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Definition

The signing of Resolution 1325 by the UN Security Council on 31 October 2000 has marked the development of the Women, Peace and Security Agenda (WPS). The agenda has emerged as the dominant normative framework for the articulation of a gender perspective in the context of crisis management and security, conflict resolution and peacebuilding. Essentially the agenda acknowledges that gender matters in conflict and in peace-making and signals commitments to centre the role of women in peace and security. It sets out aspirations and recommendations for mainstreaming gender in all aspects of conflict management, prevention and peacebuilding. These include reform of peacekeeping and other security forces, inclusion of women in all level of decision-making, responses to the diverse impact of conflict on women and men, strategies to address conflict related sexual violence, to name but a few.

Synonyms:

Introduction

The signing of Resolution 1325 by the UN Security Council on 31 October 2000 has seen the development of the so-called Women, Peace and Security (WPS) agenda as the dominant normative framework in which gender dimensions of conflict, crisis management and peacebuilding gain articulation in the arena of international security. This entry traces the institutionalisation of the agenda through the UN Security Council and its proliferation across national governments and the architecture of international security and peacebuilding. It interrogates the role of feminist activism in initiating and shaping the agenda, as well as the relevance of WPS on feminist efforts “on the ground”. This chapter maps out the emergence of a multidisciplinary research agenda in this field and outlines challenges and new directions in the assessment of WPS two decades since the signing of UN resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security. It also traces ongoing critical engagement with the colonial hierarchies and erasures reproduced through the institutionalisation of WPS, as well as through academic inquiry.

The signing of UN SCR 1325 was the result of ongoing feminist transnational organising and advocacy efforts to lobby the UN. It reflected conversations and aspirations expressed in the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action as well as principles underpinning the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW).
The campaign for the passing of the resolution was led by a coalition of NGOs which had been meeting informally since 1998 while working on the implementation of the Beijing Platform and its strategic objectives on Women and Armed conflict. As the idea for lobbying the UN Security Council emerged, the Working Group on Women, Peace and Security was created. The group worked in cooperation with UN agencies and missions to campaign members of the Security Council and propose the initial draft of the resolution (Cohn, Kinsella, and Gibbings 2004).

The signing of UNCSR 1325 is considered as highly significant moment. Not only it was the first time that the UN Security Council had a session entirely dedicated to discussing the experiences of women in armed conflict and post-conflict settings. The resolution also set out actions to be taken by the Security Council, UN departments and member states.

**Resolutions on Women, Peace and Security**

The Women Peace and Security Agenda currently comprises of 10 UN Security Council Resolutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UN SC Resolution</th>
<th>Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1325 (2000)</td>
<td>Acknowledgment of disproportionate and unique impact of armed conflict on women; women's contribution to conflict prevention, peacekeeping, conflict resolution and peacebuilding; the importance of women's equal and full participation as active agents in peace and security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820 (2008)</td>
<td>Acknowledgment of sexual violence as war crime and setting of legal parameters/calls for training of troops on prevention &amp; response to sexual violence in conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888 (2009)</td>
<td>Strengthening peacekeeping mandate of protection from sexual violence/ Establishment of reporting system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889 (2009)</td>
<td>Focus on the obstacles for women's full participation in peace processes and peacebuilding/ Establishment of indicators for tracking implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 (2010)</td>
<td>Affirming the value of collecting, monitoring and analysing sex disaggregated data on sexual violence in conflict / Processes for addressing the impunity gap/ measures including report to ICC and sanction committee, international condemnation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2106 (2013)</td>
<td>Strengthening and operationalising measures for addressing impunity and accountability for sexual violence in conflict, including support for recourse to justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2122 (2013)</td>
<td>Concrete Actions to increase women's inclusion and participation in governance/ inclusion of civil society through integrated approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2242 (2015)</td>
<td>Deepening implementation and integration across units and contexts /Women's roles in Counter Terrorism and Countering -Violent Extremism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2467 (2019)</td>
<td>Strengthening actions in prosecution and prevention of sexual violence in conflict, including survivor-centred approach and national accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2493 (2019)</td>
<td>Strengthening implementation and accountability measures on women's full participation / specific mention of funding in support of women's inclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: www.peacewomen.org
The pillars

The agenda acknowledges the necessity to employ gender-sensitive approaches and expresses a commitment to the inclusion of women as key agents in the context of peace-making and peacebuilding. These objectives are articulated along four interlinked pillars. The Participation pillar sets out interventions aimed at increasing women’s participation at all levels of decision-making for example in peace negotiations and field missions. The Protection pillar involves actions in the context of sexual and gender-based violence, including in emergency and humanitarian situations, such as in refugee camps. The Prevention pillar envisages intervention strategies in the prevention of violence against women, including prosecution through international law. The Relief and Recovery pillar sets out measures to address the diverse gendered impact of humanitarian emergencies.

The WPS architecture is binding on the UN member states. The implementation of WPS provision has been operationalised through the use of National Actional Plans. Analysis by the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom illustrates that, as of August 2020, 86 UN Member States have ratified National Actions Plans (NAPs). There are also 11 Regional Actions Plans (RAPs), for example that ratified by the the European Union (source: www.peacewomen.org).

Since its inception UNCSR 1325 has become a tool for strategic lobbying and organising for women’s and feminist organisations, see also Women’s Organizations in Post-conflict Contexts. Crucially, the Resolution paved the way for the articulation of gender expertise and demands at UN Security council, in field missions and for members states. The signing of successive sister resolutions is an indication of ongoing efforts to express a commitment to gender-sensitive analysis and policymaking in peace and security. Overall, however, there is a sense that the agenda has not yet lived up to its transformative potential. Furthermore, recent developments at the UN Security Council have seen attempts to restrict and water down the agenda. For example, in 2019 the passing of Resolution 2467 on sexual violence was possible only after difficult negotiations which saw the U.S. administration (as well as Russia and China) impose a veto on the inclusion of references to sexual health and reproductive rights, an aspect that is still insufficiently addressed in WPS (Thomson and Pierson 2018). Similarly, in October 2020, the 20th anniversary of UNSCR 1325, Russia proposed a new resolution deemed as an attempt to reverse some of the WPS commitment. While the resolution did not gain sufficient votes, these instances reflect ongoing threats against women’s rights and the rise of anti-gender politics seen globally.

Researching Women, Peace and Security

Welcomed as a landmark moment for women’s and peace activism, the institutionalization of the agenda into the architecture of international peace-making has become the focus of intense critical scrutiny (for an up to date overview see: Basu, Kirby, and Shepherd 2020; Davies and True 2019). As the normative framework of WPS proliferates across multiple institutional and activist spaces, a multidisciplinary
research agenda has emerged. Scholars have analysed different aspects, ranging from its discursive framing and implementation to the actors and institutions involved in shaping and operationalising the agenda in different contexts. Underlying this work are ongoing questions about the complex relationship between the emergence of WPS and different ideological feminist perspectives; the location, “ownership” and translations of the agenda, as well as well as the gaps, silences and marginalisation that work on WPS produces in peace and security practices, as well as in research. Two decades since its inception, scholars and activists alike have highlighted several tensions in the framing and implementation of the WPS agenda that undermine a feminist transformative ethos. More damningly, postcolonial feminist scholars draw attention to the reproduction of colonial logics and neoliberal feminist perspectives through WPS practice and research. Providing a comprehensive overview of the ever-growing field of inquiry on WPS in one single entry would impossible. Outlined below are a selection of thematic trajectories and debates that underpin research on WPS.

**Critically examining the resolutions**

From its outset, important scholarly contributions have examined the formulation of gender-sensitive actions in UNSCR1325 and the following resolutions. A key theme running through this work has been an underlying tension between the apparent commitment to deploy gender sensitive analysis of conflict and peace-making and the reproduction of essentialist ideas about women and men’s roles in conflict, peace and security (Puechguirbal 2010; Shepherd 2008). While acknowledging the role of women’s agency, the language of WPS has reproduced familiar scripts that, conceptualising women as victims of conflict and men as combatants, fail to address gendered complexities of conflict, as well as the multiplicity of roles women play in conflict and peace. Crucially, through this logic, WPS has reproduced gendered hierarchies that frame women as vulnerable individuals, often grouped with children, while envisioning international actors as protectors. One consequence of this framing is that, irrespective of the commitments set out in WPS, a resistance to view women as key actors in conflict or crucial interlocutors in the negotiations of ceasefires and peace settlements is still at play. While changes in the discursive framing of the agenda since UNSCRs 1888/1889 (2009) and UNSCR 2122 (2013) have seen more references to women as agents of change, these shifts have often paid less attention to the structural inequalities and ideological constraints that must be addressed to create conditions for meaningful participation and political transformation. Women thus have been instrumentalised as untapped resources for peacebuilding (Gibbings 2011) and peacekeeping (Karim and Beardsley 2013) and/or conceived as super heroines tasked with their own salvation, representing others and effect change (Shepherd 2011, 511). For example, strategies envisioned as part of WPS often focus on the logic of capacity building, implying that women must be better equipped to be included in the process, rather than tackling the deep-seated and structural processes leading to gender insecurities and discrimination (Hudson 2012; Deiana and McDonagh 2017). While we might see a more promising lexicon that pays attention to women’s active roles in peace and conflict, this articulation implies women as homogeneous groups and does not go far enough to challenge existing gendered structures.
Furthermore, scholars have traced the progressive narrowing down of the agenda’s scope to questions such as gender balancing of peacekeeping missions, gender-based violence and sexual violence in conflict (Kirby and Shepherd 2016; Meger 2016). An assessment of these shifts produces an ambivalent picture. On the one hand, this framing operates to privilege the logic of protection rather than participation and conceptualises gender mainstreaming as a technical tool that can problematically bolster the role of Western states and international institutions as the “right” interveners. On the other hand, the focus on sexual violence, while disproportionate, has also seen some concrete developments to address and prevent the issue, such as commitments to the use of reporting and specific references to sanctions (Basu, Kirby, and Shepherd 2020). Overall, ongoing research and activism on WPS reveal some positive openings for integrating a gender analysis and gender-sensitive measures in international peace and security. At the same time, painful trade-offs have accompanied the intersection between different feminist projects for political transformation attached to WPS and the more stark realities of international security confronting feminist actors involved in policymaking and institutions (Basu, Kirby, and Shepherd 2020).

More damningly, postcolonial and other critical feminist scholars have raised concerns about the hierarchies of knowledge and feminist perspectives produced through the agenda. Researchers have interrogated the feminist norms and visions that were privileged through UNSCR1325 and its subsequent institutionalisation, for example by showing the marginalisation of the anti-militarist ideals that were at the core of feminist peace activism (Cohn 2008; Pratt and Richter-Devroe 2011), and the resistance at the UN towards voices that were critical of the politics of international intervention such as during the invasion of Iraq (Gibbings 2011). Feminist scholars have thus complicated celebratory narratives of WPS by drawing attention to the changes in global governance that made UNSCR1325 possible. Such interventions illustrate that the path to WPS grew in parallel with the emergence of the post-cold War liberal agenda which saw the instrumentalization of women’s rights and empowerment as a “benchmark” of progress and civilization and strengthened the role of the U.S and other Western allies as democratic leaders and defenders of women’s rights (Harrington 2011). As WPS progressively emerged as a global norm, Swati Parashar writes, the Global South has problematically appeared as a space of intractable conflict, as a recipient of norms, best practices and liberal notions of empowerment, as well as a site for innumerable case studies for WPS researchers and policymakers (Parashar 2019).

While feminist scholars are aware of WPS as an uneasy, yet potentially productive compromise that can only be imperfectly navigated (for example see Cohn 2008; Otto 2009; Kirby and Shepherd 2016), there is also some ideological scepticism. For some, the commitment to gender mainstreaming at the core of WPS can been seen as a tool deployed to support the changing scenarios of international security, rather than to transform and challenge security and peace-making practices (Harrington 2011; Pratt and Richter-Devroe 2011). Post 9/11, the invocation of women’s rights to support international military intervention raised alarms about the usage of UNSCR1325 in tandem with dominant security practices that further the violence of counterterrorism and counterinsurgency measures (Pratt 2013; see also Cohn, Kinsella, and Gibbings 2004). These concerns are as valid today particularly as WPS has explicitly included actions on the sphere of Countering Violent Extremism (CVE) with the passing of
Resolution 2242 which envisions women’s pivotal role in fighting radicalization (Ni Aolain 2016). This development has been met with opposition from women’s organisations in the Global South, often the “targets” of CVE interventions, who experience the unintended consequences of such priorities (Coomaraswamy 2015; see also Aroussi 2020). Arguments against this uneasy coupling point out that instrumentalising women as actors for international security and counter terrorism can contribute to engender further militarization and insecurities for women who navigate complex situations shaped by political violence and competing narratives of conflict, security and terrorism (Parashar 2019).

Through critical postcolonial insights then, WPS is best understood as “a contested site of feminist political struggles” (Parashar 2019, 837). As Soumita Basu has argued, feminist narratives that locate the conceptual, material and institutional ownership of the agenda in the Global North, erase the contribution of key actors of the Global South in conceptualising WPS, as well as resisting its neoliberal agenda (Basu 2016). For example, this is attested by the role of states such as Namibia, Vietnam and Azerbaijan who hold the UN Security Council presidency during the ratification of UNSCR1325 and subsequent resolutions. It is also attested by state actors and organisations that resist the agenda, such as India which holds reservations about international interference by the Security Council. The work of local organisations in both interpreting WPS and resisting pressures to redirect their work to fit its priorities is another example (Basu 2016). This argument is echoed by Hastrup when showing the influence African feminists in shaping the agenda from the outset and in its institutionalization and interpretation (Hastrup 2019; see also Hudson 2016). Without an appreciation of the knowledges, practices and contestations in the Global South, as Basu contends, our understanding of WPS as global currency and multi-sited political terrain will be limited.

Overall, such interventions suggest that interrogating the uneasy entanglements between WPS proponents and international security and making visible actors in the Global South as knowledge producers and political agents of WPS must be at the centre of ongoing research and activist efforts.

The challenges of implementation

Another research trajectory focuses on the implementation of WPS. Since its emergence, extensive scholarship has highlighted a number of policy failures and tensions ranging from implementation and national ownership, to international peacekeeping, security and conflict management practices, that continue to undercut WPS' more ambitious and transformative claims (Coomaraswamy 2015; Kirby and Shepherd 2016b) Crucially, despite the diffusion of this international framework, a reluctance to see women as co-architects of peace is still at play. Between 1992 and 2019, on average women were 13 per cent of negotiators, 6 per cent of mediators, and 6 per cent of signatories in major peace processes. As of 2019, peace agreements with gender equality provisions increased from 14 per cent in 1995 to only 22 per cent (source: UN Women). Research also indicates that even when women are included through international efforts or National Actions Plans obstacles remain for their influence in shaping peace agreements (Paffenholz et al., 2016). Furthermore, gendered exclusions, stereotypes and insecurities in post-conflict scenarios have proved to be resilient, as these are reproduced or emerge anew at different stages of
a peace process in spite of institutional commitment to implement WPS (Deiana 2015; George and Shepherd 2016).

On the 15th anniversary of UNSCR1325, the UN launched a global study that assessed and critically reflected on the implementation of the Agenda in response to the Security Council invitation in resolution 2122. Among its findings, the Global study highlighted the necessity to pay close attention to contextual factors that shape implementation, acknowledging that a one-size-fits-all approach and the transferring of best practices might be counterproductive (Coomaraswamy 2015, 16). As mentioned, National Action Plans (NAPs) are the main mechanism used by member states as well as regional organisations to express commitments to translate WPS into localised actions. While researchers acknowledge the significance of these instruments as important mechanisms of accountability and transparency and norm diffusion (Swaine 2009; True 2016), there are also concerns about the state as key actor for positive change and “owner” of the agenda. As research has shown, National Actions Plans especially of states in the Global North or powerful states in the Global South are mostly outward facing (Shepherd 2016; Motoyama 2018). These often rely on militaristic and interventionist logics and reproduce racialised hierarchies, while lacking sufficient commitment to address WPS in their domestic context (Haastrup and Hagen 2020). For example, the U.K. NAP is a case in point. Despite the UK official commitment to a National Action Plan, the British Government does not acknowledge ‘the Troubles’ in Northern Ireland as a case of armed conflict, thus leaving Northern Ireland out of their WPS remit while supporting interventions “conveniently” located “out there” in contexts of the Global South.

Some studies also point out to post-conflict contexts where NAPs reproduce international driven and technocratic scripts that constrain rather support meaningful local participation and do not address structural inequalities and cultural norms impinging on women’s political agency (Björkdahl and Mannergren Selimovic 2015; Deiana 2018). The case of Liberia and Sierra Leone are illustrative of these tensions. Ryan and Basini (2016) found that consistent evidence of the women’s movements efforts and localised work on gender equality gets lost in the statist and international priorities detailed in the NAPs. While evidence indicates the contribution of women’s organisations to the development of the respective NAPs, the invocation of local ownership in these contexts is driven by a technocratic approach. This logic continues to favour internationally driven ideas and set indicators that are difficult to monitor and realise due to lack of resources, political will and institutional capacity while meaningful interventions and knowledge at the local level fail to be acknowledged and lifted up.

Overall, research on implementation draws attention to the complexities undercutting the translation of the agenda into actionable plans. In an attempt to enhance accountability for implementation, scholars have also explored opportunities to increase synergies with other international mechanisms, for example by strengthening linkages with CEDAW (O’Rourke and Swaine 2019) and through the development of a WPS index in connection to the Sustainable Development Goals (Klugman 2019). However, mapping the opportunities, challenges and trade-offs that the formulation and implementation of WPS in local contexts entails remains an ongoing research priority.

The global and the local in WPS
An ongoing thread of research seeks to examine the “localisation” of WPS norms. Since its inception, different scholars have highlighted the need to critically interrogate UNSCR1325 in terms of its applicability to widely different conflict and post-conflict scenarios and in relation to its relevance to women’s activism and everyday life in these contexts (e.g. Farr 2011; McLeod 2011; Hoewer 2013; Deiana 2015). A key contribution emerging from this strand of research is that, while the adoption of the agenda by different institutions and actors might suggest a positive example of norm diffusion, in practice the effects of such translation are more ambivalent as a result of structural constraints but also of different visions of WPS and feminism as political project. At the same time, evidence suggests that feminist activists are mobilising, re-interpreting as well as contesting, WPS as a strategic tool for their political demands and activism, see also Women and Peace Negotiations in Cyprus.

For example, Laura McLeod’s research in Serbia has shown antagonist understandings of security and post-conflict figurations that attach different meanings and actions to WPS (McLeod 2011). While anti-militarist feminist activists mobilised WPS as a tool to acknowledge Serbia’s responsibility in the conflict, state actors and other stakeholders involved in the creation of Serbia’s NAP or in its implementation used this opportunity to reframe Serbia as liberal nation that can contribute to international security or as a nation that can move away from the legacy of conflict through support and capacity-building. McLeod’s article thus underlines the importance of paying attention to multiple and contradictory visions of gender, security and post-conflict at play in the translation of WPS into localized actions.

On the other hand, Vanessa Farr’s research in the context of Palestine draws attention to the sustained struggle of women’s groups to mobilize in a complex terrain shaped by imbalance of power with the Israeli government, the everyday experiences of occupation and the legacy of local and international patriarchal structures (Farr 2011). Farr highlights how women’s groups are able to mobilize the language and spirit of UNSCR1325 to articulate their demands. However, the structural inequalities and endless constraints on the ground undermine the potential of the WPS framework to meaningfully transform women’s lived experiences and activism.

More recent interventions continue to draw attention to the persistent gap between the translation of WPS norms and the possibilities to engender change and transformation on the ground (Shepherd 2020). Such contributions reiterate the importance of theorizing that takes seriously local knowledges, contexts and experiences (Madsen and Hudson 2020; O’Sullivan and Krulišová 2020; George and Soaki 2020; Drumond and Rebelo 2020; Tamang 2020).

For example, Shweta Singh investigates the obstacles underpinning the realisation of WPS’ transformative potential in the context of Afghanistan (Singh 2020). These emerge from a complex entanglement between cultural and religious norms, and the legacy of international intervention, conflict and militarization. As Singh demonstrates, WPS has been mapped onto the institutional context but this move falls short of meaningfully supporting women’s agency and transforming their experiences of everyday insecurity. Grounding the analysis in the everyday reveals how women activists and human rights defenders navigate a complex web of cultural, religious and community practices that regulate gender relations and prescribe norms for women’s behaviour, for example through gender segregation. Furthermore, Singh’s research illustrates intersecting factors that reproduce women’s insecurities and impinge on women’s participation irrespective of the national-level institutions tasked with implementation of WPS principles. These include the militarisation of communities - a legacy of the conflict and the counterinsurgency efforts led by NATO, the USA and
the Afghan government, the effects of demobilisation and the persistence of patriarchal norms. Despite this evidence, Singh argues, the voices and experiences of Afghani women too often remain marginal in ongoing research and institutional fora. As the case of Afghanistan attests, without paying attention to the complex web of insecurities that women navigate in scenarios shaped by conflict and international intervention, WPS research and practice will be limited to tracing processes of translation, rather than meaningful transformation.

**Translating WPS into security institutions and practices**

As the normative framework of the agenda proliferates across different institutional and policy contexts, another research trajectory has examined how different entities have taken on board and developed WPS, these include analyses of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (e.g. Wright, Hurley, and Ruiz 2019), the European Union (e.g. Guerrina and Wright 2016), the African Union (e.g. Haastrup 2019; Hendricks 2017) or Pacific Island Forum (e.g. Rolls and Rolls 2019). While the articulation of the agenda in different organisational territories is an important indicator of multi-sited institutionalization and emerging communities of practice, feminist scholars have also shown that WPS’ travelling across the architecture of international peace and security is not a straightforward process. For example, Toni Haastrup’s research on the African Union, complicates linear and unidirectional understandings of norm diffusion from the UN to other institutional contexts (Haastrup 2019). To the contrary, developments around WPS in the African continent reveal the long-standing contribution of activists and institutional actors in the African Union to conceptualise WPS and embed it in regional and localized implementation. By paying attention to the interaction of different knowledges, practices and actors, it becomes clear that the AU is not merely a recipient of global norms. Rather, Haastrup demonstrates, the AU is a site wherein learning, contestation and implementation of the different meanings attributed to WPS coexist. On the other hand, Katharine Wright’s research on NATO demonstrates how the adoption of the WPS agenda is translated through an operational language of efficiency that mutes its more radical and transformative aims (Wright 2016). This is echoed in studies of the implementation of WPS in the context of EU security and peacebuilding missions wherein opening for institutional implementation through robust gender mainstreaming mechanisms are also met with a resistance to alter and transform existing security practices (Deiana and McDonagh 2018). In these contexts, arguments about the inclusion of women and/or gender perspectives are made on the grounds of operational effectiveness that eschew wider questions of gender equality and transformation. Overall, as these studies testify, WPS’ articulation across different institutional territories produces a variety of interactions and frameworks that impact implementation in specific contexts, while also running the risk of being diluted and co-opted within practices which might be at odds with feminist principles.

**Summary**

The signing of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 in October 2000 is considered an important landmark for feminist peace research and activism. The subsequent emergence of the Women Peace and Security agenda has set in motion opportunities
for the articulation of feminist demands for political transformation and for the inclusion of gender-sensitive perspectives in international peace and security practices. At the same time, assessing the development and institutionalization of the agenda across different organisational and activist spaces reveals a complex set of trade-offs and tensions that complicate, and often undermine, a feminist transformative ethos. As this entry has outlined, the WPS agenda has been the catalyst of wide-ranging scholarship and intense critical scrutiny on the strategic interpretations and contested meanings of the agenda, the practices of and failures in implementation, as well as on the global hierarchies reproduced through both research and policymaking. Two decades of intensive feminist study have also opened up new directions for research that are likely to animate ongoing critical engagements with the meanings, potential and pitfalls of the agenda. For example, these have included analyses of WPS informed by queer scholarship and LGBTQ+ studies—see also LGBTQ Perspectives in Peacebuilding, as well as studies that attend to the role of masculinities—see also Masculinity in Conflict. Recent interventions also begin to analyse WPS’ entanglements with border and asylum regimes and the missed opportunities within (Holvikivi and Reeves 2017; Kirby 2020).

All in all, research on WPS is illustrative of the ongoing and complex journey of feminist ideas into the architecture of international peace and security. At the same time, it is worth acknowledging that feminist engagements with peace are not confined to the study of WPS. While WPS is an important site of analysis, feminist peace research entails a much wider set of methodological and interdisciplinary perspectives that seek to transform and re-imagine established practices of peace and security beyond the institutional realm and statist conventions (Lyytikäinen et al. 2020; Wibben et al. 2019), see also Feminist Peace Research.
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