

**THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION
CENTER FOR NORTHEAST ASIAN POLICY STUDIES**

in cooperation with

**THE DAVID M. KENNEDY CENTER FOR
INTERNATIONAL STUDIES AT BYU**

and

**THE MAUREEN AND MIKE MANSFIELD
FOUNDATION**

**R2PW: THE RATIONALE FOR A
FOREIGN POLICY THAT TAKES THE
CAUSE OF WOMEN SERIOUSLY**

*The Brookings Institution
Washington, DC
October 28, 2010*

[Proceedings prepared from an audio recording]

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180
Fax (703) 519-7190

PARTICIPANTS:

Moderator:

RICHARD BUSH
Senior Fellow and Director
Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies
The Brookings Institution

Introduction:

L. GORDON FLAKE
Executive Director
Maureen and Mike Mansfield Foundation

Discussant:

ROBERTA COHEN
Nonresident Senior Fellow
Foreign Policy and Senior Advisor
Brookings-Bern Project on Internal Displacement
The Brookings Institution

Featured Speaker:

VALERIE M. HUDSON
Professor of Political Science
Brigham Young University

* * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

RICHARD BUSH: Why don't we get going? My name is Richard Bush. I'm the director of the Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies here at Brookings. And it's our great pleasure at CNAPS to collaborate today with the Maureen and Mike Mansfield Foundation and my good friend, Gordon Flake, to present this program.

And we do a lot on security issues at CNAPS on various things, China, Japan, Mongolia, China, Russia, but I think today we are addressing one of those sort of more fundamental issues that shapes what goes on within countries and what goes on between countries, and this is not something we should take our eye off of.

And to help us focus on this, we're very pleased to have Dr. Valerie Hudson with us today. But I'm not going to introduce her. I'm going to ask Gordon to provide that introduction and sort of get things going. Gordon.

GORDON FLAKE: Thank you, Richard, and we greatly appreciate the Brookings Institution for kindly hosting this event today. I have the joy of wearing two hats today, both as head of the Maureen and Mike Mansfield Foundation, but also as a recent addition to the newly created Advisory Board for the David M. Kennedy School for International Area Studies at Brigham Young University, of which I'm an alumni. And so it's particularly a pleasure today to have the chance to introduce to you Dr. Valerie Hudson.

First and foremost, you know, despite all of the glories and the awards and being named *Foreign Policy Magazine*'s, you know, 100 top global thinkers, and the award winning books, I think it's most important that Dr. Hudson was one of my advisors when I went to graduate school at BYU. And so my real ulterior motive in helping to organize this event today is to bask in her reflected glory, so that I will appear somehow smarter at the end of the day as we go forward.

You have in front of you as part of the program a full bio, so I won't go in great length, but Dr. Hudson, in addition to, you know, the tremendous mentoring she's done over the years for students, has done some groundbreaking research in the field of international security. You'll note mentioned in the bio in particular an award-winning book that she has done called *Bare Branches: The Security Implications of Asia's Surplus Male Population*, something that has a kind of broad range around -- for the region. And again, I urge you all to take some time to look at her bio in greater detail. But we are particularly honored to co-sponsor this event today.

As head of the Mansfield Foundation, I'm very well aware of the

Horatio Alger story and its compelling narrative in American life. Mike Mansfield is one of those persons that came from very humble beginnings in Montana and ended up as ambassador to Japan and no longer serving Senate Majority Leader.

Whenever I tell people I graduated from the Kennedy School in Washington, D.C., I have to clarify that this is not the Kennedy's of the Northeast and the money class, but David M. Kennedy, you know, a rural farm boy from Utah who ended up with his own stellar international career in banking and ultimately a Secretary of the Treasurer, U.S. ambassador to NATO, and finally ambassador at large, with a long and storied history in foreign policy.

I also will be so crass and a personal tie there. My freshman roommate in college married David M. Kennedy's granddaughter, and I had the chance to go to the wedding, and it was he that convinced me to go into foreign policy. So we can both blame David M. Kennedy and Valerie Hudson for the havoc that I wreak in Washington, D.C., and we can think Richard Bush for helping us focus that a little bit more today.

So without further ado, please allow me to turn over the podium to our speaker today, Valerie Hudson. Thank you.

VALERIE HUDSON: Thank you so much. I want to thank Gordon, the Mansfield Foundation, and Richard Bush from Brookings Institution, and I'd like to thank Jeff Ringer of the David M. Kennedy Center for arranging this event. I'm just thrilled to be here and very happy to meet you and hope to meet more of you after the presentation is over.

You're kind of my guinea pigs here. As Gordon noted, I'm an academician, and so my job is to produce research that will be of value to the social sciences. Here you have a social scientist that's kind of stepping out for a moment and kind of saying, you know, are there policy implications to my research findings.

And so I actually feel that I'm not as qualified in that area. So I'm going to debut some ideas, but I'm hoping that Roberta and the audience, that we will all be able to help refine and make these ideas stronger. I was told there were some in attendance from the Office of Global Women's Issues, and I defer to your expertise, and I salute you as pioneers in trying to wrestle with the policy implications of the notion that women do matter to national security.

Well, let's go ahead and get started then. The title of my talk is "R2PW, The Rationale for an American Foreign Policy That Takes the Cause of Women Seriously." And let's first start with just -- when I heard this quote, I typed it up in something like 50 point font and put it on my wall. This, of course,

is Secretary of State Clinton's address to the UN on the occasion of International Women's Day just this past March. And she said something extraordinary, which I think is a sign of an awakening consciousness in our national security and foreign policy establishment, that these topics are germane, and that is, the subjugation of women is a direct threat to the security of the United States.

And so let me approach it first from an academic viewpoint and then we're going to push into policy a little bit. I'm sure you know that the academic field of security studies has several mainstream conventionally accepted explanations for the origins of conflict, and those include, you know, the notion of the clash of civilizations, of ethno-nationalism, the democratic piece or its lack, right, that the lack of democracy is a cause of conflict, longstanding theories of how conflict is engendered by resource conflict and scarcity, poverty, ideological conflicts that so roiled the world during the 20th century, and then power imbalances and power vacuums, the rise and fall of great powers and how that affects state security.

When in the field of security studies you raise the question, well, what about the situation of women, does that have any bearing on conflict? And the academic field, still to this day, you will get polite, but blank stares. I think in this realm, the policy community is actually much further ahead in thinking about these things than the academic community.

But we have these wonderful sentiments coming out from folks like former Secretary General Kofi Annan. The world is starting to grasp that there's no policy more effecting than promoting development, health and education than the empowerment of women and girls. And I would venture, no policy is more important in preventing conflict or in achieving reconciliation after a conflict has ended, interesting. Well, when I presented my research idea to my department, as we were asked to do, I presented it about five years ago, and I said I think there's this link between the security of women and the security of states.

And they were very polite, because after all, it's BYU, you know, and you're very polite at BYU, and they said, we really think you're barking up the wrong tree. Democratization, ideological conflict, yes; women, no, don't think so.

So I was mad, but again, at BYU, you're not supposed to show it. So I went back to my office and I said, they told me that if we looked at the cause of the blood spilled and lives lost at the 20th century, that the situation of women would not be on the list of factors that affected this.

So I went out and perused and got as many casualty counts from every war, every genocide, all right, every civil conflict, every border conflict, forced collectivization by -- I got the whole nine yards, right, and that is the blue

column there. And again, you can't see anything, you know, really too well there at all, but all of these are conflicts that I included in those death tolls. And I put in everything, even the kitchen sink, and I got to about 152 million lives lost in the 20th century. And then I went looking for estimates of the number of missing women from the world population at the turn of the century, which would just be missing women for one generation.

And what I found was that the UN had actually made such an estimate. Their estimate of the number of missing women in Asia at the turn of the century, the year 2000, 163 million missing women, in essence, outstripping all of the blood spilled and lives lost of the great conflicts and famines and wars and civil conflicts and genocides of the 20th century.

And so, to me, that suggested that if you want to talk about blood spilled and lives lost, right, which is some of the foundational elements of what we would call national security, you have to look at the situation of women.

And, in fact, something that should give us all pause is, we commonly say women are half of humanity, well, they're actually not anymore, did you know that? All right. The overall sex ratio of the world is now over 101, and it's primarily due to the missing women of Asia, due to causes such as sex elective abortion, egregious maternal mortality rates and the like. So you can now no longer say with a straight face that women are half of humanity, they are not, and the reason they are not is because their lives are devalued simply because they have two X chromosomes.

So as an academic, I began to raise the question, surely, yes, we know that the security of states impacts the security of women. After all, a significant proportion of that 152 million people dead in the conflicts of the 20th century include women, right.

But why don't we ask the other question, all right, the reverse, might the security of women impact the security of states? And what I found, probably unsurprising to you, is that this question had not been asked in academic security studies before.

And so I'm going to just rely on a framework that we published in international security a couple of years ago. I'm not going to go into that, but I'm going to tell you the empirical foundation that my research has built over the last several years, just so you can see how we're beginning to make that linkage.

So, for example, in an article we published two years ago, in a large and statistical analysis of over 140 nations, we found that if you are interested in predicting state peacefulness, state compliance with international norms and state relations with neighboring states, by far, the best predictor was

not level of democracy, it was not level of wealth, and it was not whether the society was Islamic or not. What blew them all out of the water was the level of violence against women. That was the best predictor of how peaceful a state was in the international system.

And my work on *Bare Branches* has shown that abnormal sex ratios affected through means such as sex selective abortion do aggravate state instability and conflict. In fact, this was such a compelling argument to the Chinese government that they now implemented some very innovative and also strict methods to attempt to turn around that birth sex ratio in China simply because they now view it as a national security problem.

When I visited Beijing in 2009, and spoke with representatives of the State Family Planning Commission, they thanked me. They said, you know, we know that your work was not well received in China. In fact, there was an editorial by the China People's Daily that basically said these two western women are totally out to lunch and don't understand Chinese history at all. But they said internally what happened is, you raised the link to security that none of us could, because it was too sensitive. And now the Chinese government is throwing literally millions of dollars in research funds at universities to investigate what the social consequences of the abnormal sex ration is. And they were just pleased to tell me that their methods were having results, and it wasn't exactly the results that we had all hoped, the sex ratio is still climbing in China, but what they pointed to was that the rate of increase had slowed.

But unfortunately, the Chinese government now believes that overall, 122 boy babies are being born for every 100 girl babies in China.

Let's see, it looks like some of my animation didn't do exactly right. Also, some recent work that I've been doing with Brad Thayer at Baylor University, we've discovered a significant association between the prevalence of polygene and the emergence of violent extremist groups within society.

Now, I can assure you that if I walked into my academic meetings and I said, want to talk about terrorism, let's talk about polygene, once again, it would be sort of, what, but we hope that soon there will be a day when people say, of course, yes, polygene, duh. And then lastly, I'm just preparing an article now which shows that -- and this is another research topic that has not been enjoined, we were able to scale how inequitable family law was concerning women. And if you have studied the situation of women, you know that family law governing marriages, divorces, custody, inheritance rights and so forth and so on are just so important on the ground in the situation of women. And what we found was that nations with highly inequitable family law have high levels of violence against women.

Now, again, you're probably saying, well, that's unsurprising, but no one had ever actually asked and answered the question. And there are many apologists for inequitable family law systems that say, you don't understand, the law may look to you to be inequitable, but our women have a much higher level of safety than they would in your country, but we find out that that's actually not the case.

So instead of Huntington's clash of civilizations, I'm sure you've seen that map before, might we gain greater insight into state security and state conflict by looking at the clash of gender civilizations, okay. What is the situation of women in the various countries of the world and how does that auger for internal and external conflict?

Now, we were heartened to find that there were others who had also done some similar work and come to similar conclusions. So, for example, looking at the work of all of these individuals named at the bottom there, and using a measure that they call the gender gap. The larger the gender gap, the more likely a nation is to be involved in inter- and intrastate conflict, to be the aggressor in that conflict, to use violence first in a conflict, and to engage in higher levels of violence throughout the conflict, interesting, very interesting.

And I'm sure that most of you in this audience know that it's -- you know, there are many, many other factors related to the security and stability of states that bear a strong association with what's going on with women, so I'll simply name a few of them here.

Food security, this is not -- none of these are my field, but researchers in food security have demonstrated that food security's imperiled and famine and malnutrition rates go up in countries with a larger gender gap. The World Bank has done many innovative studies that have shown that economic prosperity and growth are inversely related to the gender gap. Disease burden, infectious disease rate, and mortality, not just for women, not just for children, but also for men, is also correlated with a high gender gap.

And fertility rates tend to be unsustainably high in nations with a high gender gap. They have found corruption levels are higher when there's a higher gender gap. And then they've found that when the gap narrows, and when there's greater representation of women, that there are greater government efforts in the area of social welfare.

And, of course, coming back to security once more, one of my colleagues and one of my former students, who's now a graduate student at Yale, has found that when women are represented in peace negotiations, participants are more satisfied with the outcome and the peace agreement lasts longer than if women were not involved in the negotiations, really some interesting things

starting to come out.

So I guess that, you know, after hearing all of these empirics, I hope you're moved to say, as I was, hmm, might one of the great keys to the structural and physical violence we see us in the world be inequitable treatment of women. And that starts to get you thinking about policy implications, right. Is it possible, one might reflect, that if we concentrated more on helping societies improve the situation of women, and we concentrated less on the export of democracy and free market capitalism, would we have a better chance of achieving sustainable development, good governance, and lower levels of poverty, disease and conflict? And I'm assuming that that's something -- that's of great interest these days.

Well, that led me to ask, have we ever seen such a relationship? And in reviewing the academic literature, I almost literally stumbled across the work of John Hajnal and Mary Hartman that had made just that assertion, that the roots of democracy in Europe are intertwined with a major change in male/female relations at the household level.

Let me just say a few things about this Hajnal/Hartman thesis, because it's possible that you've not heard about it, even as I had not heard about it. They assert that the causal error in the first place runs from the situation of women to democracy and prosperity. They point out the historical anomaly of more equitable marriage patterns in Northwestern Europe dating from about the 1200s. So, in addition to the religious ban on polygyny, there was an increase in the age of marriage for women, women were no longer being married at puberty, but being married in their early 20s to men who were also in their early 20s, and a gradual end to patrilocality, where a bride moves to the estate or the compound of her husband's family.

And they suggest that the day-in, day-out living of participatory democracy between men and women in the home led to a political awakening in Europe that was the foundations of the emergence of sustainable democracy. As we know, the Athenian democracy was not sustainable.

She also -- Mary Hartman goes further and asserts that the dampening of patrilocality led to entrepreneurialism and the development of capitalism. I'm going to read to you just a quote from what she has said so you'll get a flavor of her argument.

"Long before the contingent nature of the marital contract was recognized in law, marriages were conducted in Northwestern Europe as joint enterprises by the two adult members, right, not a pubescent girl and an adult man, but two adult members, each of whom had recognized reciprocal duties and obligations in circumstances that required both members of an alliance to work

and postpone marriage until there was sufficient economic base to establish a household. Individual self-reliance was a requirement long before individualism itself became an abstract social and political idea.

“A sense of equality of rights was further promoted by such arrangements, long before notions of the egalitarianism became the popular coin of political movements. These later marriages forged now through consent by the adult principals offered themselves as implicit models to the sensibilities of political and religious reformers grappling with questions of authority.

“Experience in families, which are miniature contract societies, social contract societies unique to Northwest Europe, offers a plausible explanation for popular receptivity to the suggestion that the state itself rests upon a prior and breakable contract with all its members.

“And if this is so, the influence of family organization on the ways people were coming to conceive and shape the world at large can hardly be exaggerated. The lingering mystery about the origins of a movement of equal rights and individual freedom can be explained. Contrary to the notion that these were imported items, it appears that they, along with charity, began at home.”

I hope you can see just an amazing assertion here that the foundations even of what we’re calling democracy has its roots in the character of male/female relations within each household, okay.

Now, let’s go back to Secretary of State Clinton’s quote, the subjugation of women is a direct threat to the security of the United States. I think on the basis of the empirics that I’ve had to spend only a few minutes going over, does that make sense now? Oh, yes, right, we begin to have an empirical foundation of evidence that suggests that Secretary Clinton is, in fact, correct on this point.

So let’s say she’s right, okay, bear with me now, let’s assume that she’s right, and Valerie Hudson and others have provided empirical evidence that she is, how would U.S. foreign policy be different if we thought she was right? So here we go, guys, bear with me. I think that U.S. foreign policy would incorporate a principle of R2PW, an international responsibility to protect women, and not protect them in terms of caging them, or protecting them in terms of circumscribing what they’re able to do and not do, or protecting them as if they did not have agency, that’s not the way in which I’m meaning that, but the notion that when less than half of the world’s population that should be half of the world’s population is endangered, all of us are endangered, including every state and including the entire international system.

Now, R2P, I’m sure most of you in this room are familiar with that

concept. I'll just say a couple of words about it. Gareth Evans in Canada authored a whitepaper that was then endorsed by the UN General Assembly at the 2005 World Summit, and Ban Ki Moon recommitted to the principle of R2P in 2009.

There are three pillars of the R2P concept: one, states have primary responsibility to protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity; pillar two, the international community must commit to provide assistance to states in building capacity to protect their population from these things and assist states both before and after crisis have broken out; and then three, it is the responsibility of the international community to take timely and decisive action to prevent and halt mass atrocities when a state is manifestly failing to protect its populations. Now, as you know, this has been quite controversial, with some states saying this completely undermines sovereignty with various parties of the UN saying this is all very well and good, but, you know, really, how are we going to actually affect R2P, right.

So it's still controversial, but nevertheless, the principal that state sovereignty does not trump the question of mass atrocities is one which many, many people, and many of those in high policy-making circles now agree.

So what if we extended that and we considered that there was an R2PW, a national and international responsibility to protect women that is part of the responsibility of states, that is then part of the responsibility of the international community if states neglect the responsibilities in this area? All right.

The rationale would be, everything that we've just gone over, that the roots of tyranny, civil conflict, state instability, extremism, and interstate conflict ultimately trace back to whether there is peace or war between the two halves of humanity. What would the standard be? Well, interestingly enough, of all the human rights covenants, the covenant with the most state signatories is CEDAW, the convention on all -- the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women. One hundred and eighty-six state parties, more than any other human rights treaty, including those on social and cultural rights, civil and political rights, CEDAW has the most signatories and provides a baseline, if you will, for establishing what is a humane situation for women, so it's not as if we have not thought about that.

I would like to suggest that there are three critical issues that, if addressed, would go far in terms of development the concept of R2PW. The first is the issue of personal status law and family law, which we've just alluded to. And this, in fact, is one of the first priorities of the new UN women organization that was just created in July.

Here Ziba Mir Hosseini on the importance of personal status and family law, “I think the issue of gender relations within the family, which is what personal laws are all about, actually relates to the core of power in society at a broader level. Since the family is the basic unit of society, only if there is justice and democracy within the family,” does that sound familiar, okay, “can you possibly have justice and democracy in the wider society.” In other words, the key to democratizing the whole society is to democratize its basic unit, the family, and for this, legal reform is crucial.

What we have found in our research at the WomanStats Project is that most of the time, the laws on the books look pretty good because most of these states are signatories of CEDAW, but then buried somewhere in the legislation, you will find, and in the case that customary or religious law applies, that law will be paramount. There are always these sort of wiggle room clauses in many of the constitutions in laws in some of these countries.

The second critical issue, unsurprisingly, is violence against women across the life cycle. So everything from sex elective abortion to higher mortality rates for girls in childhood, what I consider to be obscene maternal mortality rates in various areas of the world. For example, the chance of dying incidence to pregnancy and child birth in Sierra Leone is one in eight. That’s almost like taking a pistol and putting one bullet in it and putting it to your head every time you get pregnant.

Pervasive domestic and societal violence. For example, the UN did a recent survey in Afghanistan, 87 percent of women interviewed said that they were beaten on a regular basis, not a rare occurrence, by husbands or fathers. Eighty-seven percent of Afghan women. But even in the West, Switzerland, 25 percent of women have been physically abused. Rape of all stripes, trafficking of women, lack of consent in marriage and childbearing, and, of course, penury of widows would be issues of violence against women across the life cycle.

The third critical issue I believe is that women’s voices are going unheard, and women’s labor goes unvalued. Still across our world in the year 2010, only 19 percent of national legislators are women, okay, far short of what most people believe is the tipping point of 30 percent necessary for the real perspectives and priorities of women to be heard, and a sizeable number of these are puppets, right. Well, even in Afghanistan, many of the women elected are simple puppets.

Our systems of national accounts, as you know, do not include any examination of unpaid care giving and reproductive work performed by women. How can you make healthy economic policy if the immense labors of primarily women in care giving is totally invisible to your economic advisors? I don’t know why we think that that can be done, but it’s certainly something that needs

to be rectified. And, of course, in our own society, the work place designed in the image of the unencumbered male worker systematically makes mothers poorer than any other subcategory of the population. In fact, the biggest risk factor for being poor in old age is to have ever been a mother, not to have ever been a parent, but to have ever been a mother.

So what would we do in our foreign policy if we took R2PW as a founding principal? Well, number one, first of all, you have to start seeing women before you can do something about the critical issues that we've discussed.

First of all, gender disaggregated statistics, I can tell you, after 15 years of research, that a lot of very important statistics either are not collected at all or are not collected in gender disaggregated form, so that you can see what's going on with the women versus what's going on with the men.

Second, a lot of these statistics are not even gathered, or governments make very little effort to gather statistics, especially on violence against women. Third, we would include women's unpaid labor in the national and international systems of accounts. Fourth, our Council of Economic Advisors and similar entities throughout the world, I would require them to assess how their economic policies would have an impact on women and mothers before any economic policy could be proposed and voted upon.

And something that over and over again researchers have found is that women are, in many parts of the world, are stunningly ignorant about their rights, not only under the law of their own land, but the rights under CEDAW. And so education efforts about basic human rights for women would be important.

I think another part of R2PW is renaming, right, because as we speak, so we think, I think the discursive movement in academia has brought the power of words to our minds. So think about some of the initiatives of the various countries in the world.

Great Britain, concerned about trafficking of women and prostitution, have created ads that say walk in a john, walk out a rapist, okay, getting men to think that what they're doing is not just spending some money to have a pleasurable time, but, in fact, constitutes rape, legally and morally.

Iceland banning strip bars. Women are not for sale in this country. What a tremendously strong statement to make. Canada, there are various groups in Canada that say that it is time for the Canadian government to re-term domestic violence as non-state act or torture, which the state has an obligation to address under the CAT, the Convention Against Torture.

In Sierra Leone, the Supreme Court of Sierra Leone recently proclaimed that forced marriages are a crime against humanity, renaming a customary practice as something that might be of interest to the ICC.

My own colleague, Mary Caprioli, has argued that we stop calling nations democratic if the situation of their women is poor no matter how many free and fair elections they hold, all right, that there is something odd about calling a nation of democracy when its women are in a very poor situation. Understanding that genocide may incorporate a larger notion of gendercide, all right, and if gendercide is a genocide, then that would trigger national and international obligations under treaties.

And then we've had Radio Free Europe, we've had Radio Marti, we've had radio free this and that. Should we be considering radio free women as something that we would rename? Harvest low-hanging fruit, national governments are in a position to begin to legally ban things that are of concern to women. So, for example, it's easy to ban things that are no longer happening. So Turkey recently banned virginity testing, and this was -- they discovered that hardly anyone was doing it anymore, so it could not credibly be said to be part of Turkish culture, and they banned it. Nations should be looking for these opportunities.

Things that are still happening, but increasingly seen as problematic, we've seen a trend in the various nations of the Islamic world where honor killings used to be, you could walk away without a jail term, then we saw movement towards, well, a jail term of maybe two months, and now we're finally getting into jail terms where governments have increasingly raised the jail terms.

So, for example, Sierra now said instead of two months, those who perpetrate honor killings will now get two years. I think there's still room for improvement there, but you can see an upward trend.

And then things that haven't yet happened, okay. So, for example, some nations in Europe are now banning legally sex elective abortions, not because they have a lot of sex elective abortions, but because it's something that they should ban now, they feel they should ban now before any problem develops. Second step, real commitment of resources, now, this is, again, not surprising. Maternal mortality is one of the MBG, the millennium goals that will not be reached, clearly will not be reached. Fortunately, we now see the large agencies, including the Gates Foundation, turning to more aggressively tackle maternal mortality.

And then the standard list of issues including access to education, access to contraception alter the incentive structures. So, for example, in India,

they actually pay families to keep their baby girls alive, pay them to get them vaccinated, pay the families to send them to school.

And then something that's of great concern I think in our own country is to make care giving rationale, economically rationale. If we count women's unpaid care giving labor, then women can be recipient of resources for that.

Real legal reform, the Islamic world has seen a movement called No Reservations. Many of the signatories to NATO have reservations where they say, yes, we agree with all of it, except we reserve the right to do this, that and the other thing, usually to have primacy of customary or religious law over CEDAW. Why not create a protocol to CEDAW and ask nations to sign on, in which nations would assert that the basic human rights outlined in CEDAW would have primacy over customary religious law?

Rejection of enclaves of inequitable family law, this is becoming a big issue in places like Canada, the United Kingdom and Australia, where even we had the Archbishop of Canterbury arguing for religious tolerance and the creation of Sharia law enclaves within Britain.

Everything that I've researched said this is a bad idea if those laws contradict what we see in CEDAW. And then reformation of laws on domestic violence, marital rape, inheritance and so forth. A farther shore, could there be a farther shore? Could there be even a sort of muscular approach to R2PW? Well, maybe.

With CEDAW and the CRC Convention on the rights of the child as benchmarks, could the United States have not only a state sponsor of terror list, but how about a state sponsor of terror against women list? Could we then adjust our aid policies so that primarily aid would be targeted to women in those countries? You know, the United States has taken great strides under the Obama Administration to extend rights of asylum to women from countries in which gendercide is taking place. And so we've recently seen the case of a Guatemalan woman who won asylum on this very reason, so a look at external and internal asylum policies.

If we start naming things that trigger action under international covenants, such as torture, genocide and so forth, then ICJ and ICC involvement, UN Security Council involvement might be contemplated. I would like to see a world where egregiously flouting CEDAW is viewed by the UN Security Council as important an alarming an issue as flouting the nuclear nonproliferation treaty. I don't know if I'll live to see that day, but at least I can dream about that day.

Is there a rationale for U.S. foreign policy that takes the cause of women seriously? Yes, I think we have that rationale now. Can we reach that farther shore? Well, not today. Can we take the first steps now? I think absolutely true.

Now, let's talk about the impossible case. I'm sure some of you have seen the recent op-ed by Nicholas Kristof, who, as you know, he and his wife, Sheryl WuDunn, wrote the amazing book called *Half the Sky*, which I'm sure virtually everyone has read by this time, making a case that the situation of women is an important area of policy focus, not just for nations, but also for the international community. But in this -- a few days ago, on the 24th, Nicholas Kristof said, on the whole Afghan controversy, that is, are we betraying Afghan women, he said, well, you know, there's really nothing that we can do for those women, he said, I'm sure most of you have seen the *Time* magazine cover with Aisha, who's had her nose and her ears cut off, engendered this debate, and Nicholas Kristof said, "*Time* quoted Aisha saying of the Taliban as she was touching her disfigured face, how can we reconcile with them?"

And then Kristof goes on to say, "One man from Hamid Province told me that there would be no difference for women in his village whether the Taliban rule or not, because, in either case, women would be locked up in the home. He approvingly cited an expression and posture that translates to a wife should be in the home or in the grave. In other words, oppression is rooted not only in the Taliban, but also in the culture. The severing of a woman's nose and ears occurs not only in Taliban areas, but also in secure parts of Pakistan. Indeed, I've come across such disfigurement more in Punjab, the most powerful and populous province of Pakistan, than in Afghanistan, yet I haven't heard anyone say we should occupy Pakistan to transform it. So let's not fool ourselves by thinking we're doing favors for Afghan women by investing American blood and treasure in an unsustainable war here. The road to emancipate Afghan women will be arduous, but it runs through schools and economic development, and yes, a peace deal with the Taliban, if that's possible."

You can imagine what a fire storm this created, given that he was the author of *Half the Sky*. So if Nick were here, I'd have a few questions for him, because I don't completely agree with him. As much as he is an idol of mine, I don't completely agree with him on this.

The first thing I would ask Nick is, who are you talking to? So, for example, one of my good friends who just recently came back from Afghanistan working with aid groups there, she said, one day in November, 2009, in Hamid Providence Capital, a group of Afghan widows and divorcees met with Patricia, my friend, who had been commissioned to write a series of success stories for USAID. All the women were in their 20s, 30s and 40s, but looked to be in their 60s. Until very recently, none of them could work because they possess no

marketable skills and could neither read nor write, and were at risk of being killed if they left their homes. A number of women said that before the program, which focused on tailoring and literacy, their children used to weep at night from hunger. As Patricia prepared to leave, the women fluttered around her like moths, touching her sleeves and speaking all at once. What are they saying, Pat asked the young Pashtun speaking interpreter? They are telling you to go back to your country and to ask your people not to abandon them. The women of Afghanistan don't want you to leave, they will quite literally die if the Taliban return.

So Nick was talking to a man, but Pat was talking to the women, and there was a very different answer given. Let's have some historical perspective here. Is Afghan culture immutable on women? Well, no. More than 30 years ago, Afghan women were attending universities, teaching, working as doctors, nurses and professors, far from being a black hole, a gender apartheid, Afghanistan, though impoverished, was more progressive than many of its Muslim neighbors.

Furthermore, many young Afghans are open to new ways of doing things. In 2009, hundreds of Afghan men and women bravely stood together in Kabul to protest Karzai's support for new and oppressive Shiite family law. If Americans assume that all Afghan men are Neanderthals and capable of sympathizing with the plight of their sisters, they are wrong. And then let's not overlook that Hamid Karzai's own wife is a trained physician. So I think we may underestimate what is possible in that culture.

And let's ask Nick this question, have no real gains for women happened since 2001? That's false, isn't it? Okay. Both the Bush Administration and the Obama Administration, whether sincerely or insincerely on the part of Bush, and certainly sincerely on the part of the Obama Administration, there have been gains that are registerable.

The enrollment of girls in schools has increased. The number of schools for girls has increased. Maternal mortality, though still awful, has decreased. Women's access to health care has greatly improved. There is now a women's ministry, powerless, yes, but there is one. There's a quote for women in the jirga, right. There are actually more Afghan women, a greater percentage in the jirga there than are in the U.S. Congress. Women can vote, women can run for office, and they often do so at risk of their very lives, but they do so. Women's entrepreneurship has exploded, especially in the urban areas. There are now lots of women support networks. CEDAW was signed without reservations by the Karzai government, as bad as it is. And the Afghan Constitution asserts the equal rights of women, albeit with legal room for Sharia law.

Are we resigned to seeing these reversed? Are we really that helpless in the face of genocide just because it is perpetrated, not against an ethnic

minority, but against women, is that the problem? If they all had a different color skin or they were all a different religion, would the international community care then? Why does it care more about those things than about having two X chromosomes? Can we ask that question?

Certainly the international community has tried to stop genocide. Bosnia and Kosovo, Darfur, of course, too little, too late; Rwanda, too little, too late; Darfur, but we've tried. Why isn't it appropriate to try here? I say we refuse to throw Afghan women under the bus of realpolitik as we leave. Are we going to leave? Yes, but there's leaving and there's leaving. Are there some ways for us to think creatively about asylum for women, about perhaps even in country asylum for women? Can we say that if the Taliban is going to come back, then there better be 50 percent representation of women at that peace jirga, so the Taliban know that they're coming back where women are not dismissed as unimportant. Can we talk about ICC indictments for genocide and crime against humanity with reference to women, against top Taliban leaders? It doesn't mean we'll ever take them in, we probably never will. We'll probably never take Omar Al Bashir in either, but the indictment of Al Bashir and Sudan, even though he is sitting President, means something.

Can we talk about major funding for a Radio Free Women of Afghanistan station? Kristof himself argues that girl's schools should be transitioned to mosques so that it would be madrasas for girls, which would be acceptable to the Taliban. Okay, well, then let's make that happen, you know. If that's the only way that the Taliban will count women going to school, let's work with that. And how about continued foreign aid, of course, targeted to women. I think it's time to think strategically and comprehensively about a U.S. foreign policy that takes the cause of women seriously.

Afghanistan was the first American intervention where the situation of women was part of the rationale for intervention, whether you believe that was sincere or not. I believe Laura Bush was sincere. She even now has a new women's initiative targeted towards Afghanistan. So I think her interest is certainly sincere.

I think it's time for all of us to get sincere, for I think now we have a better understanding of why it's important, and we now have some of the important pieces. We have, after all, an extremely strong woman, Hilary Rodham Clinton, who has spoken out on women's rights in eloquent fashion. She is now Secretary of State of the United States of America.

President Obama has created the State Department Office of Women's -- of Global Women's issues. We have the new UN women architecture. We have UN Security Council resolution such as 1325, 1890, initiatives such as all women UN peacekeeping keeping forces, and we have the

ICC. So we have some of the pieces in place that we need to make this happen.

And I would just like to tell you about the peace that I and my colleagues are contributing. We have a project we call the WomanStats Project, and our brochures are on the back table there in which we have compiled what is the largest data base concerning the situation of women in the world today. We coded for over 300 variables, quantitative and qualitative. We're looking at laws and practices on the ground, and we do that for over 300 variables for 174 countries, that is, all countries with at least 200,000 population. We have over 110,000 data points, and our data, our maps and our scales are viewable on screen or can be downloaded.

Here's our database. Womanstats.org, this is our home page. All right. I'm going to show you what you can do with the data in just a moment, but I want to show you also that you can open our code book and you can see what variables we have. So we have multivariate scales and we also have lots and lots and lots and lots of variables. And so, for example, suppose you were interested in rape and sexual assault, we don't just have one variable on rape and sexual assault, we have many variables. Look at what we have, we have three variables on practice, are laws against rape enforced, are there taboos against reporting rape, can a woman be killed if she is raped. We have laws on -- we have variables on the law itself. What are the laws on rape? Is there a law against statutory rape, what are the punishments, how is fault decided, who can be a legal witness?

Data, how prevalent is rape, and then we scale it, as well, okay. And we also have wonderful, exciting maps which I will show you right now. So we have maps that will show you our scaling of women's physical security. And let's see if it will allow me to go forward. Inequity in family law, how well the government enforces laws for women, son preference and sex ratio, trafficking of females, polygene, we have the best polygene scale of anyone in the world, by the way, maternal mortality, discrepancy in education attainment between girls and boys, government participation by women, anyway, just glorious, wonderful maps for you.

Now let me show you the data base itself, assuming I can find out where the heck it is, I think that's it, all right. I'm going to log in, and I promise you, Roberta, after I show you this, I will sit down. Okay. You create a free account. I'm simply entering my log-in information. And I am brought to where I can ask to view data. When I view the data, I can select up to five countries and up to five variables, or you can choose to download the data, too. You have various filters that you can use, what kind of sources you want to see, whether you want the data sorted newest to oldest or oldest to newest.

Let's take Afghanistan, we've been talking Afghanistan. Let's take Bangladesh, let's take Columbia, all right. And here I'm just going to pull up

a few variables. Let's look at women's access to health care. Let's look at laws on rape. Let's see here, let's look at maternal mortality rates, all right.

Now I'm going to hit retrieve, and it's going to take a moment, hopefully a short moment. Okay, all of you who do research, take a look, okay. Right before your eyes you will have everything that we have found for these countries, and in addition, you will have the full bibliographic reference including what page we found it from, and if it was online, you will have a live link to the original source, okay.

There's the first variable. Look at all that stuff we have for Bangladesh and Columbia. Here's our second variable, laws on rape. Notice it all goes back to the late 1990s, early 2000s. So you have a longitudinal view, as well. What I wouldn't have given for this resource when I started asking about the linkage between the security women and the security of states. You are the beneficiaries of 10 years of data collection that will allow you a nuanced and a wide-ranging view of what the situation of women is in the nations of the world.

That's our contribution. We want to keep making it. We hope that we'll have the opportunity to continue our data collection and to continue our research. We have some ideas that we believe have policy implications, and we would like to work hand-in-hand with anyone in this room who is concerned and interested in developing R2PW. Thank you very much.

DR. BUSH: Thank you very much, Valerie, for a rich and challenging presentation. I'd now like to call on my colleague, Roberta Cohen for a few comments. Roberta has worked throughout her life to promote the protection of human rights. She was the director of our Project on the Internally Displaced here for many years, and I think she played a significant role in the formulation of the Doctrine of the Responsibility to Protect, so she's the ideal commentator. Roberta.

ROBERTA COHEN: Well, good morning, everyone. And I want to say to Valerie how extraordinary the research and the passion that you've exhibited in putting forth the ideas you have on women's security. What I'd like to do is relate some of this to my own work, which has involved studying humanitarian emergencies around the world, in particular, displaced populations, and that usually brings women front and center.

The inability and sometimes the unwillingness on the part of states to address the violence, discrimination, and marginalization of displaced women who number in the tens of millions often undermine humanitarian aid goals, as well as recovery and reconstruction, which, in turn, promote insecurity in different countries.

UN Security Council resolutions have linked violence against displaced and other women to peace and security. And the concept of the responsibility to protect (R2P) seeks to protect women, as well as men, from mass atrocities. The rhetoric is important, but massive and systematic sexual violence has recently been perpetrated against 30,000 women in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, who received little or no protection from their own government or from the United Nations. And unfortunately, I would suspect that that would be the case if there were an R2PW, as well, because there are many other issues involved, in particular higher priorities. But such violence clearly destroys families and communities, and combined with the lack of punishment directly effects peace and stability in the DRC.

Ten years ago I wrote an article entitled, "What's So Terrible About Rape and Other Attitudes at the United Nations." I wrote the article because a senior UN official actually asked me during the Balkans Wars, "what's so terrible about rape, you don't die from it."

Because of attitudes like that, I was not surprised to read in the UN Populations Fund's latest report that women in the Balkans have not received enough help in overcoming the violence to which they were subjected. The report suggests that helping women recover from the sexual violence and other trauma they suffer in a war or natural disaster is the key to moving countries forward.

Recognition that offering training and education to displaced women can promote reconstruction, development and stability in their societies when they return home has also increased. Researchers are finding links between rising education levels, development and reduced conflict within societies. But it's still instructive to note that when I visited Afghan refugee women in Pakistan in the mid-1990s, I found the UN defending schools that they were funding in which 92 percent of the students were boys.

The staff told me at that time that there were cultural sensitivities about girls being in school (sound familiar?), and that I shouldn't apply Western standards to the situation, but I discovered there were no women on the staff, so that the views being expressed were based on discussions with fundamentalist men. So I donned a burka and I went in to talk with the women, and I didn't meet one who didn't want her daughter in school.

Today, the U.S. and the UN are standing up for education and equality of women in Afghanistan as a development and a security issue. Nonetheless, the risk exists that in the search for peace, women's rights and security will be sacrificed, and that will be irrespective of the links drawn between women's security and peace in societies. I must say that I, myself, do not favor framing intervention in Afghanistan in terms of protecting women, but I agree that steps should be taken, a lot of steps, to protect them.

In natural disasters, which are increasing in intensity and number, and which produce millions of displaced people, one finds that disaster response can reinforce long standing patterns of discrimination against women. In India, during the tsunami, government officials in some areas would not provide compensation payments, relief funds and pensions to women, distributing them only to male heads of household. In some other Asian countries, lands and homes were not readily restored to women, who were often excluded from the policy and the program decision-making process. This limited the effectiveness of the relief programs and made reconstruction and development more difficult.

More women than men are reported to die or suffer injury in many natural disasters. Three times as many women as men died in the tsunami because they were not warned, they couldn't swim, or they couldn't leave their homes alone. Heightened sexual abuse and domestic violence often occur in disasters, with some governments like Pakistan, denying contraceptives to women during the period of the 2005 earthquake, making them more vulnerable to unwanted pregnancies and possible disease. The Women's Environment and Development Organization has emphasized that climate change is not gender neutral, it magnifies existing inequalities. And in recovery and reconstruction, if women are excluded, as they often are, from the design, development and implementation of programs, their capacity to benefit their households, communities, and the economic and social stability in their countries will be undermined.

Thanks to Valerie Hudson and others, linkages between gender, equality and peace within societies are being drawn, which my own work would support. However, in addition to the variables cited regarding peace, the level of democracy, level of wealth, prevalence of Islamic culture, and physical security of women, I would add the extent to which different ethnic groups in these societies share political and economic wealth, because that is what conflict often arises, leading to mass displacement.

I also would be interested to know whether evaluations of the status of women in different countries take into account how displaced women, who are usually the most marginalized and vulnerable among the female population, are treated. At Brookings -- in developing principles for the protection of displaced persons, we looked in the case of women at the extent to which food and supplies were delivered equally to them, the extent to which they had access to reproductive health care, the level of violence against them, their access to training programs and education, the extent to which their voices were heard in camp management and in policy decisions affecting their future and whether they were being included in peace processes. There really are no statistics on these issues, so I'm very delighted that you have a data base that might begin to look at this.

I have not seen evidence in my work of gender equality affecting the likelihood of countries going to war. I'd like to think that greater gender equality would be a key to peace, and I found compelling Dr. Hudson's article on security and sex ratios in Asia's largest states.

The United States' latest national security strategy affirms that countries are more peaceful and prosperous when women are accorded full and equal rights and opportunity, and yet the U.S. is engaged in two wars overseas, and there are Americans, including women, sometimes recommending a third. Israel, too, has made strides in gender equality, but it relies heavily on military solutions. I've also come across some fiercely nationalistic women's organizations in the Balkans whose programs, in my mind, do not promote reconciliation. I, therefore, look forward to more findings on this issue, and congratulate Valerie for pioneering a new approach that identifies women's security as an important factor in state security and the prevention of conflict.

In the case of China, I would just note that maybe more attention should be given to reports that urbanization is causing a change in attitude, leading families to look more favorably on girls than boys, but as the statistics show, that's going to take a long time. Also, the surplus of males in China may be accelerating the aging of the population, which, over the long term, might mitigate conflict. I will certainly explore your general thesis in my work on displaced populations. Thank you.

DR. BUSH: Thank you very much, Roberta. Now we have a little time for questions. If Roberta and Valerie would sort of mic themselves up, and we'll take questions from the floor. When called on you, please identify yourself, please wait for the mic before you identify yourself, and if you want to direct your question to anyone in particular, just please say so. Who has the first question?

QUESTION: Thank you. I must say I totally agree in your approach. I have a question. Is there such a thing as a reverse gender gap or unwilling gender discrimination, not only discrimination against man, but that leads to violence against women? So I'm asking this question because I think that all of the problems, even including those in Afghanistan, can only be solved with simultaneous education and emancipation of man together with women, and I'm asking this because of the experience my country has gone through.

I'm a visiting fellow from Mongolia. We have done and doing almost everything right. Female surplus in population, life expectancy over a decade, 10 years higher than men; universal suffrage, men and women together granted in 1924; cultural traditionally revering women where women in the household has the last decision; walking into a university class, and I'm not exaggerating, 75 percent of female students. However, this never stopped

domestic violence spouse abuse. And we think is it because of the parental obsession with the adult creation, the sort of mentality for boys parents prefer the breadwinner job, manual laborer. A couple decades ago it was a (inaudible) class. A decade ago it was the (inaudible) trader class. Now I'm afraid it will be the minors class. And when the uneducated man marries or enters a friendship with educated professional lady, that actually exacerbates the problem with domestic violence, do you think so, and then what can be resolutions? Thank you.

DR. BUSH: Valerie.

DR. HUDSON: Sure, I'm really glad to meet you, and I just wanted to say that I've had several female Mongolian students in my classes, and they are amazing. So I've come to believe that Mongolia produces exceptionally strong and tough-minded women.

Now, I almost put a slide in, but I thought it would be tangential, but I think clearly it probably was not tangential, which is, certainly we do not want to either attempt to alter male/female relations in such a way that men are in any way harmed, we can actually see the reverse.

So, for example, when you ameliorate the situation of women, men's life expectancies go up. When you ameliorate the status of women, the disease burden for men goes down, okay. And also, of course, boy children, their health and their future is very much dependent upon the situation of their mothers. So let me just say that I believe that in bringing the situation of women more in line with what we would consider to be CEDAW minimal benchmarks, I think men reap a tremendous benefit, as well.

Now, we in our country have seen how colleges now being seen by young men is less important, more important by women. I think you rightly raise the notion that education is not necessarily a panacea for what's happening between men and women. So, for example, in my studies on sex ratio, if you look at India, the sex ratio of children goes up in families where the families are college educated.

So clearly, education itself is not going to transform male/female relations. My co-authors and I have written a book manuscript that should come out next year called, believe it or not, *Sex and World Peace*. How do you like that? And we do spend an entire chapter talking about what has to happen at the household level for this not to become a zero sum game between men and women, which it cannot be. If it becomes a zero sum game, the whole purpose, you know, of your -- I think your activity is stymied. I would throw a question back on you, which is, you know, surely, the education of women on a par with men is not a bad thing for your country, is it? I can't imagine that you would argue it's a bad thing. But what you're saying is that maybe levels of domestic

violence have not decreased.

And so you suggested that perhaps men are resentful that their status is lower because the women have chosen education and they give their families pressures then to become manual laborers. Well, then if you believe that that's the case, then I think there's clearly some negative cultural attitudes concerning the future of men, concerning the future of boys, and that must be addressed, absolutely.

But I'm sure you don't mean to go in the direction of saying everything was better before, that's not the case. But with the gains that you have for women, what is it that needs to be done so that men do not feel that their own dreams are being sacrificed? I agree with you.

DR. BUSH: The next question, yes.

QUESTION: Perhaps a few observations about central Africa. I have had an opportunity to document photographically a number of things happening there, and one of the observations with women that many women have been left behind because of HIV, many of them have HIV, many of them are working to support their children.

There is a low incidence of employment, actually 70 percent unemployment, leaving a lot of males, young males, unattended, uncared for because you have to feed someone, and sometimes the other things aren't taking care of. And you see a huge population idle, on the street corner, nothing to do, no maternal guidance because of illness and displacement with -- or being forced to work, and the rumblings which could cause all sorts of internal unrest, and the implications, it looks like a call when ready to bubble over to me. Could you give some insights with what you see with your statistics?

DR. BUSH: And could you just identify yourself?

QUESTION: Jill Lynn Prince. I am a global photographer when it comes to international issues and been participating in a lot of these conversations for a number of years.

DR. BUSH: Thanks.

DR. HUDSON: I absolutely agree with you that Central Africa -- a lot of -- here in Africa, we see enormously high levels of violence against women. And I also see an amazing amount of unrest, as well. I think you've identified two factors that are very important, HIV decimating the young adult population and unemployment.

I was interested, of course, to hear you talk about the young male population, because that's certainly something that we looked at in our work on Bare Branches. What you also find is terribly inequitable law concerning women.

So, for example, just in the last two months, my coders have been looking at property rights in Africa, and one of the things that they have discovered is that in many of these societies, women are simply not allowed to own land. Even though it's legal for them to own land, they're not allowed to own land, they're not even allowed to plant trees on any of the land that they work, because if they planted trees, that would give them the status of someone who had a long-term investment in the land.

So I would add to this mix, terribly inequitable customary law. Polygyny, of course, is also highly prevalent, and polygyny is a well understood risk factor for creating just those population of idle young men with very few prospects aside from coalitionary aggression to obtain the resources that they want.

So I totally agree with you, and I would add some more to the mix. I was -- and I think violence against women is something that is sometimes overlooked when we look at the status of women. So, for example, if you look at GDI or GEM, the Gender Development Index or the Gender Empowerment Measure, often used by the UN system to look at the status of women, or even the gender gap measured by the World Economic Firm, they do not include measures of violence against women.

I think two weeks ago the gender gap report came out with their 2010 ranking of where the situation of women was best, South Africa was number 12, I almost gagged. The level of violence against women in South Africa is amazing. They have the highest rape rate in the entire world. How did they end up as number 12 on the gender gap's list of best places to be a woman? I don't understand that at all.

So I think violence against women and inequitable family law are things that we are not looking at when we see the instability of Sub-Saharan Africa, and it's time for us to take a good look. Thank you.

DR. BUSH: Another question? Yes.

QUESTION: My name is Amy Farnsworth and I actually am a BYU student and I work with Dr. Hudson on the WomanStats, so I do some coding. I'm here on an internship in D.C., so this is exciting for me to get to see her. But I was just wondering, for both of you, either of you, what is the best way to call people's attention to these ideas, or not even just to call their attention to it, but to actually get them to care about these things when they see them?

I mean -- and especially because in this room you see a lot of women, and then there are some men, how do we get especially men to care about these issues, do you think? I mean would it be kind of going Dr. Hudson's route, where you present an idea and they shoot it down, so you say, okay, well, I'm going to find the research, and then you show the research to them and then they start caring, or do you have any suggestions maybe on how this can be done to get more men involved?

MS. COHEN: I can't give you an overall blueprint on that score, but having worked in the international arena on women that are displaced, say, and where these problems are very grave, one, I think, if you do point out that not dealing with this kind of situation can undermine relief programs, as I mentioned when I was speaking, reconstruction programs, development programs, even peace, this is always something that comes across, and I think the UN staff people in the field have begun to grasp this.

There are other ways that are more bureaucratic fights that you would have over any other issue. I was sent out by UNHCR, for example, to the Kenya/Somalia border, where there were a tremendous number of rapes of Somali refugee women, and the Somalis were coming over the border at night, and they were attacking the women in the camps.

Now, what I did see at the border was that the staff was young, inexperienced, and really didn't know how to handle this. When I went back to Nairobi, I discovered that the head of the UNHCR in the capital had never been down to the border, where you really had protection issues, nor had the protection officer.

So it was a matter of then finding arguments to persuade them. I don't know if there's anyone here from Human Rights Watch, but I noticed there was somebody down at the border from Human Rights Watch, so I said to them (the UN officials), "you're going to look very bad in the newspapers unless you do something." The UN officials both got tickets to go down there very fast. I mean this is ordinary. I couldn't make a big speech about the responsibility to protect women and the fact that they were staying in the capital and looking at a small case load of refugees, whereas down at the border was the problem.

They didn't really have any idea of how to secure the area, so they asked me, and I'm certainly not an expert in that, but they asked, what should we do down here. I said you ought to put thorn branches around the whole refugee camp so it would be harder to break through it, and they did.

But I noticed that the head of the office predated his request for the

materials. The UN told me that and other staff has told me that. But that was fine, we got it done. So some of the steps you have to take are very obvious, involving bureaucratic fights. They were concerned about the evaluation that would get.

In the broader picture, the conceptualizing of protection also has ultimate impact. I mean, responsibility to protect, for example, this kind of looking at a situation, and I would have to think a good deal about what that would mean to extend it specifically R2PW. But this begins to raise consciousness or raise an expectation that something should happen, and that in itself is very -- you can't really measure it, but you do begin to see a greater awareness that if there are mass atrocities somewhere, steps have to be taken that there is an international responsibility beyond the national when the national one fails.

And so even in the Congo situation, which is really quite horrendous, and where the UN and the Congolese government have failed these women, absolutely, but you do have now the United States program to train Congolese military, for example, and make them more gender sensitive. And there's a big push by the UN peacekeeping office to get its troops much better trained when it comes to gender issues.

And all of this comes out of a generally greater international awareness to take steps and then to work with civil society. That's very important in all these countries because that's where it's happening. And this requires funds and programs that try to work with women's groups, all kinds of groups, men's groups, as well, to try to end that kind of atrocity in the society and violence. So it's a very long step, but I think that at all levels, the conceptual and then the more practical steps and then the bureaucratic ones, all of these play a role and reinforce coming to a solution.

DR. BUSH: Valerie, do you want to supplement?

DR. HUDSON: I'm taking notes. But I would like to add that I do believe that conceptual is important. I notice that a lot of what Roberta mentioned about raising expectations and saying you will be ashamed if this came out relies upon sort of making these issues part of what people think about, part of what people care about, and I think that sort of public education project is extremely important.

That's one of the reasons I was so delighted to see *Half the Sky* become a best seller, that people, not just in Washington, D.C. and New York City were reading this book, but that people all across America were beginning to read this book and to have book discussions, book club discussions about it, and so forth. Many of my labors are in the academic field, and what has pleased me to no end is that the journals that I have written, the Bare Branches article and the

article about security -- state security of gender, these are in the top 20 articles downloaded from the journal. They are making their way into the syllabi of not just graduate students, but undergraduate students, as well. So I think a lot of the action is also in training the next generation, you know, you should think about these things.

When I went to graduate school, you could have gone to my doctoral program as a Martian and never know that there were even women on the planet Earth, all right. But laugh, but, you know, those of you about my age, it's true, isn't it? It's true. You could not go through a graduate program in security studies now without knowing that there are women on the planet. That in itself, I think, is a conceptual breakthrough. But I think we need to push that even further.

DR. BUSH: Thank you. We've come to the end of our time and I'm afraid we're going to have to conclude. But I want to thank Gordon for making this possible, Valerie for a really stimulating presentation –

DR. HUDSON: Thank you.

DR. BUSH: -- Roberta for her comments, and you for coming and bringing great questions. Thank you very much.

* * * * *