

Impunity Watch is an international NGO seeking to promote accountability for past atrocities in countries emerging from a violent past. IW promotes an integrated and participatory approach to transitional justice and produces research-based policy advice. IW aims to assist communities affected by violence and local organisations to have a stronger voice in policymaking for transitional justice.

Policy Brief

Masculinities, Violence against Women in Leadership & Participation in Transitional Societies: Burundi & Guatemala

Enhancing UNSCR1325 implementation

Contents

Summary

Research Background

Burundi and Guatemala:

Thematic findings

Conclusions

Key Recommendations

Summary

On the occasion of the 17th anniversary of UNSCR 1325 on Women, Peace and Security, Impunity Watch, Oxfam Ibis, UNWOMEN and the Permanent Representation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the United Nations, will convene a side event on masculinities, violence against women in leadership, and their participation in peace and justice within transitional societies. This Policy Brief provides a country specific and thematic contribution for the side event aiming to tackling the persistent gap as regards gender norms, men and masculinities in the full implementation of UNSCR 1325.

It is our conviction that genuine societal transformation after violence must transcend a narrow focus on particular mechanisms alone, eschew one-size-fits-all approaches, and instead facilitate genuine involvement, at all levels of power, in an integrated approach to dealing with violence and abuse that is transformative in nature.

Research Background

Seventeen years after the signing of UN Resolution 1325, we take the opportunity to pause and think about the landscape of gender equality; to reflect on the tremendous gains made over almost two decades by dedicated organisations, groups, and individuals that have strategically leveraged the Resolution and its support structures. But we also take the opportunity to reflect on where gaps still exist—absences of research, cracks in implementation, and especially spaces where reform appears unable to create real systemic change.

With this motivation, our research focuses on two related questions: First, what are female leaders in contexts that have experienced political violence saying about the challenges to achieving full gender parity and deep systemic change in their own fields? And second, what roles do the performance of particular kinds of masculinity play in blocking change? This research, then, specifically seeks to understand the challenges women in leadership in peacebuilding and in the justice sector are continuing to face in Burundi and Guatemala respectively, and the role that violent and patriarchal masculinities are playing to inhibit the development of meaningful gender equality.

Focusing on critical challenges to the peace process in Burundi and deep systemic change in the Guatemalan judiciary, our goal was to look at two very different situations: one in the renegotiation of a fragile peace process, almost two decades after the original Arusha Accords were signed; and another, where entrenched structures of organised crime, abusive and corrupt political and economic elites and the military maintain power within the state, all make justice sector reform even more central to preserving the more than two decades of hard fought gains to deepen Guatemala's peace.¹

In doing this work, Impunity Watch seeks to deepen and broaden the understanding of the interplay between masculinities and the continuum of violence against women in order to strengthen primary prevention in policy and programming. In the coming weeks, we will also launch our full comparative report which contains both studies, areas where we find similar and relatable challenges, as well as areas where the challenges are specific to the context. The report provides both food for thought and a basis for next steps.

Why do this research?

“Yes, leadership positions are for men. Authority is assigned to men (...)

And when a woman is empowered and makes firm decisions, some say, ‘and who does she think she is?!’”

What has been dubbed the ‘add women and stir’ approach has failed to account for gendered power dynamics, which fuel underlying exclusionary processes. Within patriarchal and militarized structures, we have seen initiatives—intended to foster women’s participation and greater gender equality—make progress while continuing to run up against the same challenge: our inability to foster meaningful systemic change.

Impunity Watch’s research exploring alternative masculinities in Guatemala within the framework of its Prevention of Violence Against Women Programme (2013-2015) found that the majority of efforts to counter violence against women have focused primarily on *consequences* of the expression of violent masculinities rewarded and often embedded during conflict, rather than its structural *causes*.² This is true for both Guatemala and other regions of the world.

Two findings helped shape the current study. The first was that women have primarily been cast as victims, in need of protection (in particular from gender-based violence), but their agency and leadership have tended to be disregarded.³ Less careful attention has been given to strategies female leaders have used to create change. Second, there was very little accessible empirical work for policymakers to reach out to, showing how particular forms of masculinity underpin the strategic resort to violence, harassment, humiliation and body-shaming, gender and sexual stereotypes to discredit women’s leadership, and to undermine their involvement in public life. We should also reflect on the preferences of policymakers and donors—even with such knowledge—to orient away from ‘politicised’ social change work, and instead towards easier to implement technical approaches.

In other words, when it comes to creating policies for improving gender parity, limited attention has been given to the ideologies of male domination that are maintained within, and rewarded by, social structures. Equally, such masculinities tend to close out space for alternative expressions of masculinity or gender that can help foster just and peaceful societies in post-conflict periods.

¹ This work is part of a larger programme led by Impunity Watch that has focused on the need for sharper gender analysis of men and the role of masculinities in the perpetuation of violence against women in societies marked by a history of mass violence. It is part of the Funding Leadership and Opportunities for Women (FLOW) Programme: Tackling Violence Against Women Beyond Borders - Burundi, Guatemala & Liberia, in partnership between Impunity Watch and Oxfam Ibis, and was implemented by Impunity Watch.

For more information, see www.impunitywatch.org/html/index.php?paginaID=50&programID=9

² García, Glenda, “La Prevención de la Violencia contra las Mujeres y el trabajo con hombres: una Mirada de Justicia Transicional con Enfoque de Género Basada en la Resolución 1325 de Naciones Unidas”, *Impunity Watch*, (2015).

³ This finding is supported by global best practice on perceptions of women and implementation of UN Resolution 1325, which seeks to move beyond the binary of women as victims and men as perpetrators, but to understand the spectrum in between in order to craft better policy.

We found that there are several important steps to be made towards designing more impactful approaches to confront systems that cultivate, reward, and maintain severe gender inequality. One—the focus of this work—is to understand the way that hegemonic masculinity seeks to maintain a status quo that favours impunity, intimidation, and corruption, and the tools used by women and men fighting this system.

As a result, the objectives of this research are threefold:

1. To explore the role masculinities—both hegemonic and alternative—play in the continuum of violence against women in leadership, so that we can understand the underlying barriers that inhibit women’s full and meaningful participation in key decision-making environments in societies that have experienced mass violence;
2. To investigate how explicit and implicit violence is experienced by female leaders, how it is manifested, and what consequences it has, so that we can increase awareness and foster debate on the forms of everyday violence, as well as direct violence, that is perpetuated and sustained by individuals and institutions; and
3. To move our research insights about best practice into action-oriented recommendations, reinforcing the capacity of practitioners and policymakers to develop evidence-based interventions that embed an approach that addresses the perpetuation of violent masculinities.

Methodology

The two case studies were developed out of a shared research framework designed for comparative research. This framework underpinned the theoretical positioning of the work, the key dilemmas of the field, and the overarching questions. The case study teams subsequently adapted the core questions and proposed methodology to meet the needs of each context. More on methodology and approach can be found in the accompanying case studies.

Burundi and Guatemala: Thematic Findings

Links between the past and the present: Protecting those who profit

"On May 14, 2011, I left a breakfast for Mother's Day (...) with a group of friends ... when I returned to my house I saw that I had been called several times and then my companion told me, 'you're good?' [I replied =] 'Yes...' (...) then 2, 3, 4 calls; I said [to myself] 'what is happening?' A friend called, she was crying and said, 'Yassmin are you okay?' 'Yes', I asked her what happened, she said, 'we have been trying to locate you for a few hours now because we heard that they were going to eliminate a high-risk judge'".

While women were victims of all of grave crimes committed during the internal armed conflicts in both Guatemala and Burundi, the main forms of violence against women during war were gender-based. In **Guatemala** especially, this was targeted overwhelmingly towards indigenous women. The judicial system developed as part of the infrastructure of violent control of the population. It was a vehicle for instilling fear, obedience, and for breaking resistance to the state. Common to conflict contexts, it was also a site through which individuals were able to use intimidation and coercion for personal profit. A greed economy within this and other institutions became intertwined with a political system that benefited from implicit and explicit violence. Similarly, these structures became sites that upheld and profited from women’s humiliation and their fear of humiliation. State-citizen power relations, characterised by racism, misogyny, and patriarchy, were replicated and embedded into public institutions, and especially the justice system, where a symbiotic relationship of corruption and impunity flourished.

The violence, and its systemic acceptance and normalisation, has not been significantly dislodged over two decades since the signing of the historic 1996 Peace Accords. Women and men working in Guatemala’s justice sector across all levels have encountered the legacy of this normalisation in the form of implicit (and sometimes explicit) violence, impunity, corruption, and intimidation. The people interviewed for this study are not the same women, or with a few important exceptions, the same ethnic group, as those who faced the worst of the conflict years. However, the study has traced the replication of the *methods* of coercion and impunity.

The report shows that Guatemalan female leaders in the justice system face targeted harassment as a means of threat and to undermine their authority. Sexual harassment, humiliation and intimidation remain constant, and physically and emotionally exhausting, factors they face as part of their everyday environment. So long as systemic and implicit violence remains a barrier, society will continue to be hamstrung by gender-based power inequalities, and acceptance of a culture of violence. The country report provides multiple cases such as those that follow. In just one example,

in 2014 Judge Claudia Escobar was forced to leave the country with her family from fear of reprisal attacks as a result of denouncing corruption and irregularities within the nomination process for the new Supreme Court of Judges, when corrupt politicians' lawyers attempted to influence her to change her sentences against political figures in exchange for securing her election as judge. More recently, Judge Yassmin Barrios was abused in her own court by Rios Montt's defense lawyers, and has been subject to multiple actual and implied attacks on her safety.

These examples are only the most extreme along a spectrum of continuous threats to people working in the justice sector who combat the institutional culture of corruption, kickbacks and bribery. Both female and male interviewees who requested anonymity when discussing the issue of corruption and impunity were visibly afraid for their safety.

In **Burundi**, this link between the past and the present in the political system takes the form of a closed, elite group of actors who were either institutionally or personally part of the conflict. Failed power sharing agreements that were neither inclusive nor comprehensive, and that did not pay enough attention to involving rebel groups in the peace process, are part of the problem. Battles to rule the country led to (entirely male) political elites ignoring the complex societal composition, leading to exclusion and marginalisation. These leaders profit from stoking the nationalism that has driven the conflict's recent re-triggering. These actors walk a fine line between accepting the recommendations of regional and international actors to include marginalised groups and especially women in the peace process and in government, and making little room for meaningful change. As a result, the laws passed to encourage gender parity are unable to play a full embedding role; instead they remain important, but easily undermined, tools for change.

Female interviewees across the political spectrum agreed that their participation in peace negotiations in the context of the current crisis remains ad hoc. Not only are they not systematically invited to sessions of the negotiations, but they have to lobby mediators fiercely even for their inclusion. Within political parties it is rare to find members of delegations included without the intervention or special request of mediators. Women's right to political participation, and the sensitivity for inclusive gender negotiations, is still poor, regardless of whether the focus is the government or political parties.

We argue that women's absence from Arusha II is both "by default and intention". This is an important reflection. More than a decade since the implementation of Burundi's law setting a 30% female participation quota in elected and nominated public bodies, women are still virtually absent from the negotiating table. When included, it is largely as representatives of non-governmental organisations, and rarely on behalf of political parties or national or international institutions. These persistent blocks are a direct reflection of the challenges of creating qualitative change from purely quantitative approaches to participation and inclusion. They are also a reflection of the difficulty of dislodging patriarchal masculinities from hegemonic power when they are exclusively in control.

Rigid understandings of gender and ethnic roles

In both Guatemala and Burundi, the spaces in which leadership is practiced are defined by rigidly patriarchal societies, and equally rigid understandings of gender roles. These understandings, of men as 'public actors' and women as 'better in the home', or of macho cultures as 'the way we do things' also frame the way that leadership is exercised, and who is entitled to be heard as well as who is entitled to create change. In both contexts, the spaces are overwhelmingly male, and both implicitly and explicitly closed to outsiders.

Those who rock this boat—to challenge impunity and corruption, or for greater representation in decision-making power—are met with the full force of social norms. But tied into the spectrum of Guatemalan and Burundian power-holders' responses to these challenges are also sometimes quieter methods of violence, intimidation, harassment, and humiliation. Female leaders are ridiculed; criticised and objectified for the way they look, their qualifications undermined or discounted entirely. On the one end of this spectrum, they very often face explicit threats of sexual violence because of their work, and their role as *female* public actors. At the other end, their legitimacy is belittled or undermined in small and large ways. It is important to note particularly when women are being attacked either verbally or physically, no one speaks out in their defence. This silence functions to aggravate their isolation and compound their vulnerability.

These are practices learned and embedded within both countries' multi-decade conflicts, and they should be understood as institutional legacies of mass violence. To be clear, male colleagues who challenge impunity or the status quo face threats of violence. But they do not come up against the additional landscape of innuendo, ridicule, personal attacks based on physical appearance, and sexual harassment so common that it was normalised both by the system and in the perceptions of individuals.

On this front, the report makes particularly clear that indigenous female judges face intersectional discrimination, both on a gender and ethnic basis. Indigenous female judges commented on the double weight of racism and sexism they face, including disparaging comments on where they come from, on their dress, and on their capabilities. One interviewee noted that: "Unfortunately, the stereotype [about] indigenous people being ignorant, or that they do not know, more than one person has said it, or when [colleagues talk] about their judicial proceedings, so it's difficult, it's the hardest circumstance that we have to live (...)".

At the same time, in both societies, the conflict was a galvanising force for female human rights leaders. In Guatemala, female-led survivors' and families' associations were key actors in the important role civil society played during the peace process, and over the course of its implementation. In Burundi, a cross-party and cross-ideological conference of female activists and political representatives forced the creation of an 'observer' role for themselves in the Arusha I negotiations, despite being initially excluded from the process. In both societies, multiple tensions are triggered by efforts to create more inclusive, open, and fair institutions and leadership structures, and female leaders are at the frontlines.

'This is not your place: leadership is for the men': The direct effect of gender roles on perceptions of female leadership

"The stakes are too high in Arusha. We cannot afford to put anybody at the head of our delegations. To put a woman in it would be too dangerous. You can never be sure that she will assume her role correctly."

The primary tension shared in both case studies is the idea, repeatedly expressed, that leadership is for men. Interviewees across the board insisted that women's professional opinions were not listened to or respected, and that they were not perceived as serious actors. In Guatemala, female judges argue that their presence as authority figures is often undermined, and their decisions are not respected. One interviewee—in a common example—explained that: "I had a case here of violence against a woman, I cited the accused: and he arrives and says, 'look, you're not going to get me arrested. It cannot be that a woman is going to tell me what to do'". In this case, authority is closely linked to masculinity, and is expressed as contempt, rejection, ridicule, and humiliation of female judges.

Across both contexts, female leaders were told that they do not belong in their professional roles. A Burundian interviewee reported that during Arusha I, she was told that, her "place is not here, it is in the house, in the kitchen and in bed." Similarly, a Guatemalan interviewee overheard male colleagues saying of her, after her recent appointment, that: "look they named the female graduate a criminal judge. How do they name her in the criminal court? The criminal area is for men. They should have named her in the family court (...)". Another interjected: "Neither in family nor in penal: here in Jutiapa, she should be cooking".

These rigid stereotypes and gender perceptions are used to limit female influence to particular areas of engagement. In the Burundian peace process, female leaders, in or alongside the negotiations are relegated to addressing humanitarian or social issues, while core issues of the conflict are "the sphere of men". In Guatemala, females are perceived to 'belong' to the family courts, rather than criminal or peace courts. In both cases, interviewees said that females were perceived as getting in the way of the 'real work', which must be done by men. Female and male interviewees were clear that women were perceived to be irrational, emotional, and unable to do the hard work. Here we see that the rigid gender binary of female and male capacity affects the quality of peace being negotiated or built, and that patriarchal masculine behaviours close out space for alternative approaches. It was also noted that the "macho culture" within these professions reinforced the exclusion of other alternatives.

One flow-on of this is that it is especially hard for females, but also for males who do not fit patriarchal gender norms, to progress into positions of power because the institutions sustain these norms. This is perhaps most stark in Burundi, where, as in many political spheres, it is hard to position oneself as a strategic actor within parties. Moving through the ranks is defined by one's capacity to mobilise, to raise funds, to go to and lead meetings, often outside of office hours. One must be visible in the political scene in order to emerge as a political leader. But it is more difficult for females to access public spaces, they have not been socialised into the often-combative political environment, and they have fewer material and cultural support structures to help push them to the top. Here, women "emerge with difficulty from within the political party, faced with the type of subtle obstacles constructed in an environment dominated by men, that men fail to notice". As a result, there are few women in leadership of political organisations, they are underrepresented in office, and compared with Arusha I, they are less present in peace negotiations in any meaningful

way. And this, in a context where after the first Arusha Accords, a 30% gender parity law was introduced to increase the number of women in public office.

The numbers are not going up

"We are excluded from the strategic positions and the high spheres of the party where the decisions are made. In our party, for example, the president and the vice-president are men. They will tell you that women are integrated into the governing bodies, but see, if they are not confined to social posts, it will be communication and that is all."

Despite the tremendous work being undertaken by women and men in both the Guatemalan justice sector and in the Burundian political sphere, the numbers of females in both areas are decreasing: 2017 figures from the Centro de Información, Desarrollo y Estadística Judicial cited in our case study show that female judges in Guatemala have dropped 10% since 2013. And in Burundi, we note that in the 2015 parliamentary elections, female Senators and members of the National Assembly are down 4.5% on the previous election. While Guatemala shows a more sustained trend, and the Burundi figure is a single data point, they both point to a worrying downward participation of females in these roles. Institutions are not responding to these challenges; instead there are ad-hoc, and unconnected efforts for reform that are often led by brave but isolated individuals or small coalitions.

Family as a vulnerability, and psychological violence

"If they threaten a man, they threaten him that they will kill him. We women—precisely because we have that maternity-caregiver function—they say: 'We know where you are, and that you walk with your children...'"

Interviewees of both genders in Guatemala and Burundi reported the use of intimidation and threats made against them when they pushed against the status quo. However, female interviewees particularly noted the direct threats against their families, and especially their children. One Guatemalan interviewee noted the phobias her children developed because of the elevated security presence that surrounded her and their house. At the same time, female judges reported the shifts they made to their own characters: "One has to be strong, has to have a character of judge some people say, but they are touching our being woman, they are touching our sensitivity. One cannot be like a stick when there is so much injustice." In Burundi, motherhood is acknowledged as a very real security impediment to political life. One interviewee noted that a woman, "thinks first of all about the safety of her children. In a context as unstable as that of Burundi, one will prefer to leave aside one's political ambitions to protect one's family against possible reprisal".

The purposeful use of violent masculinities is a key link in both cases between the present context and the perpetuation of old methods of control. The pattern of psychological violence reported in both studies is intended to use fear as control, and to invade the everyday lives of its victims. Interviewees reported illness, fatigue, headaches, chronic insecurity, and lack of sleep. It also affected the social network of some interviewees. In this way, the individual who fights the status quo is also made an example of in the community. Regardless of whether implied violence becomes actualised, the cost of creating change is made clear, and societies with a legacy of conflict-related and authoritarian violence against those who fight for change are particularly sensitive to such messages.

The normalisation of sexual harassment

In both contexts, sexual harassment and gender-based discrimination are normalised. They traverse the full spectrum of claims, from that in Burundi that female members of the observer group in Arusha I were asked for sexual favours in exchange for their position, and requests in Guatemala that a female judge use sex to 'convince' her supervisor that a case was worth taking forward, all the way down the spectrum. It is worth noting that many of the women who received death threats also confronted threats of rape, and that complaints of workplace harassment are overwhelmingly not investigated. In Burundi, the problem was not visible to male interviewees, who said that discrimination was not systemic and that it was an exaggerated claim. In Guatemala, some male interviewees perceived such incidents to be administrative issues, rather than a crime.

Here, the media environment is also complicit. The Guatemalan report noted that traditional media and social media campaigns are run specifically to influence public opinion against particular public individuals. This was experienced by a number of female interviewees, but is also used as a tool against political figures and to sway public opinion in favour of defendants in transitional justice or corruption cases, and often in the defence of government interest. While most of this abuse is directed towards change agents of both genders, it is the nature of the abuse that is unique for

females: attacking her physical appearance, her sexuality, and her family. The Guatemala report notes a ‘damned if you do, damned if you don’t’ view of media coverage of female judges: if their work is made public, they receive extended critical attention across all aspects of their lives, as well as personal threats (especially online). But if they are not given visibility, it adds to the perception that they are corrupt. In Burundi, the media could be perceived as a tool that aids hegemonic political leaders to create splits between women’s alliances, thus dividing them and limiting their ability to powerfully lobby for inclusion in the peace process.

Top-down reform has been good, but more is needed for meaningful change

“There is no systematic discrimination [of women in Burundian politics]. We simply do not think of them because they are not active in the political sphere, it is as simple as that.”

A key divergence between the approaches to efforts to reform gender disparity between Burundi and Guatemala was the way problems have been tackled. This is true both in terms of what has been tried, and where impact has been felt. In **Burundi**, a number of legislative changes have attempted to tackle the under-representation of women, and to promote decision-makers with diverse identities beyond the traditional hegemonic male elite. The most important of these is the proportional representation of women in elected and appointed public positions. What the case study highlights, however, is the tremendous disconnect between the drafting of gender equality laws, and their lack of implementation, or their both purposeful and unwitting undermining by power-holders determined to preserve the existing status quo. The above quote provides a glimpse into this disconnect. Despite formal reforms, Burundian society, and gender activists specifically, are still fighting battles to elevate women in public spaces.

The **Guatemala** study shows the changes to access to justice, especially indigenous women’s access to justice through a number of formal mechanisms. It notes that the Women’s Secretariat within the Organismo Judicial organises a number of gender awareness trainings, and that while important work, they are oriented towards the femicide courts, family courts, and some first instance courts. Interviewees pointed to the lack of such trainings for people based in the criminal or civil courts. Similarly, female interviewees note that more support needs to be given for women with children to get to trainings generally.

Strategies for change

“There is support in the Judicial School for young people to enter, that’s good, because young people already bring other forms of thinking and how to do things, more focused on human rights and not so much authoritarianism.”

Reform needs to be targeted to the different needs of each society. In Guatemala, the end of the war marked a significant rise of female activists, professionals, and generally females in public (and previously male) spaces. In a different position, Burundian female activists continue to leverage regional and international actors to force male political elites to respect existing laws and international best practices and make space at the table (though that space, as acknowledged above, is small). This crack in the perception of women’s roles has allowed the development of high-profile female role models in positions of leadership, but also smear campaigns specifically shaped to undermine them by using gender as a tool.

In both contexts, interviewees commented on the importance of alliance-building, which can help address the culture of silence women face when speaking out against corruption and impunity. Effective alliances can place blame back at the feet of abusive systems, rather than on the individual being attacked. In Guatemala, examples drew on petitions circulated against threats to judges. These functioned both symbolically to emphasise solidarity, but also very practically to build a coalition of independent actors within the judicial system. In Burundi, the premier example of the value of alliance-building was the success of the cross-group coalition during Arusha I that ultimately forced women’s voices into the third stage of the process. However, it is important to note that much of the lobbying and advocacy work for these coalitions in both contexts is largely (though not entirely) done by female activists. There is space for sympathetic male allies and potential allies to consider how to add to these efforts. It is also important to note that strategies that worked in one particular context may not be appropriate to repeat, as we see with current challenges faced by fractured and usurped women’s coalitions in Burundi. In order to be impactful and successful, transformative approaches, processes and measures need to be context-driven and adapted to the distinctive feature of each society, as well as changing dynamics.

Conclusions

Seventeen years ago, UN Resolution 1325 urged “member states to ensure increased representation at all levels of decision making”. In Burundi, we see a number of laws enacted to increase gender parity in public office. In Guatemala, strong leadership in the justice sector, along with more programming, is challenging patriarchal gender norms. These human rights and gender parity advances have been reached because of powerful female leaders in both countries, who continue to push for reform. But we also see important disconnects that need to be addressed more systematically.

In both Burundi and Guatemala, but also globally, authority is associated with a particular form of masculinity, one that closes out spaces for alternative expressions of power. This constrains female and male leaders from exercising their leadership roles. It impedes creative approaches to building peace. It affects younger generations, who see the threats, humiliations, fear, and intimidation particularly female leaders face. A lack of gender-aware education reinforces messages of exclusion, and replicate conflict-era methods of subtly enforcing control over society. Institutional change is overdue, but it needs a shared response.

And yet, while we see some shifts, the international community largely continues to focus on viewing women as static victims, particularly of sexual violence. While this is an important aspect of the work set out in Resolution 1325’s vision, countering sexual violence alone will not build dynamic and equal societies. More work needs to be done to acknowledge, and then strengthen the strategies women leaders are already using to shape their societies.

But a critical mass of alternative leaders with more inclusive approaches cannot be created without the hard work that deconstructs violent and hegemonic masculinities first.⁴ This takes time and a cross-generational approach; including and especially by supporting innovative reform in both traditional education and alternative educative spaces such as online and in peer-to-peer youth spaces.⁵ It is only working simultaneously with existing leaders and young people that patterns of opportunism, corruption, violence and impunity will be replaced.

Three questions are crucial areas for further research both in Burundi and Guatemala, and beyond, in order to refine our approaches and frameworks going forward:

- Where are the points of rupture between the past and the present, from which greater levels of transformation can take place?
- What masculinities foster just and peaceful societies in the post-conflict period?
- How have these alternative masculinities been developed and maintained, and how can they be cultivated and embedded?

These will be key thinking points around which to challenge a corrosive status quo.

Key Recommendations

There are multiple gaps in current policy approaches to strengthening UN Resolution 1325 and the participation of women in building peace in transitioning countries. However, substantial transformative change can only come with understanding, challenging, and replacing hegemonic patriarchal systems that hold the status quo in place. Change will need to be structural, and large-scale. And ultimately, change will only come with greater understandings of how to disrupt and replace hegemonic masculinities with more inclusive identities, and with hard, long-term, focused, political work that embraces the uncertainties of social change approaches and eschews top-down tick-box exercises.

COHERENT APPROACH AND COORDINATION

Focus on a strategy, not a project. Donors, particularly, tend towards supporting individual projects, but these do not always lead to strategies for peace, justice, or development. Consider what your broader strategy is, and provide support accordingly. Prioritise structural change, deconstructing patriarchal masculinities, and supporting and enhancing the role of women in leadership positions.

Listen first, develop policies second. Before developing a programme, understand the mechanisms women use to confront a system that marginalises them, and get their views on what the international community could do to strengthen and deepen their ability to create change. This is especially important for moments when they are under attack.

⁴ The *Abatangamuco* initiative in Burundi has been doing this for some time now, and is worth exploring for its lessons. For more on this movement, see www.careinternational.org.uk/countries/burundi

⁵ See, for example, the work in Bosnia Herzegovina called ‘The Fama Collection’ (<http://www.famacollection.org/>), or the ‘Games for Change’ movement (<http://www.gamesforchange.org/>).

SECURITY

Encourage oversight mechanisms as guarantees of non-recurrence. On the domestic front, this could include an equality ombudsperson. This person would oversee, for example, the percentage of workplace harassment, intimidation, and sexual harassment complaints investigated and ensure public departments increase response quality and time.

On the international front, create a monitoring system to document gendered attacks and intimidation efforts and bring international light to them. This could be a social media platform, such as the recent #metoo awareness-raising effort.

Following up from this, develop coordinated systems of response, perhaps taking inspiration from fields that have done rapid-response work better.

Leverage UN Resolution 1325 to promote the creation of domestic protection and security mechanisms. These will help female leaders do their work, and will also encourage structural reform to ensure non-repetition.

Provide solidarity and (where appropriate) visibility. Particularly in situations where female and male actors are taking personal security risks by pushing against the norms of hegemonic masculinity, this may be useful. It could take the form of being present in high-profile court cases, or committing to mediate between national women's organisations and peace process interlocutors with the aim of including women in negotiation processes beyond token positions.

EDUCATION

Adopt a multi-pronged approach to developing more inclusive masculinities in societies in transition. This could include:

Focus on including men in creating change. This can take the form of workshops on masculinities that focuses on a series of open and honest discussions about what limits, enables, and constrains men and boys living in transitioning societies.

Develop leadership training programmes particularly for female leaders and females in leadership-track positions. Pay particular attention to including leaders from outside the capital cities in these programmes.

Support knowledge exchange between leaders working on similar struggles. This could take the form of support for cross-national, peer-to-peer learning between gender-parity activists

Develop gender awareness courses that can be used in schools. It is in childhood that gender norms are set and reinforced. Work with domestic educators and officials in education departments to create unofficial and official educational programmes for children, and help build the alliances that will ensure these programmes make it into schools or after-school clubs.

Support scholarships for students to major in Gender Studies, and the creation of training routes for them into public service.

CREATING PUBLIC-FACING ALLIES

Strategically target public actors who can build positive public perceptions of alternative leadership models. This could include:

Partnering with media actors to create programmes celebrating the work of prominent female anti-impunity actors, and to question traditional models of gender and masculinity. Workshops and trainings could be promoted with traditional media on how to portray females in leadership roles.

Talk show hosts, bloggers, and vloggers can raise the profile of such work among younger people, providing alternative models to patriarchal masculinity, and potentially building interest in the legal or political professions.

Impunity Watch is an international non-profit organisation seeking to promote accountability for atrocities in countries emerging from a violent past. IW conducts research into the root causes of impunity that includes the voices of affected communities to produce research-based policy advice on processes closely intended to enforce their rights to truth, justice, reparations and non-recurrence. IW works with civil society organisations to increase their influence on the creation and implementation of related policies. The “Tackling violence against women beyond borders: Burundi, Guatemala and Liberia” programme is being undertaken by a consortium comprising OxfamIbis and Impunity Watch. It aims to promote a life free of violence, and active citizenship by women, adolescents and girls. By empowering women as change agents, fostering greater awareness of gender equality and women’s rights, while enhancing the prevention and response to violence against women by public institutions and regional and international authorities, it seeks to address unequal gendered power relations through a transformative approach. The programme is financed by the “Funding Leadership and Opportunities for Women” (FLOW) of the The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Contact Us:

Impunity Watch

P.O. Box 43015

3540 AA Utrecht, The Netherlands

Tel: +31 30 30.722.80

www.impunitywatch.org

© Impunity Watch 2017

impunity  watch



Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the
Netherlands