

## **Cynthia Enloe – A Conversation**

**Cynthia Enloe:** Covers. Let me just alert you. Covers are very political, right? Hi everybody. It is just really nice to be here. It is a wonderful university. You are very, very lucky. I know you know that. But you are very lucky group to be here in in such a fine, serious, thoughtful, and energizing university right in the middle of Ankara, which is perfect. So, I am just going to say about that covers up here. Let me just start off about the books' covers. These are all three from the same publisher but because I work on ideas and experiences of women and men in war, especially I do a lot of work on war, and also on militaristic ideas which can happen in peace time. But it really means that I really try to have covers that both don't put you off like you are being moved over by tank, a lot of covers look like that, but also they have to be covers that make it clear that at least I am trying to be really respectful and interested and curious about women and men in many different parts of the world. Covers can really do just the opposite. So, for instance let me just give you an example here. This is about politics of publishing, politics of the media and when you write books, the relationship you have with your editors and with your publishers. So probably, the trickiest cover here, the cover for his book called Nimo's War, Emma's War, which is the subtitles making the sense, feminist sense of the Iraq War. And that does not mean so much the Iraq War, namely US-led invasion of Iraq. So, you can imagine, I am sure you can imagine, what the design department at my university press, you can imagine the first image is that they wanted to put up. It is going to be a book that they want to make visible about women's experiences of and men's experiences of the Iraq War. I must have looked at I don't know seventy different possible images. Are you imagining what were the design departments' presumption? They were going to put a weeping child or covered woman on the front of the war. I said, "No, that is not what this book is about." This book is about Iraqi women, lots of different kinds of Iraqi women, trying to make sense of the war and taking action in the middle of the war. Because as you know from your own experience, women's movements happen not just before wars and not just after the wars, women's movements happen in middle of the wars. And so, I wanted a sense that Iraq was a country that, of course has the religious differences, but how observant people learn and how they express their observants. But I also wanted this a sense that women in the war are do not just weak. The women in war are victims, but they are not only victims. They are thinkers, they are actors. They are trying to cope with the everyday experiences of war. So finally, I was able to do some digging. You have to negotiate with publishers, right? Covers are their own covers. What is inside, maybe your words, they are on the cover? Covers are what they are going to use to market their book. So, I

looked, and I found Iranian Canadian professional photographer. And she had spent weeks in Iraq as a professional photographer. Taking pictures of all kinds of daily life of Iraqi's in the middle of the Iraq War most recent. When I look through her images, there was such a wide range of images of what women's lives were like and how they were living their lives in the middle of the war. And that is why we came up with that. These women have forgotten that there is a photographer there. They are having their own debate in the stairway of an apartment house. They were in their own debate about something. And that was exactly the kind of image I wanted to show. That in the middle of the war, women and men trying to make sense about war and then trying to act out of that sense they make of it. And that was so much more what I thought this book was about. And publishers and design department and specialists agreed which I was very happy about. The other two images, again, I was lucky to come up with them. Publishers don't always listen to authors. They like authors because they have to have them to publish, but they do not necessarily think how to officially sell the books. So, they persuade and trust in the author to realize what the cover might be. But I have been very lucky and because I have a feminist editor that means that it is an editor who respects the authors. And so, between us we negotiate about the design. The second one is a photograph I found in British Imperial War Museum. The War Museum, if you ever go to London is a really interesting place to go, and it is about the British experiences of war and they have a great photographic archive. In that I found this very funny and odd image. Because when you look at it, you think "What's going on in there?" They are in the seashore. It is in the middle of the wars. There are WWI women in British uniforms, and there are women in the bathing costumes lying on the beach. What I liked about it is two different images of women in the war time in the same frame. And it leaves us the readers or lookers at it thinking, "What's going on?" And that is exactly the thing that leads the reader to open the book. This is the newest book, and it is an image that comes from an Icelandic woman artist named Carolina. This is an image that she made shortly after the financial crisis, which hit Iceland probably harder than any another country. That is the 2008-2009 financial crisis was severe in Iceland. And it is the only country where in the 2008-2009 financial crisis, it's the only country where bankers went to jail. Keep that in mind. And so, she made this print. It is ordinary, whatever ordinary means, this ordinary rural Icelandic women in her sweater and skirt and you cannot really tell if you... Have you ever been to Iceland? Is there anybody who have had a chance to go to Iceland? Such an interesting country. It does not have any military in a sense. But if you have been to Iceland, you recognize this is waffle. Iceland is a very volcanic landscape. And so, a lot of landscape has no trees and barely any grass, it has black volcanic landscape. And so, she is a rural woman, rural Iceland

and she is pushing the bankers off the bench. What I love about it is that the bankers have hardly any idea what is happening to them. Can't you see that kind of stunned look? This rural Icelandic housewife is pushing them off the bench. So that was an image that struck me as very amusing, but also captured what I was trying to talk about in the book. So, thank you very much for the great images.

So, this afternoon what I thought would be fun to do is because you have all taken the courses in international politics, you have taken courses in politics, you have taken courses in gender studies and any mix of them and I would be happy to hear any of your comments, your questions, or the stories you hear in the paper and wonder if they are connected. You do read newspapers, right? Just make me feel good. Read a good newspaper, a good newspaper. And so, I am more than happy that I open a kind of conversation. Yesterday was more of a formal lecture like, "bla bla." But today it will be much more interesting for all of us. We will get to hear some of your comments, your puzzles, your thoughts about what is going on in the world and try to make a genuine conversation. If there is anybody who happened to come to the event yesterday, I know most of you have a couple of things and have questions about, that is also fine. Otherwise, it just be why are you gendering politics, why does feminism matter? What is the difference between a feminist approach to politics and the gender approach to politics? And it is not exactly the same. So, anyone want to ask a question? There is no such thing as naïve question. Any question is interesting. Yeah, hi!

**Audience:** Thank you for being here. I feel very lucky to be here, to be here to listen to you. I was here yesterday. I kind of want to start with a follow-up question. One of the things that you mentioned at the end in the Q-A was about sexual harassment in universities. You use solidarity as a one of the most important components. It is women solidarity that is something that I worked in my PhD. Try to make sense, what women activists in Turkey think about it, how they understand it. And one of the problematic things that I found that in a way that we all know the risk of essentializing the concept, essentializing what woman is. And I guess like my question is: How do you define solidarity? What do you think women's solidarity particularly entail? And especially, I have been thinking about conflict zones and what we think about fragmented moments along the different identities. What is that thing? You know this is a kind of long-standing feminist question, I guess. What is one thing that can we unite us? How can we be together and work together? Do you see any differences between solidarity and coalition of politics? You know, do you think that is a strategical move is something.

**Cynthia Enloe:** So, it is a great puzzle to think about. You should think about it in your lives, not just intellectually or you should think about intellectually because it will affect our lives. And that is, what is solidarity with whom, around what, and how do you create it? Because of the things, you learn this in your studies I am sure, one of the things that we have learned, the learning becomes the hard way because we have imagined solidarity was easy. Solidarity is not easy. Solidarity often you have to be really uncomfortable to be in solidarity with somebody. Not just to be comfortable. That is the easy way, and that is rare, anyway. So, I think the first thing that feminists have learned in a lot of different social movements. And what I still am learning every day is that solidarity has to be created and it has to be recreated and it has to be recreated and it has to be recreated again. You do not create solidarity and then it is there for you. It has to be created. The second thing is the essence of solidarity. I mean, right at the core, this is what makes it so hard is trust. And trust is really hard to build. Trust is not the same as similarity. The first imagining a lot of us have is if we are somewhat in the same situation, or we think of ourselves as having similar identities, either in ethnic terms, racial terms, national terms, class terms, working situation similarity, gender terms, that is somehow that we have enough. It is never enough. That what really creates solidarity is learning to trust each other. So, the point is, “how to build trust?” How would you start building trust? And if trust can be sustained and there is always somebody usually if you need solidarity, it means that there is somebody who wants you to be frightened. So, oftentimes here is what happens. And this is happening time again in all kinds of social movements. Out of the fear of whoever you are trying to organize in opposition to, you are afraid that the opposition will exploit any internal divisions. And out of that fear, you try to snuff out, you try to repress any discussion of difficult things going on amongst you. And that can destroy trust. So, let me give an example, of the Vietnamese. We know this because of feminist historians, Vietnamese feminist historians, who are writing now about the 1920’s and 1930’s in the Vietnamese nationalist movements against the French. And here is what we have learned from these Vietnamese feminist historians. There was an attempt under against all odds to build a nationalist movement to push out the French colonialists in the 1920’s and 1930’s. It was a very risky movement. I mean the French security, French intelligence services were everywhere in Vietnam. So, it was really a risky enterprise, there was the beginnings of a genuine solidarity movement by Vietnamese against colonialism. And in that those early days, the feminist historians can date this about 1933, comes at a very particular time. Some feminist women or, I do not even think that they necessarily call themselves nationalist, but they were having more feminist curiosity about their lives. Some Vietnamese nationalist women within this at-risk nationalist movement were surrounded by the

French intelligence services. Enemy, it is like this, just the whole like this, stood up and said, “It’s true that we all have a shared goal of pushing out the French colonial rulers,” including the plantation owners by the way. But in the midst of creating this nationalist movement, these women stood up and said, “We need to have an honest discussion with each other about domestic violence.” Being a Vietnamese nationalist does not mean that there is not gender abuse going on inside our own families. If we are building a new nation, hopefully a postcolonial nation, we have to be a nation where fear of domestic violence does not infuse every wife and mother and daughters’ life. So, we as a nationalist movement, right here and now we should discuss violence against women. Well, Ho Chi Minh and the other leaders of the party, they were almost all male, their response was “No, no, no, we cannot have this discussion about violence inside Vietnamese families including inside of nationalist Vietnamese families because the French would just exploit this knowledge.” As if the French did not have domestic violence inside their own families. But “They would exploit this shame inside the Vietnamese community, and it would divide us.” And the second thing the leadership said, “Also it’s such a contentious issue amongst us.” “We have to have a united solidarity in its shallowest form.” “We have to have solidarity in order to stand up to the French colonialists.” “We cannot at this point in our movement have such a contentious discussion about violence against women in our own families.” “We have to wait until after the revolution.” Here is one of the things that feminists have learned. They learned from hearing stories like this and when exposed by usually feminist historians. This is true for all kinds of movements. There comes a moment inside the movement, it can be labor union movement, it can be a civil rights movement, it can be any colonial movement and anti-war movement, where some women inside the movement will say, “Before we get any further this movement, we have to talk about what is going on inside the movement between men and women.” Does somebody have to sleep with somebody in order to be taken seriously? Who is serving the coffee? Who always serves the coffee? How come we always serve the coffee? What is happening to domestic violence inside our community? And the answer almost always is – and this is in the name of solidarity is: “Not now, later.” Feminists may hear in any language: “Not now, later.” They know to sit up and be allowed. Sometimes, you in fact accept “not now, later.” Yes, it is too risky. Yes, things are so urgent. Yes, the forces that we are opposing are so superior, unequal in their resources to ours. “Okay, not now, later.” And you know what, later never comes. That is what we have learnt. Later never comes. So, solidarity oftentimes is appeal to as a way not to raise issues of inequities inside a movement, inside a community. And it is very difficult. If you have a plantation, if you are a banana plantation worker in Nicaragua, and the plantation owners are much bigger than

you are, and you have so few resources. And yet as a woman banana worker, you want to say, “Look, the men banana workers, they are our brothers in the symbolic sense.” But that does not mean that they are not abusive. We have to talk about or we won’t have a strong banana worker’s union. So, the shallow version of solidarity has come up again and again and appeal to and usually appeal to in two ways. One, what we are all sharing is what urgent than anything else. And secondly, that the forces that we are opposing that we’re trying to get justice from, that they are so much stronger we cannot afford to show any cracks in our solidarity. But what that has produced is shallow, unsustainable solidarity. Solidarity where somebody’s injustice in the movement is the price for the whole movement showing a unified front to the world. Amongst women, and you know this from your own studies, of course there are differences amongst women. So many differences amongst women. Those obviously racial differences, ethnic differences, nationality differences, but also differences in, not just age, but generation. Because generation, when you use that term in your own work, be sure you make a distinction between age and generation. So, for instance, I am of a particular age, but what is most interesting about me politically is I am of a particular generation of US feminism. And that is my generation. So, when you talk about somebody’s generation, for instance, you are talking about what has been the main form in experience that you shared as a generation. That is your generation. Not whether you 22, 32 or 52. It is your shared experience. And generational differences are really important because you derive out of your experiences and lessons. And you derive different lessons than somebody who has a different generation. So, generational differences are not minor inside of any group seeking solidarity. They have to be talked about. Differences within an otherwise shared community have to be talked about honestly, and they have to be talked about when everybody is listening. That is called building trust. You destroy trust, if you try to raise something serious and nobody will listen to you or somebody will silence you while saying “Not now, later.” That is how trust gets eaten in a way just like termites. So, within feminist movements we have so many experiences of how much stamina it takes to maintain solidarity. You have to spend so much time reflecting, being self-critical, listening when you don’t want to listen, you say, “We have things to do, you can keep talking.” And the people who raised and said that “We don’t talk about it now, don’t come on me.” So, I think solidarity, it sounds solid. It is not solid, it is dynamic. It is in time, it is always in process of anything that has been created or recreated, which means that in any group you have to have processes and structures for solidarity. You do not just have solidarity; you have ways to create it and then recreate it. When somebody begins to feel they are not listened to, they are not taken seriously, then you have cracks in your solidarity. They may not show the right way. But you

watch people who become demobilized. So, solidarity does not oftentimes break up with a big flash. You have two fishers and you have two competing strands of a movement. Sometimes solidarity breaks up just like the crumbling.

**Audience:** Do you believe that this solidarity sometimes risks reproducing heroism? For example, if I give an example of Turkish conscientious objectors, so in order to show solidarity with objectors, you need to go public and sometimes you put yourself under risk of persecution and for example women conscientious objectors in Turkey even though we don't have female conscription system, they still show their solidarity, not only solidarity, they are part of this agreement. But within the antimilitarist environment, there is a risk of being a hero. Because they face civil death, and they face repeated persecutions. But, at the same time they are trying to be aware of this risk of being a hero within the movement. So, they are always critical, but I wanted to hear your opinion about being a hero.

**Cynthia Enloe:** You are reading my mind. The first time I ever heard amongst conscientious objectors, actually they came almost within two months apart. The first time was here in Turkey in İstanbul and I was invited into a conference. I'm trying to remember the date. I bet you'd be interested in the date. It would be something like 2008 maybe, there was a public conference in İstanbul on conscientious objection. It was an international conference, some of the speakers were Turkish conscientious objectors, that is men who were refusing to join the Turkish military to do that their conscription duty. But there were also people- say "people" I'll come back to that- from other countries that still have because most countries have not got conscription, so, there are fewer countries in the world that now have a military conscription. South Korea has military conscription, Sweden has military conscription, until just recently Germany had military conscription, Russia has military conscription, and that is all, all male. The only country that has female conscription and male conscription is Israel and I'll talk about that in a minute. This was a really interesting conference, you can probably imagine, you are in Turkey, it was quite tense. It was a public conference but there was a lot of worry about whether they would be able to go on. And the question of two things came up, because this is Turkey, so that means that there are Turkish feminists, right? Thinking about this. I am a big fan of Turkish feminists, I have to tell you. My first time in Turkey was 2003 and I have been educated and re-educated constantly. So, this was one of my learning moments here in Turkey. One of the first things that came up was is a conference about the politics of conscientious objection to military conscripted service is that a male issue, right? And if it includes women, are women only supporters of the men who are taking the risk? Now, this is as I said around it's 2008, it is İstanbul, there are a

lot of Turkish feminists as audience who are not about to become merely supporters. And so, they thought very imaginatively about this and two things came out of this. The first was – and you put your finger on it when you talk about heroism. The first thing is to challenge any movement, in this case that conscientious objection movement, any movement that raises some people up to the status of heroes. Because heroes, I mean we all know that heroism itself can happen. People take selfless brave acts. But to create heroes is to create a hierarchy. That is some people are more admired than others. Some people are more listened to than others. Some people are more praised than others. Some people seem to have more authority out of the heroism than others. And in this audience, I think it was probably about two-thirds men, one-thirds women, I think in the audience, but in the audience, there was a really good discussion about how in this case Turkish men who are risking their futures by refusing to be conscripted whether they should be treated as heroes. And if they are not heroes, what are they? And can they be still be admired? Can they still be supported without becoming heroes? And that is the story of the movement and just out of heroes you create a pyramid. So, that was one of the really interesting conversations. The second thing that came out of this was what does it mean to be a conscientious objector? What does it mean to be a conscientious objector? Can you be a conscientious objector in a country that has male-only military compulsory service conscription. Can you be a female conscientious objector, when by law you are not required to the military service? What does a female conscientious objector look like if she does not have to, by law, do a military service. A wonderful group, a small group of women from İzmir had just published a manifesto on being a female. They may have said that they are feminists, I cannot remember now, they were feminists, but did they make their manifesto feminist? They may have said women objecting to militarism. And what they did say the words in the manifesto, you can still see it. It is in print. It was published in English but of course it is also available in Turkish. As published in English, probably around 2010-2012 by the War Resisters League, which is an international peace group, you can go online to the World Resisters League and you will find a paper they published called “Women Conscientious Objection.” And they said, by objecting publicly and in their practical labs, you have to do things to be an objector, you can’t just sit on your couch and drink your tea and think “I am an objector,” you have to do things. What it would mean to be a woman, in this case a Turkish woman, objecting to militarism as a set of ideas and a set of cultural practices and a set of policy? Why would you have to be an objector? What would your objection look like? It was really the first and women from İzmir created this manifesto and it is still one of the only in the world. It is really, really

interesting. But it was also cut through this notion that there is only one way to be an objector to state militarism.

The second experience I have was very close to this, that is why I cannot remember which contain first, I was invited to be in Israel with a feminist peace group. And one evening we went to an underground alternative movie film in Tel Aviv. So, I felt the underground, you know, even though there is just a movie, a kind of feeling that something is wrong in this together. Israeli feminist, Israeli conscientious objectors, both women and men, they were younger than they are here because in Israel you go to your military service when you're about 18, right after the high school. And three or four conscientious objectors who coming out of high school had refused the government's call to them to do military service. And one was a young woman. And she stood up on stage, she kind of looked at us all and she just came out of jail for being a conscientious objector. She looked at us all and she said, "Don't you dare make me a hero. Don't you dare. Because if you do that, you will create a hierarchy, a value within this anti-militarist movement." And coming from her who everyone was about to make a hero. And she said, "No no, come back to solidarity. That is not how we are going to sustain solidarity in a movement that is questioning and critiquing militaristic culture and militaristic practices in our own country." So, both those things coming together, and they got to know each other. That is the İzmir women and the conscientious objector from Israel actually got a chance to converse with each other and share ideas. It was really good. So, I think the notion of hero is really a risky notion. It does not mean that there are heroic acts. Or you cannot say that that was a heroic thing to do. That is different than being treated by others as a hero. It is very, it does really talk to the virtuality of solidarity, I think. And sometimes if you all share the same sense of somebody being a hero, that does build solidarity. But it has regular effects that are really damaging for a sense of equality inside a movement. That also builds romanticism which could be very dangerous.

**Audience:** Thank you so much for being here. I am very excited. Sorry if I make any mistakes. My question is too basic, but I want to know about feminist foreign policy. I am a Turkish international relations student. So, when we talk about Turkish foreign policy, the word "feminism" never shows up. So, right now, nowadays like Sweden has adopted a feminist foreign policy and I want to know what it is all about. Is it possible to Turkey to do the same in the future, maybe?

**Cynthia Enloe:** Yeah. It is very interesting that the first person who publicly, and this is why we know that who put feminist together with foreign policy, because it is certainly not my country, but was a Swedish UN civil servant who was also active in Swedish electoral politics. But her name is Margot Wallström. The two things that I have learned had explained Margot Wallström's coming to this idea that there could be such a thing as feminist foreign policy. She has first started articulating when her party Swedish legislature parliament after she had served in the United Nations. That really makes a difference. She had been active in the United Nations. She was, when you look her up, you'll see that her role in the United Nations was a special reporter as they call it on sexual violence in war. That really formulated a lot of what she thought had gone wrong in government's foreign policies. Because the United Nations, the United Nations is really a collection of 194, not necessarily in solidarity, member states. And so, if you are trying to do something inside the United Nations, what Wallström has a vital role as reporter on sexual violence in conflict zones. In fact, you are just constantly aware how many of the member states do not want to have sexual violence talked about. They do not really care about being lessening and certainly do not care about the perpetrators being brought to justice. It is just not where they are and what they think of national security. The second thing about Margot Wallström is not just her own United Nations experience but also the fact that in Sweden, just as they are in Turkey, there are really vibrant women's NGO's. And in Sweden, there is a very strong peace movement, and we'll talk about Sweden becoming more militarized now. Swedish feminists are constantly saying, "Cynthia, Cynthia, don't portrait Sweden as peaceful. Sweden is on the brink of joining NATO. Sweden's government send the forces to Afghanistan. Don't portrait Sweden, the government, as a peace pursuing government." It is not. And these groups, one is the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, there are branches in 60 countries around in the world. All these women's peace organization, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom which becomes WILPF. And the branch in Sweden, is called WILPF, Sweden, they are talked to by the government. As the government actually listens the ideas from peace organizations to help for their options of foreign policy. And another group that was very close and had the ear of Margot Wallström's being chosen for the cabinet, is named Kvinna, it means women. And Kvinna is one of the biggest international aid organizations for women as well as Swedish money but it is a civil society group. Margot Wallström listened to Kvinna activist and the group of Sweden activist. She did not just dream it up by herself. She was informed by women peace activist and women humanitarian and development aid activist. That is how she came up with feminist foreign policy. The way she describes it is that a feminist foreign policy has three sets of goals. The first is to reduce the

likelihood of war and women's abuse in war. That you make that actually part of a government, set of practices and policies towards the rest of the world. The second is that you have a gender equitable development policy. That is whatever aid you give abroad, whatever government support, you give abroad for development. That in fact will be designed, you have to design it, it doesn't just happen. You have to design it. So that in fact gender equity is one of the results of your development efforts. Very, very, very few governments do this. And very few governments who act for NGO's or through international organization's monitoring. So that is your second pillar. The third pillar is that women's rights are human rights. That is, you have a foreign policy that is explicit. You have to be explicit. Explicit means it has to be spelled out, it has to be operational, and it has to be evaluated regularly. That is what explicit means. As they say in English, "you have to walk the walk, you have to talk the talk." "No, we can't just talk the talk, you have to walk the walk." And "walk the walk" means you watch budgets, you watch assignments, you watch evaluations, you watch who does what with the evaluations. So, those three pillars. The first to deliberately take government policy steps to reduce war, and with the abuse of women in war. The second pillar is that you have a gender equitable development policy, which Sweden has one of the biggest foreign policy efforts, is the development policy. And the third is that you recognize the women's rights as human rights. Usually, it is thought that Hillary Clinton is the first to say that, she was so public, when she said at the 1995, Beijing Conference on UN, Beijing Conference on Women, but in fact it was first said by Charlotte Bunch, who was a NGO civil society activist who helped inform the United Nations Women's activist, "women's rights are human rights." That sounds so obvious now. But what you have to realize that for many decades of human rights law and human rights activism, it wasn't thought that reproductive rights have anything to do with human rights. The violence against women have zero interest for human rights lawyers. So, well now, we think of human rights and women's rights, of course they have to be one in the same. But what you have to remember is there is still a lot of human rights co-experts who think it's mainly about the jailing journalist. Which it is, but you have to expand your notion "what is the human right?" Is reproductive rights a human right? If only it is applied to a woman then is it not really human? Is violence against women just so natural? And so, part of the human condition? But you can't raise the level of human rights. Because when you raise something to the level of human rights, there is always going to happen all the time, everywhere, anyway, because it is natural. So that declaration of Charlotte Bunch, the civil society activist and then more publicly by Hillary Clinton, in 1995, in Beijing, "women's rights are human rights" that actually is a radical statement. And Margot Wallström believed in all of those. To say, that she, and she really is a

thinker, and she has a lot of experience and she is a party politician as she was selected for the cabinet. She was a member of Social Democrats in Sweden. But she had also experienced in the UN on the road stage but in the conference around the world. The party leadership chose Margot Wallström, knowing that this was her commitment. The foreign ministry though is not the only ministry in the Swedish government. So, one of the first things is that Margot Wallström did and it looks so minor in the big events, but it really is clear how much opposition there was going to be in Sweden to a feminist foreign policy in practice. The first thing she did was she tried to end, determinate a contract between the Swedish government and the government of Saudi Arabia to provide technical training for the Saudi air force. And she got immediate push back. The first most obvious push back came from the armaments industry in Sweden. Now, when you think about the international trade in arms, you usually think about the big kids on the block, right? Which is, of course, US, in terms of selling arms, and then comes Russia, and then comes Britain and France and lower down Italy. And further down is Sweden. But this is how you do the analysis now. In the Swedish economy, look at the world rankings now, but for the Swedish economy, international arm sales is actually significant. And who is the big player in Sweden? To see how much you know about Swedish corporate life. Who do you think is the biggest single arms seller amongst Swedish companies? It is a company agreement; it is a company that you usually think about because of other products. Give me an SAAB, you know the car? Do you know what their biggest product is? SAAB is a fire plane manufacturer. They don't make that much money of cars and they make a lot of money of fire planes. They immediately pushed back to Wallström's first attempt to implement her vision of a feminist foreign policy. And then, started to come up, a lot of other Swedish companies that make arms said, "If you start to put in any kind of limitations on Swedish arms exports, it's going to hinder our sales, as well." So, she held on to this, but there was a lot of push back and it wasn't clear that her party leadership was really going to be very strong in supporting them. When she then tried to take on actual arms sales itself, because this first attempt was just about a military training, when she started to think about arms sales as well again to Saudi Arabia which is a big purchaser of Swedish arms exports, she really got slandered. So, Margot Wallström is now resigned. The person who and there are personal reasons which you have to watch. When anybody resigns, it could very well be for personal family reasons. But don't accept it as if it is a given. Always ask, is that a reason that is covering in fact a political reason. And Margot Wallström does really have some serious illnesses in her family that she felt she had to care for and remember she has been living abroad for years. But it is also true, that her successor is chosen by the party leadership still refers to Sweden having a feminist foreign

policy and it is not all clear she's got the depth of commitment. So, it means that Swedish civil society groups that helped her nurture this very idea are of high alert now. The differences in Sweden, they actually can get hurt inside the Swedish Foreign Ministry. The other thing is just that Sweden now has a women's party. Women's party in Sweden only has one member of the parliament in the EU. But it is beginning to make inroads in city council elections and the party which is kind of a central left party in the Sweden, long time ruling party, not authoritarian but long-time popular party, that social democrats are very nervous about the women's party. Because they are showing up the people who have been lifelong social democratic voters. They are not so sure anymore. And they are showing their disaffection at the local level. So, watch the Swedish women's party, watch the militarization of Sweden, and watch WILPF Sweden, Kvinna, and other Swedish feminists.

**Audience:** I want to ask a question related to my region. I am coming from an Arab country. The first thing that I faced a situation that everyone is asking me, "You are coming from an Arab country, so there you are covered and you are wearing the scarf or hijab, but here you are taking off, right?" And not even in Turkey, also in European countries. And the other thing that, you are facing a lot of violence as woman, Arab woman, and you are also facing lack of rights as Arab woman. Is it that stupid? Is it a lack of education like to ask this question or is it like and another thing if you can please should divide like Arab feminists Thank you so much.

**Cynthia Enloe:** Most of you hear the question about what is like being an Arab woman being constantly asked about are they covered or uncovered. What is the situation of Arab feminism and Arab women in both Turkey and rest of the Europe? A couple of things and you know this, because I can tell about your question, right? But it is good for everybody to think about. First of all, is the Arab women are no more uniform that are European, right? Or North American and Latin American women. Arab women were living in Arab-mainly countries, almost in all Arab dominating country is all Arab. So, Kurds are Arab but also other groups in Arab dominated countries are Arab, Egypt for instance. So, the first thing that you probably have to remind people constantly of there is no such thing as the Arab woman. There are Arab women just like they are Turkish women and that does not mean that there is no possible solidarity amongst the women identified as Arab. But it does not mean automatic similarity. So, if you are interested in women in Arab countries, mostly Arab countries, the first thing to be is curious and one of the things that we have learned, and I have been talked by Arab feminist friends of mine, is that one of the biggest divisions is hard to overcome for the sake of solidarity in social movements is the difference between rural women and urban women, right? Who may all

identified as Arab, they may have Arab as their main language, Arabic. They may also identify as Muslim. But living in a countryside and living in the city can be really different experiences and give you different concerns and different ways of working together. We know this from the history that has been written by Arab feminist historians. Then one of the hardest things in various countries to do in the history of Syria, in the history of Iraq, in the history of Egypt, is to build movements of women who identified as Arab and who identified as Muslim, between city women and rural women. And oftentimes social movements in many countries. In many countries. It is women living in the cities who in fact become first galvanized, first mobilized and oftentimes set the agenda, define the language of the movement, do the writing for the movement, do the public speaking for the movement and then as an afterthought, "Oh my God, where are the village women?" And that has really made as a common thing throughout the Arab world, but it is also common in every country, I know anything about that is the urban world. If it is not a divide, it is really enough for a different study, really has to be positively and actively bridged. The second thing is about the secular state. So, listen to Iraqi feminist women. And there is a wonderful book by Nadjie Al-Ali. I think not just book is called just Iraqi women, so very plain title, very rich book. She realized, because she herself is Iraqi, nobody ever taught the history of Iraqi women organizing and she like many of us, I mean I never was taught anything about American women organizing, she finds out and so she did an archival work, and she began interviewing much older Iraqi women who had been active in earlier times. She found that Iraqi women really began seriously organizing in the 1940's and in the 1950's make some of their biggest political accomplishments, change in the family law, for instance which was a major accomplishment, heritance, child custody and divorce. So, this was an eye-opener to her. Iraq have had a vibrant women's movement and it is a women's movement that had accomplishments that persuaded the male run state to make changes in the law. And that was new to her. The same for Egyptian women who say, "Nobody ever taught us about the 1920's Egyptian feminist movement." Who knew? And if you do not think you ever had a movement in your country. You likely to think, "All the Europeans did, and we didn't." That is not accurate. That is there have been women's advocacy movements in every one of the Arabic speaking states for three generations and that just changes your consciousness about "who are you now?" Who you are now is you are the granddaughters of those movements. You are not starting from scratch and also nobody can say, you are not like the Europeans. But, you know, there is a new sense. The third thing is about the secular state because there is a big divide in almost every Arabic women's movement. Country by country, it does not matter what your government is that you are opposing. About whether the secular state, that is not about

preaching secularism. You really have to be careful! And you know this in Turkey. There is a real difference between being religiously tolerant of how people want to act out their fate or if they do not want to declare a fate and calling for the state to be secular. And in a lot of Arabic speaking countries, there has been a major conversation and major debate within every women's movement. And the Iraqi women's movement for instance, a call for a secular state, so did the Syrian women's movement of the 1930's through 1970's and so did the Egyptian women's movement. So, the idea of the secular state and then how you achieve it depends what is the history of your own state. So, for instance, one of the things that is so distinctive is that the Baathist Party which became the dominant party in Iraq and in Syria was really committed to the male leadership of the Baathist Party through the 1990, but still in Syria today, but in Iraq through 2003. The Baathist Party had a vision of modernization that depended on a secular state. And that vision of modernization had a particular kind of impact on each women's movement. So, Saddam Hussein, now we are not talking about his authoritarian rule but actually his vision of the state is that the state would be modern, and out of modernization would come economic growth. And out of economic growth would come the capacity to withstand the formal colonial powers. For Saddam Hussein, for economic growth and a modern state, you could not live %50 percent of the population uneducated and outside the paid labor market. So, Saddam Hussein in the 1970's and 1980's became an enthusiastic promoter of women going to university and women having professional careers and women being in the labor force. Not for the sake of women's liberation, for the sake of the building of a modern state. Now, this means that every women's movement in every country faces dilemmas. You have to be really smart to be a feminist advocate and you have to keep track of what the leaders of your current state are claiming for you. And so for Iraqi feminists, a lot of them had to decide was the Baathist Party a liberating party for women or a corrupting party for women or the both. And you would see Iraqi women as feminists in the 1960's and 1970's actually debating with each other about this. Because it was hard to figure out. So, I guess, I mean I am amateur, I only know what people taught me because I was so ignorant and the knowledge of others have really woken me up to the complexity of Arab countries' women's movements, the diversity amongst them and dynamism amongst them and they have existed these three generations. So, I think for, as you are posing this question, there is no such thing as an Arab woman, right? You are as diverse as everybody is. But everyone has histories. And one has to be curious about those histories before you make kind of sweeping assumptions. Curiosity is very much part of being politically engaged. Know what you do not know. And then try to find out. So, you will be the part of the solution.

**Audience:** I am from METU and I am here with most of my students who are taking Introduction to International Politics class.

**Cynthia Enloe:** And you are teaching it.

**Audience:** Yes. They are supposed to write a paper based on your talk. So, in order to help them, I will just ask a very simple question. If you needed to take a step back and look at the feminist international relations scholars. How would you evaluate them in terms of fighting with hegemonic masculinity where we are in the discipline because according to recent polls, most Turkish academics claimed that they are constructivist or neorealists and the very very few of them claim even a post-positivist theory let alone the feminists. So, how would you evaluate the contribution of feminist international relations to the discipline and how do you see its limitations, if you needed to make a self-criticism of the theory.

**Cynthia Enloe:** The evidence is really interesting: you are the evidence. You would not be here in 1970 and you would not have a job teaching what you teach in 1970 or even you like to think you would. It would be very hard to get some department to agree to teach this course that you are teaching. So, I am not sanguine, that is I do not just even see-through rose-colored glasses, but I actually think that there has been a lot of achievement. Here is the way I see it. I see mainly that every class in gender and international relations is full. There are very few courses that are offered as electives in political science or international relations departments, they are called gender and international relations, gender and war, you know some version of that don't fill the quotas pretty quickly. Well, that says there is a lot of interest. If you cannot do gender analysis, actually you cannot build reliable explanations. Gender analysis is a way of building reliable explanations and the more that students realize that is a skill, is a necessary skill to make sense of a very complex and risky world. It is a skill that if you do not have the skill, you will not be as valuable as a citizen. Forget this as an expert, or as civil servant as a diplomat. You will not be affective as a citizen, if you cannot fully explain why things are happening and what the consequences of those things are, and I think there is more and more realization. This is about generation now, and just age. Because a lot of people at your age, 20 years ago didn't realize they need the skill. Your generation realizes that you need the skill. The second thing is that it is always a question, is tokenism assign a progress. It is always the question, right? There are very few departments that are considered serious international relations and political science departments. There are very few departments that are considering serious international relations or political science departments now that do not have at least one gender specialist. One person

can become lonely, but usually the one person in the departments like women's studies and gender studies program and they do make their own community. But that is a change in what is defined as a serious academic department. That is change. So, this looks like tokenism, but one person can make a big difference in the department, especially if he or she attracts a lot of students and the department had kind of noticed who opens the classes that always full. But idea now that you cannot be a contemporary, serious, intellectually vibrant political science or international relations departments without at least one gender specialist. The third thing is, that we have more and more vehicles now for publishing. And publishing is the way you spread knowledge. Publishing is the way you spread evidence. Publishing is the way you spread analytical approaches. And now we have, in the area of politics and international relations, we have International Feminist Journal on Politics, Politics and Gender and virtually every other journals such as Security Dialogue which comes out of Norway is very influential, the Journal of International Relations, ISQ, International Studies Quarterly, all of them have two things. They have feminist analysts on their board who choose the articles and they have feminist articles regularly because otherwise you are not a serious journal. To change the notion of what is serious in academia, is upheaval battle, but it is happening. What is true is that there is decline for somebody doing gender analysis to not have to apologize for and everyone has to develop their elevator talk. Have you ever heard elevator talk? Your elevator talk is you can explain what you are interested in between the first floor and the third floor. You are not lucky enough if the elevator stops. This has got to be, you know, within those four minutes, can you say, "what you do in your thesis on?" "Can you say what your specialties?" So that the other people on the elevator do not want to hear you, understand what you are saying. And it is true that if you are doing gender and international relations, you still have to give your elevator talk a lot. That is a little tiring sometimes. But that is good. And case studies, that often times makes clear why international relations has to be understood in all of its complexity with a gender curiosity, if you give two explanations of what you can make sense of. For instance, why it has been so difficult to end the war in Syria. Why the international trade system is so ungender? We were just talking about Black Sea hazelnuts this morning. So, I just got a new case study in the gendering the major Turkish export. And so, it is really hard to do, but I actually think the war is whining the cracks and I think the proof of it is how many people of this current younger generation thinks "I can't get out of university, if I don't have gender analyst skills. I am not going to be ready for the world if I am not ready to explain climate change." You cannot explain climate change if you cannot analyze masculinity. And so, to be ready to be a citizen of this world in a way that is effective, you do not have to be namely a gender analyst, but you have

to at least gender analysis skills and know how you respect people who have more skills on this subject.

**Audience:** First of all, thank you so much and thank you for the center. I was going to ask do you have a board of advice for the future academics who want to study and include gender in their studies but be little by their mostly male professors and peers. What was your experience in academia?

**Cynthia Enloe:** Were you here yesterday? So, let me give my example again. So, let me give an example of somebody who tried to discourage somebody and then what happened? This is a friend of mine, colleague of mine, named Katherine Moon, Kathy is her nickname, was a graduate student at Princeton University in the US. She was doing her PhD and she is a Korean American and she so has more knowledge about Korea, she knew the big US military basis, and still are, in Korea, there are 405.000 American troops in any one time in the station of South Korea. And so, she also heard from her Korean relatives and friends in Korea that in fact the prostitution system was thriving and was a big business around the US military basis. And so, she thought, “Well, that is what I want to be my political science PhD.” So, she went to her very senior professor in the department of political science at Princeton and some of you who were here yesterday would remember, he said to her, “Oh Kathy, that is not politics.” Just think about that. “Oh Kathy, prostitution around major US military basis in the middle of the Cold War, in a major country active in the Cold War, South Korea, that’s not politics.” He was very sure himself. And the second thing he said to her, “Even so, you will never be able to find any evidence anyway.” Because who collects any documentation on military prostitution well it turns out everyone does. But he has never been interested in, so he could not even imagine what the documentation would look like. Kathy knew that was interesting. She did the investigation and interested in how you go about documenting government to government negotiation around controlling women in prostitution around military basis. This book is a classic and it is not that all but it is already. I interviewed with a friend of mine and he turned and said, “This is the book you have been waiting for?” I said, “Yes, it is.” Because nobody never documented this, nobody never shown, and it was the major issue in the Cold War politics, trying to control women’s bodies for the sake of the male soldiers. And so, she pursued it, she wrote this book, and it is now one of the most famous books in gender in international relations, should be read and taught by all. My first advice is trying to find the topic which you know you want to investigate, you do not have to be absolutely sure of what you have found but develop some sense of why it could be really serious for, again, for export product, that’s how I got interested in bananas, I

didn't actually know what I find if I ask gendered questions about the very big business of international banana trade. It is big business. I don't know what I find but I heard just enough that there are banana workers, big unions that are all male-led. And the banana workers, all male-led unions claim to be the most nationalist organizations in central America. Because bananas are so important, and bananas are controlled by American countries. I just had a sense that if you have got to dig deep maybe you find about the international politics of bananas, that you might otherwise know. So, try things through keeping an eye open, you probably have no idea, of what you really want to, that have to be the last thing of your study, but something we could give an example to somebody who will become your mentors. To say, "I want to investigate this ,two I think it is political; and three, I am almost sure I am going to find to some extent gender is going to matter, for this politics. You may find that it matters huge, you may find that it matters somewhat pretty interesting. And then you can explain to somebody who, like this guy in Princeton, because he could not imagine, he could not even think that anybody else can imagine. But you can imagine. So, think of a topic, kind of topic that you put your feet in it but do not pretend you have to do all your research. And then use it as an example of why gender matters. Combine that with something like Katherine Moon's book, it is always good to give an example of somebody your mentor doesn't wanted to be who is this the arrogant guy at Princeton. Say, "I just read about Katherine Moon, this famous book and her mentor said 'it was not political one. You don't have to say you wouldn't do that.

**Audience:** Thank you for your participation. My question would be a little bit off topic but I just want to take your opinion. There are lots of women are suffering from patriarchy in any areas of their lives, their jobs, their education and the biggest resistance basing in this procedure is their own legislative system and is their own jurisdiction, is their own decision-making mechanism. Do you have any suggestion to those women whose are suffering from the decision-making mechanism and cannot defend themselves?

**Cynthia Enloe:** When you say decision-making mechanism you mean their own local government, or you mean their own family decision making?

**Audience:** Actually, both but mostly their own government.

**Cynthia Enloe:** Their own government. I think one of the most powerful things that we have learned around the world is that local women organizing around local issues really is one of the best building blocks for building up a sense you can create change. Sometimes you have to go national right away. But often times really working locally which means you can have face to

face organizing. And social media is great, but sometimes face to face organizing is really building trust. It is very hard to build trust on social media. But building trust locally around the particular issue, for instance, companies' plan to develop an area that is economically and ecologically sense of and that can really be a vibrant way to start local organizing. So, I think building of that kind of local organization. The other thing is, for women who in their lives they have no resources to have any civic influence. Local organizing gives you a sense actually with others you can embarrass officials. You can stop of all those. You can get media coverage, not on by yourself, although I saw a video, woman protecting her land, but she had a lot of people behind. So, I think for a lot of women who just cannot even imagine having any civic voice, doing something with other people about something that you really care about and you know about because it is local. That really can have a ripple effect because that kind of influence on that issue, well, maybe you can influence something that is broad and requires alliances with groups that you have never been part of it. So, I actually think, start local, start face to face, start with something that really seriously and genuinely matters to you as women and to other women as women. For instance, sometimes it can be local police who do not take seriously calls for intervention in domestic violence. This is around the world. Around the world is the local women who have had to lobby, police or judges to take seriously violence against women in the home. You can have an impact there on the local police behavior on the local judges' behavior and on how the local media covers it. So, local activism, face to face organizing and issue the people genuinely care about. I think is one way to break down that patriarchal assumption that women are just a domestic creature.

**Audience:** Thank you very much. In your book, Bananas, Beaches and Bases, you say that military institutions are exposed as patriarchal institutions that women are urged to resist in order to get equal status. I do not know if I understood correctly the statement because are you calling for %50-%50 percent or a quota on the military? Is that the same way that feminists look for positions in the authority or are you calling for the eradication of military altogether. Because if that is the case, then it is unrealistic because you cannot call for a military removal unless the American starts. Because you cannot say that to Lebanon, to Egypt or Venezuela who are threatened all the time by. So, the problem is this I do not think can be implemented in the new world.

**Cynthia Enloe:** You can have %50-%50 women in anything, in anything, in anything. But as a feminist who is very critical of militarized foreign policy and militarized notions of what is genuine security, I do not call for quotas in anything, in any military. I might call for quotas in

state legislatures. But I, so here is what I was talking about, I am glad you ask this question, and it is always good to clarify what I am saying. I am very interested in men's participation in state militaries or insurgent militaries. I am interested in both. I am very interested in men's participation of state militaries, most militaries have a very hard time persuading enough men to join the military. That is why they have conscription. That is why they give university 17-year-old men into militaries. It is proof that most men actually do not want to join militaries or any kind of conscription or any kind of benefit allures in. The second thing is that a lot of women see their countries' military, that this really depends on where you are, this is not Norway, this is not the Netherlands, it absolutely is not the country that has no military by decision. You know any other country surrounded by war making other countries that it has decided not to have military. Costa Ricans in 1948, because they were surrounded by war making countries decided the way not to have to be involved in wars was not to have a military. Costa Rica has not been invaded in a sense like your country and my country. But women in countries, like your country and my country, women in countries where the militaries consider one of the most important and one of the most influential and sometimes one of the most admired institutions in the country. Some women, especially we talk about teenagers, women about 17-18-19, that is what militaries want, those women want to be a part of the institution that seems to be so valorized on television, and on social media, and sport events, and in the movies, and on television. And those women want to join as volunteers. What I have tried to think of in what I have been writing is how the thing about those women who want to be in their own country's state military. I have been thinking about these women in other countries. And here is why I am at this point, you have to keep thinking, right? You do not stop thinking. At this point, if a military, so I just use my country for a moment, you can make any analogies as what you want, if young women, 17-18-19-year-old women in the US where the military is so valorized, you want to join in and also you have the feeling that is kind of out of the box. You want to do something that is physically demanded, and you want to get away from home. This is really important. You want to get away from home and you want to put off marriage. I have heard a lot of women say, "Well, if you join a catholic convent or join a military and you think that my parents stop pressuring me to getting married." We all have reasons to join militaries. So, you want to do that. How should a feminist who is trying to make sense of militarism think about the young woman who is joining the military? My first thought is she is not the main person that interested in, because she does not control the military. She does not control militaristic culture. It is true. I do worry, whether she will lose her capacity to see militarism when she is in the military. That worries me about men or women. That is once you

join an institution, just like if you become a banker. Will you lose your capacity to see the impact of banking on the society? It is the thing about being in big institutions and that does worry me. It is true that some feminists who are thinking about women's equality, some feminists do think that equal opportunity of women to join the military is a legitimate goal. That I am worried about because I actually think that militarizing feminism by holding up soldiering as a way to be a first-class citizen is really risky. I think that the first-class citizen is a woman who works on a battle of shelter. I think the first-class citizen is a man who volunteers during crisis. That is what I think the first-class citizen is. So, I get very worried about the militarization of first-class citizen, the defender of the nation. So, what you can see there, I am glad about your question, what you can see is an ongoing active thinking, parsing and ambivalence. I do think in the US military, because it is such a powerful cultural institution in the US. You cannot let it get away with sexism. You have to find a way to challenge the military's sexism. For instance, the rampant sexual harassment and sexual abuse of male soldiers on female soldiers in the US military, which most of us did not know anything about, until some brave women were willing to speak to congress about it. You cannot let any military that is powerful in a country get away with sexism with impunity. Do you know the word impunity? Impunity is a really important English word to know and interest. Impunity means not being held accountable. Impunity is one of the most powerful social justice terms. Impunity says, "Somebody is being allowed to get away with being unfair, inhumane, unjust, abusive and nobody else will hold them accountable." It is impunity. You cannot let a military that is powerful in a country's culture, getting away with sexualized impunity. That does not mean the equality for women was being part of a militarized organization. Thanks everybody!