

CHAPTER 5

GENDER ANALYSIS AS A TOOL FOR MULTILATERAL NEGOTIATORS IN THE SMALL ARMS CONTEXT

Vanessa Farr¹

SUMMARY

Small arms are widely available, transportable and easy to use. As such, they play a significant role in accelerating violence, both in times of war and in degraded “peacetime” environments. Easy access to small arms is central to perpetuating social dislocation, destabilization, insecurity and crime in the build-up to war, in wartime and in the aftermath of conflict. Small arms also hamper recovery efforts and compromise the capacity of humanitarian aid workers to go about their work. Small arms are misused within both domestic as well as public spheres, and they affect everyone in the community, albeit in different ways and for different reasons. This chapter argues that one way to counter their costs is to increase our understanding of the role played by prolific small arms and light weapons in reinforcing and maintaining gender-specific violence and power imbalances between men and women, young and old. This analysis could assist multilateral negotiators in disarmament by making visible aspects of small arms-related violence that are not, at present, taken sufficiently into account in framing international responses.

INTRODUCTION

“Gender” describes socially learned behaviour and expectations that distinguish between masculinity and femininity. Because it is learned and not innate behaviour, one’s gender identity can shift over time and place. A fundamental premise of gender analysis is that it is *because* gender identities shift that the political project of female emancipation has been,

and is, possible: if we are better able to understand and explain patterns of subordination and domination, we are better able to design new interventions and support positive changes. Given the extreme imbalances between men and women the world over, gender analyses make it possible to identify the social, economic and cultural loci of male power, to better understand how the power of some men constrains and shapes the lives of other men and all women, and to develop methods to challenge the exclusive nature of this power.

This paper argues that gendered analyses are essential when we are engaged in work to better understand the underlying causes of violence, and are essential to help determine and implement the best strategies for violence reduction. A gendered perspective allows us to understand how gender ideologies are mobilized and manipulated as armed conflicts escalate, and to recognize that they are mobilized and manipulated differently when wars end. It also helps explain why some people choose to misuse small arms to achieve their personal and political goals, why some people resist picking up small arms, and even organize to oppose their proliferation, and the differential impacts of small arms misuse on different social actors. From this understanding, it is possible—with sufficient political will—to change the ways in which disarmament processes are mediated and negotiated, to bring about greater inclusivity and increase the effectiveness of arms control programmes.

When the small arms policy and research debate first began to gain momentum in the early 1990s, the humanitarian and human rights side of the problem received significant consideration. Around the same time, discussions of “gender mainstreaming” in conflict prevention found a prominent place on the international agenda, and agreements were ratified in the course of the decade whose aim was to assure women’s full-scale involvement in conflict resolution at decision-making levels, and to protect women living in situations of armed and other conflicts or under foreign occupation. Indeed, this was one of the most important priorities agreed on at the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women, held in Beijing in 1995.²

As the debate on small arms moved into international forums, the initial humanitarian and human rights focus was slowly diverted, until most of the international and regional documents on small arms—the majority crafted after 1998—failed to specifically mention humanitarian issues at all.

Nor was the hope realized that the Beijing Platform for Action would include specific attention to women. Instead, research and policy on the problem of small arms (mis)use, and discussions of the human beings responsible for it, were conspicuously absent; and if women were mentioned at all, it was only in passing.³ A problematic development was that “women and children” (and sometimes also “the elderly”) were absolutely misrepresented as the vast majority of victims of small arms violence—whereas men, and in particular young men, who in reality constitute the preponderance of abusers of guns and fatalities of gun violence, were not mentioned at all.⁴

As conversations on small arms and light weapons (SALW) have continued, women—like other non-mainstream actors who question the absence of analysis about the people behind the guns—have more insistently inserted our views on the problem. To support our activism, we have made able use of international conventions and agreements, the most recent of which being UN Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) on Women, Peace and Security.⁵ As a result, assessments of how prolific guns increase imbalances in power between males and females, young people and old, ethnic minorities, rich and poor, are becoming more descriptive and complex, and more questions are being asked about why civilian demand for such weapons remains so high.⁶ Current work on small arms has begun to look beyond simply “counting the weapons” and is, instead, increasingly focusing on the devastating human impact of their misuse.

Nevertheless, remarkably little attention has focused on the fact that gun ownership and misuse is a highly gendered phenomenon, and that it brutally reinforces unequal social hierarchies that not only give men dominance over women, but also exacerbate race and class tensions in violence-prone communities.⁷ Although rates of gender-based violence are universally high, there continues to be a general lack of political interest in the underlying causes of such violence. Instead, there remains a tendency to see “domestic” violence as a problem that can be overlooked because it so often occurs in the private domain, a perspective that often provides impunity for its perpetrators.⁸ At the same time, there is a growing tendency—through increased public scare mongering, which aims clearly to add to the number of women gun owners—to misrepresent the reality that women are most at risk from gun violence in their own homes and by men known to them. The rhetoric fosters the myth that it is in public spaces

that women are most at risk of attack, and that it is against strangers that they should wish or be able to protect themselves with a gun.⁹

Furthermore, the drafters of international agreements on SALW (while they may refer in passing to the “devastating” consequences of armed violence on women) have made little significant effort to align their work with documents such as Security Council resolution 1325, which calls for the inclusion of women in all aspects of peace-building, including small arms control. Indeed, as I have observed elsewhere, “[a]lthough weapons proliferation is often culturally sanctioned and upheld by the manipulation of gender ideologies, gender goes entirely unremarked in all documents which were not explicitly conceived to focus on gender mainstreaming.”¹⁰

It is hardly surprising that even in this very new field of research, a paucity of specific research on gender has meant an absence of broadly based surveys and data production from which to draw concrete conclusions. Despite the work of a few feminists in this field, it continues to be difficult to make incontrovertible claims about how gender roles and social stereotypes concerning what constitutes appropriate behaviour for males and females in weapons-prolific contexts might direct individual thinking and actions when it comes to small arms possession and use.¹¹ In turn, without a deeper understanding of the gender aspects of small arms proliferation, policy makers at the national and international levels do not receive a clear picture of its humanitarian effects or its characteristics and causes. This paper is an attempt to gather together some of the knowledge produced on this subject in the past five years.

The paper is divided into four sections which:

- describe the changing nature of warfare and its effects on the roles of women, non-elite men, and boys and girls;
- identify some of the gendered effects of small arms;
- discuss the importance of using the evidence of small arms violence to change social structures that perpetuate male violence against women, not only in times of war, but also in “peaceful” settings. This is ultimately of relevance to overarching international efforts, such as the UN Programme of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons, especially in monitoring and implementation; and
- review some of the guidelines for research and policy that have already been described in various publications on the gendered

impacts of small arms violence, in the hopes that these will be ever more widely considered in future work. The final section focuses on the need for better, more careful descriptions of who is hurt, and how, by these prolific weapons.

THE CHANGING NATURE OF WARFARE

Over the past few decades, internal conflicts (involving members of different ethnic, religious or political groupings within one country) have forced increasing numbers of civilians to become internally displaced, pushed into unsafe areas, compelled to flee their country altogether or to become directly involved in the fighting. The exodus of large numbers of civilians from conflict zones can itself incite upheaval in other arenas, in particular when exiles and refugees become active in conflicts in the areas to which they have been displaced or involve themselves in external offensives directed back to their country of origin.

Unsurprisingly, such changes in the face of war, its nature and conduct, have produced gendered effects.¹² The changing nature of warfare is increasingly blurring the boundaries between public and private spheres. It is drawing war into the home in new ways, where terrifying violence is used against women and children;¹³ but it is also drawing women and children out of the home to commit acts of violence that were previously considered the domain of male warriors.¹⁴

Men have always been profoundly affected by warfare because they are socialized to be its main actors. As the extremely high rates of domestic assaults around the world attest, they have, historically, had difficulty in distinguishing the boundaries between the sanctioned use of violence in public, as part of war, and its private use in response to interpersonal conflict between individuals in a household.¹⁵ When wars end, those who have been affected frequently take the fight back into their own homes: they turn the violence they have witnessed or perpetrated inwards, expressing their rage and pain in attacks on those who are nearest to them. Women, the elderly and young people (male and female) who share their domestic space with traumatized men are particularly vulnerable to the impacts of that trauma, either because they experience increased physical and emotional abuse, or because men squander the household's resources on drugs and alcohol. While the phenomenon of increased violence

associated with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) has been well documented,¹⁶ new studies show that, in general, rates of domestic violence increase when wars come to an end. As Thandi Modise, Speaker of the North West Provincial Legislature in South Africa, has stated, the “clichéd definition of not being at war” has little relevance for women and children in many conflict and post-conflict zones. “In South Africa today,” she observes, “there is increasing domestic violence, an increase in child abuse. So we cannot say South Africa is at peace.”¹⁷ Outside the home, male violence against men also increases when wars end, especially when prolific weapons remain uncontrolled—although it should be observed that all members of a society are vulnerable to being caught in the crossfire of armed violence.¹⁸

Due to their widespread availability, mobility and ease of use, small arms are a very important factor in the flaring up and perpetration of many expressions of trauma, not only in wartime, but also in the build-up to and aftermath of war. They have become central to maintaining social dislocation, destabilization, insecurity and crime in the aftermath of conflict.¹⁹ These arms are misused within domestic settings, as well as in public spaces, and they impact everyone in the community: one way to counter their effects, therefore, is to increase our understanding of the role played by prolific small weapons in reinforcing and maintaining gender-specific expressions of violence before, during and after conflict.

The availability of small arms has ensured that armed conflicts no longer take place in an identifiable combat zone. Indeed, in a number of recent conflicts, the “domestic” sphere—in wartime, a space that is largely inhabited by women, children and elderly, ill or disabled men—has been expressly targeted for violation. Even if people used traditional methods of indicating their neutrality or vulnerability, such as waving a white flag in Kosovo or taking refuge in a church in Rwanda, they were not immune from attack. Terrorist assaults on civilians in civilian spaces are also on the increase, and affect unprecedented numbers of people. The chaos and instability brought about by the large-scale forced movement of civilians has led to extraordinary levels of social disruption.

The portability and utility of light weapons facilitates this spatial change in the waging of war; and in encroaching on civilian space, such weapons have forced us to think differently about who properly constitutes an actor, and who a victim, of war. Easily accessible lethal weapons have meant that

women and children are being drawn into conflicts in new ways, and not only as victims. Indeed, they are becoming adept members of militarized forces and participate actively in the violence of war. These “non-traditional” fighters subvert deeply entrenched traditions about how, and by whom, wars are waged, creating an extraordinary philosophical challenge—as well as a logistical nightmare—for humanitarian and relief agencies seeking to manage the effects of armed conflict.

Contemporary wars have destabilized social and cultural constructs about warfare itself. Such destabilization, particularly because of ready access to SALW, affects power relations between the sexes, changes the way women are afflicted by male violence and contributes to the formation of male and female identities that can be mobilized in support of war.

One of the contradictions of war is that while it poses a significant threat to women, it may also offer them new opportunities to enter the public realm. It cannot be denied that many of the age-old, gendered patterns of victimization that characterize warfare continue unchanged—such as women being exposed to sexualized violence and men being targeted for sex-selective massacre.²⁰ In other arenas, however, there are significant shifts: in particular, broadening technological mass production, which has led to easier to use, lighter and highly durable weapons. This is changing age-old boundaries: it is no longer possible to maintain stereotypes about active, male participants, and passive, female victims in armed conflict. We continue to believe such stereotypes at our peril, as the large number of failed disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes attest.²¹

Fuelled by these lightweight, easily used weapons, numerous wars around the world indicate that armed women and children can kill with as much ease and proficiency as men. Indeed, it might even be argued that the tradition of labelling women and children as “vulnerable” in wartime has given them an increased capability to participate in the new style of waging war because they are less easily identifiable as assailants than men. In this regard, women have proven themselves adept at using popular media stereotypes to their advantage. For example, female suicide bombers in the Palestine–Israeli conflict, far from being invisible and passive, have made their active support for violent solutions devastatingly clear.²² Similarly, in the Chechen attack in Moscow in October 2002, women hostage takers were full participants—although the media seemed willing

only to acknowledge them through their relationship to men, as “the widows of Chechen rebels killed fighting the Russians”.²³

IDENTIFYING THE GENDERED EFFECTS OF SMALL ARMS

Recognizing that male and female identities are destabilized in wartime is not new. What does need to be better understood in the face of increasingly accessible SALW, however, are the implications of this destabilization of roles for the future of humanitarian and peace-building efforts. Despite the extraordinarily diverse impact of small arms, researchers at the Small Arms Survey concluded as recently as 2002 that small arms availability and misuse had yet “to emerge as an issue of specifically humanitarian concern”. They observed that there was no comprehensive humanitarian response to the problem because limited evidence had been collected, “and so awareness of the issue has not taken root”. To overcome this lacuna, the survey suggested that better information should be generated about how small arms affect the lives of citizens, peacekeepers and aid workers, so that a humanitarian perspective that focuses on people’s security and safety would replace the domination of “a disarmament and arms control approach” to the problem. They argued for both “a moral and a practical imperative” to change the direction of small arms research.²⁴ In my view, considering, identifying and articulating how men and women, girls and boys are differently affected by the misuse of small weapons is one of the best ways to achieve this goal.

While it is difficult to state with full confidence who is most badly harmed by readily accessible weapons, we do know that the use and abuse of small arms is experienced differently by men and women, girls and boys everywhere. We also know that very high rates of gun-related injury and death are being recorded in places, both rural and urban, in countries that are relatively peaceful as well as in conflict zones.²⁵

When an effort is made to collect and analyse statistics on gun-related deaths and injuries disaggregated by age, race and gender, they provide increasing evidence of the changing face of warfare and violence perpetrated in non-war settings. Some common elements behind both attitudes to guns and the perpetration of gun violence are beginning to emerge, and what is being revealed is essential to understanding the real locus of the problem of demand and misuse. In a world of increasing private

gun ownership, a significant challenge is being mounted against the cherished realm of the private—the safe haven that has traditionally, in male-dominated societies, been the arena in which the ideal that “tough men” protect “vulnerable women and children” is strongest. The entry of guns into this space belies this belief daily. But gun control legislation, law enforcers and judiciaries still have a long way to go to develop appropriate responses.²⁶

As the problems of demand and misuse become more clearly understood, it becomes more feasible to challenge deeply held gender stereotypes that had justified inaccurate statements in the early days of small arms policy-making, such as, “these weapons have taken a heavy toll of human lives, with women and children accounting for nearly 80 per cent of the casualties.”²⁷ While such a dramatic claim was presumably made in an attempt to draw attention to the destructive power of SALW, its impact was actually to divert attention away from the fact that in war zones and urban slums alike, it is men—young, poor, black men most of all—who are predominantly the perpetrators and victims of gun violence. There has for too long remained an emphasis on women as “vulnerable victims” when, in almost every country, men are killing themselves and others in ever larger numbers with increasingly accessible firearms.²⁸ Statistics show that:

- over 85% of homicide victims with weapons are under the age of 44;²⁹
- over 90% of gun-related homicides occur among men;³⁰ and
- 88% of the accidental shootings that kill about 400 children in the United States each year, and injure another 3,000, involve boys.³¹

I do not cite these statistics to argue that women are not victimized by prolific and uncontrolled weapons. Rather, I use them as a reminder that the difference between men and women in their experience of gun violence occurs because there are no societies on Earth in which women enjoy equality with men, and one of the most egregious iterations of this inequality is in male violence against women. As a result, while not their primary victims, “women suffer disproportionately from firearms violence given that they are almost never the buyers, owners or users of such weapons.”³²

Studies of the murder of women (femicide, or intimate femicide if the perpetrator is a current or former husband or boyfriend, a rejected would-

be lover or a same-sex partner) show that in violent societies, men with access to firearms will use them in deadly displays of their power over women. A growing number of gender-disaggregated studies of firearm-related violence show that women and children are far more likely to be harmed by firearms in countries where guns are seen as necessary commodities than in places where they are strictly controlled.³³

For example, in South Africa, the country with the highest documented rate of intimate femicide in the world, 50.3% of women killed—four women a day, or one every six hours—are murdered by men known intimately by the victim.³⁴ One in five of these women is murdered with a legally owned gun.³⁵ Similar levels of intimate femicide are also being observed in countries such as Guatemala, where “thousands of men carry weapons and are no strangers to extreme violence” and where this phenomenon has become manifest in “an epidemic of violence that has killed more than 1,500 women in under four years”.³⁶ In the United States, the presence of a gun makes it five times more likely that a woman will be killed by her male intimate partner.³⁷

Frighteningly, what these statistics reveal is that high levels of femicide are not unique to countries such as South Africa, which are emerging from years of systematic racialized and sexualized violence. They are, instead, a common phenomenon in societies in which: male violence against women is normalized; there is ready access to small arms; and there is a high level of impunity because of inadequate policing and legal systems that are designed not to challenge or unseat patriarchal power, but to protect it.

We will never know the true extent of the global problem of small arms violence until the collection of gender-disaggregated data is both possible and standardized around the world. It is, however, useful and possible right now to contrast societies in which efforts have been made to connect gun licensing and domestic violence. For example, the Canadian Firearms Act of 1995 prohibits men with previous convictions for domestic assault to own a firearm. In that country, under the new law:

extensive background checks are conducted on every person who applies for a licence. The questions on the firearms application form are directly linked to studies of domestic homicides involving firearms and suicide involving firearms. The studies have identified a number of risk factors: history of violent dispute, history of substance abuse (drugs and

alcohol), existing criminal record, separation or pending separation, depressive illness, employment and financial problems.³⁸

The impacts of the new law have been striking. From 1995 to 2003, when 161 murders in Canada were committed with a firearm, gun-related deaths have steadily declined: the 2003 figures accounted for slightly less than a third (29%) of all homicides. Nonetheless, shootings were still the most common method of killing. Significantly, while more women were killed by men known to them (64%, as opposed to 7% of men being killed by known assailants), Canadian police services reported a particularly dramatic decrease in domestic homicides, 34 fewer than in 2002. This decline was related to a large drop in the number of females killed (50 fewer compared with 2002),³⁹ an effect that the Coalition for Gun Control attributes directly to the new Firearms Act.

Australia offers another interesting example of the (unexpected) gendered consequences of tighter gun control laws. In that country, in response to the April 1996 massacre in Port Arthur (by one man using two high powered semi-automatic rifles), new gun laws were phased in between mid-1996 and mid-1998 across all eight states and territories. These new laws included a prohibition on semi-automatic and pump-action rifles and shotguns and laws prohibiting civilians from owning a range of weapons.

Data collected since then reveal that in Australia laws have contributed to a sharp reduction in gun deaths among both women and men. The impact is, however, more observable in the reduction of women murdered at gunpoint. From 1996 to 2001, the gun homicide rate for women dropped 65%, compared to a 54% drop for men. During the same period, the overall gun death rate for women (including suicides) dropped 56%, compared to a 40% reduction for men.⁴⁰

While showing that guns are particularly dangerous if they are kept in the domestic arena, these studies also prove that the claim that men need guns to protect "their" women and children is nothing more than a myth.⁴¹ They make it clear that, in violent societies, the high prevalence of guns is innately intertwined with culturally condoned expressions of masculinity. For example, in South Africa, researchers found that men who kill their partners do not stand significantly apart from broader society. Instead, it appeared that their peers were able to understand, if not in fact forgive, the

idea that some men should feel provoked to murder their female intimates. In some instances, this response even became a mitigating factor in judging their actions: judicial officers were among those to “subscribe to folk theories of the male mind which assume that it is an unbearable provocation for a man to discover his wife’s infidelity”, to accept that a violent response is understandable in such circumstances, and to temper their sentencing accordingly.⁴²

Another serious concern is that the violence perpetrated against women with the aid of guns does not always kill them immediately, a factor that further complicates efforts to statistically measure the gendered impacts of gun violence.⁴³ It is clear from personal accounts, often years after the event, that women in war zones and “peaceful” communities alike are being raped and otherwise violated at gunpoint. While the enormity of this violence may remain unrevealed because of the difficulties of recording it—or because of a desire and capacity to cover it up, especially in countries with degraded legal systems—eyewitness accounts and field reports attest that it is both common and extremely brutal.⁴⁴ Women are also routinely terrorized by men who threaten them with a weapon, a type of violence that is exceedingly difficult to record or measure.⁴⁵ Women are also burdened as caretakers and caregivers to people who stay alive after armed violence, only to be permanently disabled. The challenges of surviving and caring for survivors are particularly heightened in resource-poor contexts—war zones and degraded urban societies—where interpersonal violence, accessible guns, and overstretched or absent security and judicial systems are lethal norms.

SOCIAL STRUCTURES: EFFECTS AND CHANGE

War violently disrupts political, social and cultural mores: this destruction of values always has particular implications for gender relations, as decades of feminist scholarship has observed.⁴⁶ Small arms play a significant part in the process of social destruction, and their presence has a profound impact on how a society reshapes itself after conflict. Yet international attention has focused in a narrowly instrumental way on supply-related issues, which does not sufficiently promote consideration of the political dimensions of the trade in small arms. Such an approach has the potential only to address some aspects of SALW problems. Multilateral

practitioners must be made aware of this lacuna—gender analysis of SALW is an excellent means to reveal it.

There has also been a tendency to characterize the problem of small arms as one which results from “illicit” or “criminal activity”, with “illegal” guns. Such thinking leads not to meaningful actions to tackle the effects of these weapons and the structural violence in which they are embedded, but to continued vagueness and abstraction, especially about how women’s lives are impacted. As a result, we still live in a world where there is little commitment to understanding the magnitude or scale of the problem, and from which few strategies for combating it can be developed.⁴⁷

A shift in attitude to the impact of SALW, whether they are legitimately owned and subject to legal control or not, is well overdue. Feminists have long questioned the broad tendency to understand violence in a fragmented way that reduces our awareness of it as an egregious social phenomenon, whether it occurs in the domestic sphere or in the arena of war, at the point of a weapon that is legally owned or one that is not.⁴⁸ Feminist responses to violence emphasize that it is not private and individualized, but socially and structurally produced.⁴⁹ From this perspective, an exclusive focus on the high levels of political violence that occur in and after a war, or on the technical problems posed by weapons proliferation, can hide the effects of other violence, often socially sanctioned, which predates war and continues in peacetime.

Because the purpose of most new wars is neither liberation nor social transformation, attitudes which endorse violence as an appropriate response to conflict or stress may not measurably change in the aftermath. In such instances, women’s bodies all too often become the “shock absorbers of the social dislocations which are the legacy of many years of war,” continuing to bear the brunt of militarized conceptions of masculinity long after a war has officially come to an end.⁵⁰ Readily available guns, and social attitudes that tolerate gun ownership and use, significantly contribute to women’s insecurity in a post-war situation.⁵¹

In societies that have become habituated to high levels of aggression, women and other vulnerable members of society continue to bear the brunt of violent acts. This is one reason why gender-aware research on the impacts of small arms proliferation is so important: it is an invaluable means to trace the links between “everyday” violence and the “unspeakable”

extremes of violence seen in conflict situations. Feminist peace researchers would argue that these links derive, to a large extent, from the prevalence of gender ideologies which promote and glorify male superiority and condone its expression through aggression, giving men a form of power over women, children and other “inferior” men that can be readily expressed through physically violating them.⁵² The acknowledgement of this fact lies at the heart of gender-aware peace research, whose purpose, then, is ultimately to challenge ideologies which preserve and support the continuation of violence in all societies—those which are caught up in violent conflict as well as those that are supposedly “at peace”.

Social attitudes implicitly condoning violence against women can only be overcome by concerted action. But to maximize the impact of such action, it should be based on carefully documented evidence, including gendered analysis of how easily available firearms impact on women’s lives. Locally, accurate statistics are vital for the development of new, more far-reaching legislation. That gun laws need to be upgraded within terms that are gender-aware and responsive to the particular needs of women is essential for the peaceful development of a region because, as existing research shows, the most vulnerable members of aggression-prone societies must struggle daily against the effects of a continuum of violence, even in a peacetime context. For women, and often for children, then, it is devastatingly misleading to refer to gun-related trauma as something which happens most frequently in times of violent upheaval, in other words, outside of “normality”. It is also inaccurate to focus on the danger of “illicit” small arms that are used in “criminal” activity, as if gun misuse were not directly correlated to ideologies that support the use of violence, even in the home and even in times of peace.

Evidence shows that distinguishing between the impact of licit and illicit weapons in post-conflict zones characterized by robust gun cultures is, anyway, moot: in the southern African region, it has been proven that firearms used in criminal activities are systematically obtained by taking them from those who first obtained the firearms legally.⁵³ For those who fall victim to such violence, discourses on control that focus on a distinction about how firearms are obtained do little more than “support the process of minimizing and silencing evidence of violence” in their everyday lives.⁵⁴ Easy access to guns, however they are come by, buttresses traditions of militarized masculinity and plays a significant part in the frighteningly high

tolerance of gender-based violence that characterizes many countries in the region.⁵⁵

I have focused, so far, on the ways in which accessible small arms may increase violence against women in the domestic and public spheres. While far more men than women die at the point of a gun around the world, the easy availability of small arms plays a particularly egregious role in maintaining male dominance and facilitating the violence perpetrated against women (and subordinate men) in conflict zones. As I highlighted earlier in this paper, it is inappropriate to treat the impact of weapons proliferation on women as a dichotomy, in which “women are victims” and “men are perpetrators”. Instead, we have to analyse the complex ways in which the widespread presence of guns and other light weapons support ideologies of masculinity and femininity, so that some men retain power, which they can reinforce through violence over all women, children and some men.

In many societies, the bearing of arms carries a significant cultural meaning. It is seen as a right and is interwoven with multiple social rituals, such as a young man’s coming of age. Women’s “proper” role, in such societies, is to support the bearing of arms; but the cultural role played by women in normalizing gun ownership is only infrequently remarked on. In some societies, such as the cattle-raiding Karamojong of Uganda, women actively used to encourage men to use arms in raids as their increased success improved the economic position of the family unit.⁵⁶ In countries such as South Africa, even though “research shows that the gun women (and children) most need to fear, is the one owned by their husband, boyfriend, or father”, some women are helping normalize the increase in privately owned weapons by upholding the belief that their male partner needs a gun to protect them; the same trend can also be seen in the United States.⁵⁷ The role played by women in armed conflicts—whether in Africa or Sri Lanka, by young Palestinian women or by Chechen widows—shows that under the extreme duress of drawn-out insurgency, women are likely to join men in seeking violent solutions to achieve their political goals.

Such attitudes are evidence that women cannot always be characterized as innately peace loving and fundamentally opposed to the presence and use of arms. Women’s responses to weapons, like those of men, are complex: this is why we must improve our knowledge of how women are drawn into the proliferation and normalization of firearms and

gun-related violence, and how they internalize and carry out their supportive role in gun-dominated societies.

While some women will choose to support arms proliferation, some will be key motivators of initiatives to reduce the impact of small arms. This difference is not surprising: women bear the brunt of domestic violence, and the presence of firearms acutely aggravates the likelihood of women dying at the hands of their intimate partners. But women will choose to respond differently to these problems. Some “firearms feminists” insist that carrying a gun is the best form of protection, even though research does not bear out this claim.⁵⁸

By insisting on initiatives to understand the complexity of women’s relationships to small arms, peace activists and gun control lobbyists can take the fullest cognizance of what women are doing to reduce the impact of such weapons. Multilateral practitioners would benefit from such understanding too. Women activists are often key participants in civil society initiatives to build peace. They support efforts to control firearms, work as volunteer counsellors to assist those who are victims of gun violence, create grass-roots community initiatives to help protect children in gang-infested areas, and even run informal witness protection programmes in places where official police support is limited. In most countries, it is women who bear the major burden of caring for those who are injured or disabled by gunfire. Recognizing that children are often involved in gun violence, either intentionally or by accident, women are often at the forefront of firearm education initiatives aimed at youth.⁵⁹

As I have argued, differences in opinion between women as well as between women and men must be taken into account in research on the impacts of small arms. Muggah and Griffiths observe that “the humanitarian costs of small arms are often so systemic, so pervasive, that people do not see them for what they are.”⁶⁰ To this contention I would add the observation that, where women in particular are concerned, the humanitarian costs of small arms are invisible because the gender ideologies that support the situations in which small arms proliferate are invisible. This invisibility impedes the ability of policy makers and multilateral practitioners to frame responses that are appropriate or realistic aids to preventing or curbing SALW-related violence. If we fail to pay proper attention to either the gendered origin of many of the violations committed with small arms, or the gendered impact of such atrocities, we shall negate any positive

benefits that might come from a renewed effort to understand and curtail the proliferation and misuse of small arms from a humanitarian perspective. We shall also undermine local efforts, often spearheaded by women, to control arms in their community, country or region.

GENDER ANALYSIS AS A TOOL THAT HELPS MULTILATERAL NEGOTIATORS

Women's initiatives toward peace-building and violence prevention are often invisible beyond the immediate community they touch, receiving little respect or support in official circles. As Hoogensen and Rottem note:

Security claims cannot be heard from identities that have been enveloped and hidden by the dominant discourse. At the same time, though, women in many different ways have been contradicting the dominant discourse by finding ways to express their identities as women in addition to their other identities. Their experiences exemplify the complexity of life experiences and perspectives that inform their diverse securities.⁶¹

The work of activists within NGOs at the local and international levels is challenging this silencing of experiences; recognizing and boosting women-centred NGOs at the local level could, therefore, have a significant impact on the success of gun control and management efforts instituted by governments and other agencies concerned with disarmament and thus play an important role in the processes of long-term peace-building. Yet at the multilateral level, much work in awareness-raising remains to be done before gender analysis can meaningfully contribute to the reframing of the current SALW policy paradigm.

The full impact of small arms on the lives of women, girls, men and boys can only be lessened if policy makers (including diplomats) and international campaigners support the following actions:

- consult women peacemakers, as well as male leaders, when planning humanitarian interventions designed to reduce violence and build peace;
- ensure that all human rights and development programming draws on research on small arms and gender-based violence, so that

programmes are coherent and able to respond to the problems caused by uncontrolled arms;

- identify and support indigenous arms controls projects, many of which are developed and run by marginal and poorly funded local peace groups;
- facilitate the development of programmes to ensure that strict controls on firearms are enforced by local, national and regional authorities;
- demand that laws underpinning discrimination and violence against women be repealed, and make the repeal of such laws a condition for donor funding;
- request that researchers and project managers collect gender- and age-disaggregated data on firearm injuries and firearm ownership and use, and ensure that they understand the importance of analysing this data through a gender lens;
- ask more questions to better understand the diversity of the attitudes of women, men and children toward small arms. If they support gun control measures, how do they demonstrate this support? If they support gun ownership, how do they express this? How is gun ownership naturalized in a society so that decreasing numbers of people resist their presence? Do men, women and children participate differently in this naturalization process?
- ensure that the perspectives and insights of women, girls and boys have been included before supporting projects designed to reduce small arms proliferation and misuse;
- recognize the interconnectedness of the supply side of small weapons with other forms of violence and human rights abuse: for example, some gun-runners also smuggle women and children to do exploitative and illegal work; some women are involved in running munitions and weapons;
- pay attention to community perspectives on activities related to small arms misuse;
- ask whether men, women and children are differently affected by small arms proliferation in the aftermath of conflicts. This means discovering what each group thinks would make them secure, and how any mechanisms that are in place to protect civilians and demobilized soldiers from easily available guns are understood by the group. It also means finding out whether a culture of firearm ownership for self-protection has begun to arise and, if so, how each group understands this phenomenon;

- analyse resistance to being drawn into arms ownership and misuse: which social actors say no to guns? Why? How can they be supported and protected? and
- recognize that disarmament and arms control processes will only work when the trust and cooperation of *all* social actors is gained. This means impunity for crimes against women and girls, and the exclusion of boys, must end.

The issues raised in this list are intended to help diplomats and campaigners to determine the extent to which a society has adapted itself to living with violent conflict, from which can be ascertained a sense of whether peace and non-violence is possible and desirable. These questions also offer a way to identify activities that arise at the grass roots (such as peace groups or volunteer organizations to counsel victims of gun violence) which are frequently overlooked as peace-building initiatives but have significant potential with proper financial and technical support.

The rhetoric of “gender mainstreaming” has permeated international agreements in recent years, but practical strategies for ensuring that the needs of women and men receive equal attention have been more difficult to implement. However, the pervasiveness of SALW, their ease of use, and their lethal impact on everyone from combatants to innocent passers-by makes this problem an ideal platform from which to institute gender-aware policy, research and activism.

It is imperative that any shift in approach to the small arms problem should avoid the omissions of past disarmament research. There is a serious need to gather data on how different social actors perceive small arms, and use the existing tools to analyse the effects of gender ideologies on attitudes to, and the misuse of, these arms. As a research community, we have excellent theoretical frameworks that show us how to take gender into account, have developed techniques that facilitate gender-aware research, and are increasingly able to produce a gender-disaggregated pool of data on the effects of small arms misuse.

Moreover, in the Beijing Platform for Action, the Windhoek Declaration and Security Council resolution 1325, we have formal avenues through which to hold governments and international agencies responsible for the gender-based violence that small arms underpin.⁶² All of these resources allow analysts and policy makers to focus on identifying the way

in which ideologies of masculinity and femininity are constructed to support the misuse of small arms in societies that are war afflicted, suffering from elevated levels of social violence and/or severe underdevelopment—or merely highly tolerant of the presence of individually owned firearms.

WHOSE EXPERIENCES REALLY COUNT?

Clearly, a greater commitment to gathering gender-disaggregated data on the effects of pervasive small arms is essential, as is an understanding that such data needs to be analysed by gender specialists. Without this work, there is little chance of overcoming the silence about who bears the real costs of small arms proliferation or of changing the social structures that support and perpetuate men's violence against women. However, gathering such data continues to pose a significant challenge (especially in recent war zones in the developing world) where the collection of firearm-related violence is frequently haphazard, collated by hand for the purposes of regional rather than national statistics, and otherwise unsystematic. Queries about firearms-related violence are often met with hostility, and men's violence against women remains a taboo subject in many societies, thus limiting the accuracy of available figures. As a result, any indication of the sex of perpetrators or their victims, along with information about the circumstances in which attacks take place, may only be gleaned through reading between the lines of case notes.

What this lack of information suggests is that civil society organizations involved in gun control should make a particular effort to develop awareness-raising and training models through which to institute a new culture of data collection and analysis. They must emphasize the importance of collecting information on the sex of both the victims and the perpetrators of firearm-related violence. International organizations, governments and local authorities must be lobbied to make the institution of such data-collection practices standard, and seek out expert assistance in examining them. Recording and analysing these figures is arguably the most important first step in challenging the indifference and denial that currently attend cases of gender-based violence. Governments should also consider how they could assist these efforts, financially or otherwise, because the fruits of such research will benefit their understanding and enhance their capacity to respond.

We need to provide a clear picture of the particular suffering women face when guns are pervasive, when people believe a man without a weapon is not a man, and when crimes are mostly reported, judged and punished by men. It is only when we are properly informed about the effects of pervasive small arms that we will be in a position to convince opinion leaders, policy makers and the general public that easily available guns are dangerous to women, compromising their options and freedom of choice and denying them the right to lead a safe and full life, and that women have the right to participate fully in all efforts to control arms. We also need to develop a far better understanding of the ways in which dangerous images of masculinity are upheld in violent societies. The findings of research on demand must reinforce ongoing activism to encourage positive, peaceful expressions of male identity: this is a cornerstone of controlling and managing small arms.

CONCLUSION

Feminist analysis has shown that gender roles are not fixed in stone but are adapted to meet changing social circumstances. It is, therefore, possible to develop a social and political environment that facilitates positive changes in women's status. This insight is as important as its corollary: that environments can be highly detrimental to the safety and security of any group in society, whether men, women, children or the elderly. Gender analysis cannot alone explain the impacts of forms of social exclusions based on race, class or age. These issues need to be taken into consideration because they help explain why the pervasive spread of SALW has detrimental effects that are currently invisible to arms control practitioners.

Both the Windhoek Declaration and Security Council resolution 1325 commit international organizations, governments and civil society to finding ways to help women, old and young, participate meaningfully in peacekeeping efforts and post-war reconstruction. Although neither of these agreements has had the effect of revolutionizing other international protocols on the prevention and resolution of armed conflicts and the management of their aftermath, they are a step in the right direction, sending a powerful signal to the world community that women's essential social contributions have been recognized and must be upheld.

By focusing on individual people and the spaces they inhabit, both physically and in the sense of the roles they play, and explaining some of the ideologies that keep people locked in armed violence, gender analysis makes humanitarian and human security approaches to disarmament more effective. This chapter has argued that “disarmament as humanitarian action” would have clear practical benefits for multilateral practitioners in the SALW context if the real and measurable impacts of gender differences are understood as central to all disarmament work, and are inculcated into our ways of working. At the beginning of the paper, I pointed out that understanding gender ideologies is the first step to understanding interpersonal violence, from which we can move closer to instituting peaceful social transformation. This, surely, is a goal worthy of all multilateral negotiators.

Notes

- ¹ An earlier version of this chapter appeared as an article in *Contemporary Security Policy*, April 2006, pp. 45–59.
- ² For the complete text of the Beijing Declaration, see <www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/platform/declar.htm>.
- ³ For a detailed discussion of international agreements on women and conflict, and on small arms, see Vanessa A. Farr, “A Gendered Analysis of International Agreements on Small Arms and Light Weapons”, in Vanessa Farr and Kiflemariam Gebre-Wold (eds), *Gender Perspectives on Small Arms and Light Weapons: Regional and International Concerns*, Bonn: Bonn International Center for Conversion (BICC), Brief 24, July 2002.
- ⁴ See “Theme Four—Women, Men and Gun Violence: Options for Action”, in *Missing Pieces: Directions for Reducing Gun Violence Through the UN Process on Small Arms Control*, Geneva: Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, July 2005.
- ⁵ UN Security Council resolution 1325, adopted by the Security Council on 31 October 2000, at <www.un.org/events/res_1325e.pdf>.
- ⁶ The Small Arms Survey estimates that nearly 60% of weapons are in private hands. See Small Arms Survey, *Small Arms Survey 2002: Counting the Human Cost*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- ⁷ See Emily Schroeder and Lauren Newhouse, *Gender and Small Arms: Moving Into the Mainstream*, Institute for Security Studies, Monograph

-
- no. 104, October 2004, for a discussion on the lack of analysis of gender in small arms-related UN discussions, even up to the 2003 Biennial Meeting of States on Small Arms and the Programme of Action.
- ⁸ Several accounts of gun violence against women that has gone unpunished are recorded in *The Impact of Guns on Women's Lives*, produced for the Control Arms Campaign by Amnesty International, the International Action Network on Small Arms and Oxfam International, Oxford: The Alden Press, 2005; also see <www.controlarms.org>.
- ⁹ For some examples of this discourse, see Katherine von Tour, "My Transformation From Anti-Gun Feminist To Armed Feminist", 1999, at <www.gunowners.org/wv06.htm>, and Mary Zeiss Stange, "No More Raping: When Some Women Are Armed, Are All of Us Safer?" in *Women's Review of Books, Special Issue: Women, War, and Peace*, Wellesley Centers for Women, Wellesley College, February 2004, p. 12, at <www.wellesley.edu/womensreview/backiss.html#feb04>.
- ¹⁰ V. Farr, 2002, op. cit., p. 17.
- ¹¹ A global survey is underway in a book on the gendered implications of small arms and light weapons, edited by Vanessa Farr and Albrecht Schnabel, Tokyo: United Nations University (forthcoming).
- ¹² See Mandy Turner, Jeremy Ginifer and Lionel Cliffe, *The Impact of Armed Violence on Poverty and Development. Full Report of the Armed Violence and Poverty Initiative*, Department of Peace Studies, Centre for International Cooperation and Security (CICS), University of Bradford, March 2005, at <www.brad.ac.uk/acad/cics/publications/AVPI/assessment/AVPI_Full_Report.pdf>.
- ¹³ See, for one example of documentation of this violence, *The War Within the War: Sexual Violence Against Women and Girls in Eastern Congo*, New York/Washington, DC: Human Rights Watch, June 2002.
- ¹⁴ See Vanessa Farr, "The New War Zone: The Ubiquitous Presence of Guns and Light Weapons Has Changed The Definitions of 'War', 'Victim', And 'Perpetrator'", in *Women's Review of Books*, op. cit., p. 16.
- ¹⁵ See, for one account of this problem, Joshua S. Goldstein, *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- ¹⁶ See Catherine Lutz, "Living Room Terrorists: Rates of Domestic Violence Are Three to Five Times Higher Among Military Couples Than Civilian Ones", in *Women's Review of Books*, op. cit. The National

- Center for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder within the US Department of Veterans Affairs also offers a wealth of information on this subject. See <www.ncptsd.va.gov>.
- ¹⁷ Quoted in Vanessa Farr, "How Do We Know We Are at Peace? Reflections on the Aftermath Conference", *Agenda*, vol. 43, 2000, p. 24.
- ¹⁸ See Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, 2005, op. cit.; and Control Arms Campaign, 2005, op. cit.
- ¹⁹ For a recent global survey on the links between armed violence and poverty, which includes some results of gendered impacts, see the finding of the Armed Violence and Poverty Initiative (AVPI), a research programme conducted by the CICS, University of Bradford, <www.brad.ac.uk/acad/cics/publications/AVPI/>.
- ²⁰ See the findings of AVPI, University of Bradford, 2005.
- ²¹ For case studies, see Vanessa Farr, "Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration: Where do Women Stand?", in Marie Vlachová and Lea Biason (eds), *Women in an Insecure World: Violence against Women—Facts, Figures and Analysis*, Geneva: Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, 2005, pp. 193–200; Sarah Douglas, Vanessa Farr, Felicity Hill, et al., *Getting it Right, Doing it Right: Gender and Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration*, New York: United Nations Development Fund for Women, October 2004; Vanessa Farr, "Gendering Demilitarization as a Peacebuilding Tool", Bonn: BICC Paper 20, also at <www.bicc.de/publications/papers/paper20/paper20.pdf>, June 2002.
- ²² Mia Bloom, "Mother. Daughter. Sister. Bomber", *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, November/December 2005, vol. 61, no. 6, pp. 54–62.
- ²³ Nick Paton Walsh and Jonathan Steele, "Chechens Seize Moscow Theatre", *Mail & Guardian* (Cape Town), 15 October 2001, pp. 25–31.
- ²⁴ Robert Muggah and Martin Griffiths, *Reconsidering the Tools of War: Small Arms and Humanitarian Action*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002, p. 1–2; see also Small Arms Survey, 2002, op. cit.
- ²⁵ See accounts in Control Arms Campaign, 2005, op. cit.; V. Farr and K. Gebre-Wold, 2002, op. cit.; and V. Farr, 2004, op. cit.
- ²⁶ See Control Arms Campaign, 2005, op. cit., chapters 7 and 8, pp. 50–63.
- ²⁷ The UN Secretary-General included this statistic in his foreword to the *Report of the Panel of Governmental Experts on Small Arms*, General Assembly document A/52/298, 27 August 1997, p. 2.

-
- ²⁸ World Health Organization (WHO), *Small Arms and Global Health*, Geneva: WHO, 2001; and Etienne G. Krug, Linda L. Dahlberg, James A. Mercy, et al. (eds), *World Report on Violence and Health*, Geneva: WHO, 2002, pp. 372, available at <www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/violence/world_report/en/full_en.pdf>.
- ²⁹ Small Arms Survey, *Rights at Risk*, Geneva: Oxford University Press, 2004, p. 180.
- ³⁰ WHO, 2002, op. cit., pp. 274–75.
- ³¹ See <www.cnn.com/2001/HEALTH/parenting/06/04/boys.guns/>.
- ³² Control Arms Campaign, 2005, op. cit., p. 2.
- ³³ Wendy Cukier, “Gendered Perspectives on Small Arms Proliferation and Misuse: Effects and Policies”, in V. Farr and K. Gebre-Wold, 2002, op. cit., pp. 25–39; David Hemenway, Tomoko Shinoda-Tagawa and Matthew Miller, “Firearm Availability and Female Homicide Victimization Rates Among 25 Populous High-Income Countries”, *Journal of the American Medical Women's Association*, vol. 57, no. 2, Spring 2002, pp. 100–104; Katharine McKenzie, *Domestic Gun Control Policy in Ten SADC Countries*, Johannesburg: Gun Free South Africa, September 1999.
- ³⁴ Data was collected on women over 14 years of age who were killed in 1999.
- ³⁵ Shanaaz Mathews, Naeemah Abrahams, Lorna J. Martin, et al., “Every Six Hours a Woman is Killed by her Intimate Partner”: A National Study of Female Homicide in South Africa, Johannesburg: Medical Research Council Policy Brief no. 5, June 2004, pp. 1–4.
- ³⁶ Adam Blenford, “Guatemala’s Epidemic of Killing”, BBC News, World Edition, 9 June 2005; at <news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/4074880.stm>.
- ³⁷ Jacquelyn C. Campbell, Daniel Webster, Jane Koziol-McLain, et al., “Risk Factors for Femicide in Abusive Relationships: Results from a Multisite Case Control Study”, *American Journal of Public Health*, vol. 93, no. 7, July 2003, pp. 1089–97.
- ³⁸ For more information, see the web site of the Coalition for Gun Control, Canada, at <www.guncontrol.ca/Content/default-english.htm>, particularly the section on domestic violence.
- ³⁹ <www.statcan.ca/Daily/English/040929/d040929a.htm>.
- ⁴⁰ Jenny Mouzos and Catherine Rushforth, “Firearm Related Deaths in Australia, 1991–2001”, *Trends & Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology, no. 269, November 2003, in *Missing Pieces: Directions for Reducing Gun Violence Through*

- the UN Process on Small Arms Control*, Geneva: Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, July 2005.
- ⁴¹ Barbara Frey, "Progress Report on the Prevention of Human Rights Violations Committed With Small Arms and Light Weapons", Economic and Social Council document E/CN.4/Sub.2/2004/37 of 21 June 2004; A.L. Kellerman, F.P. Rivara, G. Somes, et al., "Suicide in the Home in Relation to Gun Ownership", *New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 327, no. 7, 1992, pp. 467–72; Lisa Vetten, "'Man Shoots Wife': Intimate Femicide in Gauteng, South Africa", *Crime and Conflict*, vol. 6, Winter 1996, pp. 1–4.
- ⁴² L. Vetten, 1996, op. cit.
- ⁴³ Many raped women will later die of their injuries or of HIV/AIDS. The rape of men is rarely admitted. For a discussion of the long-term impacts of war rape in Bosnia and Herzegovina, see Duska Andrić-Ružičić, "War Rape and the Political Manipulation of Survivors", in Wenona Giles, Malathi de Alwis, Edith Klein, et al. (eds), *Feminists Under Fire*, Toronto: Between the Lines, 2003, chapter 8.
- ⁴⁴ See the Human Rights Watch Report, *The War Within the War: Sexual Violence Against Women and Girls in Eastern Congo*, New York/Washington, DC: Human Rights Watch, June 2002; Jesper Strudsholm, "Please Make These People Disappear", *The Sunday Independent* (Johannesburg), 19 September 2004, p. 15.
- ⁴⁵ This statement is based on personal testimonies I have heard in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Sudan, Uganda, Liberia and Sierra Leone. The problem is by no means confined to African war zones: the Coalition for Gun Control reports that in Canada, "on average, a woman is assaulted thirty times before a formal complaint is filed", <www.guncontrol.ca/Content/DomesticViolence.html>. Given that Canada has a highly functional police and judiciary service, it is frightening to consider how much more difficult it is for women in less developed countries to report intimate assault.
- ⁴⁶ For some recent discussions, see Sarah Douglas, Vanessa Farr, Felicity Hill, et al., 2004, op. cit.; Control Arms Campaign, 2005, op. cit.; Ruth Seifert, *War and Rape: Analytical Approaches*, Geneva: Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1993, also available at <www.wilpf.int.ch/publications/1992ruthseifert.htm>.
- ⁴⁷ R. Muggah and M. Griffiths, 2002, op. cit., p. 7. See also the Amnesty International campaign *Stop Violence Against Women*, which is attempting to bring to global attention the massive scale of such violence <web.amnesty.org/actforwomen/index-eng>.

-
- ⁴⁸ Cynthia Cockburn, *The Space Between Us: Negotiating Gender and National Identities in Conflict*, London/New York: Zed Books, 1998, pp. 247; Margaret Randolph Higonnet, Jane Jenson, Sonya Michel, et al., (eds), *Behind the Lines: Gender and the Two World Wars*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1987, pp. 308; V. Farr, 2004, op. cit.
- ⁴⁹ Jenny Horsman, *Too Scared to Learn: Women, Violence and Education*, Toronto: McGilligan Books, 1999; Susie M. Jacobs, Ruth Jacobson, Jen Marchbank, et al., (eds), *States of Conflict: Gender, Violence and Resistance*, London/New York: Zed Books; Bernadette Muthien, "Human Security Paradigms through a Gendered Lens", *Agenda*, vol. 43, 2000, pp. 46–56.
- ⁵⁰ Jacklyn Cock, "Closing the Circle: Towards a Gendered Understanding of War and Peace", The African Gender Institute, *Newsletter*, vol. 8, July 2001, available at <web.uct.ac.za/org/agi/pubs/newsletters/vol8/circle.htm>.
- ⁵¹ Control Arms Campaign, 2005, op. cit.; V. Farr and K. Gebre-Wold, 2002 op. cit., p. 35; L. Vetten, 1996, op. cit.
- ⁵² See Ingeborg Breines, Robert Cornell and Ingrid Eide (eds), *Male Roles, Masculinities and Violence: A Culture of Peace Perspective*, Paris: UNESCO Publishing, Cultures of Peace Series, May 2000.
- ⁵³ Antony Altbeker and Jolene Adams, "Are South Africans Responsible Firearm Owners? Evidence from 1,000 Dockets", Johannesburg: Gun Free South Africa, 2000; K. McKenzie, 1999, op. cit.
- ⁵⁴ J. Horsman, 1999, op. cit., p. 292.
- ⁵⁵ J. Cock, 2001, op. cit.; Heidi Hudson, "A Feminist Reading of Security in Africa", Institute for Security Studies, Monograph no. 20, February 1998, pp. 22–98; Tina Sideris, "Rape in War and Peace: Some Thoughts on Social Context and Gender Roles", *Agenda*, vol. 43, pp. 41–45; Meredith Turshen and Clotilde Twagiramariya (eds), *What Women Do in Wartime: Gender and Conflict in Africa*, London/New York: Zed Books, 1998.
- ⁵⁶ Ruth Ojambo Ochieng, "A Gendered Reading of the Problems and Dynamics of Small Arms and Light Weapons in Uganda: A Public Health Approach", in V. Farr and K. Gebre-Wold, 2002, op. cit., pp. 60–71; Control Arms Campaign, 2005, op. cit.; but see Christina Yeung, *Disarmament, a Battle of the Sexes: Gender Perspectives on Small Arms Proliferation and Disarmament in Karamoja, Uganda*, forthcoming, for an analysis of how women's attitudes have changed as gun violence worsens.

- ⁵⁷ For South Africa, see Adele Kirsten, "White Men with Weapons", in V. Farr and K. Gebre-Wold, 2002, op. cit., p. 35; for the United States, see M. Stange, 2004, op. cit.
- ⁵⁸ In the United States, research conducted by James Scott of George Washington University Hospital revealed that guns bought by women for their protection are being turned against them. For every woman who bought a gun for self-defence, 239 more women were murdered, many with their own gun. Jeremy Campbell, "Risks to Women Who Buy Guns for Defence", *Evening Standard* (London), 16 August 1994. For a pro-women's gun ownership argument, see M. Stange, 2004, op. cit.
- ⁵⁹ V. Farr, 2002, op. cit.; Control Arms Campaign, 2005, op. cit.
- ⁶⁰ R. Muggah and M. Griffiths, 2002, op. cit., p. 25
- ⁶¹ Gunhild Hoogensen and Svein Vigeland Rottem, "Gender Identity and the Subject of Security", *Security Dialogue*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2004, p. 165.
- ⁶² Available at <www.unesco.org/webworld/fed/temp/communication_democracy/windhoek.htm>.