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The 1AC operates under a masculine realist frame, which subordinates gender in international relations and reinforces asymmetric gender binaries.

Blanchard, 2003

Eric M. Blanchard is currently Adjunct Assistant Professor in the Political Science department at Columbia University in New York City. His research interests include gender, IR theory, international security, and East Asian IR. His work has been published in *Signs, International Studies Quarterly, Review of International Studies, and Journal of International Relations and Development.* Blanchard, E. (2003). Gender, International Relations, and the Development of Feminist Security Theory. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 28(4), 1289-1312. doi:10.1086/368328

Feminists in IR argue that realism, dominated by elite, white, male practitioners, is a patriarchal discourse that renders women invisible from the high politics of IR even as it depends on women’s subjugation as a “‘domesticated’ figure whose ‘feminine’ sensibilities are both at odds with and inconsequential to the harsh ‘realities’ of the public world of men and states” (Runyan and Peterson 1991, 68–69). Feminists in IR explain the exclusion of women from foreign policy decision making by pointing to the “extent to which international politics is such a thoroughly masculinized sphere of activity that women’s voices are considered inauthentic” (Tickner 1992, 4). Women’s traditional exclusion from the military and continuing lack of access to political power at times presents women with a “catch-22” situation. For example, the importance of a candidate’s military service as a qualification for government office in U.S. political campaigns puts women, who cannot appeal to this experience, at a disadvantage in obtaining the elite status of national office and thus the ability to affect defense and security policies (Tobias 1990; cf. Elshtain 2000, 445). However, the FST critique is not limited to strategies for getting more women access to corridors of power; feminists also direct our attention to the gendered structure of IR theory. As the title of a classic IR text indicates, the study of international politics has been concerned first and foremost with Man, the State, and War (Waltz 1959). In this book, neorealist Kenneth 3 It is notable that two of the most prominent academic volumes treating the challenges to traditional security theory from the vantage point of the mid-1990s did not include any contributions from gender analysts (Katzenstein 1996; Krause and Williams 1997). Waltz turns to the canons of political philosophy for an explanation of the causes of war by asking whether wars are caused by human nature, by the internal structure of states, or by the international system. An important component of the study of IR is a self-positioning in the tradition of Western political theory—tracing an intellectual lineage to Machiavelli and Hobbes—particularly as it concerns the state. Feminist analysis of this pedigree shows that the feminine has long served as a symbolic threat to militarized Western conceptualizations of political community, from the ancient Greeks to the twentieth century; Aeschylus’s Furies and Machiavelli’s Fortuna are but two examples (Harstock 1983). Rebecca Grant (1991) argues that a gender bias in IR, transmitted unproblematically from Western political thought to the study of IR, results in the question of gender being taken as irrelevant. For Grant, IR’s interpretation of Hobbes allows “no room for the question of how gender relations affect the transition out of the brutish state of nature and into society,” while Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s famous stag hunt, often invoked as a parable of the problems of security, ignores the familial relations that control the hunter’s defection from the hunting circle (10–15). Taking men as the sole political actors and citizens, the political theory borrowed by IR postulates a domestic/international divide premised on the private/public distinction that relegates women to a space outside politics (9). Jean Bethke Elshtain’s rich blend of political theory, personal narrative, and history, Women and War ([1987] 1995), serves as a rejoinder to the discipline’s philosophical conceit and issues a key challenge to the domestic/international divide that Grant identifies. In a sweeping survey of the discourse of war from the Greeks onward, Elshtain details women’s complex relationships to the body politic, and thus to war, as they emerge from the narratives (war stories) that are constitutive of war. Elshtain focuses on the ways in which war’s “productive destructiveness” inscribes and reinscribes men’s and women’s identities and thus the boundaries of community: “War creates the people. War produces power, individual and collective” (166–67). Reacting to what she sees as the onset of scientism and hyperrationality in academic IR, Elshtain critiques the retreat into abstraction that the quest for scientific certainty produced in “professionalized” war discourse and attempts to revive the bond between politics and morality broken by Machiavelli. By reifying state behavior, Elshtain argues, the realist narrative ignores human agency and identity: “No children are ever born, and nobody ever dies, in this constructed world. There are states, and they are what is” (91).4 Sensitive to the importance of language and narrative in matters of security, Elshtain critiques what she calls the “strategic voice,” an authoritative discourse that is “cool, objective, scientific, and overwhelmingly male” ([1987] 1995, 245). According to Elshtain, this realm of expert language, with its talk of “peacekeeping” missiles and village “pacification,” separates ordinary citizens from civic life. Drawing on fieldwork initiated at a summer program for nuclear strategists during the last decade of the cold war, Carol Cohn’s (1987) analysis of the “technostrategic” discourse of nuclear defense intellectuals casts a feminist eye on the thinking that shapes the practices of national security. Using an ethnographic, participant-observer strategy, Cohn shows how the planners’ use of gendered euphemisms, exemplified by the talk of nuclear virginity and the association of disarmament with emasculation, contributed to a willful, discursive denial of the strategists’ accountability to “reality”—the potential cost of strategic decisions in terms of human life (1987, 1990). While denial of the horrors of nuclear war may be an occupational hazard of nuclear planning, to achieve success (in terms of professional standing and collegial status) participants must legitimate their positions by assuming the masculine—that is, tough, rational, logical—position in the gendered security discourse. The masculine position is also available to (and must be taken by) women who want to be taken seriously, while they limit their “feminine” contributions for the sake of legitimacy (1993, 238). Cohn thus shows how both men and women are implicated in, constituted through, and positioned by gendered security discourse. Realizing that merely adding women to the profession will not eliminate the degradation of “feminine” ideas, Cohn suggests that the task ahead is a revaluation of gender discourse.

**Realist and neorealist conceptions of international relations make global security collapse and environmental destruction inevitable.**

**Tickner, 1992**

J. Ann Tickner is a feminist international relations theorist. She is a distinguished scholar in residence at the School of International Services, American University, Washington DC. Tickner, J. A. (1992). *Gender in international relations: Feminist perspectives on achieving global security.* New York: Columbia University Press.

The dramatic events of the late 1980s and early 1990s brought to light many of the shortcomings in realist explanations noted by critics for some time. Whereas the world wars of the first half of the twentieth century involved the transgression of great powers across international boundaries, most of the conflicts of the second half have taken place inside or across the boundaries of weak states. Although they have frequently involved at least one of the great powers, many of these conflicts have not been fought to protect international boundaries but over ethnic or religious issues, or issues of national identity and national liberation. The militarization of the South, with weapons sold or given by the North, has resulted in a situation whereby the state is often perceived, not as a protector against outside dangers, but as the ultimate threat to the security of its civilian population. The precarious armed peace that characterized the relationship between the two superpowers during the Cold War owed whatever stability it achieved not to military strength but to the threat of nuclear obliteration of winners and losers alike**: nuclear weapons and other modern military technologies continue to pose the threat of mass destruction**. **These new threats** to security **demand new solutions quite at odds with the power politics prescriptions of traditional international relations theory.** As we face the prospect that, **by the year 2000, 80 percent of the world's population will live in the South**, we in **the West can no longer afford to privilege a tradition of scholarship that focuses on the concerns and ambitions of the great powers**. **Faced with a stubborn gap in living standards between the rich and the poor that some observers doubt can ever be overcome**, **realist prescriptions of self-help are inappropriate; the health of the global economy depends on the health of all its members**. **Environmental degradation,** a relatively new item on the agenda of international relations, **threatens rich and poor alike and appears intransigent to state-centered solutions.** Along with the traditional issues of war and peace, the discipline of international relations is increasingly challenged by the necessity of analyzing the realities of economic and ecological interdependence and finding ways of mitigating their negative consequences. We must also face the reality of how easily these **wider security issues**, which **threaten the survival of the earth and all its inhabitants,** disappear from the agenda when military crises escalate.

The alternative is to reject the affirmative’s neorealist, masculine approach to international relations in the 1AC. Instead, we advocate a feminist approach which re-conceptualizes dominant binaries associated with gender and the international order.

**Tickner, 1992**

J. Ann Tickner is a feminist international relations theorist. She is a distinguished scholar in residence at the School of International Services, American University, Washington DC. Tickner, J. A. (1992). *Gender in international relations: Feminist perspectives on achieving global security.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Scott claims that the way in which **our understanding of gender signifies relationships of power** is **through** a set of normative concepts that set forth interpretations of the meanings of symbols. In Western culture, these concepts take the form of **fixed binary oppositions that categorically assert the meaning of masculine and feminine and hence legitimize a set of unequal social relationships.** Scott and many other contemporary feminists assert that, through our use of language, **we come to perceive the world through these binary oppositions**.Our Western understanding of gender is based on a set of culturally determined binary distinctions, **such as public versus private, objective versus subjective, self versus other, reason versus emotion, autonomy versus relatedness, and culture versus nature; the first of each pair of characteristics is typically associated with masculinity, the second with femininity.** Scott claims that **the hierarchical construction of these distinctions** can take on a fixed and permanent quality **that perpetuates women's oppression: therefore they must be challenged.** To do so **we must analyze the way these binary oppositions operate in different contexts and, rather than accepting them as fixed, seek to displace their hierarchical construction.** When many of these differences between women and men are no longer assumed to be natural or fixed, **we can examine how relations of gender inequality are constructed and sustained in various arenas of public and private life.** In committing itself to gender as a category of analysis, contemporary feminism also commits itself to gender equality as a social goal. Extending Scott's challenge to the field of international relations, we can immediately detect a similar set of hierarchical binary oppositions. But in spite of the seemingly obvious association of international politics with the masculine characteristics described above, the field of international relations is one of the last of the social sciences to be touched by gender analysis and feminist perspectives. The reason for this, I believe, is not that the field is gender neutral, meaning that the introduction of gender is irrelevant to its subject matter as many scholars believe, but that it is so thoroughly masculinized that the workings of these hierarchical gender relations are hidden.

### Links

#### Diplomacy

The use of diplomatic methods in the 1AC is inherently patriarchal, perpetuating unequal opportunities for women.

Knight, 2013

Saskia Knight is a contributor for the Peace and Conflict Monitor, a peer-reviewed journal investigating international global issues. Knight, S. (2013, April 8). Peace and Conflict Monitor. Retrieved July 20, 2016, from http://www.monitor.upeace.org/archive.cfm?id\_article=1007

According to Talyn Rahman-Figueroa, “Women are innately equipped with diplomatic skills such as negotiating, intelligence seeking and maintaining peace…” Nevertheless, **we can begin to see the patriarchal nature of diplomacy wherein “…characteristics associated with “manliness” have been valued in the conduct of international politics and only been occupied by men… empirically, states are run and defended by men, and therefore advance only the interests of men…**” Therefore, it is clear that **historically, diplomacy has been a male-centric realm within a patriarchal structure**. For centuries, noted diplomats from Niccolo Machiavelli to Sir Harold Nicholson have emphasized the importance of masculine characteristics in state-to-state relations. Allowing women in positions of power has traditionally been seen as threatening to male-domination and as a sign of self-weakness as all women were believed to employ ‘honey-trap methods’ to “…lure male diplomats to sexual seduction”. Nicholson feared women in diplomacy so greatly that he said “…“women are prone to qualities of zeal, sympathy and intuition which, unless kept under the firmest control, are dangerous qualities in international affairs.” This exemplifies the hierarchies within diplomacy where ‘masculinities’ are placed above ‘femininities’. While female political leaders such as Queen Elizabeth were considered great diplomats, women were not formally included in the diplomatic profession until the middle of the 20th century. In Britain for example, the Diplomatic and Consular Services remained reserved to men until 1946. The reasoning put forward by the Foreign Service was “…on the grounds that they would not be taken seriously by foreign governments and would create insurmountable administrative difficulties, particularly in relation to their marital status”. After sustained pressure on the Foreign Service to modernize their practices, women became eligible, although a marriage ban was enforced as well as a 10 percent cap on female recruitment.[28] **Therefore, it is clear that gender-based discrimination persisted even when ‘equality’ was achieved.** The story of women in diplomacy in the United States is not much more encouraging. While the U.S. State Department theoretically opened up the Foreign Service in 1926 with the transition to a merit-based exam, the oral exams weeded out the majority of women and minority candidates. It took the American diplomatic service 25 years to have the first female Ambassador “…when Eugenie Anderson went to Denmark in 1949…” Gender-based discrimination remained rampant throughout the US State Department. For example, “Until the 1970s, the State Department expected women to give up their jobs if they married and did not remove this unfair requirement until 1974” In 2004, women accounted for eighteen percent of American Ambassadors or 30 out of one 167. **Female diplomats are not only under-represented in bilateral relations between states but also in multilateral relations between states and international organizations. In 2012, only 15 percent of permanent representatives at the United Nations were women.** In an Embassy Magazine poll that same year, current female diplomats in London were asked the following question; Is diplomacy a man’s world? Eighty-seven percent of respondents answered yes while “most felt pressure to work harder to prove themselves [and] three out of four (75 percent) said they had experienced both subtle and overt forms of prejudice.” **It is clear that men and women are unequally positioned in terms of ability to succeed within the institution of diplomacy. This overt male bias is the product of a historically and structurally male-dominated patriarchal system within which diplomacy operates. As a result, “…existing power structures within the diplomatic infrastructure remain to reinforce gender inequalities and overt discriminatory practices, making it difficult for women to enter diplomacy at the highest position”.** The above discussion of the marriage ban in the British Foreign Service articulates this notion of overt discriminatory practices. Today, women face a similar issue regarding marital status related to what is called ‘the trailing spouse’. As articulated by Caitlin Kelly, “One of the many challenges, especially for women serving in these essential roles, is that of finding a partner both willing and able to table or shelve his own career ambitions to follow the demands of your new employer”. The Media is a second challenge faced by female diplomats “when the press […] repeatedly asks questions like 'how old are you?' 'Are you married?' 'When will you have time to have children?' 'Do you find it difficult to cope with this?'” Therefore, it is clear that even though women have begun to achieve inclusion within the institution of diplomacy, female diplomats continue to experience prejudice and discrimination based on their gender.

#### Economy

The 1AC’s call for economic support perpetuates gender divides in the international economy.

Paterson, 1999

Ruth Paterson is an international political theorist whose work is published in the peer-reviewed Melbourne Journal of Politics. Paterson, R. (1999). *Towards a Feminist International Political Economy.* Melbourne Journal of Politics, 26(0).

To create a feminist international political economy (IPE) we must challenge both the scope and assumptions of traditional IPE. The spheres in which women are involved in the international political economy, as well as the gendered nature of international political, social and trade relations have been excluded from the study of IPE. This pervasive exclusion, in a discipline which is consciously critical and open ended, makes IPE look depressingly similar to the international relations and economics scholarship which it originally sought to critique. As many feminist authors demonstrate, the theory and practice of international political, social and economic relations is strongly gendered, relying on women's unpaid, or undervalued, labour to allow men to play visible public roles as workers, diplomats, soldiers and refugees. A feminist IPE would widen the scope of our study to include spheres dominated by women and to understand the gendered nature of international politics which allows the systematic differentiation between men and women to be understood as `natural'. In order to develop some suggestions for the development of a feminist IPE, I will outline what IPE is, why gender should be considered within it, and how IPE has dealt with issues of gender so far. Finally, I will consider what a feminist IPE might look like. I will suggest some new directions IPE should take in order to better represent the gendered terms in which the international political economy is experienced by people, states and markets. IPE developed in the 1970s as a response to a number of pressing international issues that could not be adequately explained by international relations and economics. It reconstituted political economy--which had preceded the specialisation of the disciplines of IR and economics--in a modern form. IPE theorists hoped that, by taking an interdisciplinary approach, they would be better able to grasp the complex interaction of interests and events which precipitated the break-up of the Bretton Woods financial system, the OPEC oil crisis, the challenge of multi-national enterprises to state sovereignty and the difficulties experienced by development programs. Simple definitions of IPE's agenda suggest that IPE studies the relationships between "states and markets", (3) or "the linkages between the political and the economic on the one hand, and between the domestic and the international political economy on the other." (4) This nexus is understood in very different ways by the three dominant traditions of economic nationalism, economic liberalism and Marxism, and has been subjected to a wide range of interpretations. Continual debate between proponents of the three main approaches has led to a vibrant field where new methodologies and interests flourish, albeit primarily within the guidelines of each tradition.

#### Environment

The 1AC conceptualizes the environment in a way that subordinates women and prioritizes masculine conceptions of environmental control.

Dobscha, 1993

Susan Dobscha, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Susan Dobscha (1993) ,"Women and the Environment: Applying Ecofeminism to Environmentally-Related Consumption", in NA - Advances in Consumer Research Volume 20, eds. Leigh McAlister and Michael L. Rothschild, Provo, UT : Association for Consumer Research, Pages: 36-40.

First, nature has been conceived by the dominant culture as "alien" and separate from humans. This human/nature separation is what feminists call a dualism which is when two concepts are separated and used for analysis. Feminists add the idea that when two concepts such as nature and humans are separated, hierarchy forms and one is given a higher status than another. In this case, humans dominate nature. Second, Ruether's quote suggests that women and nature have traditionally been aligned in terms of symbols and terminology. The popular media has demonstrated this by popularizing the slogan "Love your mother earth." Other examples that engender nature are "raping the land," and "virgin resources." Third, women are already very visible in local grassroots movements and other political activist groups centered on changing policy and rampant consumerism in order to save the environment. Thus, women have already begun to play that major role in the environmental movement that Ruether prophesied. One such role is that of environmentally-conscious consumer. The primary belief of ecofeminism is that the domination of women (as studied in traditional feminism) parallels the domination of nature and that this mutual domination has led to environmental destruction by the controlling patriarchal society. Within feminism, a locus of scholars believe that a historical, symbolic, and theoretical connection exists between the domination of nature and women. This philosophy is based on four principles (Warren 1990): 1) there are vital connections between the oppression of nature and women, 2) understanding these connections is necessary to understanding the two veins of oppression, 3) feminist theory must include an ecological perspective, and 4) ecological problems must include a feminist perspective. Ecofeminism claims that both women and nature are dominated and thus stresses the need for a more interdependent worldview. Ecofeminists believe that all living things are essential to the well being of the planet and that humans are not separate or superior. If this worldview were applied in ERC, the research agenda would be starkly different. More emphasis would be placed on the role consumers have played in environmental destruction and how basic value structures need to be changed in accordance with the concept of interdependence.

#### Security

The 1AC’s use of normative national security discourses fail to address security concerns and women’s issues.

Blanchard, 2003

Eric M. Blanchard is currently Adjunct Assistant Professor in the Political Science department at Columbia University in New York City. His research interests include gender, IR theory, international security, and East Asian IR. His work has been published in *Signs, International Studies Quarterly, Review of International Studies, and Journal of International Relations and Development.* Blanchard, E. (2003). Gender, International Relations, and the Development of Feminist Security Theory. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 28(4), 1289-1312. doi:10.1086/368328

**National security discourses are typically part of the elite world of masculine high politics**. Statesmen, diplomats, and the military conduct the business of states, and too often war**, imbuing the relations and processes of the society of nation-states with an atmosphere seemingly devoid of women and an interest in issues of concern to women.** The academic discipline charged with theorizing this world, international relations (IR), has only recently made a place for feminist analysis, and then only grudgingly. Academic feminism and IR are contemporaries, each developing through the war-torn twentieth century and motivated by some of the same international events, although **work in IR often overlooks women’s contributions, such as the 1919 International Congress of Women, which ran parallel to Versailles** (Grant 1992, 86). While in some respects estranged from the mainstream of IR, feminist and gender scholars have launched an important critique of the core issues of the discipline: war, peace, and the quest to secure the boundaries of the nation-state. **In a rapidly changing, post-9/11 world, feminist voices must be heard if the international system is to achieve a more comprehensive security in the face of terror networks, technowar, and mounting civilian casualties.** **The term security itself has been wrought with ambiguity** and has recently taken on the status of an essentially contested concept in the discipline**.** **Within international relations, discussions of international security traditionally revolve around issues of war and peace in an international system of sovereign and self-interested nation-states**, with a particular focus on issues of military strategy. In this view, the provision of security is entrusted to the state, with the assumption that states protect and secure the members of the political community from threats emanating from the dangerous, foreign realm outside state boundaries. However, feminists and other critical scholars have started to inquire into the meaning of this.

#### Space

**The aff’s rhetoric of “space exploration and development” both reproduces and prescribes the masculine ontology of patriarchy**

**Griffin 09**

(Penny Griffin, prof. Politics and International relations, university of New South Wales. “The spaces between us: the gendered politics of outer space” in Securing Outer Space Edited by Natalie Bormann and Michael Sheehan. Routledge, 2009. Pages 59-75. OCRed from the original text, minor character errors may exist)

Introduction This chapter is about sex, but not the sex that people already have clarity about. **'Outer space'** as a human, political domain **is organized around sex**, but a 'sex' that is tacitly located, and rarely spoken, **in official discourse. The poli­tics of outer space exploration**, militarization and commercialization as they are conceived of and practiced in the US, **embody a distinction** between public and private (and appropriate behaviours, meanings and identities therein) **highly dependent upon heteronormative hierarchies** of property and propriety.! The central aim of this chapter is to show how **US outer space discourse, an imper­ial discourse of technological, military and commercial superiority, configures and prescribes success and successful behaviour in the politics of outer space in particularly gendered forms. US space discourse is**, I argue, **predicated on a heteronormative discourse of conquest that reproduces the dominance of** heterosexual **masculinity(ies), and** **which hierarchically orders the construction of** other (**subordinate) gender identities**. Reading the politics of outer space as heteronormative suggests that **the discourses through which space exists consist of institutions, structures of understanding, practical orientations and regulatory practices** organized and privileged around heterosexuality. As a particularly dominant discursive arrangement of outer space politics, **US space discourse (re)produces meaning through gendered assumptions of exploration, colonization, economic endeavour and military conquest that are deeply gendered whilst presented as universal and neutral. US space discourse**, which **dominates the contemporary global politics of outer space**, is thus formed from and upon institutions, structures of understanding, and practical orientations that privilege and normalize heterosexuality as universal. As such, the hegemonic discursive rationalizations of space exploration and conquest (re)produce both heterosexuality as 'unmarked' (that is, thoroughly normal­ized) and the heterosexual imperatives that constitute suitable space-able people, practices and behaviours. As the introduction to this volume highlights, **the exploration and utiliza­tion of outer space can thus far be held up as a mirror of, rather than a challenge to, existent, terrestrially-bound, political patterns**, behaviours and impulses. The new possibilities for human progress that the application and development of space technologies dares us to make are grounded only in the strategy­ obsessed (be it commercially, militarily or otherwise) realities of contemporary global politics. Outer space is a conceptual, political and material space, a place for collisions and collusions (literally and 'metaphorically) between objects, ideas, identities and discourses. Outer space, like international relations, is a global space always socially and locally embedded. **There is nothing 'out there' about outer space. It exists *because* of us**, not in spite of us, and it is this **that means that it only makes sense** in social terms, that is, **in relation to our own constructions of identity and social location**. In this chapter, outer space is the problematic to which I apply a gender analysis; an arena wherein past, current and future policy-making is embedded in relation to **certain performances of power and reconfigurations of identity** that **are always, and not incidentally, gendered**. Effective and appropriate behaviour in **the politics of outer space is configured and prescribed in particularly gendered forms,** with heteronorma­tive gender regulations endowing outer space's hierarchies of technologically superior, conquesting performance with their everyday power. **It is through gender that US techno-strategic and astro-political discourse has been able to (re)produce outer space as a heterosexualized, masculinized realm**. A brief note on sex To talk of US outer space politics and discourse as 'sexed', and therefore gen­dered (through the pre/proscription and reproduction of those human identi­ties considered most effective and appropriate to space) is not purely to limit discussion to sex acts, or sexual identities in the usual sense; it is to talk about 'sex as it is mediated by publics', some of whose obvious relation to sex may be obscure (Berlant and Warner 1998: 547). As Bedford argues, using sexuality as an analytical concept extends beyond discussion of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender issues to consider the ways in which heterosexuality as 'unmarked' (that is, thoroughly normalized) is (re)produced in changing forms by political actors (2005: 296). The institutions, structures of understanding and practical orientations through which US space discourse privileges and normalizes het­erosexuality as universal are tacitly, not explicitly, gendered. The dominant discursive rationalizations of outer space exploration and conquest that consti­tute space as heterosexual, and (re)produce the heterosexual imperatives that constitute suitable space-able people, practices and behaviours, do so in ways that are not necessarily obvious nor are they always coherent. As Butler argues, 'gender' operates in discourse as a 'norm', a 'standard of normalization' that serves to discursively regulate the bodies over which it presides; When gender operates as a normalizing principle in social practice, it is more likely to be 'implicit, difficult to read', and 'discernible most clearly and dramatically' in the effects that it produces, thus **the prescription and reproduction of hetero­normative gender in outer space discourse, like all other norms, 'may or may not be explicit'**

#### **Military use**

**The 1AC uses military force, which historically subjugates women and upholds global patriarchy.**

**Saloom, 2006**

Ms. Saloom is currently an associate at an Atlanta law firm. J.D., University of Georgia School of Law, 2006; M.A., Middle Eastern Studies, University of Chicago, 2003; B.A., Political Science, University of West Georgia, 2000. Saloom, Rachel (2006) "A Feminist Inquiry Into International Law and International Relations," Roger Williams University Law Review:Vol. 12: Iss. 1, Article 4.

The masculinist culture of the military is manifested in many different ways. Sexual metaphors are common in the use of military jargon. For example, a well-known security intellectual under the Carter Administration stated that "'under Jimmy Carter the United States is spreading its legs for the Soviet Union.'' Carol Cohn, a theorizer on the role of gendered military discourse, describes the language used in a defense professional's lecture as follows: The language employed by defense intellectuals and military strategists is loaded with sexual connotations. By using this language, feminists argue that women are oppressed and objectified. **Men exert their power over women through sexual acts, and they equate these acts with the violent acts of the military.** Gender critics of the military argue that **the military envisions its enemy as women. At once, women play the role of both the conqueror and the conquered.** Feminists argue that the military has a distinctly masculine identity that marginalizes anything feminine. They argue that camaraderie is an essential theme of the military and the war experience. The camaraderie that forms, however, is an exclusive homosocial camaraderie that is masculinist in nature. **The masculinism that is prevalent in military culture locks out the feminine and women.** Closely linked to the masculinist nature of the military is the way in which sexuality is embodied in military culture. **"Within traditional military culture, women are cast largely as the sexual adversary or target, while men are cast largely as promiscuous sexual hunters."** Feminists posit that **this dichotomy of the hunter versus the hunted allows for sexual harassment and oppression of women in the military**.67 Military women are not seen as equal to men because of the tactics **of the masculinist military subculture that teaches sexual domination even at the basic level.** Feminists argue that military women are still seen as sexual targets while men are the sexual consumers. These feminist criticisms of the military are intertwined with feminist criticisms of international law and international relations. Gender theorists believe that **the fixation of international law and international relations theorists on military concerns privileges certain types of security over others. Military security is the central area of focus, rather than food security or the ability to feel secure from oppression in one's country.** Most **security-based theories of international law and international relations are gender blind.** Specifically, **gender is not taken into account when theorizing about security or about international law or international affairs** in general. Whitworth argues that "[t]he construction of assumptions around gender is produced as much by what is not said as what is said .. .such strategies, and the **invisibility** which results, **can be seen to reproduce unequal relations between women and men.**” The gender invisibility that exists in theorization is highly problematic for those who want to examine the role that the gender variable plays in the international arena.

### Alt/Framework

#### Ecological solvency

Feminist approaches to ecological issues have the potential to transform society and dominant approaches to environmental degradation.

Dobscha, 1993

Susan Dobscha, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Susan Dobscha (1993) ,"Women and the Environment: Applying Ecofeminism to Environmentally-Related Consumption", in NA - Advances in Consumer Research Volume 20, eds. Leigh McAlister and Michael L. Rothschild, Provo, UT : Association for Consumer Research, Pages: 36-40.

The unifying goal of feminist theory is to transform male-dominated society. This goal is to be achieved through research methods that work toward raising consciousness. Feminists employ consciousness-raising research to expose and change structures that are oppressive such as the current system that has left the lion's share of environmental responsibility to women consumers. With an ecofeminist framework, ERC research would take a more emancipatory approach. The research agenda would be focused on changing corporate and public policy so that the burden for the ecological crisis would not be placed on women alone. Policy changes would include mandatory ecological labeling of all consumer goods (as is already instated in the United Kingdom and Canada) and stricter pollution regulations. Other countries such as Italy are more dedicated to the environmental movement and have already banned all non-recyclable packaging. Education programs designed to benefit consumers would be developed in order to liberate consumers from the complexities of a marketplace that has profit as its primary motive. These educational programs would be comprised of teaching the consumer not just to consume differently, but to consume less. This redirection would aid in the development of the "green citizen" and not merely the "green consumer".

#### Global feminist consciousness

Fem IR re-conceptualizes international relations through its emphasis on a global feminist consciousness.

Reilly, 2007

Niamh Reilly is a Senior Lecturer and co-director of the Centre for Global Women's Studies in the School of Political Science and Sociology, National University of Ireland, Galway. Reilly, N. (2007). Cosmopolitan Feminism and Human Rights. *Hypatia*, 22(4), 180-198. doi:10.1111/j.1527-2001.2007.tb01327.x

A global feminist consciousness that challenges the systemic interplay of patriarchal, capitalist, and racist power relations is integral to contesting false universalization and neo-imperialist manifestations of supposedly cosmopolitan values. Such a consciousness has antecedents in Charlotte Bunch’s account of global feminism, which she defined as a “transformational feminist politics that is global in perspective [where] . . . the particular issues and forms of struggle for women in different locations will vary [and activists] . . . strive to understand and expand the commonality and solidarity of that struggle” (1990, 303). My understanding of global feminist consciousness also borrows from Chandra Mohanty (1991). Just as she has argued that a coherent Third World feminist standpoint can be identified, despite the multiplicity of identities and locations occupied by Third World women, a global feminist standpoint is possible without requiring homogeneity of identity or experience or even an ongoing consensus among women across a range of issues. From this perspective, the global arena is understood in terms of interconnected patterns of domination and resistance along geopolitical and geoeconomic lines, as well as in terms of gender, race, and class. A global feminist consciousness challenges the false dichotomies that pervade understanding of the international arena—especially in the Western, “developed” world. Powerful hierarchical binaries of North/South, Christianity/Islam, secular/fundamentalist, First World/Third World, freedom/authoritarianism are implicated in the construction of harmful stereotypes and the invisibility of inequalities along lines of gender, race, and class. For example, poverty and inequality are major features of the so-called First World; Islam is not synonymous with fundamentalism, terrorism, and antidemocratic values; forms of Christian fundamentalism, pervasive in many regions, also undermine democratic values and potentially promote terrorism (e.g., attacks on abortion clinics); and free-market privatization is not equivalent to democratization. More concretely, a global feminist consciousness brings the gendered dimensions of globalization and related global issues sharply into focus and underlines the necessity of bringing feminist analyses to bear in the formulation of cosmopolitan political responses. For example, roughly half of the forty million people living with HIV/AIDS are women in the Third World and the rate of female infection is rapidly exceeding that for males (Amnesty International 2004). This is explained by the continued prevalence of various forms of gender violence, sex-based discrimination, women’s disproportionate poverty, and the marginalization of Third World countries on the global stage. Similarly, at least half of the world’s eighty million migrants (International Labor Organization 2002) are women, and in some part of Asia this number is as high as 70 percent. While migration is inextricably linked to profound economic disparities among countries, women experience migration in genderspecific, racialized ways that leave them more vulnerable than male counterparts and nonmigrant women to violence and exploitative employment, including work in the sex industry. More generally, there is a growing recognition of the unequal, gendered impact of globalization (Streeten 2001). On balance, globalization has made most women more vulnerable to poverty, involuntary migration, economic and sexual exploitation, and related forms of violence against women. While proponents of cosmopolitanism effectively argue that current global problems cannot be “solved” without a cosmopolitan approach, women’s experiences equally underscore the need for a feminist cosmopolitan response to globalization. More positively, a global feminist consciousness also recognizes new opportunities for collaboration among groups and individuals in seeking to advance social justice internationally.

#### Realism frames out fem IR

**The realist international framework frames out feminist perspectives and women’s experiences.**

**Saloom, 2006**

Ms. Saloom is currently an associate at an Atlanta law firm. J.D., University of Georgia School of Law, 2006; M.A., Middle Eastern Studies, University of Chicago, 2003; B.A., Political Science, University of West Georgia, 2000. Saloom, Rachel (2006) "A Feminist Inquiry Into International Law and International Relations," Roger Williams University Law Review:Vol. 12: Iss. 1, Article 4.

The general arguments forwarded by gender theorists must be examined for their applicability to the international system. While these theories have tremendous potential to bring about change**, gender theorists are not always welcome in the realm of international law and international relations.** Their criticisms are often met with skepticism and sometimes scorn. **"[D]oorkeepers" determine what theories are deemed acceptable. When feminist theorists attempt to question the root cause of patriarchal power and problematize the state and other institutions, the doorkeepers quickly lock them out of the discipline.** Gender theorists' research is often times called into question and labeled as "illegitimate" or "peripheral." **In the international law realm, women only make up a small part of those who write articles on international law and who hold international law faculty positions.** Moreover, women traditionally have not occupied high power positions in the United Nations, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and other international organizations. Some of the tenets of gender and international law and international relations theories, however, are not clearly defined. Many feminist criticisms are abstract observations that cannot easily be understood. For instance, the concept of the state as a masculinist actor must be further examined. Many times the state is actually feminized and referred to as "she" or "her." Feminists criticize this notion as well, because this feminine categorization assumes the nation is like a woman in need of male protection. Notably, however, this all too common depiction in international relations calls into question the masculinist character or identity of the state. The criticisms of realism also deserve further reflection. Gender theorists contend **that realism represents only a partial picture of the world, arguing that realism marginalizes the feminine and favors the masculine.**

#### Standpoint epistemology

**Taking the epistemological standpoint of women in relation to public policy is key to solvency**

**Dricoll and Krook, PhD candidate in political science @ Washington U, professor of political science @ Washington U, 08** (Amanda and Mona Lena, “Feminism and Rational Choice Theory,” European Consortium for Political Research, 2008, http://krook.wustl.edu/pdf/Driscoll%20and%20Krook%20ECPR%202008.pdf)

A third element of feminist research is a commitment to political change. In some instances, this goal is used as an argument against feminist work on the grounds that it fails to be ‘objective,’ as political motives interfere with the discovery of ‘truth’ (Hammersley and Gomm 1997). In response to such critiques, feminist epistemologists argue for recognizing the situated and partial nature of all knowledge claims (Haraway 1991), with some even suggesting that perspectives of the marginalized should be drawn upon as a resource for generating more valid knowledge about the world (Hartsock 1983; Harding 2004). Whatever their methodological commitments – which may range from broad acceptance of the existing tools of the discipline, a position known as feminist empiricism (Harding 1986), to attempts to explore and devise new methods of analysis (Hesse-Biber and Leavy 2007; Reinharz 1992) – feminist scholars converge on the opinion that research should contribute to some type of positive transformation, whether this entails the broad empowerment of women as a group or the simple deconstruction of gendered categories in public policy.1

### Impacts

#### Human rights

A feminist approach to international relations empirically promotes human rights and saves lives.

Reilly, 2007

Niamh Reilly is a Senior Lecturer and co-director of the Centre for Global Women's Studies in the School of Political Science and Sociology, National University of Ireland, Galway. Reilly, N. (2007). Cosmopolitan Feminism and Human Rights. *Hypatia*, 22(4), 180-198. doi:10.1111/j.1527-2001.2007.tb01327.x

In keeping with other articulations of cosmopolitanism, cosmopolitan feminism expresses a commitment to public international law, particularly international human rights law. Fully recognizing the “limits” of established international law—as a “progressive narrative” and “liberal conception” with a “statecentric focus” (Crawford and Marks 1998), cosmopolitan feminist projects are characterized by a critical, practical engagement with legal discourse and a radical critique of the public-private configuration in international law. In addition to the 1990s global campaign for women’s human rights, other significant examples include efforts to ensure the inclusion of feminist analyses and gender perspectives in the ICC statute and the adoption of UN Security Council Resolution 1325, which addresses women’s roles in peace building and postconflict reconstruction. The paradigm of international human rights is generally understood in legalistic terms as a body of public international law to be interpreted by experts or as a system of intergovernmental institutions and procedures charged with implementing human rights standards. Cosmopolitan feminism challenges this legalist bias and seeks to integrate the moral, legal, and political elements of human rights into a framework of critical, global citizen action to achieve what Charlotte Bunch calls the “feminist transformation of human rights” (1990). The act of “claiming rights,” therefore, is central to this conception in which international human rights ideas and standards are subject to an ongoing process of contestation, (re)interpretation, and (re)definition. This is different, however, from saying that the content of rights is decided in a relativist vacuum because the struggle to contest the meaning of human rights is always with reference to established human rights standards (Bronner 2004, 147). Consequently, a participative, dialogic process—grounded in the idea that the content of universal human rights must resonate with the concerns of, and be defined by and with concrete, situated women—is integral to advancing women’s human rights claims. The global campaign for women’s human rights is a particularly strong example of this approach. In the late 1980s, there was a growing recognition within and across women’s movements that violence against women was a universal phenomenon that affected women in every region, even though the form it took differed from place to place (Carrillo 1991). This was pivotal in the emergence of a far-reaching feminist challenge to mainstream human rights concepts and practice. When plans for a UN world conference on human rights were underway in the early 1990s, many questioned the failure of international human rights standards and advocacy to address women’s experiences. This meant asking why abuses primarily affecting women, such as domestic violence, trafficking, or forced pregnancy had not been taken seriously as human rights issues (Bunch 1990). With the exception of the Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) (1979), which attempted to deepen the definition and scope of sex-based discrimination as a human rights issue, women’s rights have been viewed very narrowly in terms of legal equality with men and are generally invisible or marginalized within the wider human rights machinery. The global campaign highlighted the gendered ways in which traditional approaches to human rights privileged male-defined aspects of civil and political rights in situations where violations are carried out by the state. This includes, for example, denials of freedom of expression, arbitrary arrest, torture in detention, and the death penalty. While not discounting the importance of these issues, Hilary Charlesworth has argued that this constitutes a profound gender bias wherein human rights are primarily defined according to the criterion of “what men fear will happen to them” in their relationship with the state, society, and other men (1994, 71). The global campaign, especially through the use of popular tribunals organized alongside major UN forums, demonstrated how this gender bias served to deny the human rights dimensions of harmful and often fatal forms of gender-based violence, because they occur in “private” contexts of family or community and are generally perpetrated by nonstate actors such as spouses and family members (Bunch and Reilly 1994).

#### Subordination of women

**International patriarchy causes global, systemic oppression of women.**

**Tickner, 1992**

J. Ann Tickner is a feminist international relations theorist. She is a distinguished scholar in residence at the School of International Services, American University, Washington DC. Tickner, J. A. (1992). *Gender in international relations: Feminist perspectives on achieving global security.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Feminists claim that women are oppressed in a multiplicity of ways that depend on culture, class, and race as well as on gender. Rosemary Tong suggests that we can categorize various contemporary feminist theories according to the ways in which they view the causes of women's oppression. While Marxist feminists believe that capitalism is the source of women's oppression, radical feminists claim that women are oppressed by the system of patriarchy that has existed under almost all modes of production. Patriarchy is institutionalized through legal and economic, as well as social and cultural institutions. Some radical feminists argue that the low value assigned to the feminine characteristics described above also contributes to women's oppression. Feminists in the psychoanalytic tradition look for the source of women's oppression deep in the psyche, in gender relationships into which we are socialized from birth. Socialist feminists have tried to weave these various approaches together into some kind of a comprehensive explanation of women's oppression. Socialist feminists claim that women's position in society is determined both by structures of production in the economy and by structures of reproduction in the household, structures that are reinforced by the early socialization of children into gender roles. Women's unequal status in all these structures must be eliminated for full equality to be achieved. Socialist feminism thus tries to understand the position of women in their multiple roles in order to find a single standpoint from which to explain their condition. Using standpoint in the sense that it has been used by Marxists, these theorists claim that those who are oppressed have a better understanding of the sources of their oppression than their oppressors. "A standpoint is an engaged vision of the world opposed and superior to dominant ways of thinking." This notion of standpoint has been seriously criticized by postmodern feminists who argue that a unified representation of women across class, racial, and cultural lines is an impossibility. Just as feminists more generally have criticized existing knowledge that is grounded in the experiences of white Western males, postmodernists claim that feminists themselves are in danger of essentializing the meaning of woman when they draw exclusively on the experiences of white Western women: such an approach runs the additional risk of reproducing the same dualizing distinctions that feminists object to in patriarchal discourse. Postmodernists believe that a multiplicity of women's voices must be heard lest feminism itself become one more hierarchical system of knowledge construction. Any attempt to construct feminist perspectives on international relations must take this concern of postmodernists seriously; as described above, dominant approaches to international relations have been Western-centered and have focused their theoretical investigations on the activities of the great powers. An important goal for many feminists has been to attempt to speak for the marginalized and oppressed: much of contemporary feminism has also recognized the need to be sensitive to the multiple voices of women and the variety of circumstances out of which they speak. Developing perspectives that can shed light on gender hierarchies as they contribute to women's oppression worldwide must therefore be sensitive to the dangers of constructing a Western-centered approach. Many Western feminists are understandably apprehensive about replicating men's knowledge by generalizing from the experiences of white Western women. Yet to be unable to speak for women only further reinforces the voices of those who have constructed approaches to international relations out of the experiences of men.

#### **War on women and children**

**The costs of war, including death, dehumanization, and the spread of diseases, are magnified against women and children.**

**UNICEF, 1996**

Accessed from UNICEF’s official site. War hits home when it hits women and girls. (1996). Retrieved July 20, 2016, from http://www.unicef.org/graca/women.htm

**Gender-based inequity is usually exacerbated during situations of extreme violence such as armed conflict." Women and girls in particular experience conflict and displacement in different ways from men because of the gender division of roles and responsibilities.** The targeting of women and girls by armed forces further exacerbates the situation. Examples of such targeting and gender-based inequity leading to higher mortality and morbidity (illness) among females during armed conflict include**: violence against girls and women, including rape and sexual slavery; hunger and exploitation in camps for refugees and internally displaced persons, when men take control of food distribution; malnutrition, when food aid neglects women's and children's special nutritional requirements; and culturally inappropriate and/or inadequate access to health services, including mental and reproductive health services.** **Far more children die as a result of disease and malnutrition caused by war than from direct attack. Mass population movements, malnutrition, exposure and overcrowding in refugee camps encourage the spread of disease. WHO estimates that as many as half the world's refugees may be infected with tuberculosis. Health services for women, girls and the children in their charge break down in wartime, just when they need them most.** In countries where children are already vulnerable to disease, the onset of armed conflict may increase death rates by 24-fold. For example, in Mozambique between 1981 and 1988, war caused an estimated 454,000 excess childhood deaths, above what would have normally been expected. And during the conflict in Somalia, more than half the deaths in some places were caused by measles. **Often health services available in emergency situations are dominated by men, so many women and girls, for cultural or religious reasons, underutilize these services despite their need of them. The population movements and breakdown of social controls engendered by armed conflict encourage, in their turn, rape and prostitution as well as sexual slavery to serve combatants. Unwanted pregnancies and the spread of sexually transmitted diseases, particularly HIV/AIDS, are the collateral physical effects of this human degradation.**

### Affirmative Answers

#### No solvency

No solvency: fem IR is not an effective framework to challenge contemporary issues in international relations.

Saloom, 2006

Ms. Saloom is currently an associate at an Atlanta law firm. J.D., University of Georgia School of Law, 2006; M.A., Middle Eastern Studies, University of Chicago, 2003; B.A., Political Science, University of West Georgia, 2000. Saloom, Rachel (2006) "A Feminist Inquiry Into International Law and International Relations," Roger Williams University Law Review:Vol. 12: Iss. 1, Article 4.

All of these theorists highlight the manner in which gender criticisms can destabilize traditional theories. They provide no mechanism, however, for the actual implementation of their theories into practice. While in the abstract, resistance to hegemonic paradigms seems like a promising concept, gender theorists have made no attempt to make their resistance culminate in meaningful change. The notion of rethinking traditional approaches to international law and international relations does not go far enough in prescribing an alternative theoretical basis for understanding the international arena. Enloe's plea for women to speak out about international politics does not go nearly far enough in explaining how those acts could have the potential to actually change the practice of international relations. Either women are already speaking out now, and their voices alone are not an effective mechanism to challenge the system, or women are not even speaking out about world politics currently. Obviously it is absurd to assume that women remain silent about world politics. If that is the case, then one must question women's ability to speak up, challenge, and change the system. Tickner forwards the idea that until women occupy half of the positions in foreign and military policy-making, nothing will change. She contends that mediators and care-givers must be valued just as greatly as presidents and warriors. Tickner concludes with the notion that none of this is possible in the current international relations framework, and that as long as gender hierarchies are in place that oppress women the problematic international relations traditions will continue. Tickner's last point that deserves further reflection is the notion that international law and international relations will not become free from gender bias as long as we live in a gendered world. This is not to say that small steps are ineffective, but rather that international law and international relations are merely a small part of the larger systemic problem of unequal gender relations. While it is desirable that more women occupy foreign and military policy making positions, this "desire" does not necessarily transform the way international law and international relations work. To allege that this is the case assumes that women have an essential character that can transform the system. This of course is contrary to the very arguments that most gender theorists forward, because it would mean that women have some unique "feminine" perspective.

#### Perm

Perm – do the plan, then the alt. Realism is an essential starting point to understanding critical theory in international contexts.

Saloom, 2006

Ms. Saloom is currently an associate at an Atlanta law firm. J.D., University of Georgia School of Law, 2006; M.A., Middle Eastern Studies, University of Chicago, 2003; B.A., Political Science, University of West Georgia, 2000. Saloom, Rachel (2006) "A Feminist Inquiry Into International Law and International Relations," Roger Williams University Law Review:Vol. 12: Iss. 1, Article 4.

Buzan admits however that realism is not as relevant as it may have once been, although the adherence to power politics is still highly imbedded in the international system. He also believes that realism must be used as a foundation for both the theory and practice of international relations. He posits that new possibilities can emerge that go beyond power politics, but that using realism as a springboard is necessary to even be able to envision those alternatives. Other theorists also warn about dismissing realism as a key theory in international relations. Stefano Guzzini argues that one must first understand realism in order to comprehend international relations. Guzzini claims that realism cannot be disregarded without having a concrete understanding of what realism has to offer to international relations. He states that "[realism is a still necessary hermeneutical bridge to the understanding of world politics. ' 86 Guzzini concedes that realism has weaknesses, but he does not believe that a total critique of realism is viable or preferable. Dismantling realism is not the vehicle by which to gain new insights into international politics. Other theorists take issue with those gender scholars who view the state as an inherently problematic actor. Mona Harrington believes that that state can be used to achieve feminist goals. While Harrington does not view the state as entirely unproblematic, she advocates that, with some reforms, the state is a powerful agent of change. Accordingly, she does not believe a wholesale rejection of the state is preferable. John Hoffman also argues that engagement with the state is desirable to total critique of the state. He posits that even though the state is a patriarchal institution, one who develops a theory to oppose the state may not necessarily be successful in dismantling patriarchy. These authors conclude that working within the institution of the state has the power to ultimately transform the state. There is not much consensus between the gender theorists and those who adhere to current approaches to international law and international relations. The biggest obstacle for gender theorists is the application of their theories. It would be valuable to determine how international relations or international law would operate if gender were taken into account. Gender theorists themselves have trouble formulating ways to apply their theories. Most scholars believe that the "add women and stir" approach generally fails. The notion that "bringing in" more women to the areas of international law and international relations can transform existing practices has not been met with much optimism. Theorists argue that adding women into existing frameworks fails to address the larger androcentric biases that exist. Many theorists criticize this approach, supporting their criticisms with allegations that the issues that gender scholars and practitioners want to address cannot be neatly incorporated in the current framework. Smith argues that: The issues raised by feminism not only do not fit with the discipline, they disrupt the entire edifice of community and society upon which [international relations] and the other social sciences are built. Their foundations are so embedded in gendered identities, subjectivities, and therefore reified structures of common sense that they simply cannot be amended to take account of gender.

#### Realism good

A realist international frame is essential to understand global issues and human nature. Fem IR replicates the gender binary.

Saloom, 2006

Ms. Saloom is currently an associate at an Atlanta law firm. J.D., University of Georgia School of Law, 2006; M.A., Middle Eastern Studies, University of Chicago, 2003; B.A., Political Science, University of West Georgia, 2000. Saloom, Rachel (2006) "A Feminist Inquiry Into International Law and International Relations," Roger Williams University Law Review:Vol. 12: Iss. 1, Article 4.

Murray contends that realism accurately encapsulates human nature and is not necessarily androcentric or profoundly masculinist. He also attacks feminist alternatives to realism because he believes that they paint cooperation as "female" and conflict as "male." In this way, feminists replicate the binary gender categories they seek to criticize. Murray states that "[r]ealism's distinctive contribution thus lies in its attempt to drive a path between the two, a path which, in the process, suggests the basis on which some form of synthesis between rationalism and reflectivism might be achieved." He argues that realism cannot be abandoned in favor of some feminist or other critical theoretical alternative. Murray is not alone in his defense of the realist paradigm of international relations. Barry Buzan provides arguments in support of a realist interpretation of international relations. He argues that realism can be a powerful starting point for understanding international relations and for formulating more inclusive theories.80 He posits that realism has proven to be both historically and contemporarily useful in understanding international relations.8 1 Buzan applauds realism, stating that: No matter what the structure, or how differentiated the units, power politics, the logic of survival, and the dynamics of (in)security do seem to be universally relevant to international relations. At any period of history it is very hard to escape from the fact that the major powers do play the central role in defining international political and economic order.