

United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 as a Medium for Scholar/Practitioner Engagement*

Danielle Fulmer**

Abstract

This article demonstrates how international policy frameworks provide space for iterative engagement between peacebuilding scholars and practitioners. I focus on United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1325, which prioritized gender mainstreaming in all stages of peacebuilding. This analysis is based on a review of documents and literature that trace the trajectory of UNSCR 1325 from a variety of perspectives, and informal field interviews with practitioners working at the nexus of gender and peacebuilding. UNSCR 1325 was the product of practitioners who felt that gender was central to peace and security in practice and supported their views with theory. The process of drafting and implementing UNSCR 1325 simultaneously legitimized practitioner projects to incorporate women in peacebuilding and narrowed their scope, prompting critique and research from scholars and scholar-practitioners. The ensuing debates reveal how international policy frameworks can provide a space for iterative and productive discourse between scholars and practitioners by reaffirming shared normative objectives and making the contributions and limitations of both theory and practice visible. Scholar-practitioners can expand the frequency, quality and impact of interactions in this space by acting as intermediaries who circulate between and bridge the worlds of scholarship, policy and practice.

Keywords: gender, United Nations, theory, practice, peacebuilding.

1 Introduction

In fields such as peace studies, where our work has clear normative and practical applications, continually reinforcing the bridges between research, policy and

* Thanks to members of my peace studies cohort and John Paul Lederach for the conversations that sparked this article and for feedback and support along the way. Thanks also to participants in the Identity Flows panel at the Kroc Institute Young Scholars Peace Conference, especially Susan St. Ville, for thoughtful responses to an earlier version of this article. This material is based on work supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program under Grant No. DGE-1313583.

** Danielle Fulmer is a former PhD student in the joint programme in Sociology and Peace Studies at the University of Notre Dame. Her research interests include local-global collaborations to transform gender norms and the role of intermediary actors in grassroots social movements.

practice is essential, especially where these bridges are weak. Originally brought to attention by Alexander George's work, *Bridging the Gap: Theory and Practice in Foreign Policy* (George, 1993), the challenge continues to this day. Thus, scholar-practitioner Larissa Fast recently emphasized the need for human and institutional changes that create space for frequent and productive conversations, allowing practitioners and scholars to benefit from one another's unique experiences and knowledge (Fast, 2015). In this article, I explore how internationally institutionalized norms, inscribed in and distributed via international policy frameworks, function as one such space for engagement between actors at all junctures of the scholar/practitioner spectrum, helping us to bridge the worlds of theory and practice.¹

I argue that international frameworks can offer a space for productive engagement between scholars and practitioners in three ways. First, these frameworks reaffirm shared norms and objectives. They make the limitations of both theory and practice visible, particularly by eliciting discussions on the tensions between scholarly critique and the challenges of implementing theoretical ideals. Finally, they uniquely privilege the participation of scholar-practitioners who circulate between and bridge the worlds of scholarship and practice. I focus on United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1325, which called for greater attention to the unique and disparate impact of armed conflict on women.² This was the first Security Council Resolution in the Women, Peace and Security (WPS) agenda, which focuses on the promotion of gender equality and inclusion across all stages of conflict prevention, response, peacebuilding and social transformation. With the recent 15th anniversary of UNSCR 1325, it is timely to reflect on how this framework has already existed and can continue to advance both theory and practice, and the relationship between them.

My argument is based on a review of documents and literature from scholars, practitioners and scholar-practitioners. I also draw from informal field interviews with practitioners working at the nexus of gender and peacebuilding in eastern Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). I conducted field interviews with representatives of five international and 11 local non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in Goma, DRC, as part of exploratory fieldwork in July and August 2015.³ The interviews covered a range of topics including the challenges and goals encountered at the nexus of gender and peacebuilding, how gender is conceptualized and integrated into projects, and relationships between international and local actors.

- 1 While this article theorizes policy *as a space* for interaction that impacts theory and practice, these interactions will also and ideally impact policies themselves. The complex relationships between the spheres of practice, scholarship *and* policy are a common theme throughout the article.
- 2 The WPS agenda includes UNSCR 1325 and its six supporting resolutions (1820, 1888, 1889, 1960, 2106 and 2122). It draws from the ideas set forth in the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (1979) and the Beijing Platform for Action (1995).
- 3 An additional interview was conducted with a representative of the gender division in a large intergovernmental organization, also working in eastern DRC.

Danielle Fulmer

All of the interviewees were familiar with UNSCR 1325, and most of them used it to advance and shape their work.⁴

I begin with a brief summary of UNSCR 1325, focusing on the contributions of theory and practice throughout its history. I describe how the very debates that have emerged from UNSCR 1325 provide a medium for engagement, as they centre on the basis of shared objectives and function as a 'safe space' to consider the limitations of both theory and practice. Finally, I explore the potential of scholar-practitioners as purposeful intermediaries acting in the space of international policy frameworks to advance theory and practice, and the bridges between them.

2 History of UNSCR 1325

The UN Security Council unanimously passed UNSCR 1325 on 31 October 2000 in order to address the unique and disparate impact of armed conflict on women (United Nations, 2016). It calls for women's increased participation in all levels of decision making and at all stages of conflict, protection of women and girls from sexual and gender-based violence, prevention of violence against women, and gender-sensitive practices in relief and recovery efforts (United States Institute of Peace [USIP], 2016). As a Chapter VI Security Council Resolution, UNSCR 1325's significance is primarily of a normative nature.⁵

The ideas central to UNSCR 1325 grew from the Fourth World Conference on Women in 1995 and its culminating document, the Beijing Platform for Action (BPFA). The BPFA focused on three topics in relation to gender: equality, development and peace (Beijing Fourth World Conference for Women, 1995; Minnesota Advocates for Human Rights, 1996). A coalition of women's NGOs held a forum that preceded the Beijing Conference.⁶ They submitted draft resolutions and recommendations to UN delegates drafting the BPFA (Reichert, 1996), and subsequently pointed to shortcomings, which they outlined in an alternative declaration (Beijing NGO Forum, 1995).

Following the Fourth World Conference on Women, a network of NGOs began to explore how the portion of the BPFA focused on women and armed conflict could be implemented (Cohn *et al.*, 2004). The NGO Working Group on Women, Peace and Security was formed in March 2000 to push for a Security Council resolution (Cohn, 2004). This group facilitated dialogue between NGOs and council members, in order to bridge the worlds of policy and practice by

4 My position as a young, white, heterosexual, middle-class, university-educated American influences my perspective in this piece, and certainly shaped my interactions with research participants in the field.

5 Krook and True suggest that "new norms surface when there is a conflict between the theory and practice of an existing norm, exposing its limits in relation to its definition or continued 'fit' with the broader normative environment" (Krook and True, 2010: 112).

6 There were 30,000 participants at the NGO forum, compared to 17,000 at the official UN conference (Reichert, 1996). Some NGOs were also involved in the official conference, with the participation of 4,035 representatives of 2,602 organizations (Freeman, 1996).

incorporating insights from the field.⁷ As a result, the UN Security Council worked more closely with NGOs in the drafting and implementation of UNSCR 1325 than ever before (Hill, 2002).

The NGO Working Group had three goals for UNSCR 1325: gender mainstreaming in all aspects of the Security Council's decisions and actions, concrete measures for women to play an increased role at all stages and levels of conflict and peace processes, and urgent action to provide women and girls greater protection during armed conflict (NGO Working Group on Women, Peace and Security, 2000). These objectives map almost directly onto the main themes of UNSCR 1325. NGOs supported their recommendations with scholarship, which they summarized and presented to the Security Council (Cohn, 2004).

UNSCR 1325 has had an undeniable impact on the way that practitioners and governments approach women's roles and needs at all stages of conflict and peacebuilding. It was the first UN resolution that recognized women as agents for peace, rather than primarily as victims of conflict (Cohn, 2004; Pratt and Richter-Devroe, 2011). UNSCR 1325 and the broader WPS agenda serve as important tools for feminist NGOs around the world and have made significant contributions in terms of advocacy, resource allocation and agenda setting (Chowdhury, 2005; Rayman *et al.*, 2016; Tryggestad, 2009; 2010; Williams, 2004).

Nevertheless, implementing the ideals in 1325 has been challenging, resulting in reflection and critique from scholars and practitioners alike (Adrian-Paul and Naderi, 2005; Anderlini and Tirman, 2010; Bjarnegård and Melander, 2013; Chowdhury, 2005; Cohn *et al.*, 2004; Daly, 2005; de Jonge Oudraat, 2013; El-Bushra, 2012; Mazurana and Lopez, 2002; Pratt and Richter-Devroe, 2011; Willett, 2010). Perhaps most succinctly, the implementation of UNSCR 1325 has been described as a "transition from gender-rich policy to gender-poor practice" (Piálek, 2008: 281). As the vast work on this topic suggests, actors at all junctures share a deep commitment to ensuring that UNSCR 1325's implementation reflects the normative principles it represents.

3 A Shared Normative Commitment

Feminist scholars and practitioners share a commitment to social change that provides common ground and motivation to examine the rigor and efficacy of feminist projects. As international law scholar Diane Otto explains,

... as feminists, we cannot afford to separate activism and (academic) critique ... It is a false dichotomy that deprives feminists of the tools we need to promote transformative change. Activism is a form of critique, and critique – even academic critique – is a form of activism. (Otto, 2014: 167)

7 The Arria Formula, established in 1993, is a similar forum for NGOs to provide unofficial expertise on thematic issues confronted by the Council (Hill, 2002).

Danielle Fulmer

Many of the debates among and between scholars and practitioners represent a pervasive discomfort with pursuing change from within existing institutions that are seen as patriarchal or otherwise oppressive (Connell, 2005; Enloe, 2014; Shepherd, 2008). These concerns point us to a model of conflict transformation that addresses underlying causes of inequality and violence (Lederach, 2003). The balance between responding to real, immediate constraints and working gradually towards a different future characterizes the tensions that are explored throughout this article. However, the feminist orientation of scholars and practitioners working on issues related to the WPS agenda provides an overriding shared commitment. Anthropologist and activist Charles Hale explains that

to align oneself with a political struggle while carrying out research on issues related to that struggle is to occupy a space of profoundly generative scholarly understanding. Yet when we position ourselves in such spaces, we are also inevitably drawn into the compromised conditions of the political process. The resulting contradictions make the research more difficult to carry out, but they also generate insights that otherwise would be impossible to achieve. (Hale, 2006: 98)

At the same time, as a shared normative commitment provides great potential, gender mainstreaming has been largely enforced and institutionalized via donor requirements that apply to a broad spectrum of peacebuilding organizations (Clark *et al.*, 2006; Wendoh and Wallace, 2005). In some cases, this results in practices that are more procedural than substantive (Daly, 2005; Meier and Celis, 2011; True, 2003). Reflective practitioners from two international organizations in DRC denounced the practice of ‘checking boxes’ to comply with UNSCR 1325, which applies to their highest levels of leadership (Interviews 1 and 2, 2015). Thus, while UNSCR 1325 relies on the continuing normative commitment of feminist scholars and practitioners, as much as it does the UN Secretariat and UN member states, it is often operationalized in a manner that falls short of social transformation.

4 Scholarly Critique and Everyday Realities

Feminist practitioners and scholars at all point on the spectrum engage in a critique of the resolution itself, its implementation and the broader WPS agenda. I engage with two common critiques of UNSCR 1325 in order to explore the contributions and limitations of both theory and practice. The first is the perception that UNSCR 1325 reinforces an essentialist understanding of gender in both its text and implementation. The second is the argument that the framework lacks attention to differences among women based on their complex identities, social and geographical locations, and material realities. The iterative conversations around these issues underscore the necessarily divergent lived experiences of scholars and practitioners, in which they prioritize engaging in critique or responding pragmatically to everyday realities, respectively. The complexity of

the debates surrounding UNSCR 1325 equally highlights the important differences *among* scholars and practitioners, based on their individual positionalities, epistemological perspectives and the specific constraints of the contexts in which they work.

4.1 *Gender Essentialism*

Essentialism is the perspective that there are innate, natural differences between men and women. An essentialist approach to peacebuilding assumes that men are naturally violent and the main perpetrators of conflict while women are primarily victims and inherently peaceful. In general, feminist scholars are concerned with addressing essentialist norms and practices. Likewise, feminist practitioners considered essentialism in the build-up to UNSCR 1325 (Bunch and Fried, 1996). Nevertheless, the issue of sexual violence has attracted significantly more attention in the WPS agenda than has women's participation and empowerment (Krause, 2015).⁸ In practice, this can translate to an overwhelming emphasis on the 'protective' aspects of UNSCR 1325 and undermine the goal of presenting women as complex and agentic actors (Interview 1, 2015). It also disregards the harm that war does to both men and women, the idea that "rather than seeing war as the violation of women by men, we should recognize that men and women are each 'differently violated' by war" (El-Bushra, 2007: 145). To counter this overemphasis on women as victims and promote social transformation, some practitioners adopt a relational approach that seeks to include men and nuance the connections between gender, violence, war and peace (El-Bushra, 2012). A number of organizations in DRC responded to the trauma that men experience during war and actively promoted positive masculinities (Interviews 10, 13 and 14, 2015).

Nevertheless, practitioners may buy into essentialist reasoning to justify and promote women's participation in peace processes. Carol Cohn, a scholar-practitioner, explains that in her conversations with activists around the world,

many of the women – who have spent many years struggling with incredible courage against devastating armed violence – have themselves expressed the same belief in women's greater ability and motivation to end wars and create sustainable peace. (Cohn, 2004: 17)

Indeed, representatives of a local NGO in DRC explained to me that women have a sensibility that does not allow them to kill, which is why they must be involved in decision making. When I asked whether they meant that women are naturally

8 The UN Security Council has perhaps complexified its articulation of gender over time (see Pratt and Richter-Devroe, 2011). For example, Resolution 1888 states "...women in situations of armed conflict and post-conflict situations continue to be often considered as victims and not as actors in addressing and resolving situations of armed conflict and stressing the need to focus not only on protection of women but also on their empowerment in peacebuilding" (UNSC, 2009). Similarly, resolution 2106 notes that men and boys can also be victims of sexual violence, either directly or through secondary trauma (UNSC, 2013). Nevertheless, four of the six resolutions following UNSCR 1325 focus on gender-based and sexual violence.

Danielle Fulmer

peaceful, the women laughed and said “yes, everyone knows that!” (Interview 11, 2015).

Even if they do not subscribe to essentialist ideals, some practitioners argue that it is women’s inclusion that matters most, not the terms under which it occurs. Despite their normative commitments, practitioners are obligated to respond pragmatically to the constraints they face on the ground. Practitioner Felicity Hill explained to feminist colleagues working in policy and scholarship that women in post-conflict settings would not mind being categorized as ‘vulnerable women’ if it allowed for their participation. As Hill explained, “*Whatever the code words let us in! Peace-builder, decision-maker, whatever argument works, let us in!*” (Cohn *et al.*, 2004: 138, emphasis in original).

Scholars and some scholar-practitioners push back on this, arguing that an instrumental approach precludes a thorough examination of violent norms of masculinity and the institutional and structural factors that simultaneously promote these norms and marginalize women (Willett, 2010; Williams, 2004). For example, Bjarnegård and Melander (2013) argue that instrumentalizing women for peace is a

“quick fix” to a complex problem. Rather than attempting to transform gender roles, it draws on already existing expectations and traditional understandings of male and female attributes and behaviors; however, it neglects the difficulty of women to reach substantive representation and “make a difference”. (570)

However, Hill suggests that academic critique of UNSCR 1325 because it does not challenge that patriarchal structures are ‘dangerous’ for those living and working on the ground (Cohn *et al.*, 2004). Indeed, we might consider whether some feminist NGOs rely on essentialist strategies in a deliberate, reflexive mode, in response to constraints related to funding or social and political pressures in their immediate environment. Debates such as the one on essentialism exemplify the possible tensions between ideal principles and everyday realities in shaping and implementing the WPS agenda.

4.2 *Intersecting Oppressions*

Intersectionality is a theoretical tool that emerged from black feminist thought and is meant to elucidate the interactions between multiple forms of oppression, such as gender, race, class, sexuality and place of origin (Collins, 1986; Crenshaw, 1991). Essentialism is antithetical to an intersectional approach insofar as it “risks homogenizing all women, assuming that women’s needs, interests and agency are the same because of their shared gender” (Pratt and Richter-Devroe, 2013: 2). Theorizing intersectionality has prompted feminist scholars to argue that it is artificial to collapse the differences between women in favour of solidarity or ‘sisterhood’, thereby ignoring the ways that our unique positionality impacts our lived reality (Mohanty, 2003).

Intersectionality is not only a theoretical concept, but has been emphasized by practitioners involved in the formulation of UNSCR 1325. Both the BPFA and

the NGOs' alternative Beijing statement reiterate the importance and challenge of intersectionality as it relates to gender, inequality and development. For example, the BPPA calls on governments to promote

the full and equal enjoyment by women and men of all human rights and fundamental freedoms without distinction of any kind as to race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinions, national or social origins, property, birth, or other status. (Beijing Fourth World Conference on Women, 1995: 96)

The alternative BPPA notes that women may be marginalized because of age, rural/urban status, disability or sexual orientation, or because of their status as migrants, displaced persons or refugees (Beijing NGO Forum, 1995).

Despite clear articulation of the importance of difference and intersectionality in the BPPA, UNSCR 1325 and subsequent WPS resolutions fail to engage with it meaningfully. For example, UNSCR 1325 repeatedly refers to women and girls as a homogenous group, without considering how "the particular needs of women and girls" might vary as these intersect with other statuses and identities (UNSC, 2000). The resolution provides no guidance on intersectionality, perhaps in part because, despite their recognition of its importance, scholars and practitioners alike struggle to address it effectively. For example, Afghan women participants, in a workshop led by NGO Working Group member International Alert, explained how more educated women and girls have benefited from changes in Afghan society since the fall of the Taliban, while many women in rural provinces continue to struggle (Adrian-Paul and Naderi, 2005). Such experiences demonstrate the difficulty of practicing gender mainstreaming in a way that does not reinforce other forms of inequality. At the same time, many scholars struggle to meaningfully address intersectionality in their research (McCall, 2005).

The disregard for heterogeneity among women is reinforced by the WPS agenda's reliance on a liberal framework and the exclusion of women who subscribe to non-liberal feminisms (Pratt and Richter-Devroe, 2013). Feminist international NGOs may seek partner organizations that demonstrate a commitment to social change as they envision it, and develop local staff's 'ethic' towards women to be in line with 'international' norms like those laid out in UNSCR 1325 (Interview 2, 2015; Interview 15, 2015). Pratt and Richter-Devroe argue that this can undermine the transformative objectives of the WPS agenda, for example by dividing urban, educated women from rural, more marginalized women in many contexts. They argue that this practice

exacerbates fragmentation and rivalries between different constituencies of woman activists on the ground. The exclusionary nature of the WPS agenda (which stems from its liberal underpinnings and lack of intersectional analysis) thus raises questions about the role of the international community in delivering pre-approved solutions to what are often complex local realities. (2013: 3)

Danielle Fulmer

In their primary role as ‘sensitizers’ of the local population, some local NGOs in DRC simply carried the message of gender mainstreaming, but many others attempted to translate and contextualize it. They worked tirelessly to translate the framework of UNSCR 1325 for the local context, for example by engaging in participatory and community-driven approaches (Interviews 3 and 9, 2015; Interviews 12, 13 and 15, 2015). A reflective practitioner from a local NGO noted that one of her biggest challenges was the allegation that the gender framework put forth in UNSCR 1325 is inherently ‘Western’ in nature (Interview 9, 2015). Efforts to counter such suspicions are impeded by funding practices that make little room for contextualization, as well as the limited engagement that policy makers and scholar-practitioners have directly with the organizations that, in many cases, are the most direct implementers and practitioners of UNSCR 1325.⁹

In summary, we must consider differences in the forms of structural inequality and material realities that women face, as well as ideological differences in their stance towards empowerment, equality and feminism. An intersectional, transnational analysis should apply not only to the supposed beneficiaries of the WPS agenda, but also to every practitioner and scholar, as each of us is neither neutral nor distinct from these worlds.

5 Scholar-Practitioners as Bridging Actors

In light of the range of perspectives and forms of knowledge among scholars and practitioners, as exemplified in the debates on essentialism and intersectionality, there is a need for actors who can promote dialogue and understanding in order to advance social transformation. Scholar-practitioners have the potential to serve in this role. In peacebuilding processes, intermediary or bridging actors are connected to both top-level leadership and grassroots actors, derive their power from ongoing relationships and have pre-existing relations that crosscut conflicting groups (Lederach, 1997: 42). They promote cooperation by leveraging relational ties and can help to make sense of ideas in multiple worlds, in a process known as translation. In her work on Brazilian feminist NGOs, Thayer argues that theories, ideas and discourses need translation to effectively ‘arrive’ in a new setting.

Concepts that make sense in one context are likely to be inadequate or unintelligible in another. They are often initially appropriated by brokers with a foot in each of several worlds. (...) These “cosmopolitans” translate meanings

9 This points towards the power dynamics at play when large international NGOs act as donors to smaller, local NGOs. Representatives of local NGOs described international NGOs refusing to fund projects deemed most important by local organizations (Interview 11, 2015) and pre-defining problems without leaving room for context or participatory approaches (Interview 9, 2015). Most tellingly, one representative said that international NGOs “tend to behave like donors” (Interview 13, 2015). For more on the complex roles of international NGOs, see Watkins and Swidler (2012).

elaborated somewhere else to a local idiom, working to accommodate them to their new environs. (Thayer, 2010: 56)

Of course, translation itself is a political act. Intermediaries are brokers who share information among otherwise disconnected individuals, and their structural position can provide them with personal benefits since they control what is communicated and how (Burt, 2004). As intermediaries, scholar-practitioners have their own views and agendas, and therefore must operate in a self-reflexive manner informed by feminist principles if their role is to promote learning and social transformation that benefits people across a range of contexts.

Returning to Fast's (2015) call for *spaces* for engagement, it is important to consider *where* scholar-practitioners might act as intermediaries. While I have suggested that international policies and their corresponding normative frameworks provide a medium for engagement, setting aside physical or institutional space is equally important. International conferences devoted to the WPS agenda have been an important space historically, and intentionally building on the bridging potential of scholar-practitioners will make this an even more effective forum for dialogue and learning. In particular, NGOs might provide a space for scholars and practitioners at all points on the spectrum to engage with one another, given that many large NGOs employ both researchers and practitioners and could be considered scholar-practitioners at an organizational level.

For example, organizations, including Search for Common Ground and International Alert, share a commitment to minimizing Western intrusion by systematically integrating local approaches, participation and knowledge into their work (International Alert, 2016; Search for Common Ground, 2016). NGOs such as the International Rescue Committee, Mercy Corps and Alliance for Peacebuilding, which emphasize evidence-based approaches and innovation, can also provide space for productive scholar/practitioner engagement (Alliance for Peacebuilding, 2016; International Rescue Committee [IRC], 2016; Mercy, 2016). In summary, NGOs can provide a shared space that fosters data-driven and theory-informed programming, reflective practice and theory building grounded in experience.

While scholar-practitioners can act as intermediaries regarding any number of issues relating to UNSCR 1325, the tensions described in this article around essentialism and intersectionality, particularly as these intersect with normative ideals and everyday realities, suggest that privileging and giving voice to different forms of knowledge and a range of experiences are keys.¹⁰ This suggestion echoes calls to contextualize UNSCR 1325 and localize approaches to implementation (Pratt and Richter-Devroe, 2011; UN Women, 2015), commitments that are likely to have significant implications for theory and practice if fulfilled. The goal is not for scholar-practitioners to achieve all of this alone, but to act as bridge builders

10 This must be done with concern for the power dynamics at hand. For example, representatives of local NGOs in DRC suggested that international NGOs are interested in their knowledge but described this as an exploitative exchange (Interview 3, 2015).

Danielle Fulmer

between those actors making disparate contributions.¹¹ This is not a small task. To succeed, scholar-practitioners associated with universities will need to be properly recognized for the social and scholarly merits of their work. This could be part of a larger movement to both incentivize and equip academics to undertake 'engaged' or 'public' scholarship, whether in the form of community-based research or collaboration with practitioners or policy makers.¹²

6 Conclusion

In this article, I have argued that international policies and normative frameworks provide a productive medium for scholar/practitioner engagement. Such spaces are particularly effective when they are characterized by a shared normative commitment as exists for transnational feminists or peace studies scholars and practitioners. I explore the potential of scholar-practitioners to play a bridging and translating role in these conversations owing to their awareness of the variety of expectations, goals and constraints that shape scholars' and practitioners' approaches to their work. Although this article has focused on UNSCR 1325, other international frameworks and norms might provide a similar space for scholar/practitioner engagement. For example, the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations is a key site for transnational organizing and participatory processes that shape UN policies (Muehlebach, 2001: 441).

Carving out spaces with the potential for productive, iterative discourse between scholars and practitioners is warranted because it will help us to contextualize and reconcile tensions in our work. Rather than throwing our hands up at the distance between academic critique and real-time responses to crises, or between evaluation of progress against theoretical ideals and pragmatic, strategic responses to contextual constraints, these differences might drive learning and progress. Ongoing engagement between scholars and practitioners will allow us to better identify, articulate, implement and refine theories and practices that underlie effective peacebuilding and social transformation.

References

Adrian-Paul, A. & Naderi, P. (2005). *UNSC Resolution 1325 women, peace and security: Issues and instruments – The Afghan context*. International Alert and Afghan Civil Society Forum. Available at: <www.international-alert.org/resources/publications/un-sc-resolution-1325-women-peace-and-security> (last accessed 18 December 2015).

Alliance for Peacebuilding. (2016). *Affinity groups*. Available at: <www.allianceforpeacebuilding.org/our-work/affinity-groups/> (last accessed 23 July 2016).

11 For an example of one such collaborative project in the realm of gender and development, see van Eerdewijk and Dubel (2012).

12 For more on this topic, see Burawoy (2005), Freeman *et al.* (2009) and Jordan (2006).

Anderlini, S.N. & Tirman, J. (2010). *What the women say: Participation and UNSCR 1325*. International Civil Society Action Network and the MIT Center for International Studies. Available at: <www.usip.org/sites/default/files/Gender/What_the_Women_Say.pdf> (last accessed 10 July 2016).

Beijing Fourth World Conference on Women. (1995). *The Beijing declaration and platform for action*. Available at: <www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/pdf/BDPfA%20E.pdf> (last accessed 18 December 2015).

Beijing NGO Forum. (1995). The NGO Beijing declaration. *Third World Resurgence* 61/62.

Bjarnegård, E. & Melander, E. (2013). Revisiting representation: Communism, women in politics, and the decline of armed conflict in East Asia. *International Interactions*, 39, 558-574.

Bunch, C. & Fried, S. (1996). Beijing '95: Moving women's human rights from margin to center. *Signs*, 22(1), 200-204.

Burawoy, M. (2005). 2004 Presidential address: For public sociology. *American Sociological Review*, 70, 4-28.

Burt, R.S. (2004). Structural holes and good ideas. *American Journal of Sociology*, 110(2), 349-399.

Chowdhury, A.K. (2005). Foreward. In K. Lynes & G. Torry (Eds.), *From local to global: Making peace work for women* (pp. vi-vii). New York, NY: The NGO Working Group on Women, Peace, and Security.

Clark, C., Sprenger, E., VeneKlasen, L., Duran, L. & Kerr, J. (2006). *Where is the money for women's rights? Assessing resources and the role of donors in the promotion of women's rights and the support of women's organizations*. Toronto, ON: The Association for Women's Rights in Development. Available at: <www.awid.org/sites/default/files/atoms/files/assessing_resources_and_role_of_donors_fundher.pdf> (last accessed 10 July 2016).

Cohn, C. (2004). *Mainstreaming gender in UN security policy: A path to political transformation?* Boston, MA: Boston Consortium on Gender, Security and Human Rights.

Cohn, C., Kinsella, H. & Gibbins, S. (2004). Women, peace and security: Resolution 1325. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 6(1), 130-140.

Collins, P.H. (1986). Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of black feminist thought. *Social Problems*, 33(6), S14-S32.

Connell, R.W. (2005). Change among the gatekeepers: Men, masculinities, and gender equality in the global arena. *Signs*, 30(3), 1801-1825.

Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). (1979). New York, NY: United Nations. Available at: <www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/cedaw.htm> (last accessed 29 August 2016).

Danielle Fulmer

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241-1299.

de Jonge Oudraat, C. (2013). UNSCR 1325 – Conundrums and opportunities. *International Interactions*, 39(4), 612-619.

Daly, M. (2005). Gender mainstreaming in theory and practice. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society*, 12(3), 433-450.

El-Bushra, J. (2007). Feminism, gender, and women's peace activism. *Development and Change*, 38(1), 131-147.

El-Bushra, J. (2012). *Gender in peacebuilding: Taking stock*. London, UK: International Alert.

Enloe, C. (2014). *Bananas, beaches and bases: Making feminist sense of international politics* (2nd ed.). Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

Fast, L. (2015). Being a scholar-practitioner. Lecture, October 15. University of Notre Dame.

Freeman, E., Gust, S. & Aloschen, D. (2009). Why faculty promotion and tenure matters to community partners. *Metropolitan Universities Journal*, 20(2), 87-103.

Freeman, J. (1996). The real story of Beijing. *Off Our Backs*, 26(3), 1, 8-11, 22-27.

George, A.L. (1993). *Bridging the gap: Theory and practice in foreign policy*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Hale, C.R. (2006). Activist research v. cultural critique: Indigenous land rights and the contradictions of politically engaged anthropology. *Cultural Anthropology*, 21(1), 96-120.

Hill, F. (2002). *NGO perspectives: NGOs and the Security Council*. Available at: <www.isn.ethz.ch/Digital-Library/Publications/Detail/?lang=en&id=48420> (last accessed 18 December 2015).

International Alert. (2016). *Our mission and values*. Available at: <www.international-alert.org/our-mission-and-values> (last accessed 23 July 2016).

International Rescue Committee (IRC). (2016). *Welcome to the outcomes and evidence framework*. Available at: <http://oef.rescue.org/#/?_k=pn0gi6> (last accessed 23 July 2016).

Jordan, C. (2006). *Developing criteria for review of community-engaged scholars for promotion or tenure. Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative*. Available at: <http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/Developing%20Criteria%20for%20Review%20of%20CES.pdf>.

Krause, J. (2015). Revisiting protection from conflict-related sexual violence: Actors, victims and power. In L. Olsson & I. Ismene-Gizellis (Eds.), *Gender, peace and security: Implementing UN Security Council Resolution 1325* (pp. 99-115). Florence, KY: Taylor and Francis.

Krook, M.L. & True, J. (2010). Rethinking the life cycles of international norms: The United Nations and the global promotion of gender equality. *European Journal of International Relations*, 18, 103-127.

Lederach, J.P. (1997). *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Lederach, J.P. (2003). *The little book of conflict transformation: Clear articulation of the guiding principles by a pioneer in the field*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.

Mazurana, D. & Lopez, E.P. (2002). *Gender mainstreaming in peace support operations: Moving beyond rhetoric to practice*. London, UK: International Alert.

McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30(3), 1771-1800.

Meier, P. & Celis, K. (2011). Sowing the seeds of its own failure: Implementing the concept of gender mainstreaming. *Social Politics*, 18(4), 469-489.

Mercy C. (2016). *How we innovate*. Available at: <www.mercycorps.org/innovations> (last accessed 23 July 2016).

Minnesota Advocates for Human Rights. (1996). *Summary of the Beijing declaration and platform for action*. Available at: <www.theadvocatesforhumanrights.org/uploads/beijing_declaration_1996.PDF> (last accessed 18 December 2015).

Muehlebach, A. (2001). 'Making place' at the United Nations: Indigenous cultural politics at the U.N. Working Group on Indigenous Populations. *Cultural Anthropology*, 16(3), 415-448.

Mohanty, C.T. (2003). *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

NGO Working Group on Women, Peace and Security. (2000). *Letter to national women's machineries prior to the adoption of SCR 1325*. Available at: <http://womenpeacesecurity.org/media/pdf-Letter_to_National_Womens_Machineries_Prior_to_the_Adoption_of_SCR_1325_October_2000.pdf> (last accessed 18 December 2015).

Otto, D. (2014). Beyond stories of victory and danger: Resisting feminism's amenability to serving Security Council politics. In G. Heathcote & D. Otto (Eds.), *Rethinking peacekeeping, gender equality and collective security* (pp. 157-172). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Piálék, N. (2008). Is this really the end of the road for gender mainstreaming? Getting to grips with gender and institutional change. In A. Bebbington, S. Hickey & D. Mitlin (Eds.),

Danielle Fulmer

Can NGO's really make a difference? The challenge of development alternatives (pp. 279-297). London, UK: ZED Books.

Pratt, N. & Richter-Devroe, S. (2011). Critically examining UNSCR 1325 on women, peace and security. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 13(4), 489-503.

Pratt, N. & Richter-Devroe, S. (2013). *Women, peace and security: New conceptual challenges and opportunities*. Available at: <www.peacebuilding.no/var/ezflow_site/storage/original/application/8532bbaf64459772edfb097f378d5b4e.pdf> (last accessed 17 November 2015).

Rayman, P.M., Izen, S. & Parker, E. (2016). *UNSCR 1325 in the Middle East and North Africa*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace. Available at: <www.usip.org/sites/default/files/SR388-UNSCR-1325-in-the-Middle-East-and-North-Africa-Women-and-Security.pdf> (last accessed 10 July 2016).

Reichert, E. (1996). 'Keep on moving forward': NGO forum on women, Beijing, China. *Social Development Issues*, 18(1), 89-97.

Search for Common Ground. (2016). *Community*. Available at: <www.sfcg.org/tag/community/> (last accessed 23 July 2016).

Shepherd, L. (2008). Power and authority in the production of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325. *International Studies Quarterly*, 52, 383-404.

Thayer, M. (2010). *Making transnational feminism: Rural women, NGO activists, and northern donors in Brazil*. New York, NY: Routledge.

True, J. (2003). Mainstreaming gender in global public policy. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 5(3), 368-396.

Tryggestad, T.L. (2009). Trick or treat? The UN and implementation of Security Council Resolution 1325 on women, peace, and security. *Global Governance*, 15, 539-557.

Tryggestad, T.L. (2010). The UN peacebuilding commission and gender: A case of norm reinforcement. *International Peacekeeping*, 17(2), 159-171.

UN Women. (2015). *Preventing conflict, transforming justice, securing the peace: A global study of the implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325*. Available at: <<http://wps.unwomen.org/~media/files/un%20women/wps/highlights/unw-global-study-1325-2015.pdf>> (last accessed 10 July 2016).

United Nations. (2016). *Peacekeeping: Women, peace, and security*. Available at: <www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/issues/women/wps.shtml> (last accessed 9 July 2016).

United Nations Security Council (UNSC). (2000, October 31). Resolution 1325 S/RES/1325 (2000). New York, NY. Available at: <[www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1325\(2000\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1325(2000))> (last accessed 29 August 2016).

United Nations Security Council (UNSC). (2009, September 30). Resolution 1888 S/RES/1888 (2009). New York, NY. Available at: <[www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1888\(2009\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1888(2009))> (last accessed 29 August 2016).

United Nations Security Council (UNSC). (2013, June 24). Resolution 2106 S/RES/2106 (2013). New York, NY. Available at: <[www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2106\(2013\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2106(2013))> (last accessed 29 August 2016).

United States Institute of Peace (USIP). (2016) *What is U.N. Security Council Resolution 1325 and why is it so critical today?* Available at: <www.usip.org/gender_peacebuilding/about_UNSCR_1325#Why_is_participation_important_to_Resolution_1325_> (last access 9 July 2016).

van Eerdewijk, A. & Dubel, I. (2012). Substantive gender mainstreaming and the missing middle: A view from Dutch development agencies. *Gender and Development*, 20(3), 491-504.

Watkins, S.C. & Swidler, A. (2012). Working misunderstandings: Donors, brokers, and villagers in Africa's AIDS industry. *Population and Development Review*, 38(Supplement), 197-218.

Wendoh, S. & Wallace, T. (2005). Re-thinking gender mainstreaming in African NGOs and communities. *Gender and Development*, 13(2), 70-79.

Willett, S. (2010). Introduction: Security Council Resolution 1325: Assessing the impact on women, peace, and security. *International Peacekeeping*, 17(2), 142-158.

Williams, M. (2004). *Roundtable discussion on mainstreaming gender perspectives into all policies and programs in the UN system*. New York, NY: United Nations. Available at: <www.berlin-divercity.de/diwiki/images/8/86/314_UNStatementMariama-07-04.pdf> (last accessed 10 July 2016).