



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG

This is a copy of an article published in *Politics and Gender* © The Women and Politics Research Section of the American Political Science Association 2017; *Politics and Gender* is available online at:
<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/politics-and-gender>

Citation for the published paper:

Stern, M. (2017). Feminist Global Political Economy and Feminist Security Studies? The Politics of Delineating Subfields. Politics & Gender, 13(4), 727-733. doi:10.1017/S1743923X17000381

GUP

Gothenburg University Publications

<http://gup.ub.gu.se>

Feminist Global Political Economy and Feminist Security Studies? The politics of delineating subfields

Maria Stern*

When considering possible conversations, synergies, overlaps, similarities, conflicts, and distinctions between two subfields or “camps” (Sylvester 2010), the question of limits looms large. Where, why and how are the limits of Feminist Security Studies (FSS) and of Feminist Global Political Economy (FGPE) being currently drawn and to what effect? Building upon previous conversations about the relationship between FGPE and FSS, particularly as they are discussed in the forum in *Politics & Gender* (2015), as well as those about FSS and FGPE more generally, I briefly touch on a few central points regarding the politics of boundary drawing and the practices of feminist research.

The Stakes of Staking Fields of Knowledge?

IR is certainly blessed with the birth of many new fields and subfields and is heavily pregnant with even more. While arguably never uniform (see Alison 2015), Feminist IR has become an established field, which embraces numerous areas of focus and a wide range of approaches, such as FGPE and FSS, that are creatively combined in specific research endeavors. That specialized areas of research offer scholars dynamic and rich “homes” for theoretical, methodological and empirical development attest to the robustness of Feminist IR.

Nonetheless, like many before me, I wish to reconsider the appeal—indeed the seduction— of cordoning off fields and subfields, the telling and retelling of different versions of their stories and origins (c.f. Alison 2015; Enloe 2013, Hemmings 2011), and defining (however loosely) what they do and don’t do in terms of knowledge production. *Why and to what aim* do we engage in such field-defining and field-developing/opening/reintegrating exercises?

This is not meant as a flippant question. On the contrary, I ask it with the utmost respect and seriousness. For if the point is to address the ills of the world—in particular those having to do with gendered, raced, classed inequality, violence, and injustice, then a

* I thank Joel Ahlgren for invaluable input on this article.

robust conversation about how best and comprehensively to do so is indubitably in order.

Surely, a well-demarcated field provides a community of scholars who share a similar language and frame of reference, as well as purchase. Deep engagement with a body of research within which one can situate one's work inspires many to tackle challenging and vital domains of inquiry and identify and remedy crucial gaps in knowledge.¹ Clearly distinguishing a field also allows for developing a brand in the marketplace of academic hiring, journal publishing, and grant opportunities. When areas of study are marginalized in interrelated economies, the need for clear demarcation can be a necessary survival strategy. Through defining a field, it— its members and body of scholarship— can be substantiated, institutionalized and rendered legitimate in the neoliberal education market. At the same time, this market increasingly governs and polices our opportunities, our careers, and even our thinking (Brown 2015; Zalewski 2013).

Lines of Distinction?

How then do we delineate FSS or FGPE?² As is clear from the topic of this forum, there is a growing impetus to distinguish *between* FGPE and FSS. In this conversation, FGPE and FSS emerge as different from each other along several lines of demarcation. These include assumptions about FGPE's emphasis on the importance of materiality in relation to FSS' focus on the power of discourse (Elias and Ray 2015: 428; Hudson 2015: 414; Meger 2014: 417-418). Others distinguish the fields along the lines of their empirical research topics. According to True, for instance, GFPE pays explicit attention to material and structural "inequalities in local household and global political economies" (True 2012: 29), whereas FSS, she argues, largely neglects these linkages and focuses on

¹ In recent attempts to define FGPE in relation to FSS, the absence of what True labels an "IPE method" (True 2012, p. 25, 29) and attention to the "root causes" to sexual violence in FSS could be seen as compelling reasons, for instance, to delineate a FGPE subfield. Has FSS, as True (2015: 421) and Meger (2014: 418) agree, narrowed its focus in such a way that crucial questions about unequal material resources and continuums of violence remain out of focus in recent attempts to understand conflict related sexual violence? This inattention to FGPE surely emerges in relation to the agenda of globalized security politics. Clearly, attention to how and why the limits of FSS come into focus reveal much about the power relations at play and the different viable currencies circulating within academia, as well as on the global policy playing field.

² Both subfields have been defined in relation to the perceived "mainstream" fields of GPE and security studies respectively (see Cohn 2011, Elias and Rai 2015: 428; Elias and Roberts 2016: 1; Hudson 2011: 588, Peterson 2006: 499, Sjoberg 2015: 410, Tickner 2011: 576, Wibben 2011: 592; 2016: 3).

direct coercion and fatalities in a war or armed conflict rather than everyday violence in peace or on the home front” (True 2012: 28). Discussions also center on differences between the general aim of the research undertaken. Some advocates of an FGPE approach or method distinguish FGPE as aiming to address the root causes of violence and notice the linkages between political, social, and global structures from the global to the household and individual level. In contrast, FSS is portrayed as narrowly focusing on the acts of violence (such as rape) thereby missing underlying causes (Meger 2015: 417; True 2012: 29) or the continuum of violence that spans “peace” and “war” (Cockburn 2013; True 2015: 421; see also Sjoberg 2013, 2014). Relatedly, for some (Elias and Rai 2015; Hudson 2015), another deep fault line between FGPE and FSS falls along a familiar structuralist/post-structuralist divide; FGPE, according to these accounts, largely embraces structuralist ontologies³, epistemologies and methodologies, while many FSS projects tend to embrace post-structuralist ones.

The point here is not to agree with or refute these categorizations, but instead, to highlight some of the ways FGPE and FSS are being distinguished (and thus produced) in relation to each other. It is noteworthy, however, that explicit characterizations of FSS as importantly separate from FGPE are largely addressing FGPE as a solution to the perceived limitations of FSS, and not the other way around (see also Sjoberg 2015: 412). Whether or not one recognizes the pictures of FSS or of FGPE painted in contradistinction to each other, it is clear that, according to many of these accounts, FGPE has been marginalized and overlooked in a feminist IR that has become factitious and that is oriented around mainstream Security Studies and IR (see Sjoberg 2015).

Nevertheless, in revisiting lessons learned about the dangers of the politics of identity—even academic and feminist identities, we are reminded that as we strive to secure, know, develop or even open our fields through (re)naming them and (re)marking their limits—even in the hopes of “reintegrating them” from their supposed status as separate spaces, we simultaneously inscribe them as fields which have both an inside and an outside. In so doing, the limits between what they are and what they are not; what they include, do, achieve in relation to that what other fields do, include, achieve are drawn in bold lines. Yet, as with all discursive limits that serve to differentiate and to mark

³ C.f. de Goede, 2006.

difference, the boundaries themselves imbue the subjects they delineate with meaning: an FGPE emerges in contradistinction to an imagined FSS (and vice versa). And the politics of inclusion and exclusion, among other politics, risk perhaps more in terms of emancipatory knowledge than they offer.

A divided field in practice?

Furthermore, when we pay attention to what scholars are actually doing, to what kinds of questions they are asking and how they are seeking answers, the picture of a divided field of feminist IR scholars (that could usefully be re-integrated) loses much purchase, as the definitional limits that differentiate them remain slippery. These limits are already being challenged, blurred, ignored, refused, or moved in myriad ways in scholarship classified to be FGPE, as well as that of FSS, as well as by those who reside (un)comfortably in both subfield homes *and* those who had little idea that such homes existed as shelters and incubators.

What is striking in the rich scholarship associated with both subfields is the composite creativity displayed in seeking to unravel webs of complex social, political, economic, cultural, etc. processes, relations, practices and subjectivities, find linkages, and hone in on pressing problems that refuse the spatiotemporal coordinates and the orders that circumscribe our imaginaries. We find scholarship that asks questions about violence in all its myriad of forms and that interrogates the “continuum of violence” (Cockburn 2013; True 2012); that takes as its point of departure the “everyday” (see Elias and Rai 2015; Parashar 2015); that embraces structural, as well as post-structural ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies (Hudson 2015; Sjoberg 2015); that traces processes of embodiment in relation to security and economic practices (Elias and Roberts 2016; Wilcox, 2015); that focus on materiality (Abdelnour and Saeed 2014; Agathangelou 2004); that glean insight from theories and methodologies recognized as belonging to FGPE and FSS (Chisholm and Stachowitsch 2016), as well as much more.

Revisiting Feminism

There are a host of good reasons for delineations, even schismatic ones, between subfields as well as the impetus to (re)integrate already distinct fields. There is also much to be said for moves to erase, transgress, ignore and subvert those limits that are being continually crafted, and that seemingly provide a solid foundation for vital

scholarship. As Zalewski's work (2006, 2013) has continually reminded us, feminism's political purchase may lie in its failures (Stern and Zalewski 2009), its refusals, its openings, instead of in our attempts to pin it down, even ever so slightly, through the politics of (self)naming.

Bibliography

Abdelnour, S. and A. M. Saeed. 2014 "Technologizing Humanitarian Space: Darfur Advocacy and the Rape-Stove Panacea". *International Political Sociology* 8(2): 145–163.

Allison, K., 2015. "Feminist Security Studies and Feminist International Political Economy: Considering Feminist Stories". *Politics & Gender* 11(2): 430-434.

Agathangelou, A. 2004. *The Global Political Economy of Sex: Desire, Violence, and Insecurity in Mediterranean Nation States*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Brown, W. 2015, *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution*. Zone books.

Chisholm, A. and Stachowitsch, S., 2016. "Everyday Matters in Global Private Security Supply Chains: A Feminist Global Political Economy Perspective on Gurkhas in Private Security". *Globalizations* 13 (6): 815-829.

Cockburn, C., 2013. War and security, women and gender: an overview of the issues. *Gender & Development*, 21(3): 433-452.

Cohn, C., 2011. "Feminist Security Studies: Toward a Reflexive Practice." *Politics & Gender*, 7(4): 581-586.

De Goede, M. (ed.) 2006. *International Political Economy and Post Structuralist Politics*. London: Palgrave.

Elias, J., 2015. "Introduction: Feminist Security Studies and Feminist Political Economy: Crossing Divides and Rebuilding Bridges." *Gender & Politics*, 11(2): 406-438.

Elias, J. & Rai, S., 2015. "The Everyday Gendered Political Economy of Violence". *Politics & Gender*, 11(2): 424-429.

Elias, J. & Roberts, A., 2016. "Feminist Global Political Economies of the Everyday: From Bananas to Bingo". *Globalizations* 13(6):787-800.

Enloe, C., 2015. "Closing Reflection: Militiamen Get Paid; Women Borrowers Get Beaten". *Politics & Gender*, 11(2): 435-438.

Hudson, H., 2015. "(Re)framing the Relationship between Discourse and Materiality in Feminist Security Studies and Feminist IPE". *Politics & Gender*, 11(2): 413-419.

- Meger, S., 2015. "Toward a Feminist Political Economy of Wartime Sexual Violence". *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 17(3): 416-434.
- Peterson, S. V., 2006. How (the meaning of) gender matters in political economy. *New Political Economy* , 10(4): 499-521.
- Sjoberg, L., 2011. "Looking Forward, Conceptualizing Feminist Security Studies". *Politics & Gender*, 7(4): 600-603.
- Sjoberg, 2015. "From Unity to Divergence and Back Again: Security and Economy in Feminist International Relations". *Politics & Gender*, 11(2): 408-413.
- Stern, M. and M. Zalewski. (2009) "Feminist Fatigue(s): reflections on feminist fables of militarization". *Review of International Studies* (35): 611–630.
- Sylvester, C., 2010. "Tensions in Feminist Security Studies". *Security Dialouge* 41(6):607-614.
- Tickner, J. A., 2011. "Feminist Security Studies: Celebrating an Emerging Field." *Politics & Gender* 7(4): 678-718.
- True, J., 2012. *The Political Economy of Violence against Women*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- True, J., 2015 . "A Tale of Two Feminisms in International Relations? Feminist Political Economy and the Women, Peace and Security Agenda". *Politics & Gender* , 11(2): 419-424.
- Wibben, A. T., 2016. "Opening Security: recovering critical scholarship as political". *Critical Studies on Security* 4(2): 137-153.
- Wibben, A. T., 2011. "Feminist Politics in Feminist Security Studies". *Politics & Gender*, 7(4): 590-595.
- Wilcox, L. B. (2015) *Bodies of Violence: Theorizing Embodied Subjects in International Relations*. Oxford University Press.