Human Security Post 9-11:
Gender Perspectives and Security Exclusion

Ian GIBSON

Abstract

Global and national security systems have been the root cause of many violations of human rights and civil liberties and there has been a call for more effective systems of security, one of the most recently proposed has been human security. While many academics have sought to question the emerging field of human security and its place in international relations, it is interesting to note that many further disregard any feminist concepts in the debate. Leading feminist proponents of human security such as Dr. Betty A. Reardon and Dr. Kozue Akibayashi have been strong commentators on this "exclusion" of feminist perspectives from the argument. This paper will seek to explain the concepts of security, the problems threatening security such as 21st Century Terrorism, and the emergence of human security. This paper will then focus on the aforementioned exclusion of women from human security, areas of political representation, and political voice, highlighting the threats to their own security and showing why these factors do not grant them meaningful security or human rights.

Introduction

"Expectations and conditions of well-being" are cited as defining areas for human security as opposed to restrictions imposed on the people by "traditional" security. For whom is this traditional security supposed to protect? – state security is security for the state, by the state, which allows states "to violate the rights of its citizens without international interference" (Reardon, 1996:31). Patriarchy, an unwelcome word in feminist perspectives of world organization, has determined that women should be at the bottom of state security needs and who, according to

Senior Lecturer, College of International Relations, Ritsumeikan University, Kyoto, Japan.

Reardon, "suffer more of the effects of deprivation and multiple forms of violence which characterize the state system" (Ibid., 31). This has also led to an "exclusion of women's perspectives of public issues and women's experience of maintaining quotidian, fundamental human security" which is a "major obstacle to policy making for comprehensive, authentic human security." (Ibid., 31) Moreover an overlooked fact, which has to be further addressed in human security, is that women clearly have different approaches to protection needs than men.

The present system of security post 9-11 in many liberal imperialist states is based on invulnerability, that is the elimination of others to one's own advantage, and it is the state, and not the citizenry for whom invulnerability is sought. Furthermore in countries like Japan where security provided by U.S. forces in Okinawa has led to numerous incidences of attacks on women since the end of the Second World War, the question again arises who is being protected and who is this security for? Plainly for human security to be a meaningful alternative it needs to address this question head on and encompass gender perspectives in its guiding principles.

Security Perceptions

Security should be an expectation of well-being and communities should decide on security as a means of dealing with crisis. Once more the question must be posed, who is security for and how can conditions for meaningful security be achieved? The flawed concept of invulnerability perpetuated by states merely creates negative security but if the most vulnerable are made secure then undoubtedly we have human security.

Security should keep people from killing people and protect all citizens, instill trust, provide medical services and mechanisms for communication and cooperation. It should also assure credibility for people and be able to show adaptability and prevent threats from non-state actors. There should also be legal mechanisms for mediating conflict. Security should be comprehensive with a global system approach; its consequences have to be seen to be fair and based on normative values – values that are specific. It should also be functional with procedural and institutional needs and effectiveness.

Multiple alternatives that arise to the question of what is meaningful security also need considerations on other perspectives such as culture and economics. As Boutros Boutros-Ghali notes, the deepest causes of conflict are "economic despair, social injustice and political oppression" (Boutros Boutros-

Ghali, 1992:8). Security concerns must also acknowledge different parties but at the same time there is the recurring problem that power tries to maintain and replicate itself.

In a prescriptive field there should be ideas for solution and changes that seriously address the alternatives of security, whether policy orientated or practical in political terms. This of course requires education. Usually security is left to defense departments, and citizens are convinced that these issues are beyond them by both governments and the media. There should be a transparency of security and a value of responsibility to act – citizens are likely to take responsibility if they feel equipped with the necessary skills.

Issues of security should therefore be shared whether in citizen values or in negotiation between different groups of citizens, but it must be noted here that contended values lead to disputes and conflicts where groups or individuals assert their own opinion.

So what is a perfect security system? And here there are important questions to be considered and addressed; Reardon herself in her courses at Teacher's College, Columbia University, often poses these questions for her students – What are the practical policies for peacekeeping? Does it empower the population to be able to live as they please without impugning the rights of others to do the same and include future generations as well? Are the mechanisms complimentary or contradictory? Is it practical? Is it feasible? Does the system meet the basic needs of people? Is equality assured by the proposed system? Does it protect the environment? Is participation in decision-making processes assured? Does the system build trust? Is there an agency for communication? Is the proposal sustainable? Does it allow for personal freedom restrained only by the rights of others? Does the system respect cultural diversity? Is the system itself complimentary or contradictory? Is there access to mediation processes?

Questions like these arise from perceiving the overwhelming threats to people's security both within nation states and from forces threatening nation states and there has been no greater threat to security at the beginning of the 21st century than that of terrorism, arising most infamously from the terrorist attacks on the United States that took place on the morning of September 11th 2001. However while commentators have stood in line to explain the whys and wherefores as to the reason behind these attacks, and political leaders have strengthened their political resolve to be strong on terrorism in all its forms, it is first important to analyze just what is meant by the term terrorism.

States vs. Terrorism or Terrorist States? The Blurring of Language

Much has been talked about on the subject of the "war on terrorism" post 9-11. Such an abstract and nebulous term begs the question who are the terrorists and who is waging war on whom? The highly regarded political commentator and professor of linguistics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Noam Chomsky, cites as an example the U.S. Immigration and Nationality Act of 1996 which defines terrorist activity as "any activity which is unlawful under the laws of the place where it is committed" (Chomsky, 2002:123). Unlawful activity has been deemed by states as any action acted upon that state to the detriment of the state, but how about unlawful actions by states on other states? And while the U.S. administration post 9-11 has been quick to declare war on terrorism and terrorists, supported by other compliant governing bodies, it is important to remember actions by such state administrations that could also fall under the term "terrorism".

Chomsky in his own particular crusade against cant controversially cites numerous incidences where U.S. administrations could also be labeled under the term "terrorists". The 1965 U.S. backed army in Indonesia organized "the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of people, mostly landless peasants, in a massacre that the CIA compared to the crimes of Hitler, Stalin and Mao." (Ibid., 67). In Nicaragua during the 1980s, when Reagan was the U.S. president, the country suffered "violent assault by the U.S." where "tens of thousands died." (Ibid., 24). In response Nicaragua called for support in the U.N. after a ruling by the World Court, which ordered the U.S. to desist its activities and pay substantial reparations. After the U.S. refused, Nicaragua approached the Security Council, which considered a resolution asking for states to observe international law. "The U.S. alone vetoed it" (Ibid., 25) and when Nicaragua sought assistance in the General Assembly the U.S., with only Israel supporting, opposed a similar resolution two years in a row.

As Chomsky relates, the Reagan administration planned campaigns of international terrorism that "were extraordinary in scale and destruction, even leading to a World Court condemnation of the U.S. while lending their support to innumerable others" (Ibid., 68) as for example in the case of southern Africa where a million and a half people were killed by Western-backed South African depredations, and "caused $60 billion of damage during the Reagan years alone." (Ibid., 68).

The 90s saw no let up in these unlawful acts of state terrorism. Under the

Clinton administration the U.S. launched air strikes on the Al-Shifa pharmaceutical plant in Sudan in August 1998. When Sudan sought U.N. inquiry into the attack it was blocked by Washington. A year after the attack "without the lifesaving medicine (the destroyed facilities) produced, Sudan's death toll from the bombing continued to rise" where according to Chomsky, "tens of thousands of people - many of them children - have suffered and died from malaria, tuberculosis, and other treatable diseases" (Ibid., 48) medicine for which was produced at Al-Shifa, and not supposedly chemical weapons, the reason for the attack. As Chomsky notes, "what would the reaction have been if the bin Laden network had blown up half the pharmaceutical supplies in the U.S. and the facilities for replenishing them?" (Ibid., 45).

Chomsky is very clear in his thrust. States are just as culpable as groups in so called "terrorist activities". The U.S. and U.K. administrations flaunted international law in their assault on Iraq, causing an estimated 10,000 casualties of innocent men, women, and children from initial air strikes and bombardments alone. The activities of the USSR under Stalin certainly wrought great tragedy on their own people. The USSR was very much a terrorist state being responsible for the deaths of thousands of people in labor camps misguidedly in the name of an Enlightenment German philosopher. These ideological struggles were also echoed in China under Mao during the Chinese famine of 1958-1961, where one can only speculate as to the reasoning behind the personal orders of Mao that led to the deaths of tens of millions of people.

Questions remain. Is terrorism group led or state led? Moreover who exactly are terrorists? – We have as examples the ex-president of South Africa, Nelson Mandela who was branded a terrorist by the South African regime and the British Government. We also have The Stern Gang and its member Yitzhak Shamir, who became a future prime minister of Israel. In this case, unlawful terrorist led activities achieved legitimate independence and the recognition of the State of Israel. Chechnyan separatists are labeled terrorists by the Russian Federation but Russia in turn has destroyed Chechnyan cities resulting in many innocent deaths of citizens. Israel has labeled many Palestinians terrorists and yet used helicopter gunships to kill innocent civilians. Is the use of the army in these two cases here legitimate where attacks carried out by civilians, terrorism? Were members of the French Resistance in the Second World War terrorists while the Nazi state was legitimate? Of course not, but moral judgment depends on who is doing the moralizing.

Language and definitions blur but we can be in no doubt that no matter the

ideological cause, terrorism and terrorists targeting civilian populations operate in a way that deprives dignity from people. Terrorism is all about humiliation and fear and terrorists oppose values that other people uphold because, rightly or wrongly, they abhor these values.

The need for security from terrorism whether state organized or group organized has never been more necessary. In the cases of the U.K. and the U.S. administrations, these have put their trust in militarized state security and yet this form of state security has undermined the basic security of the people. By adopting aggressive stances against Islam these administrations have helped opposition group recruitment to soar and so greatly increased the chances of attacks upon their nations.

Post 9-11, human rights have been revoked in places like Guantanamo Bay in Cuba where Amnesty International have raised objections that the U.S. government's treatment of prisoners, seized in Afghanistan for having alleged links with the Taliban and terrorism, violate international law for the treatment of prisoners of war. Further incidences in Iraq in 2004 carried out by low ranking military personnel on prison detainees also incurred international condemnation. Military statements that these personnel were not familiar with the Geneva Convention on the protection of victims of war were met with incredulity. Did these admissions own up to a lack of education in their troops, a lack of discipline, or just a lack of respect for common law and fundamental human rights?

Moreover in the name of state security surveillance techniques by security forces such as the routine stop and search of minority groups has meant a convenient increase in government control and once again a diminishing of human rights. It is interesting to note that following the horrific events in the Beslan school in Russia in September 2004 allegedly instigated by a Chechnyan separatist group, leaving 300 people dead, the Russian premier Vladimir Putin was swift to seize the political initiative and declare that he alone would nominate regional governors, tightening the Kremlin's grip on Russian local politics.

Challenges to Traditional Security post 9-11

9-11 brought the question of state and citizen security into sharp relief. Intelligence services in the United States were unable to coordinate adequately enough to prevent these heinous attacks and the subsequent approval of the Department of Homeland Security by Congress in late 2002 was certainly a case of shutting the stable door several years too late. In terms of Homeland Security in

the U.S. certain minority groups have certainly felt their own security and human rights severely endangered by measures introduced by the Bush administration, namely the recent practice of Racial Profiling where "many Muslims and people of Middle Eastern and South Asian descent have become targets of workplace, housing, and law enforcement discrimination in the wake of September 11 and other terrorist attacks abroad." (Critical Policy Choices 2004, p17).

Traditional state security involves trained security forces such as the police, the army, navy, air force and intelligence services. Attempts at global collective security systems throughout the 20th Century have seen the League of Nations formed after the First World War and the United Nations after the Second World War. States have also by joint agreements of shared defense formed security alliances such as NATO and the Warsaw Pact. However powers often disagree and often don't support each other. One alliance member dominates power and causes an imbalance. This does not always ensure security as in the case of Poland in the Second World War.

State systems and collective security systems such as NATO also rely on heavy weapon stockpiling and deployment in order to maintain control. Arms spending supports economic systems and depend on these models of security. It is something of a paradox to note that contained in the predominant global security system, namely the Security Council of the U.N., are the top three armament suppliers in the world, the U.S. the U.K. and France whose weapons ironically have been deployed with devastating effect against each other. A case in point being the French Exocet missile in the Falklands War, which deployed by Argentinean forces, destroyed the British naval vessel, the Sheffield as well as British warplanes. Often allied nations are culpable in attacks on each other, as reports of "friendly fire" in the Gulf War and the Iraq War have shown.

Since the Second World War and the expansion of atomic weapons with their terrible implications for humanity, people have called for a reduction of nuclear weapons and for them to be put under more closely monitored control. Other measures proposed have been a stronger global collective security like the influential Clark Sohn Plan where all states become members of this system and which assures a more representative balance of power between states. Here Clark Sohn proposed a minimum number of troops in a country where forces are built on quotas and called for international law to be strengthened.

As can be seen from the 2003 Iraq war, countries don't always support this rule of law and some countries are deemed more worthy than others for security assistance. For instance Kuwait received international help in the 1990s whereas

Rwanda didn't. A suggestion mooted for the reason Kuwait receiving aid was that Kuwait was a nation of valuable recourses and Rwanda was an impoverished country with no recourses worth exploiting.

As well as many nation states opposing the strengthening of International Law, another objection to the Clark Sohn plan was that major powers also worried about too many soldiers coming from smaller powers and therefore were concerned about relinquishing control. This has also been a criticism of the states that form the power base of the U.N. Security Council, which comprises the victorious Second World War nations. Of course power is still state based and countries do not want to renounce this right but at the same time there is a need, especially in recommendations like the work of the Commission of Human Security, (discussed later) that power should be more local and community based and at the same time there should be a shift of country defense to world defense, where a system of collective security would lead to a prevention and reduction of arms.

Alternative Measures to State Led Security?

In response to the failings of many state systems to protect people other theories of alternative security measures have been put forward such as "nonprovocative defense, civil-based defence and qualitative disarmament" (Hollins et al. 1989:78). Nonprovocative defense or protection without threat is concerned with the unnecessarily threatening and provocative nature of nuclear deterrence, "strategists seek to reassert the vanishing distinction between defense and offense, protection and threat" (Ibid.,78). By eliminating all mechanisms that are used for attack, nations are able to remove the threat that fuels the arms race. This system uses many kinds of weapons and strategic plans such as those utilized by the Swiss army, a small army that relies on a civilian militia where arms are kept at home and light vehicles are used, suitable for mountain defense.

Civil-based defense (CBD) coined by the theorist Gene Sharp is a non-violent security system, which rejects all use of arms and instead relies on planned civilian resistance to any outward threat of force. Examples of this were the Czech resistance to the Soviets in Prague in 1968, Poland's Solidarity movement in the 1980s, and the Philippine revolution of 1986. Strategies such as protest and persuasion with marches or strikes would render a nation ungovernable and raises the costs of aggression to a level that does not justify the expense by an invading nation.

Qualitative disarmament was formulated by the military strategist B.H.

Liddel Hart and was approved by President Hoover and later President Roosevelt together with the majority of nations at the Geneva Disarmament Conference in 1932. This is regarded as being an essentially top down approach to security calling for a reduction of arms such as nuclear weapons and making armies essentially non aggressive, leaving only a defense system in place. Mikhail Gorbachev proposed his "comprehensive system of international security" in Pravda on September 16, 1987 "extending the sphere of common security well beyond military and political arrangements to include economic, ecological, and humanitarian considerations." (Hollins et al. 1989:70). The Japanese Self Defense force can be seen as an example of this where the "basic national defense policy of Japan is to deter any aggression against Japan through a versatile defense system consisting of Japan's own moderate defense forces" (Defense of Japan 2002 Urban Connections p108).

Japan having renounced war after the Second World War has been instrumental in supporting the Commission of Human Security (CHS), which is co-chaired by Sadako Ogata, Scholar-in-Residence at the Ford Foundation and former United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and Amartya Sen, Master, Trinity College, Cambridge, and Nobel Laureate in Economics, 1998. In the introduction to the most comprehensive distillation of human security so far, the Commission's report of 2003 states, "Human Security complements state security, enhances human rights and strengthens human development. It seeks to protect people against a broad range of threats to individuals and communities and further, to empower them to act on their own behalf." (CHS, p. 2)

The Commission's report raises many questions. What are the distinctions between military as realist security concepts and policies of those of human security? What are the respective securities priorities and what threat does each prioritize? What assumptions do Ogata and Sen make about the sources and causes of political and armed conflict? What are the institutional requirements of each? Does a human security framework call for institutional change?

The answer to the last question is most certainly yes, the most logical solution would be a strengthening of the powers of the UN. If so though, how could this be implemented in the wake of the current United States administration's criticism of too much U.N. power? Furthermore, what are the roles, responsibilities and possibilities for education? The buzzwords these days of "empowerment" and "empowering people" can only be brought about by meaningful education, and for education to be meaningful then it must be engendered which will be dealt with in more detail later.

Emerging Human Security

Human security can be interpreted as a form of Citizen Power vs. National Power. Human security is concerned with safeguarding and expanding people's vital freedoms. It requires both shielding people from acute threats and empowering people to take charge of their own lives. It looks at conflict and poverty, post conflict, migration, economic security, knowledge, skills and values. Security here is centered on people and not states and it strengthens human development. Credibility of the state in these times is being questioned and many people distrust the state's motives both in its intervention into their private lives and its actions on their behalf internationally. People are conscious of the fact that they are being held hostage to protect state security needs and their own security needs are being ignored.

Menaces to people's security include threats and conditions that have not always been classified as threats to state security such as pollution, environmental hazards, disease and poverty. Because of these disregarded problems calls have been made in civilian circles to create political, social, environmental, economic, military and cultural systems that together empower people. This means there must be better access to areas and frameworks such as education, health and cooperative loans.

Human security acknowledges these pressing issues and is itself directly concerned with violent conflict. It asks for disarmament, handgun and small arms control. It underlines basic education, but also education that is safe and strengthens civil society, the focus being away from glorifying war in textbooks where state run textbooks center on glorious battles won with no concern for the unwritten horror, suffering and deprivation that occurred throughout these events.

There is moreover a connection between poverty, deprivation and violent conflict. War destroys crops and economic aspects, roads, banks and habits of trust. Post conflict resolutions often focus on short-term political goals, meaningless calls for democracy or the instigation of puppet governments, as in the case of the one in Iraq installed in 2004, which often jeopardize economic growth and development.

Human security pays attention to "downside risks" insecurity that threatens people in daily life. These downturns should be addressed and responded to with meaningful security. Human security proposes perfect obligations to compliment human rights. Human security helps identify gaps in the infrastructure, it is

bottom up instead of top down and it builds public space that tolerates opposition. It recognizes that the world is more interdependent than before and that all societies depend on acts or omissions of others for the security of their people.

It is therefore proposed through these ideas that we should form moral obligations to others. The emphasis should be on creating and maintaining viable access to food and water. Critics of globalization point to the unfair distribution of resources. The eco-feminist Vandana Shiva observes that, "Globalization is a violent system, imposed and maintained through use of violence. As trade is elevated above human needs the insatiable appetite of global markets for resources is met by unleashing new wars over resources." (Shiva, 2001:136). Borders have become meaningless in globalization, a worrying development for some in the last two decades, because leading from this there has been a rise in transnational crime such as arms and drug running and the trafficking of people as exploited workers in industry, agriculture and the burgeoning sex trade.

There have therefore been calls for more multilateral strategies that focus on shared responsibilities to protect people with a strengthening of humanitarian action – respecting human rights and humanitarian laws, disarming people, and fighting crime. All actors should recognize the responsibility to rebuild in post conflict situations. There should be quicker mobilization of construction, and more development recourses are needed. Moreover in post conflict there is a need to create truth and reconciliation commissions such as those carried out in South Africa after apartheid.

In terms of economic security for people, three situations of economic insecurity can be identified that impair human security. We find that economic recourses are insufficient. There are unstable economic flows and also asset losses with insufficient market controls. The market must enhance people's freedoms by diverse institutions as much as possible.

Many aspects in security are interdependent and rely on the others. Personal security relies on communal security, communal security relies on national security, national security relies on regional security and so on. National and regional security exert the strongest force in the present system. National security as exerted by the U.S. administration under George W. Bush however, certainly doesn't allow for democratic voice and here we can refer to the George W. Bush statement after 9-11 when, following his administration's declaration of "war on terrorism," (Orwellian in its proposition of war without end) he declared that you are either with us or against us; a damning proclamation against free speech, with its inference that any dissenting voice would be seen as unpatriotic.

Communal security is however very strong in certain areas e.g. Palestine and influences personal security. Communal security is often due to cultural links, which are not often felt amongst the wider community. Institutions, most notably the U.N., govern global security but it is undermined by certain actors e.g. the Bush administration and the current British government which certainly has raised the need for more meaningful notions of security.

Human security therefore is all about grassroots security. The empowerment of the global citizen as opposed to top down security governed by states and regional organizations like NATO. Educating the people in schools and in the community could reduce violence, moreover disarmament programs could be implemented like the arms amnesty in Northern Ireland where guns were voluntarily handed in to police stations. This would certainly reduce violence.

Engendering politics such as allowing more women roles in local, national and regional government would admit gender perspectives to political debate and allow a shift in the focus of conflict. Strengthening international law and allowing more power to the ICC would send signals to national and regional institutions that human rights abuses will not be tolerated.

Also strengthening ties between communities, NGOs, and interstate institutions would allow furtherment of information gathering, anticipation of trouble areas and stronger controls of areas such as health, conflict and the environment. Economic security control should also be revalued towards prevention of poverty and the redirection of military spending. Equitable and inclusive economic growth is critical to promoting political and social stability while enlarging operations for people. Networks that promote coalition and constituency building between civil society organizations are also necessary.

Overarching issues in human security ask for more general changes in education and health education, more strength in the self, self esteem, self-possession and an understanding of violence. There is a call for a sharing of authority, though surely the nation state would object. On a national level suggestions are for more emphasis on unrecognized security crises, for example ecological crises, and a move from executive conceptualization to community. There is also a call for more representative voting for people in the south and so the vulnerable would be given greater chance to attain representation.

At regional levels the requirements are for more education for AIDS and funding for AIDS problems with also a change in patent law legislation which would help impoverished countries in the South produce cheaper generic drugs. Global levels should pay attention to more equal distribution of wealth. Human

security should be made a familiar concept with a budget allocation away from military defense. The idea should be mainstreamed through society.

Fundamental bases of human security are the environment which sustains life, needs such as food, shelter and medical care, dignity such as the respect of human rights, protection, when crises occur, such as health care, fire care and police. However despite all these recommendations and despite the merits of supporting the people and empowering the people the one aspect that most areas of human security lack and especially the Ogata Sen CHS is that of gender focus. The fact remains that however far-reaching and dynamic the proposals in the Ogata Sen final report, they assume no system change or gender perspective.

Gender Perspectives vs State Militarized Security

To look at gender perspectives we must first refer to Reardon's observations on the issue of gender. Gender is culturally and psychologically formulated through internalized forms of identity. It is fluid and changeable and so there is a degree of fluidity in sexual identity. Gender is biologically based but not biological and refers to "the social and cultural differences between the sexes." (Reardon, 2001:37) Society makes us who we are and not the birth factor, we are limited by society expectations and so Reardon suggests that we need to become more gender aware. Women are constantly fighting stereotypes internally and externally which is extremely limiting for their and their society's development. Moreover there isn't any common function of the meaning of gender. A gendered aspect is how one lives in society. To understand this is to bring about gender justice.

Gender roles are also implicit in the institution of war. Innocent women are amongst the highest casualties of war and their security constantly at risk whether during wartime or not. The 20th century, one of the most violent periods of history ever, has transpired as the century where civilians became "legitimate targets." The targeting of cities with no discernable military connections such as Dresden and Hiroshima in the Second World War was a direct strategy to undermine morale in the heartland of a nation. During these aerial bombings the casualty rate of women and children was both devastating and morally reprehensible putting paid to the idea often purported that the Second World War was a "just war."

During ground war all across the world in the last century incidences of rape were so prevalent that rape is now acknowledged to be a "deliberate strategy of

war" (Reardon, 96:31). During conflict in areas such as China, Russia, Germany, and parts of Africa numerous incidents of rape were carried out by the military without any recourse to justice. In the case of the "Comfort Women" during the Second World War who were press ganged into providing sexual services for the Japanese Army in Asia, any form of adequate recompense has been stonewalled by the Japanese Government which has further denied these victims their claim to "women's right to their own history, history as public record, painful as it is." (Ibid 96:51).

And not only in wartime, the incidences of rape from 1945 in areas surrounding U.S. military bases in Okinawa in Japan have seriously undermined the idea that these bases are deployed for the security of the people. In a recent case reported by Stars and Stripes a Marine Lance Cpl. was sentenced to three and a half years in a Japanese prison, "at hard labor, for raping a 19-year old Okinawa woman in May." (Allen & Sumida, 2004). The Japanese prosecutor had asked for five years, "arguing that the May 25th attack in an alley in Kin, near Camp Hansen, was a 'heinous and vicious crime' that could not be forgiven" (Ibid. 2004). The marine it had been documented was "so drunk he could not think straight when he dragged the woman by her hair into the darkness, punched her in the face and raped her." (Ibid., 2004).

It is small wonder that women's groups have insisted on their voice being heard and lobbied for legislation against such indiscriminate attacks. Out of these attacks came groups like The Okinawa Women Act Against Military Violence (OWAAMV) who "realized the necessity to consolidate and develop their newly emerged movement to continue the focus of action on military violence against women." (Akiyabashi 2001:2) Their issues they address came from concerns such as "violence against women and children, promoting human rights of women and children, and environmental destruction." (Ibid) Women's gender roles have been construed by society as comforters in war, both for armed forces and for the mourning of the war slain. Their position has been one of service and now they are demanding political perspectives as "a resistance to the male dominance of politics some feminists see as responsible for militarizing security." (Reardon after Birchenbach, 96:50). The emerging "feminine principle" attends on how to "achieve security so as to sustain and enhance the life chances of the most vulnerable" and "how to arrange relationships so that the vulnerability of one member or part of a system is not exploited to the advantage of another." (Reardon, 1996:37).

It is this vulnerability that women find crucial to the argument of security.

The present system is where states try to attain invulnerability to other states, driving up arms production as in the arms race during the Cold War, exploiting much needed environmental resources for this production, and deluding its respective populaces into believing that such production is required for protection.

Gender Perspectives and Economic Exclusion

Glaring discrepancies occur in the military understanding of the security of women but this is by no means the end of the problem. As well as being excluded from security here they are also excluded from decision making and policy making in the sector of work. Women are traditionally seen as providing only "private functions" (Passport to Dignity: 327) and yet they work side by side with men in the fields and in the offices as well as baring the brunt of child raising and home governance, the so-called "unpaid private work". Indeed women's work has never stopped "representing a sizeable contribution to the world's wealth" (Ibid. 327) and yet they are denied land ownership rights in the South and "discrimination in education and training, hiring and remuneration… as well as inflexible working conditions." (Beijing Platform for Action, Chap. 4, para. 152).

It is a recognized and yet unacknowledged fact that women feed the world. In sub-Saharan Africa, it is estimated that "women contribute an average of 70 percent of the total labor expended in food production for the household and for trade." (1999 ECOSOC, Women in Rural Areas report). This ranges from 30 percent in the Sudan to 80 percent in the Congo. In Asia although there are variations in country statistics, overall women contribute to 50 percent of agricultural production – 35 percent in Malaysia, 46 percent in Bangladesh, Nepal and the Philippines, 54 percent in Indonesia, and over 60 percent in Thailand. Women play an important role in the fisheries and food marketing industries in the Pacific as well as in cash crops like copra, coconut oil, vanilla, coffee and cocoa, and in Papua New Guinea women make up 71 percent of the labor force in agriculture.

Women's contribution to advanced market economies is also significant. In this area they own more than 25 percent of all businesses. It is estimated that from 1998-1999 women "created 10 percent of all new enterprises in North Africa, 33 percent of new enterprises in North America and 40 percent in the former East Germany." (Global Workforce, www.ewowfacts.com). Moreover in the health and welfare area, 89.1 percent of all employees are women but "in 1997 women employed around the world in industry and services typically earned 78 percent

for what men in the same sector earned, the proportions worldwide range between 53 percent and 97 percent…" (Ibid.)

Patriarchy and Gender Apartheid

Such omission of recognition for their contribution to the world economy falls under the banner of what Reardon terms "gender apartheid" (Reardon 2001:37). This is the separation of gender function. Men here are seen as the producers where economic decisions and power are in the hands of men and where men manage macro economy and the national economy while women manage the micro economy. Here women are closed off from a great range of the benefits of society and where gender apartheid limits "their influence over society and their capacity to control their own lives" (Ibid., 37).

Again as in military "security" women suffer from hierarchical rulings often referred to as the term patriarchy. Patriarchy refers back to the family ruling in which the father rules the rest of the family. In the 20th century feminist scholars explored social structures where women were oppressed and gave more sophisticated definitions to patriarchy. They deduced that patriarchy underlines the notion that certain masculine characteristics are superior and patriarchy is also embedded in and refers to social structure.

The sources of patriarchy are mutual reinforcement in that it provides stability and is self-perpetuating. It is embedded in the belief systems of a society and in fear. There are punishments and rewards for argument and dissent where women submit themselves to men through fear of violence. It is also embedded in military organizations in the structures of hierarchy where exclusive ownership of power gives more choice to those who control power. There is less choice however in lower levels of hierarchy. Power is upheld by the nation state and extended through militarism. Women are prone to danger so men maintain power over women and inequality maintains the status quo. Life is therefore simplified for men. Gender inequality also illuminates injustice. In order for change gender preferences have been proposed and of course by imaging preferences is how political change begins. The planning of a model based on constructive discourse and a gender analysis is required in order to find a means to a change.

The Feminist Struggle for Human Rights and Legislation

In most cases, human rights conventions have been deemed inadequate to the

protection of women's rights. Most institutions are gendered. Rights are defined by gender so there should be legal mechanisms for this. Since the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted and proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 women have sought to procure meaningful rights of their own. That is to progress towards more evenhanded relations between women and men because in many cases gender issues are envisioned as only concerning the number of women participants within mainstream programmes or the development of marginal side initiatives for women.

A significant means to address this was The Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) September 3, 1981 which combated objectification and commodification of the person in areas such as trafficking. It called for education for universal dignity and critical and participatory education, the valuing of women's contribution to educating other women for social participants and the valuing of the dignity of labor.

CEDAW was a way of addressing gender assumptions, raising critical awareness and analyzing institutions. It provided a problematic of what deprivation is and it also projected a set of aspirations such as the guarantee of basic human rights and fundamental freedoms on an equal basis with men. This was further supported by Security Council Resolution 1325 in 2000 on women peace and security. The resolution "called on all actors involved in negotiating and implementing peace agreements to adopt a gender perspective that would take into account the special needs of women and girls during repatriation and resettlement, rehabilitation, reintegration and post-conflict reconstruction."

Such documents go some way to altering and changing women's perspectives but the prevailing problem of security still remains. State controlled security is detrimental to human security in that traditional security is still embedded in the patriarchal system. We have seen that human security at least tries to deal with the needs of people rather than the state. Its dimensions encapsulate the environment, people's needs, their dignity and their protection. Where state security demands that the state survives, human security raises an expectation of well being and the survivability of the people. The environment has to sustain life and not kill us, basic needs of people must be met and there is a need of humans to experience basic dignities. In the words of the Vandana Shiva in her testimony before the World Court of Women in South Africa, "Women's worlds are worlds based on protection of our dignity and self-respect, the well being of our children, of the earth, of her diverse beings, of those who are hungry and those who are ill. To protect is the best expression of humanity." (Shiva, 2001:136).

Conclusion

Human security has offered a meaningful alternative to state security. Traditional state military security has always meant a perpetuation of the status quo and as a consequence the sacrifices of large numbers of ordinary working people whether in the air attacks of the Second World War, the battlefields of Flanders, or the Wars of the Crusades. At this point of writing the Iraq War has claimed tens of thousands of lives of civilians proving that traditional military security is a questionable and extremely flawed model, capable as much as the "terror" it seeks to combat of destroying lives. Currently the coalition forces in Iraq in 2004, by pursuing the will of their leaders, have killed and maimed more women and children than they have sought to protect. This is an untenable position and will surely be seen as one of the great tragedies of the early 21ˢᵗ Century.

By focusing on the welfare of people, by supporting human rights, by addressing post conflict resolution and challenging traditional security, human security is a way forward. However there is still not enough legislation submitted or recognized that addresses gender perspectives. Women are criminally overlooked in their rights to protection, whether from rape in wartime or rape in peacetime. Furthermore their contribution to the world's economy, their rights to land ownership in the South, and the sexual enslavement and trafficking of large amounts of women, continues to be dismissed or ignored. Human security means security for all and not just for half the world.

References

Akibayashi, K. (2001). *Okinawa: Women's Struggle for Human Security.* Unpublished Paper but prepared for submission to the Commission of Human Security as part of an open letter by scholars.

Allen, D., Sumida, C. (2004). Marine gets three and half years for rape, *European and Pacific Stars and Stripes*, April 27ᵗʰ.

Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action (1995). Available on-line at http/www.un.org/womanwatch/daw/Beijing/platform/declar.htm. Retrieved 21ˢᵗ May 2004.

Boutros Boutros-Ghali, (1992). *An Agenda for Peace, Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping.* Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to the statement adopted by the Summit Meeting of the Security-Council on 31 January 1992. NY: United Nations.

Chomsky, N. (2001). *9-11.* New York: Seven Stories Press.

Commission on Human Security, *Human Security Now: Protecting and Empowering People,* (New York: CHS, 2003). Available on-line at http/www.human-security-chs.org. Retrieved 6ᵗʰ June 2004.

Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Violence Against Women. Adopted 18ᵗʰ Dec. 1979,

entered into force 3 Sept. 1981, G.A. Res. 34/180, 34 UN GAOR supp, (No. 46), UN Doc. A/34/46, at 193 (1979). Available on-line at http/www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw. Retrieved 8th June 2004.

Current Issues (2004). *Critical Policy Choices Facing the Nation and the World*. Alexandria: Close up Foundation.

Defense of Japan (2002). Japan Defense Agency, Urban Connections.

Global Workforce http://www.ewowfacts.com/wowfacts/chap.15.html. Retrieved 13 September 2004.

Hollins, H. Powers, A & Sommer, M. (1989). *The Conquest for War: Alternative Strategies for Global Security*. London: Westview Press, Inc.

Improvement in the Situation of Women in Rural Areas: Report of the Secretary-General Economic and Social Council Substantive Session of 1999 United Nations Dist. General A/54/123, E/1999/66 7 June 1999.
http:/www.hri.ca/fortherecord1999/documentation/genassembly/a-54-123.htm. Retrieved 9 September 2004.

Koenig, S., Reardon, B. (2003). *Passport to Dignity: Working with the Beijing Platform for Action for the Human Rights of Women*. NY: People's Decade for Human Rights Education.

Okinawa Women Act Against Military Violence. (2001). *List of Sexual Crimes against US Soldiers in Okinawa* (English Version). Naha: Okinawa.

Reardon, B. (1996). Gender and Global Security: A Feminist Challenge to the United Nations and Peace Research, *Journal of International Cooperation Studies* Vol. 6, No. 1 pp. 29-56

Reardon, B. (2001). *Education for a culture of peace in a gender perspective*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000). *Women Peace and Security*. NY: United Nations Department of Information.

Shiva, V. (2001). Excerpts from her testimony at the World Court of Women, South Africa, March 8th, pp 135-136. *The Hindu March* 25th 2001: India.