Gender, violence and peace: a post-2015 development agenda

Conflict and violence have been the most important factors obstructing progress on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to date. Countries that have recently experienced major violence have higher poverty rates than other countries, and UN Member States have recognised that “conflict and post-conflict countries are the most challenged in achieving any of the Goals by 2015.”

Gender has increasingly become a part of the international peace and security agenda, particularly since the passage of UN Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1325 and subsequent resolutions on women, peace and security. Yet little attention has been given to examining how the resources and political will generated by the post-2015 framework could help move this agenda forward.

In this paper, Saferworld and Conciliation Resources set out a vision for including gender, peace and security in the post-2015 framework. A gender, peace and security approach to post-2015 includes, but also goes beyond a focus on women’s empowerment. Inter alia, it means paying attention to the relationships between gender, violence and inclusive decision-making. Building on our previous recommendations for including peacebuilding commitments in the post-2015 development agenda, we suggest targets and indicators that illustrate how gender, peace and security can best be integrated into the framework.

1 The World Development Report 2011: conflict, security and development warned that a country that experienced major violence over the period from 1981 to 2005 has a poverty rate 21 percentage points higher than a country that did not experience such levels of violence.
2 UN System Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda (2012), Peace and security thematic think piece, p. 3.
3 At the time of writing, UNSCRs on women, peace and security include 1325, 1820, 1888, 1889, 2160, 2106 and 2122.
4 This paper complements work done by our organisations on post-2015, individually and in cooperation with others. It is not meant to set out a comprehensive peacebuilding / conflict prevention agenda for post-2015, but rather looks at the intersections of gender, peace and security and explains its relevance to post-2015. We also include what we think are useful suggestions from other organisations.
**Recommendations**

**Things the post-2015 development framework should do:**

- be universal, aimed at advancing sustainable peace for all. People, not states, should be at its core.
- integrate peacebuilding and violence prevention by including goals and targets, which address the most common drivers of conflict and violence.
- include a standalone gender equality goal, which balances targets on ending abuses of women’s rights, targets supporting women’s agency and leadership and targets to tackle the underlying causes of gender inequality, including discriminatory attitudes and social norms.
- include among these commitments targets and indicators to address gender issues which drive conflict, violence and exclusion. Inclusive decision-making should also be a key feature of the new framework.
- utilise disaggregated data to help eliminate gender inequality and a range of other inequalities in every element of the new framework, and invest in data-gathering capacities to enable this.

**Targets the post-2015 framework should include:**

- All social groups can express political opinion without fear and participate in the decisions that affect society.
- Increase women’s political participation and influence on decision-making at all levels.
- All social groups are free from violence and insecurity.
- Violence against women and girls is eliminated.
- Broader targets to address key drivers of conflict and violence (see Saferworld: Addressing conflict and violence from 2015: A vision of goals, targets and indicators).

Cover image: A woman in Sunsari, Nepal, expresses her security concerns to district and national level government stakeholders during an event in her village as part of a project that brings together community members and authorities to address local security issues. © Saferworld/Anil Poudel
Gender matters for sustainable peace

A number of studies have found a strong correlation between levels of conflict and gender inequality. The nature of this relationship is not always clear – that is, it is unclear whether violence fuels gender inequality, gender inequality fuels violence, or both. While in some cases women make gains in advancing their strategic interests during times of conflict, this is often – though not always – followed by a post-conflict backlash in which more unequal gender roles are restored.

There is strong evidence that the gender norms which underpin gender inequality can drive conflict and violence, particularly where militarised notions of masculinity are prevalent. This is most obvious when discriminatory attitudes fuel gender-based violence; however, it can also be observed in armed conflict within and between communities.

“Conflict and violence have been important barriers to achieving the MDGs for women and girls”

There are many examples of how gender dynamics can fuel conflict. Research by Saferworld and others in South Sudan reveals that participation in violent cattle raids, which perpetuate conflict between communities, is seen as a prerequisite to manhood and a rite of passage for young men. The bride price system, in which cattle are exchanged for girls and women, exacerbates violent cycles of abduction and revenge.

As a result, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) argues that addressing gender norms in South Sudan is crucial to addressing the underlying causes of conflict. Similarly, in parts of Yemen, owning a gun is considered an integral part of being a man. This close association between masculinity and gun ownership has no doubt contributed to Yemenis becoming the second most heavily armed population in the world. The widespread availability of weapons among the young male population has meant that small disputes can rapidly escalate into violent conflicts.

Peace matters for gender equality

As well as causing death, injury, and displacement, armed conflict destroys infrastructure, disrupts markets, disturbs social ties, diminishes the capacity of states, and diverts vital resources away from development. It is therefore no surprise that conflict can exacerbate gender inequality. Conflict and militarisation tend to reinforce men’s traditional roles as decision-makers and fighters, which may explain why the available evidence suggests that men are more likely to suffer violent deaths during armed conflict.

At the same time, conflict and violence exacerbate many of the causes of women’s exclusion. For example, they typically increase:

- violence against women
- women’s double burden of productive and reproductive labour
- the number of women’s dependents (including the injured and orphaned)
- disease and malnutrition among women and girls

Conflict and violence have been important barriers to achieving the MDGs for women and girls, for example, in 2008 all eight of the countries with the highest maternal mortality ratios were in or emerging from violent conflict.

---


7 Saferworld (2012), People’s peacemaking perspectives In South Sudan. For further analysis of gender norms and cattle raiding in South Sudan see Small Arms Survey 2010, Symptoms and causes: insecurity and underdevelopment in Eastern Equatoria; United States Institute of Peace (2011), Dowry and division: youth and state building in South Sudan; Ofxam (2013), Challenges to security, livelihoods and gender justice in South Sudan; Richmond, M. and Krause-Jackson, F. ‘Cows for bride inflation spurs cattle theft in South Sudan’, Bloomberg News, 26 July 2011.

8 OECD INCAF (2013), Gender and statebuilding in fragile and conflict-affected fragile states

9 For a summary of evidence on the relationship between conflict, violence and the MDGs, see Saferworld (2012), The impact of conflict and violence on achieving development.


Defining goals, targets and indicators

The post-2015 framework is not going to be and should not be regarded as the solution for all problems. The six UNSCRs on women, peace and security and the UN’s accompanying global indicators set out a wide range of international commitments, and the post-2015 framework ought to complement – not duplicate – these. While the UNSCRs focus on responding to conflict and violence, the post-2015 agenda can and should take a longer term approach, addressing structural, developmental barriers to peace, development and gender equality. Issues which are relevant only for countries currently affected by conflict, such as women’s participation in peace negotiations, may be less relevant to a global development framework. However, key elements of the gender, peace and security agenda – including some of the UN’s global indicators – are universally relevant and could make important contributions to promoting peace and gender equality post-2015. The following sections set out our recommendations for goals, targets and indicators to be included in the framework.

A standalone goal on gender equality

Gender equality is an important end in itself, deserving its own goal. A range of research from the World Bank, UN Development Programme (UNDP), UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), OECD and others also demonstrates that achievement of MDG3 on gender equality is vital to the achievement of the other MDGs, and the OECD has declared that “it is evident that continuing discrimination against girls and women will make it difficult to fully achieve any of the MDGs.”

A post-2015 gender equality goal should be transformative: it should address structural causes of gender inequality at all levels – national, local and household. This should include addressing concrete barriers to access to resources and participation in

“Only when all feel they have a stake in the future, and societies are able to manage competing interests constructively, will sustainable peace come within reach.”

decision-making processes, as well as social norms and attitudes which uphold gender inequality (both elaborated on in the section below).

Gender inequality results in women being disadvantaged around the world, and hence the post-2015 framework should have targets that focus specifically on women’s rights. But gender inequality should not be treated only as a women’s issue. Even as we focus on women’s rights, progress is impossible unless behaviour and attitudes towards gender change. Transforming gender relations requires both women and men to change the way they think about their roles and identities, and indicators focused on men’s and women’s attitudes are vital to challenging social norms and values.

In addition, the framework needs to address other axes of inequality and therefore disaggregate data according to age, disability, ethnicity and other factors.

While a standalone gender equality goal is important, in itself it will not be enough. Gender equality will also need to be mainstreamed throughout the framework, including through gender-sensitive targets and gender-disaggregated data.\(^{14}\) Mainstreaming gender inequality will also help address other inequalities and problems. For example there is evidence that increasing women’s paid employment in post-conflict countries can improve community welfare and may lead to significant peace dividends.\(^{15}\)

Inclusive governance and women’s participation

Sustainable peace requires inclusive decision-making processes. As evidenced in the *World Development Report 2011: conflict, security and development*, peace and development can only be upheld by states that are inclusive, responsive, fair, and accountable to all of their people. Exclusion of some social groups from participation in governance structures can be a key driver of conflict.\(^{16}\) Only when all feel they have a stake in the future, and societies are able to manage competing interests constructively, will sustainable peace come within reach. A target on inclusive governance, ensuring that all social groups can participate in the decisions that affect society, should therefore be a key component of the post-2015 framework.

In addition to ensuring that individuals from all social groups - including the most marginalised - take up decision-making positions, such a target should aim to open up decision-making processes to enable people to voice concerns.

In addition to a target on inclusive governance, the post-2015 framework should include a target on increasing women’s participation and influence in decision-making under a gender equality goal. While women make up half the world’s population, they continue to be excluded from leadership positions around the world – in developing and developed countries alike. Women very rarely get to take part in decision-making on matters of peace and security, and this reflects their exclusion from senior decision-making positions in most societies. Support for women’s leadership can also help to break down gender stereotypes: in current peace and security efforts, women are often depicted merely as victims in need of protection. This ignores the active role that women can and do play in peace and conflict, whether as agents of change or within fighting forces.\(^{17}\) Including this gender-specific target would enhance broader efforts toward inclusive governance by addressing gendered barriers to participation.

As with other targets, a target promoting women’s participation should be based on an analysis of the specific barriers to their participation in each context. In some cases, it may be that women require further education, organisational and advocacy skills. In other cases, addressing structural barriers such as resistance to women’s participation, the burden of unpaid care, and lack of access to resources is just as important.

Furthermore, participation in decision-making does not guarantee influence on it. Efforts to further participation should not just be focused on numbers of representatives; participation must be meaningful too. For example, during negotiations for the Comprehensive Peace Agreement in Sudan, while female delegates were included, they were expected to toe the party line and their perspectives and experiences were overlooked in the negotiations.\(^{18}\) Recognising the tendency for representation in public institutions to be limited to those from more privileged backgrounds, all indicators should be disaggregated where possible by factors such as ethnicity, region and income group.

An indicator measuring women’s perceptions as to whether decision-makers are addressing their concerns would help to assess whether women and their concerns are adequately represented.

Moreover, grassroots initiatives – often involving or even led by women - should be more greatly valued and financially and politically supported. These initiatives

\(^{14}\) Policymakers should consider ways of ensuring that this does not assume binary gender identities of ‘male’ and ‘female’ but takes into account those who self-identify outside of this binary.

\(^{15}\) UN Women (2012), Women working for recovery: the impact of female employment on family and community welfare after conflict.


\(^{18}\) Accord Insight: Women building peace, case study Sudan.
Each illustrative target contains a range of indicator options which could be further developed. In each case, the indicators we consider more promising are placed closer to the target. The ‘source’ identified for each indicator illustrates that there is a recent multinational metric available attempting to monitor the variable in question, but this is not a claim that this data source is adequate.
## Voice and accountability score
**Source:** World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI)

## Percentage of voter turnout in national and local elections
**Source:** IDEA; also proposed by IDPS

## Election integrity
**Source:** Global Integrity Index

## Freedom of the press index score
**Source:** Reporters Without Borders

## Number of journalists killed, imprisoned, missing or in exile
**Source:** Committee to Protect Journalists/Reporters Without Borders Press Freedom Barometer

## Combined scores: freedom of speech, freedom of assembly & association, electoral self-determination
**Source:** Cingranelli-Richards (CIRI) database

## Civic activism
**Source:** ISS-ISD

## Combined scores: civil liberties, political participation
**Source:** Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) Political Democracy Index

## Voting and party information score
**Source:** Global Integrity Index

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Situation</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of political rights</strong></td>
<td><strong>Percentage of voting age population registered to vote</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of civil liberties</strong></td>
<td><strong>Combined scores: electoral process &amp; pluralism, political culture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During election campaigns, how much do you personally fear becoming a victim of political intimidation or violence?</td>
<td><strong>Perceptions of voting age population registered to vote</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How free are you to say what you want?</td>
<td><strong>Enabling space/environment score</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How free are you to join any political organisation you want?</td>
<td><strong>Non-governmental organisations, public information &amp; media score</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of population who feel that political decision-makers are addressing their concerns</td>
<td><strong>Electoral process</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of population satisfied with opportunities and channels for public participation in decision-making processes</td>
<td><strong>Diversity in representation (by gender, region and social groups) in key decision-making bodies (legislature, government, security services, judiciary)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Overall, how satisfied are you with the way democracy works in your country? | **Source:** none known; proposed by IDPS

---

**All social groups can express political opinion without fear and participate in the decisions that affect society**
play an integral role in building and sustaining peace, and more should be done to focus not only on formal processes and governance but also on informal. In various contexts, supporting grassroots initiatives can be just as vital as increasing the participation of women in official decision-making.10

Addressing violence and insecurity

Lack of basic security is both a driver and a consequence of armed conflict,20 and preventing direct violence and insecurity is one – though by no means the only – element of building sustainable peace. People experience violence and insecurity differently according to their gender and a range of other factors. For example, the available data suggests that while men are more likely than women to suffer violent deaths both in conflict and in peacetime, certain forms of violence are more likely to affect women, such as abuse by an intimate partner.21 Research by Conciliation Resources revealed that women make up the overriding majority of small-scale traders in cross-border communities, making them more likely to experience security threats relating to corruption and sexual harassment from officers as they cross the border.22 Such examples illustrate why the post-2015 framework needs to be designed to address the diverse security needs of all social groups, including women.

One means of measuring people’s security without being prescriptive about what makes people feel insecure would be to measure levels of security through a ‘basket’ of indicators. Thus indicators on security would include perception indicators asking people how safe they feel, using disaggregated data to capture responses from all social groups. From a gender perspective, it is important to consider that discriminatory treatment by security and justice providers on the basis of not only gender but also ethnicity, class and other factors can be a key barrier to accessing security and justice services. So a disaggregated measure of men’s and women’s trust in security and justice providers is particularly vital.

In addition to a general measure of perceptions of security, targets and indicators measuring specific forms of violence can help to ensure that important issues are not missed. For example, the issue of violence against women has been referred to as the “missing MDG target”.23 A target on this is needed under a gender equality goal in the new framework. Many forms of violence against women, such as harassment, domestic violence and marital rape, are often not thought of as security issues even by women themselves, and so would not necessarily be accurately accounted for under a general target to improve people’s security. This is particularly true of mental and emotional abuse, which is not always thought of as a form of violence. Including indicators measuring a variety of forms of violence is therefore crucial from a human rights perspective.

Measuring levels of violence – particularly gender-based violence - is notoriously difficult due to the contestation of the concept, taboos around speaking out about it and risks of retraumatising survivors or putting them at further risk. Resources will need to be invested to find ways of measuring it which are rigorous, ethical, conflict-sensitive and minimise the risk of manipulation.

From a peacebuilding perspective it is also vital to address violence – including gender-based violence – against men. Whereas men are commonly depicted as perpetrators of violence, gender-based violence against men, including in the form of sexual violence, forced recruitment into armed groups, and gender-based killings, is a common feature of armed conflict.24 A recent study by Oxford Research Group in Syria, for example, found that deaths among boys outnumbered those among girls by two to one, and that older boys were “consistently the most frequent victims of targeting killings such as those involving sniper fire, execution or torture.”25

Measuring the prevalence of gender-based violence for the purposes of the post-2015 framework would be exceptionally difficult, as efforts to identify in practice which instances of violence are gender-based and what can be classified as violence would be open to contestation. However, it is feasible to include these forms of violence in the post-2015 framework in other ways, for example through a target on violence and insecurity (which could include a measure of sexual violence) that relies on perceptions and utilises gender-sensitive and minimise the risk of manipulation.

“People experience violence and insecurity differently according to their gender”
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Deaths due to violence, war, civil conflict and other intentional injuries per 100,000 population

Alternative: Homicides per 100,000 population

Rate of population displacement due to violence

Number of deaths from armed conflict

Number of children recruited by armed groups and violent gangs per 100,000 population

Political stability and absence of violence score

Total recorded crimes per 100,000 people

Deaths due to violence, war, civil conflict and other intentional injuries per 100,000 population

Alternative: Homicides per 100,000 population

Rate of population displacement due to violence

Number of deaths from armed conflict

Number of children recruited by armed groups and violent gangs per 100,000 population

Political stability and absence of violence score

Total recorded crimes per 100,000 people
It is also necessary to address the attitudes underlying gender-based violence, as this is key to prevention. As above, qualitative evidence suggests a strong link between conflict and militarised notions of masculinity which normalise relations of domination and control and valorise violence. One means of addressing this as a cause of conflict and violence could be through an indicator measuring acceptance of others’ use of violence as a means to an end, which is included in the illustrative target on page 9. This is also particularly important in relation to gender-based violence: the evidence tells us that discriminatory attitudes towards women, including a belief in a man’s right to beat or force sexual contact on his partner, are among the factors most consistently associated with male violence against women. Given the importance of social norms and attitudes as an underlying cause of gender inequality more broadly, these are included as indicators in each of our illustrative targets, but alternatively could be separated out into a target on discriminatory attitudes under a gender equality goal.
