documents exist in

total, and whether or not important evidence continues to go unreleased due to legal restrictions and parliamentary privilege. However, no irrefutable new information is contained in the first release of documents that would concretely prove whether or not Canadian military officials were aware of the torture being suffered by Afghan detainees (Chase and Curry 2011). To date, there has been no official public inquiry into the case; however, the Official Opposition has “said the newly released documents reveal nothing substantively new, [and] is calling for a judicial inquiry with full investigative powers” (Chase and Curry 2011).

Evidently, this issue continues to be a significant aspect of Canada’s role in Afghanistan and membership of the international community fighting against terrorism. The intense domestic interest in the case and criticism of the government’s responses suggest that allegations of torture and human rights violations are deserving of attention and investigation, and are important to civilians watching the continuation of the War on Terror. While this chapter focuses specifically on the Canadian case, there are many insights from which we can extrapolate understandings of terrorism, torture, and human rights in the post-9/11 realm of security more generally. The following sections examine in detail some of these understandings - knowledge, responsibility, and care - from a feminist ethics perspective on security in order to demonstrate the usefulness of theoretical concepts of feminist ethics in feminist security studies and to shed new light on the Afghan detainee torture allegations in critical security scholarship.

Knowledge and Discourse Ethics

A primary aspect of the criticism drawn upon the Canadian government for their handling of the Afghan detainee torture allegations revolves around knowledge. Some

key questions of the investigation into the case ask: did Canadian military officials *know* that Afghan prisoners were being tortured by NDS authorities once transferred to them after capture? If they did know, *why* did they not respond by attempting to stop it, or at the very least inform others of the atrocities that were occurring? And if military officials *did* attempt to pass on information suggesting that detainees were being tortured in Afghan prisons, *why* did officials higher in the chain of command take no action? Each of these questions points to particular aspects of the detainee case and the War on Terror more generally, on which feminist ethics can shed new light. Specifically, these questions highlight the useful insights brought to bear on the case when examined through lenses of feminist epistemology and discourse ethics, as well as through the notion of responsibility, which will be discussed in detail in the following section.

For many feminist theorists, rejecting the rationalist bias of Western epistemology is central to their approach towards knowledge. Unlike mainstream perspectives on international security, feminist security scholars acknowledge the historical particularity of knowledge and move beyond traditional conceptions of knowing towards multiple explanations for the processes through which individuals gain understandings of their world. As Wibben (2011) suggests, “feminist poststructuralists deconstruct modern science and reject its object/subject opposition as well as the assertion that there is only one valid type of knowledge construction” (33). In this rejection, space is created that allows for alternative epistemologies. This questioning of knowledge is an important aspect of many approaches to feminist ethics. It suggests that there are other ingredients to knowing aside from rationality and the scientific method, and that the ingredients involved have lasting ethical implications. In her edited volume with Susan Bordo,

Alison Jaggar (1989) notes that a feminist ethical conception of the knowing subject is “a historically particular individual who is social, embodied, interested, emotional, and rational and whose body, interests, emotions, and reason are fundamentally constituted by particular historical context” (6). She goes on to argue that “emotion is an indispensable even if unrecognized part of all knowledge, in science as well as in daily life” (Jaggar and Bordo 1989: 6). Such a shift away from the positivist traditions of IR is particularly useful in this case, as the commitments of feminist ethicists with respect to knowledge align closely with many of those offered by feminist security scholarship. It remains important to acknowledge, however, that there exist multiple conflicting epistemologies brought to bear by feminists on IR, and the particular epistemological traditions of feminist ethicists are not identical to those presented by other feminists in the field.

The realities of the Afghan detainee case present a vastly different story than the one presented by feminist ethics theorizing in security, however. For politicians and the public, the key to answering the many questions surrounding the case revolved around concrete evidence. Above all else, those who were critical of the allegations and sceptical of the evidence presented, including *The Globe and Mail* investigation of 2007 and the Colvin testimony of 2009, demanded the presentation of “real” evidence in order for them to believe that the allegations of detainees themselves could be true. This scepticism and desire for irrefutable proof is rampant in the political discourse surrounding the case. During Question Period after the release of *The Globe and Mail*’s findings in April of 2007, Prime Minister Stephen Harper said there was “no evidence” of detainee torture in Afghan prisons and that the concerns over the treatment of prisoners were “baseless accusations” (Bonoguoire 2007). During the same week, General Rick Hillier, the Chief

of Defence Staff, said he “just let[s] the theatrics, if you will, of these things go on around me”, suggesting a lack of serious attention towards the allegations and the evidence that had surfaced through The Globe and Mail investigation (Bonoguore 2007). A similar casting of doubt took place over Richard Colvin’s testimony in November of 2009. Conservative MP Laurie Hawn, among other committee members, noted, “I really do have to question...whether this is really credible testimony in the direction that people want to take this. ...I’m a little bit sceptical” (Canada 2009) after Colvin noted how unreliable the record-keeping system at the prisons often was with respect to positive detainee identification.

From these examples, it is evident that a pre-occupation with concrete, scientific evidence existed amongst many Canadians during the unfolding of the Afghan detainee case. This obsession with rational knowledge falls in line with realist understandings of international politics, but fails to acknowledge the new conceptions of knowledge brought to bear by feminist ethics in security scholarship. Specifically, the Canadian government discourse surrounding irrefutable evidence obscures the many other questions and moral concerns that are important to the allegations, many of which are central to feminist theorizing about the discourses of terrorism and torture. While demanding positivist evidence, the individual experiences of the detainees themselves - 30 of whom were interviewed directly for The Globe and Mail investigation - were discounted, as was the physical suffering felt by the torture victims, the aftermath of which was seen by investigators and diplomat Richard Colvin. These exclusions are of detriment both to the victims and to the Canadian military, whose reputation has been put in question due to the seriousness of these allegations. Feminist ethics and its approach to

knowledge production in this particular security context demonstrates the perspective's usefulness in feminist security scholarship. By highlighting the bias existing in the type of knowledge desired by the Canadian government as evidence for torture, it is clear that the actions of politicians in Canada, as well as many high-ranking military officials, were informed by mainstream security thinking of rationality, rather than an approach – such as that proposed by feminist ethics – that acknowledges the highly contextual nature of knowledge and knowing, particularly in contemporary situations of international security.

The work of feminist ethics in reconstructing discourse ethics is also particularly relevant to this case. As mentioned previously, a key question surrounding the Afghan detainee torture allegations centres on the question of response. If Canadian military personnel knew of abuse at Afghan prisons against transferred detainees, why was information not passed up the chain of command and acted upon? Feminist discourse ethics, and ethical considerations of dialogue in particular, provides important insights into these significant questions.

As Robinson (2011) points out, despite “the emphasis on discourse and dialogue in International Relations, there has been relatively little emphasis on the moral and political value of effective listening” (856). In this instance, there are numerous dependent and vulnerable parties whose voices are excluded from the Afghan detainee debate. While the detainees themselves have had opportunities to speak to investigators as well as monitoring agencies, those meant to listen and understand the complexities of their serious concerns are unable to enact substantial change. As outlined in the previous section, the AIHRC and ICRC are the two organizations whose role is to monitor activities at Afghan prisons and the treatment of detainees by the NDS. However, their

capabilities for change are limited, as they report back to the Afghanistan government and have few effective mechanisms in place for swift and direct improvements to detention facilities. Therefore, the voices of detainees go unheard, as the relocation of care to this particular public sphere has not taken place (Robinson 2011: 856).

Another group of voices who are negatively impacted by the lack of emphasis given to sincere listening in International Relations are Canadian military officials on the ground in Afghanistan. In his November 2009 testimony, Richard Colvin makes numerous mentions of the difficult position he and his colleagues were in with respect to reporting the abuses they knew were occurring at the hands of Afghan authorities: “we kept hopeless records, and, apparently to prevent any scrutiny, the Canadian Forces leadership concealed all this behind walls of secrecy” (Canada 2009). Colvin goes on to describe the culture of secrecy affecting those in charge of the Afghanistan mission, and says that despite numerous oral and written reports, “senior officials in DFAIT and the Canadian Forces did not welcome our reports or advice” (Canada 2009). He also suggests that the information that *was* transferred from military officials in Afghanistan back to administrative personnel in Ottawa was often embellished or overly optimistic, describing optimistic contexts that did not accurately reflect the situations in Afghan-controlled detention facilities (Canada 2009).

These instances within the Canadian military’s chain of communication also reflect a lack of genuine listening on the part of high-ranking military officials, both in Afghanistan and domestically. Feminist security scholars have long documented and critiqued the hypermasculine, nationalist, and hierarchical nature of the military as an institution (Sjoberg 2010; Enloe 2007; Higate 2003). As feminists rethink Habermasian

discourse ethics, it is necessary to reconfigure the contexts of listening situations such as those in conflict zones to combat against these characteristics, and to introduce an alternative understanding of listening that takes into account its moral and political significance. As Robinson (2011) suggests, this type of effective listening “requires the cultivation of moral attitudes of patience, attentiveness and trust” (860). While it may be difficult to imagine today’s Canadian military as an organization that takes these virtues as central concerns, the work of feminist ethicists in transforming the discourse ethics approach is nevertheless highly valuable and sheds new light on the particular discourses taking place in the Afghan detainee case.

Responsibility and Obligation

Notions of responsibility and obligation are also key concerns surrounding the Afghan detainee torture allegations and the relevance of feminist ethics to studying post-9/11 security dilemmas. A central question in the investigation of the allegations focused on whether or not Canada failed in its responsibility to protect the Afghan citizens it had detained and subsequently transferred to NDS authorities. As a signatory to the Geneva Convention, Canada is bound to uphold Article 12 which states that “the detaining power is responsible for the treatment given” to prisoners of war (Third Geneva Convention 1949). However, as described previously, those who initially revealed the torture allegations, including Amir Attaran, *The Globe and Mail*, and Richard Colvin, all believed that Canada had violated the responsibilities of the Convention by handing Afghan detainees over to Afghan security forces where they were allegedly tortured. Hooks and Mosher’s (2005) examination of torture and abuse by American forces during the War on Terror demonstrates the many complexities surrounding notions of

responsibility and obligation, even at a domestic level. They describe a military context whereby “instead of taking responsibility for their individual actions or finding fault with the U.S. chain of command, high-ranking officials place all responsibility on the soldiers of the lowest rank and with the least control over the situation” (Hooks and Mosher 2005: 1631). Such power inequalities and hierarchical control structures demonstrate the susceptibility of the military as an institution to contexts in which no one wants to take responsibility for their actions. Similarly, in his analysis of human rights abuses in Iraq, Forsythe (2006) highlights the Bush Administration’s “determined effort to minimize obligations under international humanitarian law (IHL), international human rights law, and US law” (473-4) in regard to the abuses inflicted on detainees suspected of terrorism in Iraq. This utter disregard by the United States and others for international obligations demonstrates the ineffectiveness of international law as it currently exists, and the need for a new and innovative approach to encourage increased awareness of responsibility and obligation towards detainees of the War on Terror.

As highlighted in the previous chapter, feminists working in IR generally and security specifically often pay ethical attention to notions of responsibility and obligation. Ackerly and Zhang (2010) suggest that “responsibilities are understood as ongoing practices and actions of responsiveness and care towards particular others” (para. 21), and that feminist work in international ethics seeks to understand the particular moral ontology of relationships of responsibility and care in the international community. This leads back to evidence of unequal power relations that remains so central to feminist approaches to ethics. Moreover, responsibility and obligation are ways in which a feminist ethic of care is manifested in the everyday experiences of international politics.

Notions of empathy and connectedness are taken from theoretical concepts to particular contextual practices in order to engage with others in a meaningful, responsive way.

The Afghan detainee torture case signals a lack of this meaningful and responsive engagement. When investigators and diplomats began to reveal the allegations of torture in 2007, Canadian politicians and military officials refused to accept responsibility for the actions of Afghan forces, despite evidence suggesting that there was at least some knowledge on the part of the Canadian military of the torture being inflicted on detainees by the NDS. A February 2007 interview with General Rick Hillier noted that Hillier “said he’s confident Canadian soldiers in Afghanistan are behaving appropriately and professionally...[and] are handled in accordance with the Geneva Conventions” (CBC News 2007b), while refusing to comment specifically on the responsibility and obligation for Canada to protect detainees from harm during the Afghanistan mission. While Hillier’s response to media questioning did not constitute an outright denial of the allegations, it passed responsibility down to ‘Canadian soldiers’ on the ground in Afghanistan rather than taking a leading and responsive role to the initial allegations. This is symptomatic of how this case was handled by high-ranking political and military officials in Canada, and an understanding of responsibility informed by feminist theory allows for greater insight into the deeply problematic nature of such a (non-) response.

Although not explicitly feminist, Oren Gross’s (2007) discussion of an ethics of responsibility is particularly useful here, and demonstrates some of the empathy and relationality that underscores feminist ethical approaches to responsibility and obligation. Gross (2007) advocates for maintaining a complete legal ban on torture, with the addition of an “official disobedience” whereby public officials wishing to engage in torture for

exceptional cases “may act extralegally and be ready to accept the legal ramifications of their actions” (35). The usefulness of Gross’s (2007) conception is that it allows for the inclusion of emotion into an otherwise rigid and sterile legal framework surrounding torture. Through an ethics of responsibility, Gross (2007) suggests that those who believe torture is truly the only way to deal with a particular threat or danger must make an extraordinarily difficult ethical and moral decision before using it, as they are acting outside the law and will likely face imprisonment. Such a moral debate introduces notions of care and connectedness to decision-making surrounding torture. No longer is torture simply a choice of military response; rather, it constitutes a departure from the legal order and entrance into a realm of lawlessness whereby the vulnerabilities of the torturer as well as the potential victim(s) are revealed as the official chooses between torture and another less violating means of tackling international security threats. Using this understanding of the ethics of responsibility, the Canadian military would have had a more effective legal framework at their disposal in order to prevent and stop the torture of detainees whom they had handed over to Afghan authorities. This connection between the law and notions of responsibility and obligation in feminist ethics is significant as it demonstrates the complexities involved in applying the theoretical approach to everyday security experiences. Gross’s (2007) discussion highlights the moral and political significance of including an empathic, relational aspect – as put forward by feminist approaches to ethics - to analyses of responsibility and obligation in international security contexts.

Care and Compassion

As was discussed in the previous chapter, feminist work on the ethics of care is of particular interest to feminist security scholarship as it emphasizes the contextual and relational nature of international security concerns while often noting the importance of connectedness and empathy. An analysis of the Afghan detainee torture allegations through a lens of care ethics demonstrates how traditional understandings of international security, terrorism, and torture fail to acknowledge the particularities of individual experiences in the War on Terror. An example of one such experience is the repeated report of kindness shown to Afghan detainees by Canadian forces, just prior to their transfer to Afghan detention centres where they were then tortured.

As Smith (2007) reports, many detainees interviewed by *The Globe and Mail* “expressed puzzlement” over the politeness shown to them by Canadian soldiers. They described “foreign soldiers handling their personal belongings carefully, and giving them sips of cool water on hot days”, even protecting their heads with their hands as vehicles travelled along a bumpy road on the way to an Afghan prison for their transfer and eventual torture (Smith 2007). While those interviewed wondered why Canadian forces would perform such acts of compassion if they knew they were sending the detainees to be brutally beaten, starved, and electrocuted, their repeated mention of the acts suggests that the small signs of empathy were immediately noticed by the detainees. Such a benign wartime experience exists in paradox with the intense torture alleged to have occurred at NDS prisons around Afghanistan, and it is through a feminist ethic of care that we can begin to understand the importance of such compassionate acts and their significance in the context of the War on Terror.

In her examination of feminist IR through a care ethics approach, Porter (2006) recognizes that “the capacity for feeling pain at the distress of others and imaginatively responding draws us together in communities” (117). From this perspective, the actions of Canadian soldiers exist as moments of hope and optimism outside a particularly violent context of torture in war. Whether or not Canadian forces were aware that detainees were being transferred into the hands of torturers, their compassionate actions as captors constitute an imaginative response in a conflict where resources for empathic interactions are undoubtedly limited. Such compassionate responses, as Porter (2006) stresses, are needed at all levels of politics in order to lead to corresponding policy changes.

While Porter (2006) emphasises these linkages between compassion and care, it is important to acknowledge that her claims are not wholly representative of the ethics of care approach. Many feminists view compassion, empathy, and care as distinct and separate from each other. This diversity within the ethics of care perspective also highlights how feminist care ethics moves beyond simple acts of caring and compassion and reveals the way in which relations of care and responsibility shape our lives more substantively. From this understanding of feminist care ethics, the kind acts of Canadian soldiers towards Afghan detainees prior to their transfer are not necessarily indicative of an ethics of care approach being used. Rather, they suggest a tacit acknowledgement by Canadian military forces of their responsibilities in their role as captors and their relationships with detainees, both of which are grounded in highly unequal power relations.

The full power of compassion, care, and attentiveness in the Afghan detainee torture case remains unknown, but the small experiences of the interviewed detainees provide evidence in support of a feminist approach to care ethics in international security scholarship. Connecting care ethics to feminist understandings of post-9/11 security concerns enriches concepts of what is morally and politically significant in wartime relationships, and attempts to shift the focus of security actors from state-centred and militaristic approaches to a perspective on the individual that acknowledges their particular and contextual circumstance, whether as a Canadian soldier, Afghan prison guard, or detainee in the War on Terror.

Conclusions

This chapter has attempted to present some of the key theoretical concepts of feminist ethics in international security through a practical examination of the allegations against Canadian forces of knowingly transferring Afghan detainees to facilities where they were being tortured. As the case continues to unfold, it is impossible to make concrete judgements regarding the validity of the allegations and resulting outcomes for Canadian military officials and Afghan detainees. However, the case does provide an appropriate backdrop on which evidence has been shown of the usefulness of feminist ethics theorizing – particularly notions of knowledge, responsibility, and compassion – in improving our understandings of distinct experiences in the War on Terror. As the discourse surrounding the case has demonstrated, feminist approaches to security issues such as torture that are grounded in ethics provide more nuanced insights into the events as well as security actors themselves than do mainstream and other critical approaches in the field.

While some aspects of the Afghan detainee torture case are undoubtedly too complex to be fully explained by any one perspective on international security, the use of a feminist ethical perspective in examining the case reveals the gendered power relations at play in national discourses of terrorism and torture. Notions of responsibility, compassion, and knowledge as understood by feminists serve to elucidate the highly contextual and relational context in which processes of international security take place. Using feminist ethics to unpack the Canadian government's response to torture allegations suggests that the relationships between captors, detainees, military officials, and politicians in the War on Terror are more complex than mainstream security scholarship has claimed. Further, feminist ethics points to the serious moral dilemmas faced by security actors in the ongoing fight against terrorism, particularly as they relate to obligation and knowledge. The use of a feminist ethical approach to understanding international security highlights the multiple sites of ethical and moral interrogation when examining torture and terrorist activity beyond a simple analysis of the concrete evidence that mainstream theorists rely heavily on. From these substantive theoretical contributions, we see not only a potential for further integration of feminist ethics into feminist security scholarship, but also the opportunity for cross-context examinations of torture allegations through a feminist lens to discover whether particular phenomena are shared across multiple contexts in the post-9/11 world of international security.

CHAPTER FIVE – RETHINKING FEMINIST ETHICS AND SECURITY

As the preceding chapters have shown, the existing relationship between feminist ethics and feminist security scholarship in International Relations is complex and varied. The debates amongst scholars concerning what constitutes notions of security, war, terrorism, and violence in feminist IR continue to raise new questions about our understandings of post-9/11 international security. Similarly, feminists working in the field of ethics remain committed to a variety of ethical approaches – including those centred around care, peace, and discourse – that each provide useful insights into the way in which security dilemmas and threats are constructed and resolved by the actors involved. As Ackerly and Zhang (2010) suggest, international security “is gendered and experienced in a gendered way and is therefore an important domain for ethical reflection” by feminists (para. 15).

Key Contributions of Ethics to Feminist Security Studies

This ethical reflection on feminist security theorizing in IR has shed light on a number of important theoretical and practical concerns for international security in the 21st century. Of primary interest to many feminists examining security from an ethical perspective is the highly particular and contextual nature of experiences in the realm of global security. Whether in times of war, peace, or post-conflict rebuilding, feminist ethics highlights the unique characteristics of security experiences felt by individuals and advocates for an approach that acknowledges and adapts the responses to these particularities. This constitutes a rejection of the notion of universal justice based on rationality and the state as the single and primary actor in international security, and

places increased significance on multiple injustices occurring at the domestic and international levels that contribute to the insecurity of individuals (Hutchings 2000 123)

Related to these particular experiences is the concern among feminist ethics scholarship regarding responsibility and relationality, concepts that are highly relevant to the threats and events of international security, as well as the ensuing responses of governments, individuals, and organizations. Thinking about responsibilities and their negotiation in global politics as a central aspect of moral life “highlights the specifically feminist argument about the substance of moral life being made up of care and caring practices among real people existing in personal relationships” (Robinson 2006 234). Feminist theorists using an ethics of care approach attempt to demonstrate that the practices of response and care seen through responsibilities in global politics helps to highlight the varied positioning of particular others in international security. Moreover, an ethics of care allows those studying IR to move beyond a simple analysis of who or what is responsible for a security threat or phenomenon into a more complex understanding of the type of response required by an ethical and moral international community. While mainstream analyses of global security incidents continue to view independent and autonomous actors who are largely disconnected from the moral responsibilities of the world around them, feminist ethics scholarship on responsibility implies a much deeper sense of connection between these actors, built on a foundation of care and compassion.

Like responsibility, relationality is understood by feminist care ethicists in IR as a key aspect of security theorizing. Feminist scholarship strives for the ideal of “care and relationality providing the framework within which principles of justice are developed and

applied”, while in reality “universalism at best, or realism in most cases, reigns” (Ben-Porath 2008: 69). The notion of relationality as the set of commitments, responsibilities, and long-term ties existing in the unique relationships between security actors is significant to the study of war and conflict on the international stage as it emphasises the continual nature of these relationships. Beyond the beginning, middle, and end of any security threat, war, or conflict, the network of connections that reaches myriad actors in the realm of international security remains intact. As Tronto (1987) suggests in her early work on care ethics, “the perspective of care requires that conflict be worked out without damage to the continuing relationships” (658). This requirement is an important consideration brought to bear by feminist work in care ethics, and is a useful insight for feminist security scholarship more generally, particularly in discussions of post-conflict contexts.

An additional contribution made to feminist security studies by the work of feminist ethicists centres on the concept of power. Feminists working in IR have long been aware of the importance of power in the discipline. As Ann Tickner (1988) suggested in her critique of Han’s Morgenthau’s realist understandings of global politics, “international relations is a man’s world, a world of power and conflict in which warfare is a privileged activity”. Tickner’s remarks have proven significant to the orienting of the field by feminist scholars in recent decades, and one of the key concerns of feminist security theorizing is the unequal power relations found in global political interaction. Feminist ethics supports this concern and as Ackerly and Zhang (2010) suggest, “the commitment to revealing and deconstructing power dynamics, a normative and critical lens rather than a principle, is the organizing device of feminist ethics in IR” (para. 24).

Viewing the complex power relations at work in global politics in this way allows feminists to highlight the ethical implications of particular relationships that are embedded with benefits and costs for certain groups. Recognizing those more vulnerable to these power inequalities – women, for example – provides important opportunities for feminist theorizing to imagine contexts where ethical judgements help in the transformation of power in the practice of international relations.

Finally, epistemological understandings of knowledge are integral to the contributions of feminist ethics to feminist security scholarship. As with power, feminist security studies has been concerned with the sources and construction of knowledge in IR since its inception. In her overview of feminist security studies' epistemological commitments, Wibben (2011) outlines several feminist projects related to modes of inquiry, including “[a challenging of] authoritarian attitudes and emphasizing personal experience and self-confidence; the belief that it is possible to redefine political and intellectual progress as changeable; [and an emphasis on] the analysis of everyday life and the role of human activity as a source of cognition” (30). These projects are reiterated by the work of feminist ethics. As evidenced in Chapter 4, a shift away from rational and positivist ways of knowing towards an approach to relational and contextual knowledge is a key concern for many feminists working in a framework of ethics. This shift is highly relevant to feminist research in international security, as it demonstrates the political and moral significance of thinking about knowledge in ways other than those used by mainstream security scholarship. When knowledge and its production is thought of with respect to the particular circumstances of the individuals involved – that is, acknowledging the contexts of those producing and consuming said knowledge - a more

accurate epistemological portrait is presented and our understandings of knowing are more reflective of the unique participants in particular discourses. While debate continues amongst feminist scholars working in international ethics regarding the specific details of such epistemological commitments, their shared understandings of knowledge with feminist security theorizing makes their ethical approach to knowing an important contribution to feminist security studies.

Feminist Ethics in Practice

After having identified some of the key contributions that have been made by feminist ethicists to feminist security scholarship in IR, this thesis attempted to provide practical evidence for the use of feminist ethics in theorizing about international security with an examination of the ongoing Afghan detainee torture case in Canada. The allegations against Canadian military forces of knowingly transferring Afghan detainees to facilities where they were being tortured provide an interesting contemporary backdrop on which to analyze the effectiveness of feminist ethics in security studies. Specifically, the case's relevance to notions of responsibility/obligation, discourse/knowledge, and care/compassion allows for the full range of benefits offered by a feminist ethical analysis of international security to be shown.

Beyond demonstrating that feminist theorizing can provide useful insights outside the rigid boundaries of gender analysis, such an approach also suggests the possibility for transformation. Mainstream perspectives in the field have often described practices of international security as somehow being normal or natural, a description that Enloe (2004) suggests occurs since "no decisions have to be made" (1). This resistance to transformation in the realm of global security has changed somewhat since the

proliferation of critical security studies in IR; however, it remains the case that many aspects of international security – including the hierarchical and rationalist nature of the military, for example – are viewed as unchangeable concepts by many in the discipline. The research of feminist ethicists and security scholars attempts to move towards a critical, transformative understanding of international security that is underpinned by a relational and caring approach, acknowledging the possibility for emancipatory change and improvement in current security paradigms. The Afghan detainee case demonstrates the usefulness in such a way of thinking. By using a critical lens of feminist ethics, it is possible to suggest ways in which the discourse surrounding this case – particularly the government's response to the allegations – can be reoriented to focus more on the individual experiences of the detainees themselves, as well as those reporting the abuses. From this perspective, Richard Colvin's testimony is no longer a piece of concrete evidence to be discredited; rather, it is one part of a complex set of power relationships existing between Canadian military officials, Afghan security forces, and detainees.

Furthermore, feminist ethics allows for a consideration of the context in which the allegations are taking place, as feminists' work on the War on Terror highlights the mobilization of particular discourses to the detriment of vulnerable groups. Denike's (2008) analysis of human rights discourses in the War on Terror argues that narratives of human rights as justification for the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq post-9/11 serve to reinforce colonial and imperialist understandings of global politics and entrench the sovereignty of Western powers (97). Feminist ethical arguments such as this increase our awareness of the particular context of the War on Terror, and allow for more accurate conclusions about phenomena therein, such as the Afghan detainee issue. Understood

through this lens of feminist ethics, the refusal of the Canadian government to take journalistic investigations and diplomatic testimony as sufficient evidence to support the allegations against military officials in Afghanistan is problematic. It demonstrates the need for feminist scholarship to advocate for alternative narratives to those described by Western imperial powers, and to consider the legitimacy and credibility of *all* individuals' experiences in the Afghanistan war, not just those of high-ranking military officials. Eric Blanchard's (2003) examination of feminist security theory supports this understanding, noting that the "negotiation of cultural relations between the West and Islam and the effects of state anti-terror campaigns on civilians are problems that military campaigns in Afghanistan...are not designed to address and traditional non-feminist theories of IR are not entirely equipped to handle" (1306).

As these considerations suggest, IR scholars' understandings of the Afghan detainee torture case would be substantially expanded if examined from the perspective of feminist ethics. Feminist commitments to responsibility, care, and discourse provide a useful ethical framework through which this thesis has examined the case. While the torture allegations remain unresolved by the Canadian government and military, and the case continues to exist without a public inquiry, it is incumbent on feminist scholars of ethics and security to expose the problematic nature of the government's response to what are serious charges of torture and abuse, and to suggest viable alternatives to the current political discourse.

The Future of Ethics in Feminist Security Scholarship

Since its inception as a field of feminist theorizing in IR, feminist security studies has aimed to broaden the scope of what is considered a security concern in global

politics. Through a politicized, multi-layered approach, feminist security scholars have exposed some of the problematic assumptions of the field and proposed alternatives to better capture the realities of post-9/11 international security phenomena. As this thesis suggests, the future of feminist security scholarship would be improved through an increased engagement with the insightful academic investigations being undertaken by the field of feminist ethics. The shared commitments between the two literatures suggest a mutual benefit both in terms of theoretical innovations and new research directions. As Ackerly and Zhang (2010) note, the questions and perspectives brought to bear by feminists on International Relations “contribute to and expand the scope of international ethics because of the normative weight of the feminist concern with exploitative hierarchies” (para. 41).

This expansion of international feminist ethics research will undoubtedly raise additional questions from multiple theoretical perspectives about the ways to study security using an ethical framework. As many feminist ethicists suggest, however, these questions contribute positively to insightful debate within the field. Whether through an ethics of care, pacifism, or discourse, the conceptual inputs of feminist ethics to the realm of security studies create openings whereby useful discussions between feminist security theorists and feminist ethicists can take place.

Such a starting point already exists, as much of the existing work in feminist ethics has focused on international security concerns, but there is a need for a more explicit presentation of this important theoretical connection from both sets of scholarship. As recent work from the field of feminist international political sociology helpfully points out, feminist IR has long advocated for “new concepts for understanding

disciplinary change in the social sciences” despite remaining tied to the original language of a discipline holding rigid boundaries (Soreanu 2010: 396). It is now necessary for feminist ethics and security scholars to demonstrate leadership in the field and move beyond the existing limited disciplinary imagination, into what Soreanu (2010) calls the “third space in the discipline” – a space consisting of “imaginary identification, centred on an image of what we would like to be” (396). A broadening of the intellectual imagination of feminist theorizing in International Relations would allow a feminist analysis of security to be infused with an ethical perspective, adding to both the theoretical and practical value of the approach.

Of course, there remain specific areas of inquiry that have not yet been fully explored by scholars of security in feminist IR. As Eric Blanchard (2003) rightly suggests, feminists have stayed relatively quiet regarding the burgeoning of technocratic warfare and the use of technology in post-9/11 conflict zones (1306). The relationships between war, gender, and technology certainly call for a framework of ethics, as these new types of weaponry are rife with complex moral questions surrounding responsibility and compassion. In particular, the use of drones and smart bombs by 21st century militaries leave wide gaps in our understandings of ethical warfare and the extent to which humans can be removed from combat itself, and are in need of serious consideration from feminist security scholars with an ethical perspective.

Similarly, the methodological development of feminist ethics and security scholarship remains incomplete. Wibben (2011) and others have correctly exposed the “clumsy do-goodism that homogenizes the Third World” (113) sometimes exhibited by feminists, particularly those from the West. It is therefore of utmost importance for the

future work of feminist ethics and international security scholarship to ensure they use empathetic and attentive listening techniques in their research. This is a particularly salient point when considering the transformative work done in feminist ethics, as there is a high risk of attempting to ‘save’ vulnerable groups through an imposition of ethical judgements, rather than acknowledging the unique experiences felt by those most in need of protection. More generally, feminists working with ethics in IR theorizing must remain committed to methods of inquiry that acknowledges “the relationship between ethics and moral practices on one hand, and politics and power relations on the other” (Robinson 2006: 240). This is important as the realities of international politics make it impossible to separate ethics from notions of politics and power. Therefore, despite the focus of non-feminist IR theorizing on state power and politics as primary areas of concern for the discipline, feminist ethicists must remain cognizant of the infusion of such ideas into ethics itself so to remain continually aware of the particular ethical position of those holding power and privilege in the international community.

Finally, as the preceding examination of the Afghan detainee torture case suggests, it is essential that feminist ethics and security scholarship in IR continue to ask new questions about the War on Terror and the future of counter-terrorism measures. In so doing, feminists may demonstrate the true usefulness of notions of ethics in international security, and begin to propose alternative understandings of post-9/11 threats than those given to us by mainstream security scholarship. As we reach ten years since the September 11th, 2001 terrorist attacks, the new ways in which international security concerns are identified and addressed continue to shift away from those used in traditional warfare, making it ever more important that appropriate theoretical

mechanisms exist to examine such measures through a critical lens. Feminist security scholarship infused with notions of feminist ethics provides the necessary scope and breadth of analysis and acknowledges the particular contexts and experiences of security actors, making it the ideal perspective from which to study security in International Relations. Its ability to act as a transformational force in the future of global security is beneficial not only to the academic discipline of IR but also to the existing relations between states, individuals, and organizations in the international community. Therefore, it is necessary that security studies in IR genuinely acknowledge the particular contributions made to the field by feminist examinations of security infused with ethics. This acknowledgement, along with an increased dialogue between feminist and non-feminist approaches to international security, can result in a more accurate identification of the often-problematic nature of security processes in the post-9/11 world. It is only through this meaningful integration of feminist security studies and feminist ethics that we can hope for a world in which international security processes result in ethical judgements which into account the importance of gender and the prevalence of power inequalities in the highly relational and contextual experiences of global security.

REFERENCES

- Aaron, Julia J 2004 "Recent Contributions to Feminist Ethics " *Hypatia* 19(2) 201-208
- Ackerly, Brooke, Maria Stern, and Jacqui True 2006 "Feminist methodologies for International Relations " In *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*, eds Brooke A Ackerly, Maria Stern, and Jacqui True Cambridge Cambridge University Press
- Ackerly, Brooke, and Jacqui True 2008 "Reflexivity in Practice Power and Ethics in Feminist Research on International Relations " *International Studies Review* 10 693-707
- Ackerly, Brooke, and Ying Zhang 2010 "Feminist Ethics in International Relations " *The International Studies Encyclopedia*, ed Robert A Denemark Blackwell Reference Online [http //www isacompendium com/subscriber/ tocnod?id=g9781444336597_chunk_g97814443365978_ss1-7](http://www.isacompendium.com/subscriber/tocnode?id=g9781444336597_chunk_g97814443365978_ss1-7) (15 February 2010)
- Bellamy, Alex J and Roland Bleiker 2006 "Introduction " In *Security and the War on Terror*, eds Alex J Bellamy, Roland Bleiker, Sara E Davies, and Richard Devetak London Routledge
- Benhabib, Seyla 2002 *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era* Princeton, NJ Princeton University Press
- Ben-Porath, Sigal 2008 "Care Ethics and Dependence Rethinking Jus Post Bellum " *Hypatia* 23(2) 61-71
- Bigo, Didier 1996 *Polices en réseaux: l'expérience européenne* Paris Presse de Sciences Po
- Blanchard, Eric 2003 "Gender, International Relations, and the Development of Feminist Security Theory " *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 28(4) 1289-1312
- Bonoguro, Tenille 2007 "PM says Afghan concerns are 'baseless' " *The Globe and Mail* [http //www theglobeandmail com/news/national/article755663_ece](http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/article755663_ece) (31 March 2009)
- Booth, Ken 1991 "Security and emancipation " *Review of International Studies* 17(4) 313-326
- Buzan, Barry, Ole Waever and Jaap de Wilde 1998 *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder, CO Lynne Rienner Publishers
- Byron, Jessica and Diana Thorburn 1998 "Gender and International Relations A Global Perspective and Issues for the Caribbean " *Feminist Review* 59 211-232
- Canada 2009 Parliament House of Commons Special Committee on Canadian Mission in Afghanistan Evidence 40th parl , 2nd sess (18 November 2009) Online [http //www parl gc ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?DocId=4236267&Mode=1&Parl=40&Ses=2&Language=E](http://www.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?DocId=4236267&Mode=1&Parl=40&Ses=2&Language=E)
- Caprioli, Mary 2005 "Primed for Violence The Role of Gender Inequality in Predicting Internal Conflict " *International Studies Quarterly* 49(2) 161-178
- Carver, Terrell 1996 *Gender is not a Synonym for Women* Boulder, CO Lynne Rienner
- Carver, Terrell 2010 "Conclusion " In *Gender Matters in Global Politics*, ed Laura Shepherd New York Routledge

- case collective 2006 "Critical Approaches to Security in Europe A Networked Manifesto" *Security Dialogue* 37(4) 443-487
- CBC News 2007a "In Depth The controversy over detainees" Online
<http://www.cbc.ca/news/background/Afghanistan/detainees.html> (27 April 2007)
- CBC News 2007b "Military probes abuse allegations in Afghanistan" Online
<http://www.cbc.ca/news/world/story/2007/02/06/military-probe.html> (6 February 2007)
- CBC News 2009 "All Afghan detainees likely tortured diplomat" Online
<http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/story/2009/11/18/diplomat-afghan-detainees.html> (18 November 2009)
- Chase, Steven and Bill Curry 2011 "4,000 pages on Afghan detainees leave questions of torture unanswered" *The Globe and Mail* Online
<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/4000-pages-on-afghan-detainees-leave-question-of-torture-unanswered/article2071291/> (22 June 2011)
- Cockburn, Cynthia 2004 "The continuum of violence a gender perspective on war and peace" In *Sites of Violence*, eds Wenona Mary Giles and Jennifer Hyndman Berkeley University of California Press
- Cohn, Carol 1987 "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 12 687-718
- Denike, Margaret 2008 "The Human Rights of Others Sovereignty, Legitimacy, and "Just Causes" for the "War on Terror"" *Hypatia* 23(2) 95-122
- Elshtain, Jean 1987 *Women and War* New York Basic Books
- Enloe, Cynthia 1989 *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics* Berkeley University of California Press
- Enloe, Cynthia 2000 *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives* Berkeley University of California Press
- Enloe, Cynthia 2004 *The Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire*. Berkeley University of California Press
- Enloe, Cynthia 2007 *Globalization and Militarism: Feminists Make the Link* Lanham, MD Rowman and Littlefield
- Ferguson, Michael L 2007 "Feminism and Security Rhetoric in the Post-September 11 Bush Administration" In *W Stands for Women: How the George W. Bush Presidency Shaped a New Politics of Gender*, eds Michael L Ferguson and Lori Jo Marso Durham Duke University Press
- Forsythe, David P 2006 "United States Policy toward Enemy Detainees in the 'War on Terrorism'" *Human Rights Quarterly* 28(2) 465-491
- Franceschet, Antonio 2001 "Moral Principles and Political Institutions Perspectives on Ethics and International Affairs" *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 31(2) 347-357
- Gould, Carol C 1996 "Diversity and Democracy Representing Differences" In *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, ed Seyla Benhabib. Princeton, NJ Princeton University Press
- Gross, Oren 2007 "Torture and an Ethics of Responsibility" *Law, Culture and the Humanities* 3 35-54

- Hansen, Lene 2000 "The Little Mermaid's Silent Security Dilemma and the Absence of Gender in the Copenhagen School" *Millennium: Review of International Studies* 29(2) 285-306
- Hansen, Lene 2010 "Ontologies, Epistemologies, Methodologies" In *Gender Matters in Global Politics*, ed Laura Shepherd New York Routledge
- Higate, Paul 2003 *Military Masculinities: Identity and the State*. New York Praeger
- Hoglund, Anna T 2003 "Justice for Women in War? Feminist Ethics and Rights for Women" *Feminist Theory* 11(3) 346-361
- Hooks, Gregory and Clayton J Mosher 2005 "Outrages Against Personal Dignity Rationalizing Abuse in the War on Terror" *Social Forces* 83(4) 1627-1645
- Hooper, Charlotte 2001 *Manly States: Masculinities, International Relations and Gender Politics* New York Columbia University Press
- Hudson, Heidi 2005 "'Doing' Security as Though Humans Matter A Feminist Perspective on Gender and the Politics of Human Security" *Security Dialogue* 36(2) 155-174
- Hunt, Krista, and Kim Rygiel 2006 "(En)Gendered War Stories and Camouflaged Politics" In *(En)Gendering the War on Terror*, eds Krista Hunt and Kim Rygiel Burlington, VT Ashgate
- Hutchings, Kimberly 2000 "Towards a Feminist International Ethics" *Review of International Studies* 26(5) 111-130
- Hutchings, Kimberly 2005 "Speaking and hearing Habermasian discourse ethics, feminism and IR" *Review of International Studies* 31(1) 155-165
- Hutchings, Kimberly 2007a "Feminist ethics and political violence" *International Politics* 44(1) 90-106
- Hutchings, Kimberly 2007b "Simone de Beauvoir and the Ambiguous Ethics of Political Violence" *Hypatia* 22(3) 111-132
- Jaggar, Alison M 1998 "Globalizing Feminist Ethics" *Hypatia* 13(2) 7-31
- Jaggar, Alison M and Susan R Bordo, eds 1989 *Gender/body/knowledge: feminist reconstructions of being and knowing* New Brunswick, NJ Rutgers University Press
- Kirk, Gwyn 2008 "Contesting Militarization Global Perspectives" In *Security Disarmed: Critical Perspectives on Gender, Race, and Militarization*, eds Barbara Sutton, Sandra Morden, and Julie Novkov New Brunswick, NJ Rutgers University Press
- Koring, Paul 2007 "What Ottawa doesn't want you to know" *The Globe and Mail* Online <http://v1.theglobeandmail.com/servlet/story/RTGAM.20070424.wdetaineereport0425/BNStory/Afghanistan> (25 April 2007)
- MacKenzie, Megan 2009 "Securitization and Desecuritization Female Soldiers and the Reconstruction of Women in Post-Conflict Sierra Leone" *Security Studies* 18(2) 241-261
- Maruska, Jennifer Heeg 2009 "When are states hypermasculine?" In *Gender and International Security: Feminist Perspectives*, ed Laura Sjoberg New York Routledge
- Masters, Cristina 2008 "Bodies of technology and the politics of flesh" In *Rethinking the Man Question: Sex, Gender, and Violence in International Relations*, eds Jane L Parpart and Marysia Zalewski London Zed Books

- Pajnik, Mojca 2006 "Feminist Reflections on Habermas's Communicative Action The Need for an Inclusive Political Theory" *European Journal of Social Theory* 9(3) 385-404
- Parashar, Swati 2010 "Women, militancy, and security the South Asian conundrum" In *Gender and International Security: Feminist Perspectives*, ed Laura Sjoberg New York Routledge
- Parpart, Jane, and Marysia Zalewski 2008 "Introduction rethinking the man question" In *Rethinking the Man Question: Sex, Gender and Violence in International Relations*, eds Jane Parpart and Marysia Zalewski New York Zed Books
- Peterson, V Spike, and Anne Sisson Runyan 1999 *Global Gender Issues* Boulder, CO Westview Press
- Poe, Danielle 2008 "Replacing Just War Theory with an Ethics of Sexual Difference" *Hypatia* 23(2) 33-47
- Porter, Elizabeth 1999 *Feminist Perspectives on Ethics* Upper Saddle River, NJ Pearson Education
- Porter, Elizabeth 2006 "Can Politics Practice Compassion?" *Hypatia* 21(4) 97-123
- Porter, Elizabeth 2007 *Peacekeeping: Women in International Perspective* London Routledge
- Porter, Elisabeth 2008 "Is Human Security a Feminist Peacebuilding Tool?" Paper presented at the 49th annual meeting of the International Studies Association March 26, 2008 San Francisco, CA
- Robinson, Fiona 1999 *Globalizing Care: Ethics, Feminist Theory and International Relations* Boulder, CO Westview Press
- Robinson, Fiona 2006 "Methods of Feminist Normative Theory A Political Ethic of Care for International Relations" In *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*, eds Brooke A Ackerly, Maria Stern, and Jacqui True Cambridge Cambridge University Press
- Robinson, Fiona 2008 "The Importance of Care in the Theory and Practice of Human Security" *International Political Theory* 4(2) 167-188
- Robinson, Fiona 2009 "Feminist Ethics and Global Security Governance" In *The Ethics of Global Governance*, ed Antonio Franceschet Boulder, CO Lynne Reiner Publishers
- Robinson, Fiona 2011 "Stop Talking and Listen Discourse Ethics and Feminist Care Ethics in International Political Theory" *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 39(3) 845-860
- Ruddick, Sara 1989 *Maternal Thinking: Towards a Politics of Peace*. Boston Beacon Press
- Ruddick, Sara 1993 "Notes towards a feminist peace politics" In *Gendering War Talk*, eds Miriam Cooke and Angela Woollacott Princeton, NJ Princeton University Press
- Ruddick, Sara 2004 "Maternal thinking as a Feminist Standpoint" In *The feminist standpoint theory reader*, ed Sandra G Harding London Routledge
- Sevenhuijsen, Selma 1998 *Citizenship and the Ethics of Care: Feminist Considerations on Justice, Morality, and Politics* London Routledge

- Sharoni, Simona 2008 "Teaching about Gender, Race, and Militarization after 9/11 Nurturing Dissent, Compassion, and Hope in the Classroom" In *Security Disarmed: Critical Perspectives on Gender, Race, and Militarism*, eds Barbara Sutton, Sandra Morgan, and Julie Novkov New Brunswick, NJ Rutgers University Press
- Shepherd, Laura 2006 "Veiled References Constructions of Gender in the Bush Administration Discourse on the Attacks in Afghanistan Post-9/11" *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 8 19-41
- Sherpherd, Laura 2008 *Gender, Violence, and Security: Discourse as Practice* New York Zed Books
- Shepherd, Laura 2010 "Sex or Gender? Bodies in World Politics and Why Gender Matters" In *Gender Matters in Global Politics*, ed Laura Shepherd New York Routledge
- Sjoberg, Laura 2006 *Gender, Justice, and the Wars in Iraq* Lanham, MD Lexington Books
- Sjoberg, Laura 2007 "Agency, Militarized Femininity and Enemy Others Observations from the War in Iraq" *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 9(1) 82-101
- Sjoberg, Laura 2008 "Why Just War Needs Feminism Now More Than Ever" *International Politics* 45 1-18
- Sjoberg, Laura 2009 "Gendering power transition theory" In *Gender and International Security: Feminist Perspectives*, ed Laura Sjoberg New York Routledge
- Sjoberg, Laura 2010 "Introduction" In *Gender and International Security: Feminist Perspectives*, ed Laura Sjoberg New York Routledge
- Sjoberg, Laura, and Jillian Martin 2010 "Feminist Security Theorizing" *The International Studies Encyclopedia*, ed Robert A Denemark Blackwell Reference Online http://www.isacompendium.com/subscriber/tocnode?id=g97814443366597_chunk_g978144433665978_ss1-11 (15 February 2010)
- Sjoberg, Laura, and Caron Gentry 2007 *Mothers, Monsters, Whores: Women's Violence in Global Politics* London Zed Books
- Smith, Graeme 2007 "From Canadian custody into cruel hands" *The Globe and Mail* Online <http://v1.theglobeandmail.com/servlet/story/RTGAM.20070423.wdetainee23/BNStory/Afghanistan> (23 April 2007)
- Smith, Steve 2005 "The contested concept of security" In *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*, ed Ken Booth Boulder, CO Lynne Rienner
- Soreanu, Raluca 2010 "Feminist Creativities and the Disciplinary Imaginary of International Relations" *International Political Sociology* 4 380-400
- Steans, Jill 1998 *Gender and International Relations: An Introduction* Cambridge Polity Press
- Steans, Jill 2006 *Gender and International Relations An Introduction*. 2nd ed Cambridge Polity Press
- Stern, Maria 2006 "Racism, sexism, classism, and much more reading security-identity in marginalized sites" In *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*, eds Brooke A Ackerly, Maria Stern, and Jacqui True Cambridge Cambridge University Press

- Stern, Maria and Marysia Zalewski 2009 "Feminist fatigue(s) reflections on feminism and familiar fables of militarization" *Review of International Studies* 35 611-630
- Sutton, Barbara, Sandra Morgan, and Julie Novkov, eds 2008 *Security Disarmed: Critical Perspectives on Gender, Race, and Militarism* New Brunswick, NJ Rutgers University Press
- Sylvester, Christine 1994 *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era* Cambridge Cambridge University Press
- Sylvester, Christine 2002 *Feminist International Relations: An Unfinished Journey* Cambridge Cambridge University Press
- Sylvester, Christine 2007 "Anatomy of a Footnote" *Security Dialogue* 38(4) 547-558
- Sylvester, Christine 2009 "War, sense, and security" In *Gender and International Security: Feminist Perspectives*, ed Laura Sjoberg New York Routledge
- Sylvester, Christine 2011 *Experiencing War* London Routledge
- Third Geneva Convention, Article 12 1949 "Convention (III) relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War" Geneva Online <http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/WebART/375590016?OpenDocument> (12 August 1949)
- Thobani, Sunera 2001 "Sunera Thobani's Speech" *Independent Media Centre* Online http://print.indymedia.org/news/2001/10/923_comment.php (6 October 2001)
- Tickner, J Ann 1988 "Hans Morgenthau's Principles of Political Realism A Feminist Reformulation" *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 17(3) 429-40
- Tickner, J Ann 1992 *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security* New York Columbia University Press
- Tickner, J Ann 1997 "You Just Don't Understand Troubled Engagements between Feminists and IR Theorists" *International Studies Quarterly* 41 611-32
- Tickner, J Ann 1998 "Continuing the Conversation" *International Studies Quarterly* 42(2) 205-10
- Tickner, J Ann 2004 "Feminist Responses to International Security Studies" *Peace Review* 16(1) 43-48
- Tickner, J Ann and Laura Sjoberg 2007 "Feminism" In *International Relations Theories*, eds Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki and Steve Smith New York Oxford University Press
- Tronto, Joan C 1987 "Beyond gender difference to a theory of care" *Signs* 12(4) 644-63
- Tronto, Joan 1993 *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care* New York Routledge
- Van Munster, Rens 2007 "Security on a Shoestring A Hitchhiker's Guide to Critical Schools of Security in Europe" *Cooperation and Conflict* 42(2) 235-243
- West, Lois 1999 "The UN Women's Conferences and Feminist Politics" In *Gender Politics in Global Governance*, eds Mary K Meyer and Elisabeth Prugl Lanham, MD Rowman & Littlefield
- Whitworth, Sandra 1989 "Gender and the Interparadigm Debate" *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 18(2) 265-72
- Whitworth, Sandra 2005 "Militarized Masculinities and the Politics of Peacekeeping The Canadian Case" In *Critical Security Studies in World Politics*, ed Ken Booth Boulder, CO Lynne Rienner

- Wibben, Annick T R 2011 *Feminist Security Studies: A narrative approach* New York Routledge
- Woods, Allan 2008 "Canada halts transfer of Afghan detainees" *Toronto Star* Online <http://www.thestar.com/news/canada/article/296993> (24 January 2008)
- Wright, Susan 2009 "Feminist theory and arms control" In *Gender and International Security: Feminist Perspectives*, ed Laura Sjoberg New York Routledge
- Young, Iris Marion 2000 *Inclusion and Democracy* Oxford Oxford University Press
- Zalweski, Marysia 2003 "'Women's Troubles' Again in IR" *International Studies Review* 5(2) 287-302