

CPR Working Papers

Social Development Department
Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Network

Paper No. 8
September 2003

Gender Equality and Civil Wars

Mary Caprioli

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CINC	composite index of national capability
COW	correlates of war
GDI	Gender Development Index (UNDP)
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEI	Gender Empowerment Index (UNDP)
MAR	minorities at risk
PRIO	Peace Research Institute of Oslo
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund

Foreword

The research and paper on Gender Equality and Civil Wars was commissioned by the CPR Unit. It is part of an ongoing effort by the Unit to encourage original research on issues of gender and conflict, raise awareness inside the World Bank on what up to now has been a generally neglected dimension—both the conflict dimensions of gender and development, and the gender aspects conflict and development—and gradually contribute to improve the way we think about and address gender and its complex linkages with the causes and effects of violent conflict. Other elements of this effort currently under way include a comprehensive literature review on gender and conflict, a stocktaking of how the Bank has approached gender in conflict-affected countries, and an analysis of international experiences and conceptual framework to help us think about young men at risk and their deadly interplay with violence, conflict and other risky behavior such as HIV/AIDS transmission.

Dr. Mary Caprioli is Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Tennessee. She is also Associate Editor, *International Studies Perspectives*, and a member of the Minorities at Risk Advisory Board. She has published extensively on gender, violence and conflict. She can be reached at: mcapriol@utk.edu.

Ian Bannon
Manager
Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction Unit

Table of Contents

Foreword	
Introduction	1
Recognized Causes of Intrastate Conflict.....	2
The Role of Gender and Structural Violence in Intrastate Violence.....	3
Gendered Nationalism—An Appeal for Domestic Violence.....	6
Potential Measures of Gender Equality.....	8
Hypothesis	10
Research Design and Methodology.....	10
1. Dependent Variables	10
2. Independent Variable Measuring Gender Equality.....	11
3. Control Variables.....	11
Results.....	14
Control Variables	16
Implications	17
Endnotes	19
Tables	
1: The Impact of Gender Equality on the Likelihood of a State Experiencing PRIO/Uppsala Coded Internal Conflict, 1960-1997	20
2: The Impact of Gender Equality on the Likelihood of a State Experiencing COW Coded Intrastate War, 1960-1997	21
Work Cited	22

GENDER EQUALITY AND CIVIL WARS

Introduction

A recent trend in post-Cold War international relations research reveals a new-found interest in intrastate conflict,¹ which occurs more frequently than interstate war (Gleditsch et al. 2002; Sarkees et al. 2003). Scholars studying intrastate conflict either focus on the underlying social conditions leading to domestic conflict (see Gurr 1970) or on the rational calculation preceding a decision to use violence (see Tilly 1978). In general, the political science literature on intrastate conflict emphasizes the role of prevailing domestic norms in predicting intrastate conflict (Ayres 2000; Ellingsen 2000; Fox 2001; Gurr 1994; Henderson 1997; Mazrui 1990; Saideman 1997). Such studies center on the role of ethnicity in predicting intrastate conflict and reveal that most intrastate conflict is ethnic based (Gurr 1994; Vayrynen 1994). What is missing from the research, however, is an examination of the cultural roles assigned to women and the overall impact of gender on intrastate violence.

Analyzing the potential impact of gender on intrastate conflict is important. Rather than being universal, human political behavior is context specific based on variables such as race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, culture, and gender (see Skjelsbaek and Smith 2001). In general, our understanding of human political behavior is based on a masculine stereotype with masculine characteristics valued over feminine. Although men and women have a combination of masculine and feminine characteristics, women are taught to subscribe to stereotypical feminine values and to behave accordingly, and men are taught to subscribe to stereotypical masculine values and to behave accordingly. Masculine characteristics include competitiveness, violence, intransigence, and territoriality; feminine characteristics, on the other hand, are linked with interdependence and egalitarianism (Gidengil 1995; Miller 1988; Welch and Hibbing 1992; White 1988). The political sphere is considered man's domain and is permeated with masculine characteristics. It is irrelevant to this study whether or not men and women have innate biological characteristics or whether differences are the result of socialization, for the end result is the same. On average, men and women conform to gendered behavior – men must exhibit stereotypical masculine characteristics in order to be a 'real' man, and women must display stereotypical feminine characteristics in order to be a 'real' woman. There are a myriad of masculine and feminine characteristics, all of which are not universal but are assigned by each culture. This paper focuses on those masculine and feminine values that have been found to be the most accurate cross-culturally.

The political world cannot be completely understood when based on stereotypical masculine characteristics (see Tickner 1992, 2001). Hence the necessity for exploring the impact of domestic gender equality on intrastate conflict, for gender equality might have a dual impact in hindering the ability of groups to mobilize the masses in support of insurrection through the use of gendered language and stereotypes and in reducing societal tolerance for violence.

Studies focusing on the role of gender equality and *interstate* conflict highlight the relationship between international violence and domestic gender equality (Caprioli 2000, 2003; Caprioli and Boyer 2001; Tessler and Warriner 1997). In general, countries characterized by gender inequality are more likely to be involved in interstate disputes and more likely to rely on violence to settle those disputes. Consequently, there is reason to believe that gender equality will also have an impact on *intrastate* conflict.

This research project adds to our knowledge on the causes of intrastate conflict in two ways. First, this project further tests the general theoretical assertions concerning the role of social conditions in predicting intrastate conflict. Second, this research synthesizes feminist literature and theoretical expectations with the more traditional, presumably gender neutral but actually male-centric understanding of intrastate conflict. I suspect that greater levels of gender inequality will help predict the likelihood of domestic conflict thereby helping to identify those states most likely to become embroiled in domestic conflict.

After first providing the relevant theoretical and conceptual arguments regarding intrastate conflict, I provide an analysis of structural violence and its potential role in predicting intrastate violence. Next, I explore the feminist literature illuminating the role of gender inequality and discrimination in nationalist uprisings. I then empirically examine through logistic regression the impact of gender inequality on the likelihood of intrastate conflict. Ultimately, I seek to discover whether domestic gender equality reduces the occurrence of intrastate violence. This project supports a growing body of research in international relations and comparative politics predicting intrastate conflict based on such malignant societal characteristics as domestic inequality and discrimination.

Recognized Causes of Intrastate Conflict

Two main and complementary lines of scholarly inquiry are associated with the study of intrastate conflict, defined herein as violence within state borders with citizens and their government as antagonists. One aspect in explaining intrastate conflict focuses on grievance, which provides the motivation for a group to use violence “based on a sense of injustice in the way a social group is treated, often with a strong historical dimension” (Murshed 2002:389). Although Collier and Hoeffler (2001) characterize grievance as ethnic and religious divisions, political repression, and inequality, most political scientists adhere more closely to Murshed’s definition following Gurr’s (1970) seminal work on *Why Men Rebel* which highlights the complex interaction of inequality, discrimination, and rebellion and the role of relative deprivation in predicting intrastate violence. It is not merely inequality or diversity that spurs intrastate violence but rather systemic discrimination, often systematic economic discrimination targeting specific groups (see Murshed 2002), thus explaining Collier and Hoeffler’s (2001:1) conclusion,² based in part on the number of ethnic groups and the numerical population dominance of the largest ethnic group, that “[N]either inequality nor political oppression increase the risk of civil war.”

Indeed, ethnic groups demonstrate an increase in aggressive behavior when they experience discrimination (Gurr and Harff 1994). And the greater the level of discrimination, the more likely the ethnic group is to organize against the source of discrimination (Gurr 1994). Similarly, Van Evera (1997) hypothesizes that the more severely nationalities oppress minorities living in their states, the greater the risk of violence. In short, intrastate violence is most likely when groups have a sense of common identity with a concomitant in-group/out-group distinction (Gurr 1994; Tilly 1978, 1991); opportunity based on a rational actor model (Gurr 1970, 1994; Tilly 1978, 1991); and frustration based on relative deprivation (Davies 1962; Gurr 1970).

A strong sense of group identification with its important in-group/out-group distinction is a precondition to mobilization and predominates “when existing institutions are not fulfilling people’s basic needs” (Snyder 1993:86). A strong sense of group identification increases the likelihood of violence, as conflict and violence are a likely consequence of in-group/out-group distinctions (Snyder 1993:93). In addition, a strong sense of group identification is necessary to mobilize groups toward collective action (see Gurr 1970). Collective action is associated with a rational calculation based on the shared advantages and disadvantages of acting collectively as well as opportunity and the likelihood that the group will face further repression as a result of its action (Tilly 1978). In other words, groups suffering from discrimination must weigh the cost of inaction versus the cost of action. People with a strong sense of group identification and a commitment to collective action as a means of achieving their interests will have an advantage over people acting individually (Gurr 1985). The motivation for collective action coupled with group identification is not, however, a sufficient cause of intrastate violence. Collier and Hoeffler (2001) make an important contribution to the rational actor/greed model in highlighting the importance of economic factors as a predictor of intrastate conflict by focusing on the critical importance of a group’s ability to finance rebellion (see also Hegre 2003).

A crucial aspect in people gaining a strong sense of group identification is related to the theory of relative deprivation. In other words, a sense of relative deprivation by a subgroup within society tends to create a sense of shared identity within that group based on their shared grievances and can provide a motive for violence. Relative deprivation is based on individual perception when expectations for need satisfaction, often based on economics, exceed reality. Put simply, relative deprivation is the result of a person or group not enjoying what they believe they deserve. This frustration breeds aggression (Davies 1962) and provides the motive for collective action and violence. According to Gurr (1970), relative deprivation is a necessary component leading to intrastate conflict. “The greater the deprivation an individual perceives relative to his expectations, the greater his discontent, the more widespread and intense is discontent among members of a society, the more likely and severe is civil strife” (Gurr 1970:596).

Recent work has attempted to test these two main theoretical lines of inquiry—relative deprivation and the rational actor/greed model – and has resulted in the creation of one model based on both constraints and preferences (Collier and Hoeffler 2002). Indeed, greed and grievance are related (see Kalyvas 2001; Murshed 2002). A continuum of intrastate violence exists from low levels of violence between the government and some of its citizens to full-scale civil war. The escalation from domestic violence to civil war with high casualties and of a long duration may be based on a rational calculation. A motivation based on grievance/relative deprivation, however, is a necessary component of provoking domestic violence. In short, intrastate violence is more likely when people have a motive based on relative deprivation that in turn fosters a sense of group identity. The likelihood of intrastate conflict is further increased when the resultant group has both the economic means to act and the opportunity to act based on a rational calculation of a state’s potential response based on the likelihood of greater repression or of facilitation.

Thus far the literature on intrastate war excludes an examination of gender in the calculus. We cannot assume, however, that gender has no impact in predicting intrastate violence. Indeed, gender plays an unrecognized role in the current literature on intrastate conflict. This literature is based on masculine stereotypes in which grievance by default leads not to a negotiated settlement based on identified commonalities, but rather to competition and violence. Why does or would grievance lead to violence? And what accounts for the varying tolerance for violence within societies? Certainly, grievance does not always lead to violence. We need to examine the underlying cultural norms that legitimize violence and facilitate a call to arms. Intrastate conflict is more likely in those societies whose cultural norms support violence as a legitimate means toward addressing grievances. Such conditions are inherent to structural inequality, leading to structural violence.

The Role of Gender and Structural Violence in Intrastate Violence

Structural violence (Galtung 1975) and cultural violence (Galtung 1990) are key to understanding societal levels of violence and create the fundamental justification for violence. The importance of state and societal level factors, including regime type, on the likelihood of war is supported by three decades of research from Small and Singer (1976) to Russett and Oneal (2000) and beyond. According to the democratic peace thesis as well as research by anthropologists in some two-dozen ‘peaceful societies’, states apply the same domestic norms and behaviors in both domestic and international settings (see Bonta 1996; Maoz 2003). This proclivity toward international peace in certain societies is based, in part, “on tolerance and a respect for the rights of opponents” (Raymond 2000:290). If norms of tolerance and respect have a pacifying impact on domestic and international behavior, then norms of intolerance and inequality should have an incendiary impact on domestic and international behavior by legitimizing violence as a tool of conflict resolution.

Gender is an integral aspect of structural and cultural violence, for gender forms the basis of structural inequality³ in all countries. Although the power and role of women vary across countries, women are

universally unequal in both the economic and political spheres (Scott 1986). Gender is a multifaceted aspect of discrimination with issues of gender determining roles, power relationships, responsibilities, expectations, and access to resources (UNPFA 2003).

Gender, as an analytical category, captures the complex matrix of social relationships within society (Rosaldo 1980; UNPFA 2003). Although a hierarchy among women exists, gender stratification subsists across class and socio-economic status. 'Female' is only meaningful in relation to male, thus establishing a dichotomy that "reinforces itself through an elaborate system of rules and punishments enforced in all aspects of life" (Grant 1993:161). Although gender roles change over time and are culturally dependent, gender is used as a benchmark to determine access and power, and is the rubric under which inequality is justified and maintained. Indeed, "Gender power is seen to shape the dynamics of every site of human interaction, from the household to the international arena" (Cockburn 2001:15). This interaction includes economic, political, and social dynamics. The intrusion of gender inequality throughout all aspects of human interaction thus creates the foundation for structural inequality.

Structural inequality is based on subjugation and inequality (see Dietz 1985) that is rooted in hierarchy, domination, and the use of force (Brock-Utne 1990). The structural system of male domination is sustained through the persistence of gender stereotypes (Humm 1990), which are themselves socially endowed labels (see Millett 1970). Maintaining power under a system of structural inequality requires the acquiescence of the oppressed (Gaventa 1980; Millett 1970). Socialization, gender stereotyping, and a constant threat of violence assure acquiescence to structural inequality (see Bunch and Carrillo 1998). When structural violence is minimized, societal tolerance of violence is decreased (see Caprioli 2003), thus leading to fewer international disputes and potentially to fewer instances of intrastate violence as argued herein. Conversely, when societal tolerance of violence is supported and legitimized by an environment of structural violence, the incidence of both inter- and intrastate violence should increase, for violence becomes a way of life and a valid tool for settling disputes.

According to Galtung (1975), who developed the theory of structural violence, structural violence is understood as systematic exploitation that becomes part of the social order.

When this structural violence is built around a feudal interaction pattern with a tightly integrated topdog group and a highly atomized underdog group, then personal violence is no longer necessary. Personal violence is only for the amateur in dominance; structural violence is the tool of the professional. The amateur who wants to dominate uses guns, the professional uses social structure. (Galtung 1975:80)

Although Galtung focused on structural violence in terms of economic inequality, his theory can readily be applied to other forms of structural violence. Structural violence has four basic components: exploitation which is focused on the division of labor with the benefits being asymmetrically distributed; penetration which necessitates the control by the exploiters over the consciousness of the exploited thus resulting in the acquiescence of the oppressed; fragmentation which means that the exploited are separated from each other; and marginalization with the exploiters as a privileged class with their own rules and form of interaction. (Galtung 1975:264-265)

In applying Galtung's (1975:265) model of structural violence to women, we find all four components of structural violence. In terms of exploitation, gender roles and expectations lead "to highly differential possibilities for personal development." The second component—penetration is closely related to exploitation "by providing a structure that produces extreme differentials in development of consciousness." As noted above, structural violence is maintained through socialization, gender stereotyping, and a constant threat of violence (see Bunch and Carrillo 1998), all of which insidiously identify women as inferior. Third, fragmentation results from women having fewer job opportunities

outside the home that would allow for participation and create a sense of efficacy (Pateman 1970). Fragmentation also results from women having greater family responsibilities, thus minimizing leisure time that could otherwise be used to socialize, meet with other women, or to become politically active. And finally, “marginalization is the clear separation line between the two [in this case men and women], leaving no doubt as to who are first class and who are second class.” Indeed, gendered hierarchies are indicative of “a set of social practices, beliefs, ideas, values and speech that promote male domination and superiority and female subordination and ‘secondariness’ (Rowbotham 1983:27)” (Sideris 2001:143).

Structural violence does not magically appear within cultures but is based on norms found within the culture. In other words, structural violence is a process by which cultural violence is institutionalized. Indeed, Galtung (1990) builds on his concept of structural violence in highlighting the role of cultural violence as part of the social matrix of violence that is used to both justify and legitimize structural violence. Norms of cultural violence can be found in religion, ideology, language, and art, among other aspects of culture. “Cultural violence makes direct and structural violence look, even feel, right—or at least not wrong” (Galtung 1990:291). Put simply, cultural violence legitimizes structural violence. To further explain the dynamics of violence, Galtung clarifies the differentiation and interrelatedness of direct, structural, and cultural violence:

Direct violence is an *event*; structural violence is a *process* with ups and downs; cultural violence is an *invariant*, a ‘permanence’. The three forms of violence enter time differently, somewhat like the difference in earthquake theory between the earthquake as an event, the movement of the tectonic plates as a process and the fault line as a more permanent condition. (Galtung 1990:294)

Although women have become active agents with notable success in the struggle for equality, violence remains a component of relations between men and women (Sideris 2001)—an enduring aspect of cultural violence that underscores gendered structural violence. Multiple causes of violence against women exist, yet inequality of power is a common denominator in all acts of violence.

The structural inequality of power that exists between men and women across societies creates the conditions for the social control of women. Thus, while general societal violence, that is, the levels of violence prevalent in a specific social situation, may limit the degree of violence used to control women, violence against women reflects relations of domination and subordination. (Sideris 2001:142)

These malignant norms of domination and subordination become enshrined in structural violence, which thrives on social conditions of exploitation, domination, repression and discrimination (see Ibeanu 2001) and sustains a worldview that is competitive rather than cooperative (see Schwartz 1996). Inequality, when extreme and systematic, leads to political violence (Midlarsky 1999). In other words, norms of equality facilitate cooperation among groups who are then more likely to rely on influence or persuasion, rather than on violence (Ross 2000). Norms of inequality—cultural violence—create intransigence.

Thus gender inequality underscores norms of violence and explains the correlation between militarism⁴ and sexism, measured as women’s inequality in relation to that of men (Elshtain 1987; Reardon 1985; Ruddick 1983). This link between militarism and sexism is an aspect of structural and cultural violence, as it is based on discrimination, assignment of ‘other’, and hierarchy with male valued over female. Not surprisingly, masculinity is also linked with militarism (Cohn 1989; Enloe 1989). The dichotomization of masculinity and femininity and subsequent gendered hierarchy is a crucial component of militarism based on arguments linking inequality to violence. Gendered structural hierarchies are based on stereotypical gendered behavior valuing masculine characteristics over feminine, thereby providing men a higher social status in relation to that of women. Thus, militarism is linked with sexism—gendered structural

hierarchies—and therefore, with masculinity. The root of violence can be found in power relationships with a patriarchal hierarchy enabling “men to use and abuse their power” (Pillay 2001:39).

The link between inequality and violence and more specifically between gendered inequality and violence leads UNESCO (1995) to conclude that inequality between men and women is an impediment to sustainable peace. In other words, achieving peace necessitates “overcoming social relations of domination and subordination” (Tickner 1992:128). The impact of gender inequality on intrastate violence should not be underestimated. Just as domestic norms of peaceful conflict resolution and of gender inequality predict state behavior internationally, so should gender inequality help predict intrastate violence. Structural hierarchies, which are maintained by norms of violence and oppression, should result in higher levels of intrastate violence by inuring people to violence and by providing the framework for justifying violence. Gendered hierarchies have an additional role in explaining ethnic insurgencies, which comprise the majority of intrastate conflicts.

Gendered Nationalism—An Appeal for Domestic Violence

Given the ethnic dimension to most internal conflicts, it is important to explore the gendered dimension of nationalism to more fully understand the role of gender in intrastate conflict. As with the broader study of intrastate conflict, political science literature analyzing the role of nationalism in intrastate conflict excludes a gender analysis. Yet a number of feminist studies have identified gender as a theoretically important aspect in the calculus for understanding intrastate conflict. Indeed, feminist literature focusing on the role of women in domestic conflict has identified gender inequality as a justification for violence and insurrection. Yet this literature has been largely ignored. In particular, international relations and comparative politics scholars studying the role of nationalism in intrastate violence focus on ethnic and national appeals for violence (see Ellingsen 2000). These ethnic and national appeals for violence depend on gender inequality and structural violence as a legitimization of violence by relying on gendered language and gender stereotypes to mobilize the masses.

There is an inherent nationalist antipathy toward feminist goals, for men are considered the guardians of culture and tradition and any reforms to the cultural distribution of power are viewed as a threat to nationalist efforts to protect or unify the community (Caprioli and Boyer 2001; Papanek 1994; Tessler and Warriner 1997; Tickner 1992, 2001). Indeed, the dichotomy between men and women is an integral aspect of nationalism. “Throughout the period of state building in the West, nationalist movements have used gendered imagery that exhorts masculine heroes to fight for the establishment and defense of the mother country” (Tickner 2001:43). This gendered perception of unity and strength is recreated in the actions of female leaders who avoid gender-related issues so as not to undermine national or communal solidarity (Hawkesworth 1990; Jayawardena 1986; Peteet 1991). Both male and female leaders encourage women to support the collective goals of the nation even when those collective goals are contrary to goals of gender equality (Mostov 2000). These goals might include limiting women’s freedom in the name of national security; limiting women’s career opportunities by focusing on childrearing and limiting childcare in the name of economic growth; and sometimes forcing women to bear children for the sake of the nation.

Literature on nationalism and domestic conflict focuses on how minority groups, particularly ethnic groups, become targets in nationalist calls to violence. Women, however, also constitute a minority group in terms of power, yet are largely excluded from systematic studies on civil war. Because minority groups are often targeted as a means to nationalist mobilization (Snyder 1993), women have the potential misfortune of being targeted by both their own ethnic group under gendered nationalism as will be discussed below; and as women of ethnic groups, they suffer the same ethnic discrimination as their male counterparts.

The effectiveness of this nationalist rhetoric, however, is limited in societies that are more open and pluralistic in which structural and cultural violence is minimized. Although not specifically included in the literature, pluralism might also refer to equality between the sexes. Just as societies possessing norms and institutions that offer ethnic minorities assimilation into the body of the nation, political equality, and cultural autonomy are less likely to experience violence (Snyder 1993), so too should societies that provide gender equality. Once again, a gendered analysis would predict that societies possessing norms of gender and structural equality, rather than inequality and structural violence, should be less likely to experience violence based on a cultural intolerance of violence.

Indeed, the prior existence of equality hampers the ability to mobilize through demoralizing women. A shift in discourse centering on dichotomies of ‘us verses them’ serves as a precursor to intrastate violence. This discourse serves to unite in-group members by drawing a clear distinction between the in-group and all others. More importantly, the changing discourse intertwines a discussion of gender with that of the nation (Yuval-Davis 1997). “This divisive discourse is often accompanied by a renewal of a patriarchal familial ideology, deepening the differentiation of men and women, masculinity and femininity” (Cockburn 2001:19).

Clearly nationalism is not gender neutral. The category ‘woman’ becomes a tool of leaders in a call to arms, and women are forced into traditional roles as wives, mothers, and nurturers. Dichotomizing the sexes becomes one of many ways of creating in and out-groups both within and between groups. “Gender relations are a crucial, not peripheral, dimension of the dynamics of group identities and intergroup conflicts” (Peterson 1998:42-43). Conscious decisions of power, in which the role of women is one part, are used “to develop ethnic consciousness, to politicize it, to transform it into nationalism” (Enloe 1998:52) and to justify violence.

Peterson (1998) argues that gendered nationalism has five basic components: The first aspect of gendered nationalism relates to fertility. Peterson examines the “battle of the cradle,” which symbolizes cultural norms or directives controlling under what conditions, when, how, how often, and with whom women may procreate. In short, women are responsible for reproduction—long-term group survival—resulting in the restriction of contraception and abortion for in-group members and policies of immigration control and sterilization targeting out-group members. When a group is involved in violence, there becomes an ever increasing need for higher birth rates as people die (Turpin 1998:11); thereby highlighting the role of women as child-bearers in juxtaposition to men as soldiers and legitimizing men’s control over reproduction. Although women might also have an interest in ensuring their cultural survival, their choices become restricted to those of biological producers. Dichotomous gender definitions necessarily accept the devaluation of other, thus bolstering structural violence.

Second, in addition to women’s role as biological reproducers, women are also “social reproducers of group members and cultural forms” (Peterson 1998:43). Women are responsible for socializing children regarding their cultural rights, obligations, norms, and myths. Social reproduction is another means of ensuring long-term group survival. Children must learn about the hierarchy of power within their own culture and between their culture and other cultures. In short, children must learn who has power and why (superiority) and who should not have power and why (inferiority), thus recreating social hierarchies—structural violence. In this way, women are unwittingly complicit in their own subjugation, in ensuring the longevity of cultural violence and structural hierarchies. Cultural survival need not be linked to gender discrimination.

Third, the category ‘woman’ and its cultural definition become a reification of the culture and a symbol of group differences, thus maintaining and intensifying a sense of ethnic belonging. Women are held responsible for conforming to traditional cultural dictates thus serving to delineate the boundaries of culture and the differences between other cultures and their own (see Peterson 1998; Pettman 1992).

Indeed the role of women as caretakers, and that of men as soldiers, is a foundation of patriarchal militarism (see Kaplan 1994). “Militarization of ethnic nationalism often depends on persuading individual men that their own manhood will be fully validated only if they perform as soldiers, either in the state’s military or in insurgent autonomous or quasi-autonomous forces” (Enloe 1989:55).

Fourth, women become involved in the conflict “as participants in political identity struggles” (Peterson 1998:43). Yet these contributions often remain hidden. In other words, women’s contribution to the defense of the nation, beyond her reproductive capacity, goes unrecognized, thus further marginalizing women and drawing a greater distinction between men and women. Fifth, women are members of society—of the nation. Women find themselves with competing allegiances (see Smith 1993) between their own well-being⁵ and the needs of the nation as defined by men. For instance, the needs of the nation are defined in terms of security for the nation, rather than in terms of personal security (see Tickner 1992, 2001).

Social violence targeting women is a tool to maintain men’s control over women’s productive and reproductive labor (Carrillo 1991; Turshen 2001) and as such, is a crucial aspect of gendered nationalism. In sum, both structural violence and gendered nationalism lead to the expectation that women’s domestic equality would result in fewer incidences of domestic conflict. The absence of domestic oppression and violence associated with gendered hierarchies that fuel militant nationalism should lead to lower societal violence overall. This leads to the broader expectation that the inclusion of women as equal members of society should result in a change in overall societal values that effect state policies both internationally, as has been the subject of several studies (Caprioli 2000, 2003; Caprioli and Boyer 2001; Tessler and Warriner 1997), and domestically, as will be tested in this project.

Potential Measures of Gender Equality

The basic premise of this research predicts that the presence of higher levels of gender inequality increase the likelihood that a state will experience intrastate conflict. According to the theories outlined above, gender inequality should have a dual impact on intrastate conflict. First, gender inequality is a manifestation of structural and cultural violence with their inherent norms of discrimination and violence that result in heightened levels of societal violence. Second, gender inequality facilitates a nationalist call to arms.

Two of the best measures of gender equality are fertility rate and percent women in the legislature. The objective in measuring gendered structural violence is capturing the complex matrix of gender discrimination and inequality that includes political, economic, and social discrimination. Fertility rate and percent women in the legislature are two measures that embody multiple aspects of this complex matrix of discrimination and inequality.

Ultimately, fertility rates are included in the final models as a measure of gender inequality and as such will be explained in more detail below. Basically, high fertility rates are not only a result of gender discrimination but also have a negative impact on women’s health and are related to lower levels of education, employment, and decision-making authority in both the family and the community (Blumberg 1989; Dasgupta 1995; UN 1995; UNDP 1995). Furthermore, the expectation of women as biological and social reproducers, particularly as emphasized in gendered nationalism, also serves to lower occupational aspirations (Huber 1991). Lower aspirations coupled with structural and cultural violence allow for fewer opportunities, thus explaining the link between economic power and fertility (Blumberg 1991). Fertility rate is thus a direct measure of gender equality and a proxy measure for education, employment, and social standing.

Percent women in the legislature (Inter-Parliamentary Union 1995) is a potentially strong measure of gender inequality. Unfortunately, 97.3 percent of the cases within the time period of this study have fewer than 30 percent women in the legislature, and 95.7 percent of the cases have a maximum of 25 percent women in the legislature. This does not allow for much variation. Indeed, the UN Commission on the Status of Women (1990) identifies a threshold of 30 percent in order for women to influence outcome – to influence key decisions and be taken seriously (UNDP 1995:108). Percent women in the legislature cannot be used as a measure of gender equality for several reasons. First, the percentage of women in parliament rarely reaches the critical mass to affect policy raising the issue of states having ‘token’ women legislators. Second, the legislature is often suspended during civil war, thus resulting in many missing variables during domestic conflict. Third, the percent women in legislature measure is complicated by quotas for women as well as a lack of information on women’s actual positions. For instance, are women only on committees for women’s health issues or other ‘women’s’ issues? If so their status in the legislature or in society as a whole is not necessarily one of equality but one that perpetuates gender dichotomies and hierarchies—structural violence.

In many ways, the globally low level of women in legislatures indicates widespread gender inequality. “Absence is not merely a sign of disadvantage and disenfranchisement, but the exclusion of women from positions of power also compounds gender stereotypes and retards the pace of equalization” (Reynolds 1999:549). As with fertility rate, percent women in the legislature has the potential to capture more than political equality. Reynolds (1999:550) argues:

Most politicians, male and female, come from a pool of citizens who are highly educated, have professional jobs, and have access to the resources of public life. When the dominant social culture precludes young women from enjoying a full education and socializes them from birth into roles that are removed from the world of public decision-making, then the pool of likely women politicians is substantially reduced. Furthermore, women find it much more difficult to break into electoral office en masse when they are socioeconomically disadvantaged due to the burdens of poor health care, poor child care, and un/underemployment.

Again, the low global percent of women in legislature highlights the universal low status of women as compared with men and precludes the use of this variable in the model.

Not only have women not gained political equality but they also have yet to achieve economic equality. Women’s economic equality is, therefore, another potential measure of gender equality. Labor participation statistics, however, are difficult to compare cross-nationally due to differences in measurement, the lack of information on type of employment relative to education, and the lack of any figures for women as a percent of the labor force in relation to men’s participation rate. To further complicate matters, the percent women in the labor force, as with percent women in legislatures, has little variance with 78.4 percent of cases having a female percent women in the labor force of 45 and below. Theoretically, women should represent at least 50 percent of the paid labor force though choice plays a role. A better economic indicator of equality might be an examination of the gender wage gap. Within each country, men earn more than women in similar positions with varying degrees of discrimination. Unfortunately data for the gender wage gap are not comparable cross-nationally or consistently available.

Various women’s health related measures would be useful if they were available relative to men. For instance, a measure comparing the average caloric intake of girls and boys/men and women as a percentage of dietary requirements would hold promise. In addition, education rates in terms of percent of men attending secondary school relative to the percent of women would help capture gender discrimination. Simple statistics on the percent of women in secondary education are limited, for we are left guessing what percentage of eligible men are attending secondary school. We need relative measures

for women and men in order to go beyond issues of development. For example, a 20 percent women in the work force does not necessarily mean that 80 percent of working age men are employed in the formal sector. Literacy rates might also prove useful if they were consistent cross-culturally. As it stands now, there are different definitions of literacy. Further complicating matters, some states only report data for 'citizens,' variously defined, or only for urban areas, thus rendering them useless in cross-national data comparison.

Thus the choice of using fertility rate as a measure of gender equality is to some extent a legitimate default option that highlights the lack of information on women and the need for more data. Given theoretical examinations of the link between fertility rates and overall gender inequality, fertility rate should certainly be included as a measure of gender equality. Although there are several indices for gender equality such as the UNDP's Gender Development Index (GDI) and Gender Empowerment Index (GEI), they were not introduced until the 1990's thus limiting their usefulness in longitudinal studies. The choice of measuring gender equality using fertility rate, as both a continuous and dichotomized measure of women's equality while controlling for economic measures, is not without precedent in the limited cross-cultural quantitative literature that includes gender variables (see Caprioli 2000, 2003; Caprioli and Trumbore 2003; Regan and Paskeviciute 2003).

Hypothesis

As argued above, a domestic environment of gender inequality and discrimination should increase the likelihood of intrastate violence. Moreover, gender discrimination and structural violence are important aspects in mobilizing groups and in legitimizing violence. Based on the previous discussion, the expected relationship between domestic norms of gender inequality and intrastate conflict can be stated as follows:

Hypothesis: The higher the fertility rate, the greater the likelihood that a state will experience intrastate conflict.

Research Design and Methodology

Beyond theoretical inquiry, this project uses statistical analysis to test the above hypothesis, which will be analyzed using a cross-national, longitudinal study of intrastate conflict, coding for gender equality while controlling for other variables known to predict intrastate conflict. The unit of analysis is the country-year in order to predict the likelihood of a state experiencing intrastate conflict based on measures of gender inequality.

The model tests,⁶ using logistic regression, the impact of gender inequality on the likelihood of state being involved in intrastate disputes. The quantitative analysis spans the 1960-1997 time period, which is limited by the availability of data used in the analysis. Given this limited temporal domain, caution about the generalizability of any findings is warranted. The base data set was created using EUGene (Bennett and Stam 2000) to generate a list of all country-years from 1960-1997, providing an N of 5743. Added to the analysis are controls for other possible influences on domestic conflict including middle regime, democracy, GDP per capita, GDP per capita growth rate, prior domestic conflict, and the existence of and number of at risk minorities. All of the variables appearing in the analysis are described in detail below.

1. Dependent Variables:

Intrastate conflict is defined as conflict confined within a recognized state boundary between the government and one or more groups within the state and will be measured as either civil war or internal conflict using two different thresholds of violence. The measure for civil war is based on a larger scale conflict than that required for internal conflict as will be defined below. Two different thresholds of battle deaths are used in order to determine whether grievance and gender inequality might be the

motivating factor for internal conflict whereas larger scale civil war might be determined more by resources and opportunity.

a. Internal Conflict—defined using the PRIO/Uppsala dataset (Strand et al. 2003:8) criteria for internal conflict. The threshold for coding internal conflict begins at a minimum of 25 battle-related deaths, thus capturing more instances of intrastate conflict that would not meet the COW criteria.

b. Intrastate War—measured according to the correlates of war (COW) criteria (Sarkees et al. 2003) for intrastate war as requiring a minimum of a thousand battle deaths.

Both measures of domestic conflict are coded dichotomously with ‘0’ representing no domestic conflict and ‘1’ representing domestic conflict alternatively as a minimum of 25 or of 1000 battle-related deaths.

The hypothesis listed above—that the higher the fertility rate, the greater the likelihood that a state will experience intrastate conflict—is further modified in order to test two different measures of intrastate conflict. The hypotheses to be tested in the models are as follows:

Hypothesis 1: The higher the fertility rate, the greater the likelihood that a state will experience PRIO/Uppsala defined internal conflict.

Hypothesis 2: The higher the fertility rate, the greater the likelihood that a state will experience COW defined intra-state war.

2. Independent Variable Measuring Gender Equality

a. Fertility

A fertility rate of 2.1 is necessary to ensure population replacement with the global fertility rate average currently at 2.7 (UNICEF 2003). The variable for fertility rate is dichotomized in order to minimize any inconsistencies in the data as well as better estimate data points for missing years. Considering the current global fertility rate average and the necessary fertility rate to ensure population replacement, the cut-off point for the dichotomous fertility rate variable is set at 3, which represents a conservative measure allowing for a certain amount of personal choice and need, in addition to discrimination, all of which factors into fertility rate. This choice and need must be balanced with the strong correlation between fertility rate and women’s health, level of education, and employment.

Fertility rate is categorized as follows:

0 = 0 – 3.00 fertility rate.

1 = 3.01 – highest fertility rate.

Thus a score of ‘1’ represents gender inequality. Fertility rate is categorized in order to reduce the number of missing variables. For instance, a state with a fertility rate of 6.5 in 1985 and a fertility rate of 6 in 1988 can be coded with a high degree of confidence as a 1 (fertility rate of 3.01 or higher) for 1986 and 1987. Only obvious cases are recorded.

3. Control Variables

Several control variables are incorporated into the model: presence of at-risk minorities, the number of at-risk minority groups, middle regimes, democracy, average GDP per capita growth rate, GDP per capita, state capability score, and prior domestic conflict.

a. Middle Regimes

Middle regimes are those countries that are neither democratic nor autocratic but rather in transition (Marshall and Jagers 2000). The middle regimes variable is generated by EUgene (Bennett and Stam 2000) based on the Polity III data set (Jagers and Gurr 1996) and ranges from –10 to 10 with 10 being the highest score for democracy. This scale is then squared as the relationship between intrastate war and regime type is curvilinear with middle level regimes more likely to experience domestic conflict than other regime types (Gurr 1974; Hegre et al. 2001; Muller and Weede 1990).

The middle regimes variable is included for the following reasons:

- Democratic regimes as discussed below, are less likely to experience civil war. On the other hand, high levels of oppression reduce the opportunity for domestic insurgency. Thus, the middle regimes variable offers a dual control for liberal as well as repressive regimes.
- As a control for the possible confounding effects of regime type and discrimination, equality, and repression.

b. Democracy

States with scores of six through ten on the Polity III scale (Jagers and Gurr 1996) are considered democracies. Democratic states are coded as ‘1’ and all others as ‘0’.

Democracy is included as a control variable for the following reasons:

- As an additional control for the possible confounding effects of democracy and gender equality.⁷
- As a proxy measure for regime repressiveness (see Butaug and Gates 2002). There is less discontent in democratic regimes and therefore, a lower incidence of domestic conflict (Auvinen 1997). In other words, excessive repression might diminish the opportunity to act, but liberal regimes provide little motivation to act.
- As a deterrent of civil war. Although there is no clear evidence on democratization and civil war (Sambanis 2001), democratic states are less likely to experience civil war (Elbadawi and Sambanis 2002; Ellingsen 2000; Gurr 2000; Hegre et al. 2001; Sambanis 2001).
- As a control for structural violence and gendered nationalism, for less democratic regimes are based “on gendered foundations, relying particularly on the construction of masculinity and femininity which assigns particular ‘traditional’ roles to women” (Waylen 1996:114).
- As a control for gender inequality because “political liberalization enables women to mobilize within the public sphere and the more illiberal a state is, the fewer women will be in position of power” (Reynolds 1999:554).

c. GDP per Capita (constant dollars, 1995 US\$)

The World Bank (2003) provides data on GDP per capita. At the most basic level socioeconomic level as measured by GDP per capita predicts intrastate conflict—as income increases conflict decreases (Collier and Hoeffler 2002; Ellingsen 2000; Fearon and Laitin 2002; Hegre et al. 2001). Both education (Collier and Hoeffler 2002) and infant mortality (Gurr and Harff 1997) have been identified as predictors of intrastate conflict. Both measures are correlated with income per capita, which raise education levels and

improves public health (Sambanis 2002). Controlling for GDP per capita helps isolate measures of gender equality and the norms of inequality beyond economic issues.

This variables is included in the model for several additional reasons:

- Level of economic development reduces deprivation (Weede 1981), which as discussed above is linked to domestic conflict.
- Low per capita income serves as an indication of state failure, which in turn can lead to a strengthening of kinship ties (Azam 2001) and a strong sense of group identity both of which can lead to ethnic conflict as discussed above.
- Wealth is sometimes thought to be a precursor to equality (see Inglehart 1990) and elements of discrimination and inequality may also be linked with resource scarcity (Choucri and North 1989), thus necessitating a control for the possible confounding effect of GDP per capita on state discrimination and inequality.
- GDP per capita also serves as a proxy measure of opportunity costs (see Collier and Hoeffler 2002). Opportunity is related to means, which is partly a factor of state strength. The GDP per capita variable serves as a measure of state strength and therefore, a measure of opportunity costs—the stronger the state is economically, the higher the costs of insurrection. In other words, strong states should experience less domestic conflict.

d. Average GDP per Capita Growth Rate

The economic growth rate variable represents a five-year average (t-1) using GDP per capita in 1995 constant US dollars—data provided by the World Bank (2003). Put simply, recession increases domestic conflict (Blomberg and Hess 2002; Collier and Hoeffler 2002; Ellingsen 2000; Fearon and Laitin 2002).

- As with GDP per capita, elements of discrimination and inequality may be linked with resource scarcity (Choucri and North 1989). A negative growth rate might increase competition for goods, thus increasing discrimination and inequality and necessitating a control for the possible confounding effect of average GDP per capita growth rate on state discrimination and inequality.
- As with GDP per capita, low or negative per capita income growth rates serve as an additional indication of state failure.
- Average GDP per capita growth rates also serve as a measure of state strength and therefore, a measure of opportunity costs (see Collier and Hoeffler 2002).

e. Prior Domestic Conflict

This dichotomous variable indicates whether or not the state experienced domestic conflict in the past decade with '0' representing no domestic conflict in the preceding decade and '1' representing domestic conflict in the preceding decade. Previous domestic conflict increases the likelihood of future conflict (Collier and Hoeffler 2002; Ellingsen 2000) and also controls for ongoing disputes especially in the case of PRIO/Uppsala internal conflict which captures multiple years and levels of violence within ongoing domestic disputes. This variable is coded separately for each measure of domestic conflict as prior PRIO/Uppsala internal conflict and prior COW civil war with each control variable matched with the appropriate dependent variable in the models below.

f. Minorities at Risk (MAR)

This variable is generated by MARGene. Minorities at risk (MAR) (see Gurr 1993) are ethnopolitical groups that collectively suffer or benefit from systematic discrimination relative to other domestic groups and/or that collectively mobilize in defense or promotion of their self-defined interests. The MAR project tracks the political, economic, and cultural status and characteristics of more than 280 politically active ethnic groups. Ethnic discrimination is a measure of ethnic dominance, which unlike diversity, is associated with intrastate conflict (Bates 1999; Collier and Hoeffler 2000; Elbadawi and Sambanis 2000).

Two measures of MAR will be used—the first is a dichotomous measure with ‘0’ representing the absence of any at-risk minority in the state, and with ‘1’ indicating the existence of one or more at-risk minorities. The second measure will indicate the actual number of at risk minorities within each state. Although the number of groups within society (Collier and Hoeffler 2002; Ellingsen 2000) is not linearly related to domestic conflict, it is unclear what the relation between the existence and number of at-risk minority groups and intrastate conflict is. There is a clear distinction between the existence of various ethnopolitical groups and the existence of ethnopolitical groups that have a strong sense of group identity as discussed above.

g. State Capability Score

The capability score is based on the National Material Capabilities data set (Singer and Small 1990), which includes demographic, military and industrial indicators including military personnel, military expenditure, iron and steel production, energy consumption, urban population, and total population. The capability score is a composite index of national capability (CINC) recorded annually for each country as calculated using EUGene (Bennett and Stam 2000).

Opportunity is related to means, which is partly a factor of state strength and the group’s ability to raise funds and obtain weapons. The strength of the group is relative to the strength of the state, the goal of the group, and the tactics employed. As such, they are difficult to measure. The CINC score serves as a measure of state strength and therefore, a measure of opportunity costs.

Results

Hypothesis 1 is confirmed. Gender inequality increases the likelihood that a state will experience internal conflict. Hypothesis 2 using the COW definition of civil war remains untested as will be explained below. There are two basic models—Model 1 with PRIO/Uppsala internal conflict and Model 2 with the COW civil war as the dependent variable. In both models, three iterations (Sub-models A, B, C, D and E, F, G respectively) of the logistic regressions are reported. With the inclusion of GDP per capita, average GDP per capita growth, and state capability, a low level of multicollinearity is introduced into the model as measured by the condition index (see Gujarati 2003). This does not affect the statistical significance of the variables in Model 1 and only has a slight substantive impact. The inclusion of these three measures of state strength does, however, pose a problem with Model 2. Indeed, Model 2 is statistically meaningless—primarily due to the low number of civil wars which number 54 out of a total of 5743, thus a state of civil war represents only 0.9 percent of the total cases. This does not allow for much variation thus undermining the validity of Model 2.

Although the results for all three iterations of Model 2 are presented in Table 2, only sub-model G will be discussed and even that model is statistically suspect. The gender equality variable—fertility rate—does not reach the 0.05 level of significance. The only significant variables are middle regimes and GDP per capita growth rate. The higher the GDP per capita growth rate, the more likely a state is to experience civil war but only marginally at 0.4 percent. The statistics reveal that middle level regimes are 1.9 percent less likely to experience civil war—a marginal impact.

Clearly the low incidence of civil war as measured by COW during the time frame of this study prevents any determination of gender equality or any other variable as a cause of civil war. In order to better understand the relation, if any, between gender inequality and civil war, I ran a cross tabulation, which was statistically significant at the 0.0001 level. The results show that civil war is much more likely in states with high fertility rates. In fact, 94.3% instances of states experiencing COW coded civil war have a fertility rate of 3.01 or higher. These results are consistent with the argument presented herein that gender inequality increases the likelihood of civil war based on domestic levels of structural and cultural violence and the role of sexism in mobilizing group militias.

In addition, 90.2 percent of instances of civil war occurred in nondemocratic states. A cross tabulation of civil war and average economic growth with a statistically significant Pearson's Chi Square of 0.027 shows that 55.6 percent of civil wars occurred in states experiencing a positive growth rate, which would be consistent with the theories of relative deprivation when rising expectations are not being met (see Gurr 1970). A cross tabulation of civil war and per capita income reveal that 42.5 percent of states with a GDP per capita of under 500 1995 US dollars experience civil war with an additional 30 percent having a per capita income between 500 and 1000. Thus, 72.5 percent of instances of civil war are experienced by states with a per capita income less than or equal to 1000 US 1995 dollars. These results are consistent with other studies. It must be noted, however, that cross tabulations are not a clear measure of causality.

I shall now turn my attention to Model 1 and sub-models A through D using the PRIO/Uppsala definition of internal conflict, which codes 752 cases of internal conflict from 1960-1997. All three sub-models are similar with only slight substantive impact. Basically, the low level of multicollinearity introduced with the inclusion of GDP per capita, average GDP per capita growth rate, and state capability score is not effecting Model 1, sub-model A. As such, I will only address sub-model A, which is the most inclusive model with the most controls for any confounding effects of wealth on gender equality.

Fertility rate is highly significant—states with high fertility rates are twice (2.073) as likely to experience internal conflict than those states with low fertility rates, while controlling for other possible causes of internal conflict. This result is consistent with theoretical expectations—higher levels of gender inequality increase the likelihood of domestic conflict. A simple statistically significant cross tabulation shows that 87.9 percent of PRIO/Uppsala coded internal conflict is within states having a fertility rate of 3.01 or higher. Collier and Hoeffler (2002:11) argue that “rebellion cannot afford diversity” and apparently this diversity includes gender equality in that rebellion depends on gender-defined roles and on a norm of violence inherent to structural hierarchies.

As a further analysis of the models and to minimize any potential problems relating to the study of rare events (see King and Zeng 2001) though minimized with larger N's, I created a decennial version of the data by averaging the variables for each decade and only including a decade if data were available for at least five years during each decade. Each country has a maximum of four entries—one for the 1960s, 1970s, 1980, and 1990s. The decennial data also limits any impact of autocorrelation. The resultant N is 622. The dependent variables for intrastate conflict remained binary with a code of 1 indicating that the country experienced intrastate conflict at least once during the decade. The results for fertility rate using the PRIO/Uppsala internal conflict variable were significant with a slightly higher substantive impact (2.27). This model resulted in a 23.97 reduction in error. The model using COW defined civil war is weak with only a 2.67 improvement over the null hypothesis. Once again, the extremely rare occurrence of COW defined civil wars with civil wars representing only 7.5 percent of the cases in this model undermines the utility of basic statistical models in examining civil wars.

Control Variables

A state that has an at-risk minority is nearly three and a half (3.453) times more likely to experience internal conflict. Furthermore, those states with three at risk minority groups are three (3.312) times more likely to experience internal conflict than states with no at-risk minority groups. In other words, each additional at-risk minority group increases the chances of a state experiencing internal conflict by 10 percent. These results support the grievance theory of domestic conflict.

The significance of the control variables for middle regimes, democracy, and prior conflict support the results of previous studies as detailed in the variable section. In keeping with other studies, middle regimes are more likely to experience internal conflict when the measure for regime type does not distinguish between democracies and autocracies but only isolates middle level or transitional regimes. Indeed, a middle level regime scoring 4 (a polity score of either 2 or negative 2) is nearly 8 times (7.86) more likely to experience intrastate conflict than a state scoring 100 (a polity score of either negative 10 or 10). Yet, democratic states are also more likely to experience internal conflict when regimes are measured dichotomously as democracies versus all other regimes types, thus revealing that democratic regimes are three times (3.060) more likely to experience internal conflict than are nondemocratic states. This seems to lend support to the theoretical argument that repressive regimes do not provide the opportunity for groups to take action against the state. Although democracies are said to reduce the motivation for insurgency, this supposition is not supported by this test. It is important, however, to note that democracy scores only measure specific procedural aspects of democracy rather than the actual experience of citizens, thus they do not measure access or cultural discrimination. In addition, democratic states are constrained by the rule of law limiting their ability to strike back at insurgents thus lowering the risk/cost for the group and potentially increasing the likelihood of violence. Plus, the insurgents benefit from living in an open society in providing greater opportunities to meet, organize, plan an attack, and obtain weapons. This result warrants further study. Finally, states that experienced internal conflict within the prior decade were twenty-two times (22.256) more likely to experience internal conflict. This is not surprising as many internal conflicts last more than one year.

State capability score was not significant nor were GDP per capita and average GDP per capita growth rate. Capability score is a significant predictor of interstate war in dichotomous models that measure the relative power between two states. Capability score is used in this project as a proxy for state strength. Indeed, higher capability scores are an indication of state strength but do not provide any relative measure of state strength vis-à-vis the strength of domestic groups.

The insignificance of per capita income and average per capita income growth rates is interesting and contrary to other studies. First, these potential measures of opportunity may not be as important in predicting internal conflict with its lower threshold of deaths than it is for predicting civil war with its 1,000 death threshold. In other words, opportunity might be more of a factor in predicting large-scale civil war rather than internal conflict. Second, examining issues of discrimination and inequality is inherently tied to issues of wealth. In many ways, this project analyzes in detail some possible explanations for why GDP per capita (Collier and Hoeffler 2002; Ellingsen 2000; Fearon and Laitin 2002; Hegre et al. 2001) is sometimes found to be a significant predictor of civil war. Indeed Collier and Hoeffler (2002:22) note the similar statistical results for GDP per capita and male secondary school enrolment as alternate variables in two separate models and point out that the two measures might not necessarily proxy opportunity costs as much as other effects of income and education.

Other effects of income and education include greater gender equality. States with low per capita income might be more prone to civil war, with gender inequality (measured by fertility rates) and their concomitant societal norms of cultural violence explaining the link between per capita income and civil war. The relation between per capita income and civil war might be spurious. Gender discrimination,

including the interrelationship among a lack of paid labor and low social standing, “combined with the usefulness of children for labor in subsistence conditions ... leads to high fertility rates” (Dasgupta 1995: 40-42), thus relegating women to the role of child bearers and fostering the dichotomy between masculine and feminine roles that contributes to cultural and structural violence. Simply put, the link between per capita income and domestic conflict, considering the literature and theories presented above, might very well be partly explained by domestic norms of equality (Pearson Correlation coefficient for per capita income and the categorized fertility rate, -0.588 $p < 0.0001$). It is irrelevant whether the need for children in low subsistence conditions lowers women’s status to baby producers, for in the end societal values based on structural violence and inequality remain the same. It is equally possible that the exclusion of women from the political and economic spheres perpetuates these low subsistence conditions.

Implications

Put simply, measures of gender equality are not merely issues of social justice. Gender inequality has negative repercussions at the societal level that go beyond the negative impact on women. It is important to recall that fertility rates capture the complex social matrix of gender inequality, discrimination, and structural violence. Although fertility rates should be lowered through policies supporting education on family planning, fertility rates must be recognized as a symptom of a much larger cancer. Beyond lowering fertility rate is the need to raise women’s social status and recognize the role gender inequality plays in violence at the individual, societal, and state levels. In short, what the world needs now is new values and new policies.⁸

- Lowering Fertility Rates

Lowering fertility rates will increase women’s health and should provide women with more time to participate in paid labor, which in turn results in a sense of empowerment, which increases individual political efficacy, thus fostering political participation (Pateman 1970). When women become active participants in their own societies, they acquire a sense of efficacy, “which ensures their continual and broadening participation in multiple spheres of their lives” (Caprioli 2000:58). Education, for both men and women, is of utmost importance as is family planning and the distribution of birth control to those unable to afford it.

- Providing Opportunities

International organizations can continue to provide opportunities for women within state-level organizations and through policies such as micro-level loans to women. Even if these policies have mixed outcomes, as micro-level loans do, the policies must be given time to be effective as society is slow to change. These policies must also be coupled with the recommendations below in recognition of the complex matrix of gender discrimination. For instance, women might earn money, but are they able to control the money they earn, and do they have the right to own property?

- International Policies Fostering Economic Growth

Given the hypothesized link between inequality and wealth, international and state policies should foster economic growth while ensuring that this growth does not only benefit certain segments of society. An unequal distribution of benefits could increase feelings of relative deprivation that might lead to intrastate conflict as discussed above. If policies of economic growth do not target women, women will not necessarily gain greater equality as highlighted in the above discussion of structural and cultural violence.

- International law and policy concerning the rights of women need to be clarified.

As with discussing any aspect of human rights at the global level, this recommendation is a difficult one to fulfill. It is important to note that there has been heightened awareness at the international level

concerning women's rights and differing experiences from those of men. There are basic human rights that are based on male experiences and interests (Bunch 1995; Charlesworth 1995; Friedman 1995). Now basic women's rights, such as issues of abortion and female infanticide, malnutrition, and genital mutilation (see Charlesworth 1995), need to be included under the rubric of human rights. If nothing else, the dialogue must continue.

- Existing international law and policies concerning the protection of women's rights within states should be consistently enforced.

Not only do we need clarification and the further expansion of international law and policy concerning women's rights, we also need to ensure that existing policies are enforced. Currently, there is little international oversight concerning gender discrimination and abuse beyond information dissemination such as the UN's Women's Watch. An international task force should monitor women's rights—their abuse and discrimination. And the results along with traditional human rights reports should be taken into consideration by states as they make their foreign policy decisions. States that routinely undermine women's rights should be the target of foreign aid policies that aim to encourage states to improve the status of women. This encouragement might also take the form of education in highlighting the complex role between economic issues, societal and state level conflict, and women's equality. In this way, the issue of women's rights is framed beyond issues of social justice and more directly in terms of state interest and security.

- International law and policies and the role of international task forces in tracking women's rights must be supported by established doctrines of humanitarian intervention.

In many ways, women's rights have become part of the popular global rhetoric. Yet as demonstrated above, women are not equal in any country—it is the degree of inequality that varies. An international example must be set through an intervention of behalf of women—only then will the issue rise above mere rhetoric. Female infanticide (the killing of female fetuses and babies), female genital mutilation, and trafficking in women certainly should qualify as gross human rights abuses. States should be encouraged to establish policies and to help grass-roots organizations that benefit women. For example, the issue of eliminating female genital mutilation has been more effectively addressed at the grass-roots level. And policies in China and some areas of India prevent medical staff from identifying the sex of a fetus through ultrasound for fear of female infanticide. International treaties might be as simple as guaranteeing that women be granted asylum based on their discrimination to policies of direct intervention.

- Gather and Disseminate Measures of Gender Equality

As discussed in the 'Potential Measures of Gender Equality' section, better measures of women's equality *relative* to men need to be gathered and disseminated. This data will aid researchers and policy experts in better understanding the link between gender inequality and violence.

Admittedly, the seven recommendations for achieving greater levels of gender equality are easier to acknowledge than to accomplish and are interrelated—they must all be addressed simultaneously. For instance, economic growth will not necessarily achieve gender equality without education and opportunities for women. Many people, both men and women, suffer from discrimination, which the international arena has yet to address effectively. There is no justification for not attempting to identify, monitor, support, and defend women's rights as human rights. In part, human rights are viewed as issues of social justice, thus minimizing their importance. The implications of gender inequality, however, are far more dire.

Endnotes

¹ Intrastate conflict, internal conflict, domestic conflict, and domestic violence are used interchangeably. Civil war is used to denote occurrences of intrastate conflict that are characterized by higher numbers of casualties. This particular distinction is particularly important in the statistical analyses.

² Underscoring the complex interrelationship between societal conditions and intrastate conflict and measuring grievance in part as either the number of ethnic groups or the percent of the population comprised by the largest ethnic group, Ellingsen (2000) finds the relation between intrastate conflict and the number of ethnic groups within a state to be an inverted U shaped curve. This is consistent with Collier and Hoeffler's (2000) finding that more diverse societies decrease civil war, thus underscoring the need to measure discrimination not merely diversity.

³ Of course structural hierarchies may also be based on race, religion, etc.—an analysis that is beyond the scope of this study. Gender is, however, a cross-cultural foundation of structural inequality.

⁴ Militarism is analogous to violence and is used to denote violence at all levels of analysis from the individual to the state. Hence, sexist individuals are more likely to be violent as are cultures infused with sexism – cultural violence.

⁵ Well-being includes issues of gender equality and choice. Gender inequality, low education coupled with high birth rates, are detrimental to women's physical and emotional health—their well-being.

⁶ The SPSS statistical package is used to run the statistical analyses.

⁷ The Pearson's correlation coefficient for the dichotomous democracy variable and the categorized fertility rate is -0.436, $p < 0.0001$

⁸ In many ways, this list of recommendations mirrors those that Gurr (1994) proposed when studying at risk minorities.

TABLE 1: The Impact of Gender Equality on the Likelihood of a State Experiencing PRIO/Uppsala Coded Internal Conflict, 1960-1997

MODELS ⁺ Internal Conflict	A	B	C	D
Fertility Rate	.729*** (.239)	.720*** (.221)	.656*** (.196)	
At Risk Minorities	1.239**** (.307)	1.343**** (.304)	1.350**** (.304)	1.326**** (.306)
# of At Risk Minorities	.099*** (.029)	.093**** (.026)	.091**** (.025)	.097*** (.029)
Middle Regimes	-.017**** (.003)	-.016**** (.003)	-.016**** (.003)	-.016**** (.003)
Democracy	1.119**** (.172)	1.039**** (.166)	1.050**** (.165)	1.102**** (.172)
GDP per Capita Growth	.000 (.001)	.000 (.001)	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)
GDP per Capita	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)		.000 (.000)
State Capability	-2.424 (3.355)			-4.583 (3.356)
Prior Intrastate Conflict	3.103**** (.161)	3.110**** (.157)	3.103**** (.156)	3.152**** (.160)
Constant	-4.865**** (.397)	-4.993**** (.386)	-4.934**** (.374)	-4.287**** (.338)
Model Significance	p < .0001	p < .0001	p < .0001	p < .0001
N	2986	3131	3131	3007
% Categorized correctly	88.6	88.3	88.3	88
Reduction of Error	21.92	19.86	19.86	16.89
-2 x LLR	1522.715	1603.699	1604.094	1543.795
Model chi square	963.576	1002.547	1002.152	973.789
Mean of dependent variable	.146	.146	.146	.148

⁺ The SPSS statistical package was used to run the logistic regression. The table includes parameter estimates with standard errors in parentheses.

* = p < .05; ** = p < .01; *** = p < .001; **** = p < .0001

TABLE 2: The Impact of Gender Equality on the Likelihood of a State Experiencing COW Coded Intrastate War, 1960-1997

MODELS ⁺ Civil War	E	F	G
Fertility Rate	.059 (.822)	.284 (.778)	.741 (.747)
At Risk Minorities	16.765 (1211.175)	17.712 (1027.714)	20.567 (873.006)
# of At Risk Minorities	-.327 (.169)	-.183 (.128)	-.148 (.122)
Middle Regimes	-.018* (.009)	-.016 (.008)	-.019* (.008)
Democracy	.283 (.612)	-.036 (.599)	-.220 (.605)
GDP per Capita Growth	-.004 (.004)	-.005 (.003)	-.004* (.002)
GDP per Capita	-.001 (.000)	.000 (.000)	
State Capability	6.789 (10.817)		
Prior Intrastate Conflict	.101 (.518)	.341 (.481)	.464 (.477)
Constant	-18.987 (1211.987)	-20.585 (1027.715)	-24.317 (873.066)
Model Significance	p < .0001	p < .0001	p < .0001
N	2986	3131	3131
% Categorized correctly	99.1	99.1	99.1
Reduction of Error [†]			
-2 x LLR	261.191	274.054	279.747
Model chi square	46.680	45.842	40.149
Mean of dependent variable	.01	.009	.009

⁺ The SPSS statistical package was used to run the logistic regression. The table includes parameter estimates with standard errors in parentheses.

[†] The Reduction of Error term is meaningless in this model and sub-models. In fact, this model is no improvement over the null hypothesis due to the low number of civil wars versus country years.

* = p < .05; ** = p < .01; *** = p < .001; **** = p < .0001

Work Cited

- Auvinen, J.Y., 1997. 'Political Conflict in Less Developed Countries, 1981-1989', *Journal of Peace Research* 34:177-195.
- Ayres, R. William, 2000. 'A World Flying Apart? Violent Nationalist Conflict and the End of the Cold War', *Journal of Peace Research* 37(4): 105-117.
- Azam, Jean-Paul, 2001. 'The Redistributive State and Conflicts in Africa', *Journal of Peace Research* 38(4): 429-444.
- Bates, Robert H., 1999. 'Ethnicity, Capital Formation, and Conflict', *CID Working Paper* No. 27 (October), Harvard University.
- Bennett, D.S. and A.C. Stam (2000) EUGene, v1.94. [Computer software].
- Blomberg, S. Brock, and Gregory D. Hess, 2002. 'The Temporal Links between Conflict and Economic Activity', *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 46(1): 74-90.
- Blumberg, Rae Lesser, 1991. 'Women and the Wealth and Well-Being of Nations: Macro-Micro Interrelationships', in Joan Huber, ed., *Macro-Micro Linkages*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications: 121-140.
- Blumberg, Rae Lesser, 1989. *Making the Case for the Gender Variable: Women and the Wealth and Well-Being of Nations*. Washington, DC: Agency for International Development, Office of Women in Development.
- Bonta, Bruce, 1996. 'Conflict Resolution Among Peaceful Societies: The Culture of Peacefulness', *Journal of Peace Research* 33(4): 403-420.
- Brock-Utne, 1990. 'Feminist Perspectives on Peace', in Paul Smoker, Ruth Davies, and Barbara Munske, eds., *A Reader in Peace Studies*. New York: Pergamon Press, 144-150.
- Bunch, Charlotte, 1995. 'Transforming Human Rights From a Feminist Perspective', in Julie Peters, Andrea Wolper, eds., *Women's Rights, Human Rights: International Feminist Perspectives*. New York, NY: Routledge: 11-17.
- Bunch, Charlotte, and Roxanna Carrillo, 1998. 'Global Violence against Women: The Challenge to Human Rights and Development', in Michael T. Klare and Yogesh Chandrani, eds., *World Security*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 229-248.
- Butaug, Halvard, and Scott Gates, 2002. 'The Geography of Civil War', *Journal of Peace Research* 39(4): 417-433.
- Caprioli, Mary, 2000. 'Gendered Conflict', *Journal of Peace Research*, 37(1): 51-68.
- Caprioli, Mary, 2003. 'Gender Equality and State Aggression: The Impact of Domestic Gender Equality on State First Use of Force.' *International Interactions* forthcoming.
- Caprioli, Mary, and Mark A. Boyer, 2001. 'Gender, Violence, and International Crisis', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 45(4): 503-518.
- Caprioli, Mary, and Peter F. Trumbore, 2003. 'Hierarchies of Dominance: Identifying Rogue States and Testing Their Interstate Conflict Behavior', *European Journal of International Relations* forthcoming.
- Carrillo, Roxanna, 1991. *Violence Against Women: An Obstacle to Development*. New Brunswick, Center for Women's Global Leadership.
- Charlesworth, Hilary, 1995. 'Human Rights as Men's Rights', in Julie Peters, Andrea Wolper, eds., *Women's Rights, Human Rights: International Feminist Perspectives*. New York, NY: Routledge: 103-111.
- Choucri, Nazli and Robert C. North, 1989. 'The Underlying Causes of War', in Melvin Small and J. David Singer, eds., *International War* 2nd edition. Chicago, IL: Dorsey Press: 249-253.
- Cockburn, Cynthia, 2001. 'The Gendered Dynamics of Armed Conflict and Political Violence', in Caroline O.N. Moser, and Fiona C. Clark *Victims, Perpetrators or Actors?: Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence*. New York, NY: ZED Books: 13-29.
- Cohn, Carol, 1989. 'Emasculating America's Linguistic Deterrent', in Adrienne Harris and Ynestra King, eds., *Rocking the Ship of State*. Colorado: Westview Press: 153-170.

- Collier, Paul, and Anke Hoeffler, 2002. 'Greed and Grievance in Civil War', World Bank CSAE Working Paper 2355, Washington DC.
- Dasgupta, Partha, 1995. 'Population, Poverty and the Local Environment', *Scientific American* 272 (2): 40-45.
- Davies, J. C., 1962. 'Toward a Theory of Revolution', *American Sociological Review* 27:5-19.
- Dietz, Mary G., 1985. 'Citizenship with a Feminist Face: The Problem with Maternal Thinking', *Political Theory* 13: 19-35.
- Elbadawi, Ibrahim A., and Nicholas Sambanis, 2000. 'Why Are There So Many Civil Wars in Africa? Understanding and Preventing Violence Conflict', *Journal of African Economies* 9(3): 244-269.
- Elbadawi, Ibrahim A., and Nicholas Sambanis, 2002. 'How Much War Will We See? Explaining The Prevalence Of Civil War. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 46(3): 307-334.
- Ellingsen, Tanja, 2000. 'Colorful Community or Ethnic Witches' Brew?' *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 44(2): 228-249.
- Elshtain, Jean Bethke, 1987. *Women and War*. New York: Basic Books.
- Enloe, Cynthia, 1989. *Bananas Beaches & Bases*. California: The University of California Press.
- Enloe, Cynthia, 1998. 'All the Men Are in the Militias, All the Women Are Victims: The Politics of Masculinity and Femininity in Nationalist Wars', in Lois Ann Lorentzen and Jennifer Turpin eds., *The Women and War Reader*. New York: New York University Press: 50-62.
- Fearon, James D., and David D. Laitin, January 2002. 'International Institutions and Civil War', <http://sshi.stanford.edu/Dinners/Laitin-DinnerJan17.pdf>
- Fein, H., 1979. *Accounting for Genocide*. New York: The Free Press.
- Fox, Jonathan, 2001. 'Religious Causes of International Intervention', *International Politics* 38: 515-532.
- Friedman, Elisabeth, 1995. 'Women's Human Rights: The Emergence of a Movement', in Julie Peters, Andrea Wolper, eds., *Women's Rights, Human Rights: International Feminist Perspectives*. New York, NY: Routledge: 18-35.
- Galtung, Johan, 1975. *Peace: Research, Education, Action: Essays in Peace Research Volume One*. Romania: CIPEXIM, Bucuresti.
- Galtung, Johan, 1990. 'Cultural Violence', *Journal of Peace Research* 27(3): 291-305.
- Gaventa, John, 1980. *Power and Powerlessness*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Gidengil, Elisabeth, 1995. 'Economic Man—Social Woman?', *Comparative Political Studies* 28(3): 384-408.
- Gleditsch, Nils Petter, Peter Wallensteen, Mikael Eriksson, Margareta Sollenberg and Havard Strand, 2002. 'Armed Conflict 1946-2001: A New Dataset', *Journal of Peace Research* 39(5): 615-637.
- Grant, Judith, 1993. *Fundamental Feminism*. New York: Routledge.
- Gujarati, Damodar N., 2003. *Basic Econometrics*, fourth edition. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Gurr, Ted Robert, 1970. *Why Men Rebel*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gurr, Ted Robert, 1985. 'On the Political Consequences of Scarcity and Economic Decline', *International Studies Quarterly* 29(1): 51-75.
- Gurr, Ted Robert, 1993. *Minorities at Risk: A Global View of Ethnopolitical Conflicts*. Washington D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Gurr, Ted Robert, 1994. 'Peoples Against States: Ethnopolitical Conflict and the Changing World System: 1994 Presidential Address', *International Studies Quarterly* 38(3): 347-377.
- Gurr, Ted Robert, 1997a. *Minorities at Risk Phase III Dataset*. Minorities at Risk Project, Center for International Development and Conflict Management (CIDCM): University of Maryland.
- Gurr, Ted Robert, 1997b. *Minorities at Risk Phase III Codebook*. Minorities at Risk Project, Center for International Development and Conflict Management (CIDCM): University of Maryland.
- Gurr, Ted Robert, 2000. *Peoples Versus States: Minorities at Risk in the New Century*. Washington, DC: US Institute of Peace.
- Gurr, Ted Robert, and Barbara Harff, 1994. *Ethnic Conflict in World Politics*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

- Harff, Barbara, 1986. 'Genocide as State Terrorism', *Government Violence and Repression*, in M. Stohl and G. A. Lopez, eds., Westport, CT: Greenwood Press: 166-187.
- Harff, Barbara, 1987. 'The Etiology of Genocide', *The Age of Genocide*, in M.N. Dobkowski and I. Wallimann, eds., Westport, CT: Greenwood Press: 41-59.
- Hawkesworth, Mary E., 1990. *Beyond Oppression: Feminist Theory and Political Strategy*. New York: Continuum.
- Hegre, Havard, 2003. 'Disentangling Democracy and Development as Determinants of Armed Conflict', paper presented at the Annual Convention of the International Studies Association, Portland, OR, February 27, 2003.
- Hegre, Havard, Tanja Ellingsen, Scott Gates, and Nils Petter Gleditsch, 2001. 'Toward a Democratic Civil Peace? Democracy, Political Change, and Civil War, 1816-1992', *American Political Science Review* 95(1): 33-48.
- Henderson, Errol A., 1997. 'Culture or Contiguity: Ethnic Conflict, the Similarity States, and The Onset of War 1820-1989', *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 41(5): 649-668.
- Huber, Joan, 1991. 'Macro-Micro Links in Gender Stratification', in Joan Huber, ed., *Macro-Micro Linkages*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications: 11-25.
- Humm, Maggie, 1990. *The Dictionary of Feminist Theory*. Ohio: Ohio State University Press.
- Ibeanu, Okechukwu, 2001. 'Healing and Changing', in Sheila Meintjes, Anu Pillay, and Meredith Tursher, eds., *The Aftermath: Women in Post-Conflict Transformation*. London, UK: Zed Books Ltd: 189-209.
- Inglehart, Ronald, 1990. *Culture Shift*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Inter-Parliamentary Union, 1995. *Women in Parliaments 1945-1995: A World Statistical Survey*. Geneva, Switzerland: The Inter-Parliamentary Union.
- Jagers, Keith, and Ted Robert Gurr, 1996. *Polity III: Regime Change And Political Authority, 1800-1994* [Computer file]. 2nd ICPSR version. Boulder, CO: Keith Jagers/College Park, MD: Ted Robert Gurr [producers], 1995. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor].
- Jagers, Keith, and Ted Robert Gurr, 1995. 'Tracking Democracy's Third Wave with the Polity III Data', *Journal of Peace Research* 32(4): 469-482.
- Jayawardena, Kumari, 1986. *Feminism and Nationalism in the Third World*. London: Zed Books.
- Kalyvas, Stathis, 2001. "'New" and "Old" Civil Wars: A Valid Distinction?', *World Politics* 54(1):99-118.
- Kaplan, Laura Duhan, 1994. 'Woman as Caretaker: An Archetype That Supports Patriarchal Militarism', *Hypatia* (Spring): 123-134.
- Keith, Linda Camp, 1999. 'The United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: Does it Make a Difference in Human Rights Behavior?', *Journal of Peace Research* 36(1): 95-118.
- King, Gary, and Langche Zeng, 2001. 'Logistic Regression in Rare Events Data', *Political Analysis* 9(2): 137-163.
- Maoz, Zeev, 2003. 'The Controversy over the Democratic Peace: Rearguard Action or Cracks in the Wall?', *International Security* 22(1): 162-198.
- MARGene: the Minorities at Risk Data Generation and Management Program, Version 1.1, <http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/inscr/mar/home.htm>
- Marshall, Monty G., Ted Robert Gurr, and Barbara Harff, 2001. 'State Failure Problem Set: Internal Wars and failures of Governance, 1955-2001', <http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/inscr/stfail/SFSPCodebook.rtf>
- Marshall, Monty G. and Keith Jagers, 2000. *Polity IV Project: Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800-1999, Dataset Users Manual*. Integrated Network for Societal Conflict Research (INSCR) Program, Center for International Development and Conflict Management (CIDCM) College Park, MD: University of Maryland, <http://www.bsos.umd.edu/cidcm/inscr/polity>

- Mazrui, Ali A., 1990. *Cultural Forces in World Politics*. USA: Heineman.
- Midlarsky, Manus I., 1999. *The Evolution of Inequality: war, State Survival, and Democracy in Comparative Perspective*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Miller, A., 1988. 'Gender and the Vote: 1984', editor C.M. Mueller, *The Politics of the Gender Gap*. California: Sage, 258-282.
- Millett, Kate, 1970. *Sexual Politics*. New Jersey: Doubleday and Company.
- Mostov, Julie, 2000. 'Sexing the Nation/Desexing the Body: Politics of National Identity in the Former Yugoslavia', in Tamar Mayer, ed., *Gender Ironies of Nationalism: Sexing the Nation*, London: Routledge: 41-59.
- Muller, E.N., and E. Weede, 1990. 'Cross National Variation in Political Violence: A Rational Action Approach', *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 34: 624-651.
- Page, Benjamin I. and Robert Y. Shapiro, 1992. *The Rational Public: Fifty Years Of Trends In Americans' Policy Preferences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Papanek, Hanna, 1994. 'The Ideal Woman and the Ideal Society: Control and Autonomy and the Construction of Identity', in Valentine M. Moghadam, ed., *Identity Politics and Women: Cultural Assertions and Feminism in International Perspective*. Colorado: Westview Press.
- Pateman, Carole, 1970. *Participation and Democratic Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Peteet, Julie Marie, 1991. *Gender in Crisis: Women and the Palestinian Resistance Movement*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Peterson, V. Spike, 1998. 'Gendered Nationalism: Reproducing "Us" versus "Them"', in Lois Ann Lorentzen and Jennifer Turpin eds., *The Women and War Reader*. New York: New York University Press: 41-49.
- Pettman, Jan Jindy, 1992. 'Women, Nationalism and the State: Towards an International Feminist Perspective', Occasional Paper 4 in Gender and Development Studies, Asian Institute of Technology, Bangkok.
- Pillay, Anu, 2001. 'Violence Against Women in the Aftermath', in Sheila Meintjes, Anu Pillay, and Meredith Tursher, eds., *The Aftermath: Women in Post-Conflict Transformation*. London, UK: Zed Books Ltd: 35-45.
- Raymond, Gregory A., 2000. 'International Norms: Normative Orders and Peace', in Vasquez, John A., ed., *What Do We Know About War*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc.: 281-297.
- Reardon, Betty, 1985. *Sexism and the War System*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Regan, Patrick M., and Aida Paskeviciute, 2003. 'Women's Access to Politics and Peaceful States', *Journal of Peace Research* 40(3): 287-302.
- Reynolds, Andrew, 1999. 'Women in the Legislatures and Executives of the World: Knocking at the Highest Glass Ceiling', *World Politics* 51(4): 547-572.
- Rosaldo, M.Z., 1980. 'The Use and Abuse of Anthropology: Reflections on Feminism and Cross-cultural Understanding', *Signs* 5(Spring): 389-417.
- Ross, Marc Howard, 2000. 'The Relevance of Culture for the Study of Political Psychology', in Stanley Renshon and John Duckitt, eds., *Political Psychology: Cultural and Crosscultural Foundations*. New York: New York University Press: 33-46.
- Rowbotham, S., 1983. *Dreams and Dilemmas*. London: Virago Press.
- Ruddick, Sara, 1983. 'Pacifying the Forces: Drafting Women in the Interests of Peace', *Signs* 8(3): 470-489.
- Russett, Bruce and John Oneal, 2000. *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence and International Organizations*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Saideman, Stephen M., 1997. 'Explaining the International Relations of Secessionist Conflicts: Vulnerability versus Ethnic Ties', *International Organization* 51(4):721-753.
- Sambanis, Nicholas, 2001. 'Do Ethnic and Non-Ethnic Civil Wars Have the Same Causes? A Theoretical and Empirical Inquiry (Part 1). *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 45(3): 259-282.
- Sambanis, Nicholas, 2002. 'A Review of Recent Advances and Future Directions in the Quantitative Literature on Civil War', *Defence and Peace Economics* 13(3): 215-243.

- Sarkees, Meredith Reid, 2000. 'The Correlates of War Data on War: An Update to 1997', *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 18(1): 123-144.
- Sarkees, Meredith Reid, Frank Whelon Wayman, and J. David Singer, 2003. 'Inter-State, Intra-State, and Extra-State Wars: A Comprehensive Look at Their Distribution Over Time, 1816-1997', *International Studies Quarterly* 47(1): 49-70.
- Schwartz, S., 1996. 'Value Priorities and Behavior: Applying a Theory of Integrated Value Systems', in C. Seligman, J. Olson and M. Zanna, eds., *The Psychology of Values: The Ontario Symposium*, vol. 8: 1-24.
- Scott, Joan, 1986. 'Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis,' *American Historical Review*: 91: 1053-1075.
- Sideris, Tina, 2001. 'Rape in War and Peace: Social Context, Gender, Power and Identity', in Sheila Meintjes, Anu Pillay, and Meredith Tursher, eds., *The Aftermath: Women in Post-Conflict Transformation*. London, UK: Zed Books Ltd: 142-158.
- Singer, J. David, and Melvin Small, 1999. *National Material Capabilities Data Codebook*.
<http://www.umich.edu/~cowproj/capabilities.html>
- Small, Melvin, and J. David Singer, 1976. 'The War-Proneness of Democratic Regimes, 1816-1965.' *The Jerusalem Journal of International Relations* 1(4): 50-69.
- Smith, A., D., 1993. *National Identity*. Reno: University of Nevada Press.
- Snyder, Jack, 1993. 'Nationalism and the Crisis of the Post-Soviet State', in Michael E. Brown, ed., *Ethnic Conflict and International Security*, Princeton: Princeton University Press: 79-102.
- Strand, Havard, Lars Wilhelmsen, and Nils Petter Gleditsch, 2003. 'Armed Conflict Dataset Codebook' version 1.2a, 14 March 2003.
- Tessler, Mark, and Ina Warriner, 1997. 'Gender, Feminism, and Attitudes Toward International Conflict', *World Politics* 49(January): 250-281.
- Thomas, Sue, 1991. 'The Impact of Women on State Legislative Policies', *Journal of Politics* 53(4): 958-976.
- Tickner, J. Ann, 1992. *Gender In International Relations*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Tickner, J. Ann, 2001. *Gendering World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Tilly, Charles, 1978. *From Mobilization to Revolution*. New York: Random House.
- Tilly, Charles, 1991. 'Ethnic Conflict in the Soviet Union', *Theory and Society* 20:572-580.
- Turpin, Jennifer E., 1998. 'Many Faces: Women Confronting War', in Lois Ann Lorentzen and Jennifer Turpin eds., *The Women and War Reader*. New York: New York University Press: 3-18.
- Turshen, Meredith, 2001. 'Engendering Relations of State to Society in the Aftermath', in Sheila Meintjes, Anu Pillay, and Meredith Tursher, eds., *The Aftermath: Women in Post-Conflict Transformation*. London, UK: Zed Books Ltd: 78-96.
- United Nations Development Programme, 1995. *Human Development Report 1995*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- United Nations, 1995. *The World's Women 1995: Trends and Statistics*. New York: United Nations Publication.
- UNESCO, 1995. *Statement on Women's Contribution to a Culture of Peace*. Presented to the Fourth World Conference on Women, Beijing.
- UNICEF, 2003. <http://childinfo.org/eddb/fertility/index.htm>
- United Nations Development Programme, 1995. *Human Development Report 1995*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- UNPFA, 2003. 'Ending Widespread Violence Against Women', in *Promoting Gender Equality*,
<http://www.unpfa.org/gender/violence.htm>
- Van Evera, Stephen, 1997. 'Hypotheses on Nationalism and War', in Michael E. Brown, et. al., eds., *Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict: An International Security Reader*. Cambridge: MIT Press: 26-60.
- Vayrynen, R., 1994. *Towards a Theory of Ethnic Conflicts and Their Resolution*. Notre Dame, IN: Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, Notre Dame University.

- Waylen, Georgina, 1996. *Gender in Third World Politics*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Weede, Erich, 1981. 'Income Inequality, Average Income and Domestic Violence' *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 25: 639-654.
- Welch, Sue, and J. Hibbing, 1992. 'Financial Conditions, Gender, and Voting in American National Elections', *Journal of Politics* 54: 197-213.
- White, Jacquelyn W., 1988. 'Influence Tactics as a Function of Gender, Insult, and Goal', *Sex Roles* 18(7/8): 433-448.
- World Bank, 2003. *World Development Indicators*. Washington DC.
- World Bank, 1998. *Conflict Prevention and Post-Conflict Reconstruction: Perspectives and Prospects*. Washington DC. August.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira, 1997. *Gender and Nation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.