

1 A HUGE Security Approach: Towards Human, Gender, 2 and Environmental Security

3 *Úrsula Oswald Spring*

4 **1. Introduction**

5 Gender violence is still an invisible aggression that occurs primarily within families. It is often
6 socially accepted and sometimes even promoted. The origins of this subtle and sometimes brutal
7 discrimination are complex, and closely related to the social representations (Moscovici 1976;
8 Herzlich/Graham 1993) of gender construction. This chapter develops a broader security concept of
9 *Human, Gender and Environmental Security* (HUGE), based on a widened concept of security
10 (Wæver 2008; Brauch 2005, 2005a, 2008). HUGE combines a broad gender concept that includes
11 children, elders, indigenous and other minorities with a human-centred focus on *environmental*
12 *security* (ES) challenges, peace-building and gender equity. *Gender security* (GS) reflects
13 livelihood, food, health, and public security issues as well as education and cultural diversity.

14 The most frequent violence is related to gender, nevertheless there are only few theoretical
15 developments on gender security. This chapter asks why this happened. As gender security is
16 related to human and environmental issues aggravated by regressive globalization
17 (Kaldor/Anheier/Glasius 2003) and climate change (IPCC 2007, 2007a), women and children are
18 also highly vulnerable and threatened in multiple ways. As GS has only recently been discussed in
19 the social science literature and in *international relations* (IR), the analysis focuses first on the de-
20 velopment and limits of this concept that are imposed on gender epistemology by the prevailing
21 patriarchal mindset in science. It then reviews the theoretical elements that are contributing to the
22 evolution of GS (3) within four main feminist currents: epistemological feminism, feminist
23 empiricism, postmodernism, and standpoint feminism.

24 As a historically and socially constructed concept, the author explores four phases of GS studies (4):
25 the analysis of identity and social representation; postmodern feminism and its links it to the gift
26 economy; ecofeminism and the new social movements focusing on peace movements. In the
27 conclusions (5), the HUGE concept discusses gender links with HS and ES in order to stimulate a
28 new economy of solidarity and a democratic, 'glocal' and participative model of governance that
29 guarantees for the most vulnerable persons equity, and peace with quality of life and prospects for a
30 future threatened by global environmental changes (GEC).

31 **2. Human, Gender, and Environmental Security: HUGE**

32 From a constructivist approach, the conceptualization of security has evolved focusing on the -
33 relationship among different security concepts. The 'Copenhagen school' systematized the links
34 among several security approaches (Wæver 2000, 2008, 2008a; Buzan/Wæver/de Wilde, 1998).
35 The different security dimensions and levels of analysis are interrelated: often military security
36 directly affects societal and economic security by causing for individuals and groups a fear for
37 survival. These national security concerns still prevail in almost all countries in the South and in the
38 'war on terror', by defending national borders in a globalized world, the transnational economy and
39 the occidental civilization process. Migration and the cultural homogenization processes resulting
40 from instant communication, fashion, and consumption is contrarily creating also greater diversity
41 and new cultural interlinks.

1 Among the extended concepts are *societal security* (Wæver 2008a), labelled by Møller (2003) as
 2 ‘incremental’; HS described as ‘radical’ and ES termed as “ultra-radical” (table 1). Going beyond
 3 the traditional realist approach of Wolfers (1962), the security definition of the Copenhagen school
 4 distinguished between different referent objects (state, nation, societal groups, individuals,
 5 humankind, and ecosystems), depending on the security concern where the values at risk are
 6 sovereignty, national unity, survival, and sustainability (Ullman 1983). Asking for *security from*
 7 *whom* or *what*, *risks from whom* and *threats from whom* and *from what*, the sources of threat have
 8 changed since the late 20th century. This classification has offered a specific heuristic contribution
 9 that has inspired subsequent modifications and where gender security was included.

10 **Table 91.1:** Human, Gender, and Environmental Security (HUGE): A Transradical Approach.
 11 **Source:** Møller, 2003: 279; Oswald Spring, 2001, 2004, 2007.

| Degree of expansion | Denomination (security of what?) | References object (security of whom?) | Value at risk (security of what?) | Sources of threat (security from whom and for what?) |
|----------------------|---|--|--|---|
| No expansion | National Security (political, military) | The State | Sovereignty, territorial integrity | Other states, terrorism, sub-state actors, guerrilla |
| Incremental | Societal Security | Nations, societal groups | National unity and identity | Nations, migrants, alien cultures, mass media |
| Radical | Human Security | Individuals, humankind | Survival, quality of life, livelihood | State, globalization, elites, terrorism |
| Ultra-radical | Environmental Security | Ecosystem, Humankind, | Sustainability | Nature, global change, global warming, humankind |
| Trans-radical | Gender Security | Gender relations, indigenous, minorities, children, elders | Equity, equality, identity, solidarity, social representations | Patriarchy, totalitarian institutions (governments, religions, elites), dominant culture, intolerance, violence |

12

13 3. Human Security

14 Why do more than 24,000 persons, basically children, die each day of hunger, and why only in Sub-
 15 Saharan Africa has the number of undernourished children augmented from 29 to 37 million during
 16 the last decade? Why do three billion persons lack access to basic sanitation systems? Why did the
 17 globalization process and scientific progress create more than 2 billion extremely poor people? Why
 18 do 55 million Latin Americans not have enough to eat while living in the most biodiverse region on
 19 the planet that provided the world three of the five basic food crops (corn, beans, and potatoes)?
 20 How did this situation develop and get worse in different countries of the south? What is happening
 21 with China and India and how are the UN *Millennium Development Goals* (MDGs) related to

1 processes of development, modernization, efficiency, and justice? Why are 70% of extreme poor
2 people women? The present situation of existing gaps in a world of plenty requires a deeper and
3 wider approach to GS (Bellamy/McDonald 2002), and an epistemological shift from a techno-
4 centric perspective to a holistic approach.

5 Social inequalities are historically developed and accentuated within developing countries due to
6 the North-South and the internal gaps, creating social vulnerability. It includes unsatisfied human
7 needs and limited access to resources (Melillo/Suárez/Rodríguez 2004), therefore the lack of human
8 security is understood as ‘freedom from fear’ and ‘freedom from want’.

9 **4. Environmental Security**

10 Due to global and climate change, environmental security (Mathews 1989) is not only an issue of
11 scientists (Dalby 2008; Dalby/Brauch/Oswald 2008) but increasingly also of politicians (Stern
12 2006). Resource depletion (water, land, air, minerals, and fossils) and their pollution are limiting the
13 offer for productive processes and life quality, worsened by higher demand due to population
14 growth, urbanization, more food demand, and the claim of an ongoing process of modernization in
15 developing countries, particularly in China and India (The Economist 2007; IPCC 2007, 2007a).
16 Disasters will further reduce available resources. These factors are pressuring on the demand side,
17 reducing at the same time the supply due to scarce and contaminated resources. Besides oil and gas,
18 water and virtual water (food) is threatening *ES*. Scarcity alone is not what kills people or causes
19 political violence; numerous other factors are important in the destruction of the social networks
20 that ensure survival.

21 There is no reason to believe that states are necessarily acting in ways that ensure the security of
22 their populations, despite official rhetoric. The critical development literature and discussions of
23 political ecology emphasize that state actions in support of development may be a contributing factor
24 to the vulnerability of social and ecosystems, which are then incapable of ensuring survival
25 when disaster strikes. Neither are states the innocent arbiters of disputes, nor necessarily benign
26 agencies primarily interested in the welfare of their populations; they may be involved in the violent
27 suppression of resistance to central rule or to the dislocations of economic globalization and the
28 concomitant commoditization of items essential for survival. Therefore the shift from the
29 ‘holocene’ to an ‘anthropocene’ (Crutzen/Stoermer 2000) suggests that the link between human and
30 ecological matters must be understood in a way that transcends the divisions between the ‘natural’
31 and the ‘human’ that have structured the thinking on security and especially identity since the
32 emergence of modernity.

33 **5. Gender Security**

34 **5.1. Gender as Analytical Concept**

35 Several organizations within the United Nations systems that collect data (UNSC Resolution 1325¹;
36 UNIFEM 2007; FAO 2006) have confirmed that the violence against women and girls is the most
37 frequent form of violence on earth (Riviere/Cominges 2001). Each third woman in the world is
38 being beaten, and each fifth is being sexually harassed or violated (UN 2006). Normally, this
39 violent behaviour happens inside the house; however, in research surveys men who were re-
40 sponsible for committing these crimes claim guilty for men from other cultural backgrounds,
41 different regions, and lower social classes. Most countries in the South still lack laws against this

¹ See: United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 on “Women, Peace and Security”; at: <http://www.un.org/events/res_1325e.pdf> and: <<http://www.peacewomen.org/un/sc/1325.html>>.

1 type of violence, and even if they exist, they are not being enforced by male judges due to a
2 patriarchal practice of law and power exercises.

3 Thus, gender security is normally taken for granted, socially identified, and represented within so-
4 ciety. The world has been organized for at least five thousand years on patriarchal patterns, where
5 the male gender (the strong sex) dominates the female (the weak sex), creating inequity, exclusion,
6 violence, and submission. Female powers were considered marginal and merely delegated. The
7 main control on material goods remains in the hands of men who decide on family expenses,
8 property, productive activities, inheritance, and gifts. The lack of the right to own property has
9 reduced the negotiation capacity of women and increased their insecurity.

10 As the relationship between men and women implies complex interlinks and relates to human and
11 societal security, the threats are not always perceived as purely confrontational. Nobody is born as a
12 man or woman; everybody is born with a body which acquires a generic significance in this world
13 (De Beauvoir 1949; Lama 2002, 1996). From early childhood on gender is socialized (Lloyd/Du-
14 veen, 1992; Piaget 1950) and consolidated during the personal life history. Family structures,
15 schools, work, and clubs are organized to subsume gender identity into daily life, avoiding that
16 gender discrimination get perceived and combated. Gender is also an analytical tool, socially
17 constructed, and the axis of classification is linked to genital difference (sexual dimorphism:
18 female-male), facts that permits a biological explanation of social representations of gender, rooting
19 still more the mechanisms of distinction, and with them the process of discrimination. The key role
20 of women is in caring about the well-being of children, family, and animals, and is considered a
21 *homo domesticus*.

22 **5.2 Gender Security Studies**

23 Nonetheless, violence against women did not lead to a theory on gender security (GS). The UN
24 Security Council referred to it in Resolution UNSC 1325 separately to ‘gender, security, and human
25 rights’. Key elements point to the economic security of women with respect to property rights,
26 education and training, equal access to paid work regardless of ethnic, religious, and caste
27 differences, and the encouragement of small-scale business within local areas (Beijing Conference
28 1995). In analytical terms and linking up human and ES to GS, this author proposes a transradical
29 level of expansion (table 1). An initial definition of GS refers to the process of socialization to
30 ‘become’ a gendered human being; a man or a woman, depending on the position of the social
31 structure. Thus, GS is socially constructed and systemic within the present patriarchal society, and it
32 is normally taken for granted. The relations are linked to gender status – ethnicity/race, class, age,
33 and minority status – in relation to the model of reference. Equity and identity are values at risk, and
34 the source of threat comes from the patriarchal hierarchical and violent order, characterized by
35 exclusive, dominant, and authoritarian institutions, non-democratic governments, churches, and
36 elites; secondly, from the established and developed social relations of violence and prejudice. They
37 are penetrating the most intimate space of a couple and family, affecting labour relations, political
38 and social contacts, and primarily also the exercise of power where a system of exclusion,
39 discrimination, and stigma dominates, threatening equity and personal or group identities.

41 **5.3 Evolution of Gender Security**

42 GS has a long history and complex analytical processes behind it. The European Union refers to GS
43 as the systematic examination of the differences in “conditions, needs, rates of participation, access
44 to resources and development, management of the patrimony, of the power, of decision and images
45 among women and men relating to their roles assigned in the function to their sex”². Structural
46 inequity is reduced in some progressive countries through quota systems, which can improve the
47 participation of women, but it still remains discrimination, although a positive one with the goal to

² See at: <lacitoyennete.com/magazine/mots/glossaireegaliteHF.php; a glossary from the European Union>.

1 achieve greater equality. Clear political norms and roles supported by institutional actions that note
2 existing differences could improve the gender balance, and therefore may reduce gender insecurity
3 and violence.

4 The historical evolution of feminist thinking and the diverse practices had a strong influence on the
5 deconstruction of the GS concept. Feminist studies have evolved through several phases: from
6 theoretical feminism to the desire for female voting and greater equality. The relation between GS
7 and HS started with the debacle of five decades of failed and misguided development, directly
8 linked to the omission of gender considerations. The exclusion of women and other minorities from
9 science, technology, history, and public life have implied and continue to cause enormous costs for
10 the political process, the economy and the environment, for peace-building, and culture of the world.

11 The patriarchal system constituted the base of gender insecurity. It is characterized by male
12 dominated extended households, patrilineal inheritance and patrilocal housing for married women
13 (the Roman *pater familiae*). Community owned property became private property, and a system of
14 norms was created that obliged society to legally consolidate the changes in the context of the *pax*
15 *romana* (Oswald 2008). Male kings or leaders strengthened their power due to conquests of new
16 territories; they developed better weapons and armies, and made slaves out of the conquered people,
17 and exploited nature. The leading elite established monarchies of absolute power ruling their land,
18 commodities, resources, and subjects. With supernatural forces or as divine deputies of god on earth
19 (pope, prophet) they consolidated empires. Military control stabilized their empires externally and
20 internally and social unrest obliged them to legitimize elite's hegemony (Gramsci 1977). Later,
21 democratic institutions and a division of power consolidated economic and political power and a
22 system of rule justified the legal use of physical force in the hand of the state (Max Weber 1987).
23 This summarized process of the rise of patriarchy was further consolidated by the three mono-
24 theistic religions (Judaism, Christianity, and Islam). The belief in one father god and the only truth
25 relied on male priests, representatives of god on Earth.

26 Thus 'gender insecurity' is a historical process whose root causes is dominance, oppression,
27 violence, and invisibility. Only one part of society dominates and exploits the other part.
28 Hierarchical orders and repressive mechanisms maintain control, and mass media, ideology and
29 religion the hegemony. They create social representations and identity processes to maintain the
30 status quo. Therefore, only the overcoming of patriarchy related to other systemic factors of control
31 and violence could overthrow the present unjust system of global society and liberate everybody,
32 men and women. Existing social representations also excluded women from science and technology.
33 By deconstructing assigned social roles and patriarchal thinking several schools of feministic
34 epistemologies were developing.

35 **6. Scientific Currents in Feminism**

36 *Feminist epistemologies* have analysed the ways in which metaphors of masculinity operate in the
37 construction of ideals of rationality and objectivity (Bordo 1990; Lloyd/Duveen 1992; Longino
38 1990, 1993, 2001). Sandra Harding (1986, 1988, 1991; Harding/Hintikka 1991) argued that dualism
39 such as nature-culture, subject-object, and masculine-feminine supports modern epistemological
40 analyses, and that feminist epistemology should deconstruct this dualism (Stuart 1990). Scientific
41 theories contain also a gender bias, not only due to the under-representation of women, but also in
42 the construction of objectivity and underlying values. Therefore, a GS approach proposes the
43 incorporation of explicit gender-related values, represented by the selection and delimitation of the
44 object of study, the empirical work, the justification, the methodology, and a theory-building with
45 ethics. Therefore, the analysis on GS must critically understand the diversity and values in a so-
46 called rigorous or objective scientific analysis. It scrutinizes especially the narrow concept of
47 military security, the related military complex, and its economic interests (Valenzuela 1991).

1 *Feminist empiricism* criticizes the ‘androgenic’ mainstreaming in science, where the stereotypical
2 masculine mental approach excludes emotions. Objectivity in scientific knowledge also in physics
3 and biology (Harding 1986, 1988, 1991) has gender biases (selection, objectives, methods), and
4 methodologies have themselves male-centred limits (Harding/Hintikka 1991). GS studies promote a
5 shift and ask for cognitive ‘equality’ or ‘sameness’ with the patriarchal thinking. Therefore, the
6 approach of GS shifts from opposition to collaboration. It creates a common front of the multi-
7 disciplinary and process thinking that allows dealing with the present threats and the coming
8 challenges of climate change, which will affect both genders and the planet as a whole (Haraway
9 1988, 1997).

10 *Postmodern perspectives* (Butler 1990; Alcoff 1996; Alcoff/Potter 1993; Nicholson 1990; Persram
11 1994) have established radical critiques by rejecting any gender category, due to the fact that every
12 individual is unique. They also oppose possible coalitions between women and other suppressed
13 groups, because most of them would repeat the patriarchal conduct within these groups. For the GS
14 analysis, their critiques of theories justifying sexist practices, where women are treated in an
15 essentialist sense or as objects, are useful. These currents avoid in GS studies a bias of
16 androcentrism, super-generalization or super-specialization, insensitivity to gender analyses and
17 issues, the normal elimination of sex and sexuality, double evaluation standards and payment for
18 men and women in scientific achievements, sexist dichotomies, and a formalism limiting the unity
19 of analysis (Bartra 1998). However, a postmodern approach limits also the deepening of GS, due to
20 its influence by individualistic occidental thinking.

21 The *standpoint* feminism was initially developed in the social sciences (Hartsock 1983, 1983a, 1988,
22 1993; Harding 1988; Chodorow 1978; Collins/Pinch 1998; Smith 1974). Women and other
23 oppressed groups are better trained and sensitive to deconstruct the mechanisms of exclusion,
24 domination, violence, and submission. With these epistemic privileges they can deepen their analy-
25 sis and better understand discrimination. Their analysis does not glorify women in research nor does
26 introduce gender issues in a collateral way into international studies, but promotes a transversal and
27 gender-clear approach, where both quantitative and qualitative methods should understand the
28 processes of identity formation and consolidation of stereotypes, thus generating, reproducing, and
29 anchoring the present situation of inequity. A GS approach observes that there could be no single
30 standpoint, since women and marginal groups are differently situated within diverse social positions,
31 cultural backgrounds, socio-economic conditions, race, class, ethnic group (Warren 1998), sexual
32 orientation and geographic location, and that it is precisely this diversity which can enrich their
33 analyses.

34 Such an advance permits to situate knowledge socially by anchoring it in local interests and values.
35 When oriented to a liberation perspective, the disadvantageous situation induces learning processes
36 that are able to free them from their situation of oppression (Freire’s liberation methodology 1998).
37 In relation to GS studies, a clear distinction between the context of discovery and the context of
38 justification would avoid confusions. Harding insists further that modern science is “deeply and
39 completely constituted” by “local resources” (Harding 1986: 157) and bottom-up processes. This
40 approach offers not only a theoretical and empirical link to HS, but includes also ES concerns when
41 resource appropriation and distribution and social vulnerability as result of disasters are
42 incorporated.

43 **7. Four Phases of Gender Security Studies**

44 By linking logically and empirically *human* and *environmental security* with *gender security*, the
45 construction and visibilization of the invisible, of the reproduction of injustices, and of the
46 production and ideological circulation process can be understood. Four phases can be included in
47 the consolidation of ‘GS’: *first*, the process of identity building and social representation; *second*,

1 the gift economy; *third*, the evolution of ecofeminism; and *fourth*, the emergence of social
2 movements.

3 **7.1 Gender Identity and Social Representations**

4 'GS' has gender relations (men and women) as its object of reference, and the values at risks are
5 precisely identity and social representations (table 1). Thousands of years of experiences have
6 permitted to consolidate a system of social representations that has been able to control all elements
7 in the specific socio-historic context of a society. Symbolic elements of identity were developed –
8 such as class, ethnicity, age, religion, race, nationality, professional ascription, political ideology,
9 education, and others – which are in permanent change, reflecting a large diversity and capacity for
10 adaptation, while conserving the outstanding historic attributes (gender, sex, and race) and the
11 material conditions of late capitalism: poor and rich (Giménez 1999, Habermas 1995, 2000).
12 Gender identity refers to the process of socialization to 'become' a gendered human being: man or
13 woman, depending on the position in the social structure. Sociology defines gender identity as "a
14 social construct regarding culture-bound conventions, roles and behaviours for, as well as relation-
15 ships between and among, women and men and boys and girls" (Krieger 2001: 693-700). The
16 formation of gender identity is a complex procedure that includes processes of gestation since birth,
17 of learning during the first infancy, and later the socialization and acquiring of social roles. Identity
18 generates roles within society where a systematic process of identification establishes the
19 differences between status, needs, positions, and privileges of each gender. These roles have two
20 explanations: they articulate the totality of ways through which oneself expresses gender identity,
21 and secondly, it defines the roles in relation to the type of activities that a society determines as
22 adequate for a person with specific gender identity. The result of this long-standing gender
23 discrimination has produced historical inequality and inequity, exclusion and discrimination. They
24 are highly exposed in daily life to gender-related violence, and their labour inside the house and in
25 childrearing is not considered productive with economic dependency from men.

26 Moscovici understands social representations as a systems of ideas, values, and practices fulfilling a
27 dual function: a) establishing a framework of order where the subjects are oriented in their material
28 and social world where they live; and b) permitting the communication with a common code among
29 the members of a collective, where all objects are named and the processes precisely classified
30 (Moscovici cited in: Herzlich/Graham 1993). At the same time, social representations enforce the
31 communication among members of the community (Flores 2001), providing them with a socially
32 shared code of interchange where names are classified without any ambiguities, including world-
33 views, mindsets, and personal and social histories. Duveen explains two basic processes of
34 production of social knowledge linked to 'anchoring' and 'objectification'. *Anchoring* is a process
35 that permits integrating the unknown situation within the existing representation (internalization).
36 *Objectification* permits that these new representations are projected into the world as concrete
37 objects (Duveen 1997: 87). The acquisition of these control mechanisms permit in independent
38 situations to internalize in society two basic psychological processes, which works as control me-
39 chanisms and therefore generate gender insecurity: a) women *should be*: assigned an identity (social
40 facts); and b) women *should be available for others*: self-identity (socialized).

41 The exercise of *power* is the basis for a privileged access to socially valued resources, such as
42 commodities, money, status, leadership, group membership, education, and knowledge. Power im-
43 plies the necessary control or change of mentalities of others to impose the proper ones. All
44 dominant groups tend to create homogeneous identities and social representations within their
45 subjects, where the oppressed decide to support and maintain the oppressive situation in the name of
46 their supposed own interests. These social representations turns women are extremely vulnerable
47 during disaster situations, and recent studies have shown that the death rate of women has been
48 between 68 to 85 per cent. But a crisis situation creates also conditions for resilience-building and
49 empowerment, reinforcing gender security. The affected people get prepared for dealing better:

1 preventing from further disasters and adapting to difficult life situations. Women who are heads of
2 single households are at greater risk, due to stereotypes developed in any specific society, and as a
3 result of generally accepted social representations based on identity processes.

4 **7.2 Identity and Gift Economy**

5 Genevieve Vaughan (1997) deconstructed postmodern feminism, including women's free labour for
6 child rearing and unpaid homework as a 'gift economy'. This free gift is related to maternal
7 thinking (Ruddick 1995) or mothering (Chodorow 1978), producing collective social changes which
8 go beyond capitalism and communism, both systems with clearly patriarchal roots (Nikolic 2004),
9 and belonging to the logic of exchange. Economic and gift paradigms coexist today. "One is visible,
10 the other invisible; one highly valued, the other under-valued. One connected with men; the
11 other with women. "Exchange puts the ego first and allows it to grow and develop in ways that
12 emphasize me-first competitive and hierarchical behaviour patterns...What we need to do is
13 validate the one connected with women, causing a basic shift in the values by which we direct our
14 lives and policies" (Vaughan 2004: 11).

15 The gift agenda implies to liberate "everyone – women, children and men – from patriarchy without
16 destroying the human beings³ who are its carriers and the planet where they live" (Vaughan 1997:
17 23). These practices emphasized the need-oriented satisfaction, which creates emotional bonds
18 between givers and receivers. Especially raising young children, mothering requires kindness and
19 creativity, and for this reason it is an important gift for the child and society, what deeply challenges
20 the patriarchal economy of exchanges, profit, and interests. "Giving and receiving word-gifts
21 organized in sentences and discourses creates a human relationship among people with regard to
22 things in the world" (Vaughan 1997: 38). By this intentionality of giving, the caretaking is more
23 important than the objectivity of an account, satisfying the constant social communicative needs,
24 where reality is represented and reinterpreted without competitiveness, transforming *homo sapiens*
25 into a *homo donans*.

26 Values and the symbolic understanding of male power (skyscrapers, monuments, jewels, arms, bank
27 accounts, supermarkets, and malls) transform social processes into property. Nevertheless, gender
28 identities of men and women are based on processes, and mothering is threatened by narrow
29 military security concerns. Thus, GS understands this mothering not as a self-sacrificing process
30 leading to victimization and control, but as an integral human process and an especially intense
31 moment of gift giving, which is able to increase human and gender security with care for the
32 environment. The gift-economy visualizes also the invisible passivity and receptivity of women not
33 as a mechanical concatenation, but as a creative process, where always equal exchanges not only
34 are self-reflecting, but also self-validated by reciprocity. These processes would change the
35 dominant system of existing social representations by creating new identities, increasing GS, and
36 reducing violence and exclusion.

37 **7.3 Ecofeminism**

38 The gifts of nature, such as air, water, sunlight, food, biodiversity, biomass, that are used by humans
39 unconsciously permitting them adaptation, evolution and well-being (D'Eaubonne 1974;
40 Diamond/Orenstein 1990) coexist alongside human gifts. The 'exchange paradigm' privatizes these
41 collective natural good and protected by the World Trade Organization (WTO) through Trade-

³ There is a second triggering process related to the exchange paradigm. Markets are creating artificial scarcity to reevaluate goods and services. Usually this scarcity is artificially created in order to maintain control and increase power, but induces simultaneously processes of depredation in social and environmental terms. This scarcity is increased by wasting resources, invested in armament. Only 17 billion US dollars would feed everybody in the world during one year. The same amount is spent in one week on the military, a typical example of waste that creates artificial scarcity. Further, gift giving by big 'exchange-ego' in the form of aid from industrialized countries to developing ones is not functioning, due to the strings imposed by the donors which often impoverish the poor countries

1 Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIP's) and only a small elite is benefiting. Similar
2 processes are occurring with the privatization of water, health care, and education (Illich 1976).
3 Thus, the gift economy creates transitional structures to HS and ES, and criticizes the patriarchal
4 capitalism and the position of power over other human beings and nature. In this process
5 subsistence economies from the South are questioning the dominant way of understanding earth and
6 life. Gift economy and 'ecofeminism'⁴ are deeply interrelated and complementary, and are in-
7 terpreted here as the third phase of GS studies. Ecofeminism is understood as a convergence of
8 environmental, social, and feminist movements, where mothering spirituality is caring about nature
9 and society; about the vulnerable above all. It represents a movement which is applying feminist
10 modes of analysis and concepts to the environment. The key values are equality and equity,
11 including care, inclusion, solidarity, and respect for other humans and for nature. The principle of
12 sustainability and concern over the coming generation gives the philosophical approach and the
13 activist a theoretical background to link up with human and environmental security.
14 Ecofeminists see the oppression of women and the exploitation of nature as interconnected. The
15 dominant patriarchal system in late capitalism is affecting human, environmental, and gender
16 securities with the same root causes. Control and commoditization of life and goods in favour of a
17 small bourgeoisie are destroying the livelihood of billions of people, pushing them into extreme
18 poverty (Forrester 1999). Also, human health and environment are affected when toxic waste is
19 dumped into seas, waters, the ground, and the atmosphere. As a result, anthropogenic reinforced
20 GEC causes more and worse disasters. However, human and economic losses are affecting
21 differently geographical regions with higher impacts in the Tropics, the Arctic, the Andeans, and
22 the Himalayas, and lower social classes (poor and marginal) and gender (highly women, children
23 and elderly) are the most vulnerable.

24 When ecofeminists integrated with philosophers of ethics (Zimmerman 1987) and social
25 movements, they deepened in the analysis of the differences between gender and sexuality
26 (Szasz/Lerner 1998). With regard to environmental destruction, food scarcity, and women's
27 discrimination and violence (Pickup 2001), they found an analogue process of exploitation between
28 gender and nature. The complexity of the interlinked processes brought ecofeminists to criticize
29 neoliberalism and regressive globalization.⁵ From a transradical perspective, ecofeminists linked up
30 to ecoindigenism, cultural resistance and GS. With other movements (women, peasants, indigenous
31 groups and environmentalists) ecofeminists participated in a campaign against multinational
32 oligopolies of genetic modified seeds, pointing to the destruction of rural economies and the
33 resulting migration of peasants to shanty towns (Shiva 1993; CLOC 2004).

34 By promoting cultural and biological diversity, ecofeminists overcame the Cartesian relationship
35 between subject and object. A critical revision of traditional cultural postulates found the patriarchal
36 roots and the dichotomy between liberty and emancipation. Local sustainable development got
37 excluded from the globalization process that excludes and only a 'glocal' approach – internationally
38 linked and locally anchored – supported by affected people is able to overcome the imposition and
39 assignation of roles promoted by multinationals. The universality of Western thought was
40 scrutinized, and culturally diversity, environmental sustainable self-reliance and food sovereignty

⁴The term was originally coined by Françoise d'Eaubonne (1974) as a philosophy and a social movement emerging from the union of feminists and environmentalists. It was related to eco-anarchism and bioregional democracy with a strong involvement of feminism and deep feminism. According to Warren (1997: 218): "Since 1974, ecofeminism has surfaced throughout the globe in the form of both women-initiated, grass-roots environmental actions and interdisciplinary perspectives on the inextricable interconnections among human systems of unjustified domination – both of humans and earth others. The distinctiveness of ecofeminism, then, is that it is a feminist environmentalism and an environmental feminism." See also Eaton/Lorentzen (2003) on the debate in the US, Brazil, and Japan on aspects of the relationship between ecofeminism and globalization.

⁵Margret Thatcher proposed in the 1980's her 'TINA' (There is No Alternative, Mies 1988) concept. Confronted with regressive globalization, alternative processes of transversal, multi-local, and decentralized efforts are undertaken in the sense of TAMA: There Are Many Alternatives (Oswald 2008).

1 with diverse cosmovisions bloomed again and thus reinforced the cultural plurality and biodiversity,
2 especially in towns and rural communities in poor countries.

3 **7.4 New Social Movements**

4 The confluence of diverse social movements represents a fourth phase of GS studies. Historically,
5 after the explosion of nuclear bomb, feminist movements allied with pacifists, creating peace
6 institutes and nonviolent social behaviour (López 2004). Since the 1970's, these social groups have
7 cooperated with ecofeminists, indigenous people and ecologists on issues of environmental and
8 social deterioration. When the neo-liberal model spread everywhere, workers, trade unionists, the
9 displaced middle class in many countries in the South, the unemployed, the young without a future,
10 and many elders have joined.

11 During this fourth phase, questions related to GS acquired greater visibility, especially in Mexico
12 when the Zapatistas, an indigenous movement in Chiapas, launched their 'conflict against neo-
13 liberalism' on the same day (1 January 1994) when the *North American Free Trade Agreement*
14 (NAFTA) entered into force (Oswald 2008). This phase of GS also coincided with the rise of
15 international postmodern social movements (Melucci 1996). In Latin America they started with the
16 opposition against the *Free Trade Agreement of the Americas* (FTAA). The global connection
17 among social movements emerged during the protest against the WTO in Seattle and alliances were
18 strengthened during the World Social Fora. Sara Larraín (2005) called these new social movements
19 *altermundism*⁶.

20 As diverse social movements they are training inside their organizations processes of democra-
21 tization and sustainability. Although differences exist among these social movements, they agreed
22 on specific themes such as the decentralization of power; even though they still have not yet
23 determined how social and territorial decentralization should be implemented, and which could be
24 the institutional options (Kaldor/Anheier/Glasius 2003). The social imaginary, once explored how
25 to transform their legitimate demands – human rights, gender rights (Peters/Wolper 1995) welfare,
26 food sovereignty, peace, environmental care and poverty relief. They questioned the hegemonic
27 development agencies with their technological modernizing paradigms, using political power and
28 economic pressure (IMF, WTO) to privatize public services at any costs of social conditions in
29 developing countries and poor social sectors.

30 These social movements asked for social representation with greater harmony among human beings
31 and nature, coherence between public and private policies, between political offers and public
32 policies, and a relationship based on reciprocity and cooperation, as well as on solidarity. Habermas
33 (1995) correctly mentioned that this phase aims at an ideological and discursive struggle. It is
34 expressed clearly in the strategies of the Zapatistas. They struggle against the control of the mind by
35 mass media, thus imposing socio-cultural representations (Castells 2002; Chomsky 1998). This
36 fourth phase of GS offers an understanding of the interrelationship and mediation processes of
37 different social levels: of micro and macro; of individuals or groups; of relationships among
38 discourses and power domination, and deconstruction where the raising of local consciousness for a
39 global struggle emerged. In strategic terms, the social representations, shared socially, permit the
40 establishment of new identity patterns able to create wider alliances with greater achievements and
41 increasing capacity for alternatives (CLOC 2004, 2002; Via Campesina 2005).

42 In summary, the transformation of identity patterns, the creation of alternative social representations,
43 and the visibilization of the gift-giving economy reinforce cooperation and nurturing of humans and
44 nature. Ecofeminists and social movements not only criticized the Euro-American power exercises

⁶Altermundism is the self-defined term of the networks of different social movements working with the slogan: 'another world is possible'.

1 and ideological domination but proposed integrative mechanisms such as a HUGE security concept
2 consisting of *Human, Gender, and Environmental Security* (Oswald 1992, 2001, 2005).

3 **8. Human, Gender, and Environmental Security: HUGE**

4 The revision on the three security concepts has shown that there is still a predominant disciplinary,
5 male and Western approach in security research (Buzan/Wæver/Wilde 1998;
6 Kaldor/Anheier/Glasius 2003; Steffen/Sanderson/Tyson/Jäger/Matson/Moore III/Oldfield/Richard-
7 son/Schellnhuber/Turner/Wasson 2004; Wæver 2000) deepening and widening in one or another
8 aspect. The evolution of HS has broadened the discussion from personal mine protection to poverty
9 alleviation, human rights (UN 2006), governance, gender participation (IFAD, 2005, UNFPA 2004;
10 Whitehead/Lockwood 1999) and dignified jobs and social protection through income and
11 governmental services (UNMP 2005). Substantially more environmental concerns (UNDP 2007)
12 appear in HS reports (UNDP 2004; World Bank 2007); food and livelihood issues (IBRD/WB
13 2007; World Bank 2007); peace and conflict resolution (UNESCO, 2002), and on the regional level
14 new actors and triggering situations are analysed (BID 2007). The five lost decades of development
15 and the increase of poor people worldwide is reorienting the discussion also towards ethical
16 concerns.

17 GECHS (Matthew/Fraser 2002) has linked social vulnerability (Birkman 2006) with a loss of
18 wealth as a result of the increasing and more severe disasters (MunichRe 2005). UNEP (2004)
19 included the potential conflict situation due to scarce and polluted resources, and the chronic
20 neglect of governments in poor countries (IFRC-RCS 2006, 2007). Economic concerns were widely
21 debated when the Stern Report (2006) appeared, and critics in favour and against obliged the
22 UNFCCC (2007) in Vienna to quantify future investments for mitigation and adaptation. After the
23 appearance of the IPCC reports (2007, 2007a) and the G-8 Meeting in Heiligendamm (2007)⁷, ES
24 studies deepened in the transversal process of interrelated social problems with the environment⁸
25 (UNEP-PCAU 2004), but few gender-related issues, mostly without any implicit reference to
26 security (United Nations, 2006a; WECF 2006) were discussed. Diverse publications searched for
27 protection of vulnerable social groups (youth, gender, minus valid, elderly; Villagrán 2006; UNDP
28 2007), animals, coral reefs, and specific ecosystems such as the dry tropical forests, whenever the
29 GS aspect was missing. Nevertheless, an integral concept, linking HS, GS, and ES is still missing,
30 particularly when risks inherent in the model of development are growing (Beck 2007).

31 The combined *Human, Gender, and Environmental Security* (HUGE) concept will contribute more
32 both analytically (as a scientific tool for analysis) but also by putting new concerns on the policy
33 agenda (as a policy tool for action by social movements, NGOs, as well as by governments and
34 international organizations) than the three isolated HS, ES, and GS concepts introduced above. As
35 discussed before, HUGE relies on a wider gender concept and includes other vulnerable groups
36 with a human-centred focus on ES challenges as well as peace-building and gender equity (Oswald
37 2001, 2004, 2006). As 'GS' is still in incipient concept, it was necessary to explain the historical
38 evolution and conceptual components that permitted the creation of a GS reflection with some solid
39 theoretical bases.

40 The historical evolution of the constituent elements also revealed the deepening and widening
41 analysis of GS from socio-psychological identity concerns, to gift-giving, ecofeminism and social

⁷“G-8 Meeting in Heiligendamm, Germany on 8 June 2007”; at: <<http://www.g-8.de/Webs/G8/EN/G8Summit/SummitDocuments/summit-documents.html>>.

⁸ The concept of sustainability, as a base of ES, had from the Brundtland Report on a clear social component.

1 movements, where livelihood, food,⁹ health and public security, as well as education and cultural
2 diversity (Stephenson 1992) are interacting. Therefore, the HUGE proposal pretends simultaneously
3 an epistemological critique and a policy advice. It revises several levels¹⁰ and looks from an
4 institutional and a grass-root perspectives. Theoretical and empirical diversity permits on one side a
5 deeper understanding of GS linked up with social deterioration and growing poverty, GEC, and
6 armed conflicts in many countries of the world (Muthien/Taylor 2002). Confronted with increasing
7 risks and threats, multilateral organizations (FAO, UNDP, BID, WB) have launched a discussion on
8 empirical standpoint studies and possible alternatives (Mason/King 2001).

9 A general agreement was crystallized in the *Millennium Development Goals* (MDGs) that was
10 approved unanimously by the member countries of the United Nations. They established specific
11 gender policies, first reversing the present situation of inequality through gender quota as a process
12 of positive discrimination, specifically in rural and traditional societies, where the conventional
13 roles are still very rigid and the process of gender differentiation is still taken for granted (UNMDG
14 2000). But this is not enough. Also in progressive and gender sensitive societies, differences and
15 inequalities exist as socially constructed phenomena and must be eradicated. This means not only
16 reducing the explicit factors of oppression (time, money, preferences), but also to deepen in the
17 social and individual unconsciousness, where psychoanalysis and Marxism both have tried to show
18 the structural disadvantages of women in any existing society (Basu 1995; Muñón 1999; Muriel
19 1982; Oswald 1991; E. García 2004; B. García 1999). This process is challenging the present
20 identity processes, consolidated in mass media and anchored by the existing social representations.

21 In this sense, HUGE reorientates ‘human security’ against structural discrimination processes,
22 where specific governmental policies, institution building, and legal reinforcements should
23 stimulate political and social participation of women, the young, and elders. It deepens GS concerns
24 by transforming existing processes of social representation-building and traditional role assignment,
25 linking them up with HS and ES processes. Empiric research during the last years on disasters in
26 different parts of the world has shown that a higher number of the dead and displaced people are
27 women and girls, but also victims of human trafficking, rape, and sexual exploitation.

28 HUGE focuses on ‘ES’ concerns where a healthy environment and resilience-building for highly
29 vulnerable groups can reduce the impacts of risks associated with hazards. Reinforcing the own
30 resilience through a bottom-up organization and combined with top-down policies effective early
31 warning, preventive evacuation, disaster help, and reconstruction is granted. Thus, social
32 vulnerability¹¹ in the recovery phase can be reduced and nonviolent conflict resolution processes
33 prevent and mitigate civil war situation. In synthesis, HUGE integrates social, environmental,
34 human, and cultural and identity concerns, offering solidarity, resilience, sustainable peace-building,
35 and equity in an increasingly insecure and risky world (Beck 2007).

36 HUGE put on the agenda questions related to internal and external structural inequality and
37 dependency. Linking social movements simultaneously across the international levels (through the
38 internet and web pages) and localities (through myths, symbolic acts, protests and daily struggle),

⁹ Women generate among 60 to 80 per cent of the food in poor homes, and half of the world’s food requirements. In Mexico only 17 per cent of women own land property or have access to agrarian land rights. In Africa women in agriculture represent 33 per cent of the labour force, 70 per cent of the rural daily wages, 60-80 per cent of the subsistence, 100 per cent of the transformation of food, 80 per cent of food storage, 90 per cent of weaving and 60 per cent of the activities of the market, but they only own 2 per cent of communal land rights (FAO 2002).

¹⁰ Through the HUGE concept the patriarchal, violent, and exclusive structures within the family and society are scrutinized and focused to overcome the consolidated gender discrimination, where an alternative ‘femininity’ and ‘masculinity’ establish a field of experimentation, based on equality and mutual cooperation.

¹¹ Immediate and efficient support for isolated regions affected by social and natural disasters could prevent long-term effects such as famine and violent conflicts (Denov 2005).

1 the associative function of the anchorage is guaranteed and the processes of communication can be
2 expanded. From this process of micro-genesis onward it is feasible to consolidate a wider social
3 identity, motivating the participants to plan, participate, and develop creatively alternatives, taking
4 as social norms the unconformity against the established model and their methods of domination,
5 violence, discrimination, and exclusion. Once social facts have been transformed into normative
6 and practical processes of alternatives, the structure of social representations is changing in daily
7 life. Simultaneously, in different parts of the world diverse processes of autonomy and political
8 alternation (Bolivia, Venezuela, South Africa, and Liberia) are arising and are able to consolidate
9 participative and more equal models of societies.

10 The HUGE concept is therefore based on a sustainable culture of peace, but goes a step further by
11 including widened security concerns (ES and HS), that were discussed in April 2007 for the first
12 time in the Security Council. Thus, HUGE complements the top-down policy approach on official
13 human security approaches (UNDP 1994) by extending the traditional scope of security, the actors
14 (also including grass-root perspectives), the referent objects and institutions, and the sectors of
15 security concepts (water, seeds, gender). Consequently, a *horizontal widening* from national
16 military security to political, economic; social, environmental security; a *vertical deepening* from
17 'state' to 'human' and 'gender' security as well as from 'national' upward to 'regional', 'global'
18 and downward to 'societal', 'local' and 'grass-root' security; and a *sectoralization* from arms and
19 military industry to energy, food, health, water, and livelihood security is included (Oswald/Brauch
20 2008: 941-942).

21 **9. Conclusions**

22 As population and environmental stresses increase conflicts and struggles about natural resources
23 (Gleditsch 1997; Oswald 2006, 2006a, 2008b; 2008c), complex strategies are required from
24 governments and international organizations, but also from all organized groups at grass-root level
25 to prevent, mitigate, and resolve them. Thus, the interrelationship of HS, GS, and ES is not simply a
26 sum of three security concepts with their proper development; HUGE is more than the sum. HUGE
27 links together in theoretical terms the social, physical, and ideological components of the three
28 concepts, establishes levels of analysis with chaotic system and sub-system relations, and revises
29 the capacity of the system consistence by self-regulation. In policy terms it orientates the proposals
30 in the direction of a desirable future for majorities, but especially for the highly socially vulnerable.
31 The utopia is a decentralized, diverse, sustainable world with equity and dignity, where ecofeminist
32 and ecoindigenist paradigms care for humanity and nature.

33 Growing complexities during Anthropocene are impeding the prediction of future scenarios and
34 risks (Beck 2007) that are growing exponentially and in direct relation to the non-action and
35 immobility of powerful nations (Stern 2006; UNFCCC 2007). The theoretical and ethical
36 parameters are clear (Brown 2005). What is missing is an agreement of action (Post-2012) where all
37 nations, social groups, and levels of society are co-ordinately involved and create a multicultural,
38 diverse, and sustainable development for everybody. This means that nations with historical
39 accumulation of greenhouse gases and high technological and economic development (USA, EU,
40 Australia, and Canada) are historically and morally obliged to support poor nations in their efforts
41 to adapt to GEC. A diverse world implies also political and cultural diversity, able to establish
42 fragile equilibria and to generate nonviolent conflict resolution processes that can be reinforced by
43 peace-building and prevention in conflict-prone regions.

44 On the policy side, horizontal interchange among social movements, organizations, and experiences
45 could strengthen the empowerment of the vulnerable. Solidarity with the poorest countries and
46 social groups, financial aid, debt reductions, and genuine support for development (Sachs 2005) are
47 pillars for sustainable peace (Oswald 2008, 2008c), able to reduce threats and fears, and to

1 strengthen the HUGE perspective. The confluence and diversity of different strategies, ideological
2 and political struggles and activities, share common basic ethical principles such as plurality,
3 diversity, equity, justice, sustainability, and social equality. Globalization with a human face, social
4 integration, gender equity, peace-building, nonviolent conflict resolution, environmental care, and
5 risk reduction can be achieved by flexible structure and alliance.

6 Respect for diversity, voices of the voiceless, and empowering the socially vulnerable opens more
7 than survival and resistance-building processes. Understanding of root causes, new threats of GEC
8 and diverse experiences are permitting new alliances and alternative grass-root strategies which
9 links up with top-down peaceful conflict resolution, environmental care and genuine social
10 development, where traditional technologies merge with modern ones. Locally created dignified
11 employment can reduce migration and informal labour market, where gift-giving economy
12 (Vaughan 1997) is strengthening also international solidarity in case of disasters.

13 Less violence and more cooperation means that the hard security and related sectors of the military
14 and police can be trained for civil protection and disaster management, enabling them to guard
15 citizens from hazard impacts by reinforcing early warning, evacuation, and rebuilding processes.
16 Arms complexes and research can be transformed into the creation of sustainable energy. New
17 investments in education and culture would help to consolidate a sustainable development process
18 with environmental restoration in high-risk areas (islands, coastal areas, coral reef, mangroves,
19 forests, savannas). This would reduce threats and consolidate security in hazard-prone regions,
20 where conscious communities and social groups are enabled to create resistance and resilience.
21 Bringing together human, environmental, and gender security with peace-building and risk
22 reduction, the concept of the “Anthropocene suggests the interconnection of human and ecological
23 matters [which] needs to be understood in a way that transcends the divisions between the natural
24 and the human that have structured thinking about security and especially identity since the
25 emergence of modernity. We are not on earth; we are part of an ecosystem we are changing.”
26 (Dalby/Brauch/Oswald 2008).

27 The positive outcomes of these processes create larger ‘freedom from fear’, ‘from want’, and ‘from
28 hazard impacts’, consolidating peaceful behaviour that is supported creatively by active and equal
29 participation of women (Kameri-Mbote/Anyango Oduor 2008) and children (UNICEF 2000),
30 bringing new energy to decentralized developing models that can consolidate nonviolent daily
31 interaction. Emerging conflicts get resolved through negotiation and conciliation; where the vul-
32 nerable receive an opportunity to express their concerns and the solutions are proposed in equal
33 terms, offering the conflicting parts as a win-win opportunity.

34 Physical and structural violence is inherent in the present highly competitive free market system and
35 its present mechanisms of regressive globalization. The Socialist utopia was destroyed by a
36 repressive and bureaucratic communist regime in the USSR. Which utopia is left to develop ethic
37 principles, communitarian responsibility, gender visibilization and environmentally sustainable
38 development, in order to induce a ‘postmodern democracy based on consensus’, with equity, real
39 citizen representation, and quality of life? The history of wars, domination, and destruction brought
40 poverty and death; will such an emerging civilization guarantee diverse, just, equitable, and sustain-
41 able coexistence, with tasking care for the vulnerable? This is a challenge for the diverse actors of
42 the 21st century, and HUGE locally and globally developed can find concrete answers to these new
43 challenges.

44 **10. References**

45 Alcoff, Linda, 1996: *Real Knowing: New Versions of Coherence Epistemology* (Ithaca: Cornell
46 University Press).

- 1 Alcott, Linda; Potter, Elisabeth (Eds.), 1993: *Feminist Epidemiologies* (New York: Routledge).
- 2 Baldwin, David A., 1993: *Neorealism and Neoliberalism. The Contemporary Debate* (New York:
3 Columbia University Press).
- 4 Bar Din, Marianne, 1991: *Los niños de Santa Úrsula. Un estudio psicosocial de la infancia*
5 (Mexico, D.F.: UNAM).
- 6 Barad, Karen, 1999: "Agential Realism: Feminist Interventions in Understanding Scientific
7 Practices", in: Biagioli, Mario (Ed.). *The Science Studies Reader* (New York: Routledge): 1-11.
- 8 Bartra, Elí (Ed.), 1998: *Debates en torno a una metodología feminista* (Mexico, D.F.: PUEG-
9 UNAM, UAM).
- 10 Basu, Amrita (Ed.), 1995: *The Challenge of Local Feminism: Women's Movements in Global*
11 *Perspective* (New Delhi: Pauls Press).
- 12 Beck, Ulrich, 2007: *Risikogesellschaft, auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne* (Frankfurt a.M.: Ed.
13 Surkamp).
- 14 Bellamy, Alex J.; McDonald, Matt, 2002: "The Utility of Human Security': Which Humans? What
15 Security?", in: *Security Dialogue*, 33, 3 (September): 373-377.
- 16 BID, 2007: *Informe 2008. Los de afuera? Patronos cambiantes de exclusión en América Latina y El*
17 *Caribe* (Cambridge: BID).
- 18 Birkman, Jörn (Ed.), 2006: *Measuring vulnerability to natural hazards. Towards disaster resilient*
19 *societies* (Tokyo: United Nations University Press).
- 20 Bordo, Susan, 1990: "Feminism, Postmodernism and Gender-Scepticism", in: Nicholson, Linda J.
21 (Ed.), *Feminism/Postmodernism* (New York: Routledge).
- 22 Bordo, Susan, 1990: "Feminism, Postmodernism and Gender-Scepticism", in: Nicholson, L. (Ed.):
23 *Feminism/Postmodernism* (New York: Routledge).
- 24 Brauch, Hans Günter, 2005: *Environment and Human Security, InterSecTions 2* (Bonn: UNU-EHS).
- 25 Brauch, Hans Günter, 2005a: *Threats, challenges, vulnerabilities and risks of environmental and*
26 *human security*, UNU-EHS, Source 1 (Bonn: UNU-EHS).
- 27 Brauch, Hans Günter, 2008: "Introduction: Globalization and Environmental Challenges: Recon-
28 ceptualizing Security in the 21st Century", in: Brauch, Hans Günter; Oswald Spring, Úrsula;
29 Mesjasz, Czeslaw; Grin, John; Dunay, Pal; Behera, Navnita Chadha; Chourou, Béchir; Kameri-
30 Mbote, Patricia; Liotta, P.H. (Eds.): *Globalization and Environmental Challenges:*
31 *Reconceptualizing Security in the 21st Century*. Hexagon Series on Human and Environmental
32 Security and Peace, vol. 3 (Berlin – Heidelberg – New York: Springer-Verlag): 27-43.
- 33 Brown, Doald; Tuana, Nancy; Averill, Marilyn; Baer, Paul; Born, Rubens; Lessa Brandão, Carlos
34 Eduardo; Frodeman, Robert; Hogenhuis, Christiaan; Heyd, Thomas; Lemons, John; McKinstry,
35 Robert; Lutes, Mark; Müller, Benito; Gonzalez Miguez, José Domingos; Munasinghe, Mohan;
36 Muylaert de Araujo, Maria Silvia; Nobre, Carlos; Ott, Konrad; Paavola, Jouni; Pires de Campos,
37 Christiano; Pinguelli Rosa, Luiz; Jon Rosales; Rose, Adam; Wells, Edward; Westra, Laura,
38 2005: *White Paper on the Ethical Dimensions of Climate Change* (Penn State: Rock Ethics
39 Institute).
- 40 Butler, Judith, 1990: *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York:
41 Routledge).
- 42 Buzan, Barry; Wæver, Ole; de Wilde, Jaap, 1998: *Security. A New Framework for Analysis*
43 (Boulder: Rienner).
- 44 Castells, Manuel, 2002: *La edad de la Información* (Madrid: Taurus).
- 45 Chodorow, Nancy, 1978: *The Reproduction of Mothering* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- 46 Chomsky, Noam, 1998: "A Century Later", *Peace Review*, 10,3 (September): 313-321
- 47 CLOC [Coordinadora Latinoamericana de Organizaciones del Campo], 2004: *Semillas patrimonio*
48 *del pueblo al servicio de la humanidad* (Guatemala: CLOC).
- 49 CLOC [Coordinadora Latinoamericana de Organizaciones del Campo]; Vía Campesina;
50 ANAMURI, 2002: *21 Desafíos para las Mujeres Rurales, Indígenas y Pescadoras* (Santiago de
51 Chile: CLOC, ANAMURI).

- 1 Collins, Harry; Pinch, Trevor, ²1998: “A New Window on the Universe: The Non-Detection of
2 Gravitational Radiation”, in: Collins, Harry (Ed.). *The Golem: What You Should Know about*
3 *Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- 4 Crutzen, Paul J.; Stoermer, Eugene F., 2000: “The Anthropocene”, in: *IGBP Newsletter*, 41: 17-18.
- 5 D’Eaubonne, Françoise, 1974 : *Le Féminisme ou la Mort* (Paris: Pierre Horay).
- 6 Dalby, Simon, 2008 : “Security and Environmental Linkages Revisited”, in: Brauch, Hans Günter;
7 Oswald Spring, Úrsula; Mesjasz, Czeslaw; Grin, John; Dunay, Pal; Behera, Navnita Chadha;
8 Chourou, Béchir; Kameri-Mbote, Patricia; Liotta, P.H. (Eds.): *Globalization and Environmental*
9 *Challenges: Reconceptualizing Security in the 21st Century*. Hexagon Series on Human and
10 Environmental Security and Peace, vol. 3 (Berlin – Heidelberg – New York: Springer-Verlag):
11 165-172.
- 12 Dalby, Simon; Brauch, Hans Günter; Oswald Spring, Úrsula, 2008: “Towards a Fourth Phase of
13 Environmental Security”, in: Brauch, Hans Günter; Grin, John; Mesjasz, Czeslaw;
14 Krummenacher, Heinz; Chadha Behera, Navnita; Chourou, Béchir; Oswald Spring, Ursula;
15 Kameri-Mbote, Patricia (Eds.): *Facing Global Environmental Change: Environmental, Human,*
16 *Energy, Food, Health and Water Security Concepts*. Hexagon Series on Human and Envi-
17 ronmental Security and Peace, vol. 4 (Berlin – Heidelberg – New York – Hong Kong – London –
18 Milan – Paris – Tokyo: Springer-Verlag, 2008), i.p.
- 19 Diamond, Jared, Irene; Orenstein, Gloria Feman, 1990: *The Emergence of Ecofeminism* (San
20 Francisco: Sierra Club).
- 21 Doise, W., 1986: *Levels of Explanation in Social Psychology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University
22 Press).
- 23 Dore, Elizabeth, 1997: *Gender Politics in Latin America* (New York: Monthly Review Press).
- 24 Dore, Elizabeth; Molyneux, Maxine (Eds.), 2000: *Hidden Histories of Gender and the State in*
25 *Latin America* (Oxford: Duke University Press).
- 26 Dos Santos, Marina, 2004: “Brasil: Raíces del MST”, in: *ALAI* 385, 26 May: 14-17.
- 27 Dos Santos, Theotonio, 1978: *Imperialismo y dependencia* (Mexico, D.F.: Ed. Era).
- 28 Duveen, Gerard, 1997: “Psychological Developmental as a Social Process”, in: Smith, L., Dockerell,
29 J.; Tomlinson, P. (Eds.): *Piaget, Vygotsky and Beyond* (Thousand Oaks: Sage).
- 30 Duveen, Gerard; Lloyd, Barbara (Eds.), 1990: *Social representations and the development of*
31 *knowledge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- 32 European Union, 2007: “Glossaire de termes sur l’égalité entre les femmes et les hommes”, at:
33 <lacitoyennete.com/magazine/mots/glossaireegaliteHF.php>.
- 34 FAO [Food and Agricultural Organization of the UN], 2006: *Gender and Agrobiodiversity* (Rome:
35 FAO).
- 36 Flores Palacios, Fátima, 2001: *Psicología Social y Género* (Mexico, D.F.: Mac Graw Hill).
- 37 Forrester, Viviane, 1999: *El Horror Económico* (Mexico, D.F.: FCE).
- 38 Freire, Paulo, 1998: *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Continuum).
- 39 García Plutarco, Emilio, 2004: “Conflictos agrarios y pueblos indios: de la contrarreforma agraria a
40 los llamados focos rojos”, in: Oswald Spring, Úrsula (Ed.): *Resolución noviolenta de conflictos*
41 *en sociedades indígenas y minorías* (Mexico, D.F.: Coltlax, CLAIP, Fundación IPRA, F. Böll):
42 261-274.
- 43 Garcia, Brígida (Ed.), 1999: *Mujer, género y población en México* (Mexico, D.F.: El Colegio de
44 México, SOMEDE).
- 45 Giménez, Gilberto, 1999: *Identidades Religiosas y Sociales en México* (México, D.F.: UNAM).
- 46 Gleditsch, Nils Peter (Ed.), 1997: *Conflicts and the Environment* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic
47 Publisher).
- 48 Gramsci, Antonio, 1977: *Cuadernos de la Cárcel* (Mexico, D.F.: Juan Pablos Eds.).
- 49 Habermas, Jürgen, 1995: *Problemas de Legitimación en el Capitalismo Tardío* (Buenos Aires:
50 Amorrortu Editores).
- 51 Habermas, Jürgen, 2000: *La constelación posnacional: ensayos políticos* (Barcelona: Paidós).

- 1 Haraway, Dona, 1988: "Situated knowledge: The science question in feminism and the privileged
2 of partial perspective", in: *Feminist Studies*, 14 (Fall): 575-599.
- 3 Haraway, Dona, 1997: *Modest_Witness@Second_Millennium.FemaleMan@Meets_ OncoMouse*
4 (New York and London: Routledge).
- 5 Harding, Sandra, 1986: *The Science Question on Feminism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).
- 6 Harding, Sandra, 1988: *Is Science Multicultural? Postcolonialism, Feminism, and Epistemologies*
7 (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).
- 8 Harding, Sandra, 1991: *Whose Science Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives* (Ithaca:
9 Cornell University Press).
- 10 Harding, Sandra; Hintikka, Merrill B. (Eds.), 1991: *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on*
11 *Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science* (Dordrecht: D. Reidel
12 Pub.).
- 13 Hartsock, Nancy C. M., 1983: "The feminist standpoint: Developing the ground for a specially
14 feminist historical materialism", in: Harding, Sandra; Hintikka, Merrill B. (Eds.): *Discovering*
15 *Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology, and Philosophy of*
16 *Science* (Dordrecht: D. Reidel Pub.): 283-310.
- 17 Hartsock, Nancy C. M., 1983a: *Money, Sex and Power: Toward a Feminist Historical Materialism*
18 (New York: Longman).
- 19 Hartsock, Nancy C. M., 1988: *The feminist standpoint revisited and other essays* (Boulder:
20 Westview Press).
- 21 Hartsock, Nancy C. M., 1993: "Feminist Challenges to Political Science." in: Finifter, Ada (ed.),
22 *The State of the Discipline II*, (Washington, DC: APSA) 55-76.
- 23 Herzlich, Paul; Graham Dorothy, 1993: *The cast Report* (Oxford: University of Oxford Press).
- 24 IBRD [International Bank for Reconstruction and Development]; WB [The World Bank], 2007:
25 *World Development Report: Agriculture for Development 2008* (Washington: IBRD/WB).
- 26 IFAD, 2005: "Engendered Mobilization, the Key to Livelihood Security: IFAD's Experience in
27 South Asia (updated 15 March 2007)"; at: <[http://www.ifad.org/gender/thematic/southasia](http://www.ifad.org/gender/thematic/southasia/south_2.htm)
28 [/south_2.htm](http://www.ifad.org/gender/thematic/southasia/south_2.htm)>.
- 29 IFRC-RCS [International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies], 2006: *World*
30 *Disaster Report. Focus on neglected crises* (Geneva: International Federation of Red Cross and
31 Red Crescent Societies).
- 32 IFRC-RCS [International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies], 2007: *World*
33 *Disaster Report. Focus on discrimination* (Geneva: International Federation of Red Cross and
34 Red Crescent Societies).
- 35 Illich, Ivan, 1976: *Imprisoned in the global classroom* (London: Writers and Readers Publ. Corp.).
- 36 IPCC, 2007: *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis* (Geneva: IPCC).
- 37 IPCC, 2007a: *Climate Change 2007: Climate Change Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability*
38 (Geneva: IPCC).
- 39 Kaldor, Mary, Anheier, Helmut; Glasius, Larlies (Eds.), 2003: *Global Civil Society 2003* (Oxford:
40 Oxford University Press).
- 41 Kameri-Mbote, Patricia; Anyango Oduor, Jacinta, 2008: "Following god's constitution: The gender
42 dimensions in the Ogiek claim to Mau Forest Complex", i.p.
- 43 Krieger, N. A., 2001: "Glossary for Social Epidemiology", in: *Journal of Epidemiological*
44 *Community Health*, 55: 693-700.
- 45 Larraín, Sara, 2005: "Perspectiva ecologista y perspectiva de género", in: *Revista Polis* 3,9; at:
46 <www.revistapolis.cl/9/parad.htm>.
- 47 Lloyd, Barbara; Duveen, Gerard, 1992: *Gender Identities and Education: The Impact of Schooling*
48 (New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf).
- 49 Longino, Helen, 1990: *Science as Social Knowledge: Values and Objectivity in Scientific Inquiry*
50 (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- 51 Longino, Helen, 1993: "Economics for Whom?", in: Farber, Marianne; Nelson, Julie (Eds.): *Beyond*
52 *Economic Man: Essays in Feminism and Economics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

- 1 Longino, Helen, 2001: “Subjects, Power and Knowledge: Description and Prescription in Feminist
2 Philosophies”, in: *Conference in Gender Syllabus*, 6 November.
- 3 López Austin, Alfredo, 2004: *Cuerpo Humano e Ideología. Las Concepciones de los Antiguas*
4 *Nahuas* (Mexico, D.F.: IIA-UNAM).
- 5 Mason, Andrew; King, Elizabeth, 2001: *Engendering development through gender equality in*
6 *rights, resources, and voice*, A World Bank Policy Research Report (Washington: World Bank):
7 at: [http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/
8 main?pagePK=64193027&piPK=64187937&theSitePK=523679&menuPK=64187510&search
9 MenuPK=64187283&siteName=WDS&entityID=000094946_01020805393496](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/main?pagePK=64193027&piPK=64187937&theSitePK=523679&menuPK=64187510&searchMenuPK=64187283&siteName=WDS&entityID=000094946_01020805393496).
- 10 Mathews, Jessica Tuchman, 1989: “Redefining Security”, in: *Foreign Affairs*, 68,2 (Spring): 162-
11 177.
- 12 Matthew, Richard A.; Fraser, Leah, 2002: *Global Environmental Change and Human Security:*
13 *Conceptual and Theoretical Issues* (Irvine, CA: GECHS Program Office); at:
14 www.gechs.uci.edu/gechsprdrafinal.pdf.
- 15 Melillo, Aldo; Suárez Ojeda, Elbio Néstor; Rodríguez, Daniel (Eds.), 2004: *Resiliencia y*
16 *Subjetividad. Los Ciclos de la Vida* (Buenos Aires: Paidós).
- 17 Melucci, Alberto, 1996. “The Process of Collective Identity”, in: Johnston, Hank; Klandermans,
18 Bert (Eds.): *Social Movements and Culture. Social Movements, Protest and Contention*, vol. 4,
19 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).
- 20 Mies, Maria, 1998: *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale* (Melbourne: Zed).
- 21 Møller, Bjørn, 2003: “National, Societal and Human Security Discussion. A Case Study of the
22 Israeli-Palestine Conflict”, in: Brauch, Hans Günter; Liotta, P.H.; Marquina, Antonio; Rogers,
23 Paul F.; Selim, Mohammad El-Sayed (Eds.). *Security and Environment in the Mediterranean;*
24 *Conceptualising Security and Environmental Conflicts* (Heidelberg: Ed. Springer): 277-288.
- 25 Moscovici, Serge, 1976: *Social Influence and Social Change* (Cambridge: Academic Press).
- 26 Moscovici, Serge, 2000: “The history and actuality of social representations”, in: Duveen, Gerard
27 (Ed.): *Social Representations. Explorations in Social Psychology* (Cambridge: Polity, CUP).
- 28 MunichRe, 2005: *Weather catastrophes and climate change – Is there still hope for us?* (Munich:
29 Munich Re/Pg Verlag).
- 30 Muñón Pablos, Julia, 1999: *Women in Mexico. A Past Unveiled* (Austin: University of Texas).
- 31 Muriel, Josefina, 1982: *Cultura Feminina Novohispana* (Mexico, D.F.: UNAM).
- 32 Muthien, Bernadette; Taylor, I., 2002: ‘Executive Outcomes: The Return of Mercenaries and
33 Private Armies’, in: Hall, Rodney Bruce; Biersteker, Thomas J. (Eds.): *The Emergence of*
34 *Private Authority in Global Governance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- 35 Myers, Norman, 1989: “Environment and Security”, in: *Foreign Policy*, 74 (Spring): 23-41.
- 36 Nicholson, Linda J., 1990: *Feminism/Postmodernism* (New York: Routledge).
- 37 Nikolic-Ristanovic, Vesna, 2004: “Post-communism: women’s lives in transition”, in: *Feminist*
38 *Review*, 76,2-4: 2-5.
- 39 Oswald Spring, Úrsula (Ed.), 1991: *Estrategias de Supervivencia en la Ciudad de México*
40 (Cuernavaca, México: CRIM-UNAM).
- 41 Oswald Spring, Úrsula, 1992: “Sistema Alimentario y Desarrollo Social”, in: González Casanova,
42 Pablo (Ed.): *Diseño de Investigación y la Metodología en Ciencias Sociales* (Mexico, D.F.: Ed.
43 Centro de Investigaciones Interdisciplinarias en Humanidades /UNAM): 23-45.
- 44 Oswald Spring, Úrsula, 2001: “Sustainable Development with Peace Building and Human Security”,
45 in: Tolba, M.K. (Ed.). *Our Fragile World. Challenges and Opportunities for Sustainable*
46 *Development, Forerunner to the Encyclopaedia of Life Support System* (Oxford: Oxford-EOLSS
47 Publisher): vol.1: 873-916.
- 48 Oswald Spring, Úrsula, 2002: *Estudios para la paz, democracia y seguridad en América Latina*
49 (Mexico, D.F.: CRIM-UNAM, CLAIP, Coltlax, Böll Foundation).
- 50 Oswald Spring, Úrsula, 2002a: “Transgénicos: Una panacea o amenaza”, in: Heineke, Corinna
51 (Ed.): *La Vida en Venta: Transgénicos, Patentes y Biodiversidad* (El Salvador: Fundación Heinrich
52 Böll): 51-87.

- 1 Oswald Spring, Úrsula, 2003: “La Mujer y el Hombre: Mitos y Realidades”, in: Raquel Chávez
2 Torres (ed.) (Mexico, D.F.: Ed. Médica Panamericana): 76-93.
- 3 Oswald Spring, Úrsula (Ed.), 2004: *Resolución noviolenta de conflictos en sociedades indígenas y*
4 *minorías* (Mexico, D.F.: Coltlax, CLAIP, Fundación IPRA, F. Böll).
- 5 Oswald Spring, Úrsula, 2006: “International Security, Peace, Development, and Environment”, in:
6 Oswald Spring, Úrsula (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Life Support System* (Oxford: Oxford-EOLSS
7 Publisher), vol.39 [published on line only].
- 8 Oswald Spring, Úrsula, 2006a: “Calentamiento Global, Conflictos Hídricos y Mecanismos de
9 Resolución”, in: *Coyuntura 130* (November-December): 3-21.
- 10 Oswald Spring, Úrsula, 2006a: “Políticas Alimentarias”, in: Calva, José Luís (Ed.). *Seminario*
11 *Interdisciplinario sobre Políticas Alternativas en México*, Vol. Social Policy (México, D.F.:
12 Taurus/ UNAM, i.p.).
- 13 Oswald Spring, Úrsula, 2007: *Climate Change: A Gender Perspective on Human and State Security*
14 *Approaches to Global Security, Concept Paper* (New York: International Women Leaders’
15 Global Security Summit); at: <[http://womenandglobalse-](http://womenandglobalsecurity.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=22&Itemid=33)
16 [curity.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=22&Itemid=33](http://womenandglobalsecurity.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=22&Itemid=33)> and at: <
17 http://www.afes-press.de/pdf/Oswald_Climate_Change_gender_perspective_abs.pdf>.
- 18 Oswald Spring, Úrsula 2008: “Globalization from Below: Social Movements and Altermundism-
19 Reconceptualizing Security from a Latin American Perspective”, in: Brauch, Hans Günter;
20 Oswald Spring, Úrsula; Mesjasz, Czeslaw; Grin, John; Dunay, Pal; Behera, Navnita Chadha;
21 Chourou, Béchir; Kameri-Mbote, Patricia; Liotta, P.H. (Eds.): *Globalization and Environmental*
22 *Challenges: Reconceptualizing Security in the 21st Century*. Hexagon Series on Human and
23 Environmental Security and Peace, vol. 3 (Berlin – Heidelberg – New York: Springer-Verlag):
24 379-402.
- 25 Oswald Spring, Úrsula, 2008a: *Gender and Disasters. Human, Gender and Environmental Security:*
26 *A HUGE Challenge*, Intersection no./2008 (Bonn: UNU-EHS).
- 27 Oswald Spring, Úrsula, 2008b: “Oriental, European and Indigenous Thinking on Peace in Latin
28 America”, in: Brauch, Hans Günter; Oswald Spring, Úrsula; Mesjasz, Czeslaw; Grin, John;
29 Dunay, Pal; Behera, Navnita Chadha; Chourou, Béchir; Kameri-Mbote, Patricia; Liotta, P.H.
30 (Eds.): *Globalization and Environmental Challenges: Reconceptualizing Security in the 21st*
31 *Century*. Hexagon Series on Human and Environmental Security and Peace, vol. 3 (Berlin –
32 Heidelberg – New York: Springer-Verlag): 175-193.
- 33 Oswald Spring, Úrsula, 2008c: “Peace and Environment: Towards a Sustainable Peace as Seen from
34 the South”, in: Brauch, Hans Günter; Oswald Spring, Úrsula; Mesjasz, Czeslaw; Grin, John;
35 Dunay, Pal; Behera, Navnita Chadha; Chourou, Béchir; Kameri-Mbote, Patricia; Liotta, P.H.
36 (Eds.): *Globalization and Environmental Challenges: Reconceptualizing Security in the 21st*
37 *Century*. Hexagon Series on Human and Environmental Security and Peace, vol. 3 (Berlin –
38 Heidelberg – New York: Springer-Verlag): 113-126.
- 39 Oswald Spring, Úrsula; Brauch, Hans Günter, 2008: “Reconceptualizing Security in the 21st
40 Century: conclusions for Research and Policy-making”, in: Brauch, Hans Günter; Oswald Spring,
41 Úrsula; Mesjasz, Czeslaw; Grin, John; Dunay, Pal; Behera, Navnita Chadha; Chourou, Béchir;
42 Kameri-Mbote, Patricia; Liotta, P.H. (Eds.): *Globalization and Environmental Challenges:*
43 *Reconceptualizing Security in the 21st Century*. Hexagon Series on Human and Environmental
44 Security and Peace, vol. 3 (Berlin – Heidelberg – New York: Springer-Verlag): 941-954.
- 45 Persram, Nalini, 1994: “Politicizing the *Féminine*, Globalizing the Feminist”, in: *Alternatives*, 19,3
46 (Summer): 275-314.
- 47 Piaget, Jean, 1950: *The Psychology of Intelligence* (London: Routledge – Kegan Paul).
- 48 Pickup, Francine, 2001: *Ending Violence against Women: A Challenge for Development and*
49 *Humanitarian Work* (Oxford: Oxfam Publication).
- 50 Rehn, Elizabeth; Johnson Sirleaf, Ellen, 2002: *Women, war, peace: The Independent Experts’*
51 *Assessment*, Vol.1 (New York: UNIFEM).

- 1 Riviere, Margarita; Clara de Cominges, 2001: *El Tabú. Madre e Hija frente a la Regla* (Barcelona:
2 Planeta).
- 3 Ruddick, Sara, 1995: *Maternal Thinking. Towards a Policy of Peace* (Boston: Beacon Press).
- 4 Shiva, Vandana, 1993: *Monocultivos y biotecnología* (Montevideo: Instituto del Tercer Mundo).
- 5 Smith, Dorothy, 1974: “Women’s perspective as a radical critique of sociology”, in: *Sociological*
6 *Inquiry*, 44,1: 7-13.
- 7 Steffen, W.; Sanderson, A.; Tyson, P. D.; Jäger, J.; Matson, P. A.; Moore III, B.; Oldfield, F.;
8 Richardson, K.; Schellnhuber, H. J.; Turner, B. L.; Wasson, R. J., 2004: *Global Change and the*
9 *Earth System. A Planet under Pressure*. The IGBP Series (Berlin: Springer Verlag).
- 10 Stephenson, Caroline 1992: “New conceptions of security and their implications for means and
11 methods”, in: Teheranian, Katharine; Teheranian, Majid (Eds.). *Restructuring for World Peace: On*
12 *the Threshold of the Twenty-First Century* (Creskil, NJ: Hampton Press): 47-61.
- 13 Stern, Nikolas, 2006: *Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change*, Report 30 October
14 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- 15 Stuart, Andrea, 1990: “Feminism: Dead or Alive”, in: Rutherford, Jonathan (Ed.) *Identity –*
16 *Community – Culture – Difference* (London: Lawrence & Wishart).
- 17 Szasz, Ivonne; Susana Lerner (Eds.), 1998: *Sexualidades en México: Algunas Aproximaciones*
18 *desde la Perspectiva de las Ciencias Sociales* (Mexico, D.F.: El Colegio de México).
- 19 The Economist. 2007, “Reaching for a Renaissance. Special Report on China and its Regions”, in:
20 The Economist, 15 August: 1-52.
- 21 Ullman, Richard, 1983: “Redefining Security”, in: *International Security*, 8,1 (issue): 129-123.
- 22 UN [United Nations], 2006: *International Human Rights Instruments* (New York: United Nations
23 Publishing Section).
- 24 UN [United Nations], 2006a: *The World’s Women 2005. Progress in Statistics* (New York: United
25 Nations Publishing Section).
- 26 UN Millennium Project, 2005: *Who’s Got the Power: Transforming Health Systems for Women and*
27 *Children. Task Force on Child Health and Maternal Health* (London - Sterling: Earthscan).
- 28 UNDP, 1993-2005: *Human Development Report 1993-2005* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- 29 UNDP, 2007: *UNDP Human Development Report 2007/2008. Fighting climate change: Human*
30 *solidarity in a divided world* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- 31 UNDP, 2007a: *Climate Change Adaptation: Knowledge Needs Survey* (New York: UNDP); at:
32 <[http://www.energyandenvironment.undp.org/undp/index.cfm?module=Library&page=](http://www.energyandenvironment.undp.org/undp/index.cfm?module=Library&page=Document&DocumentID=6508)
33 [Document&DocumentID=6508](http://www.energyandenvironment.undp.org/undp/index.cfm?module=Library&page=Document&DocumentID=6508)>.
- 34 UNEP 2004: *Understanding Environment, Conflict and Cooperation* (Nairobi: UNEP); at:
35 <<http://www.wilsoncenter.org/topics/pubs/unep.pdf>>.
- 36 UNEP, 2007: *Global Environment Outlook 4. GEO-4* (New York: UNEP); at:
37 <<http://www.earthprint.com/>>.
- 38 UNEP-PCAU, 2004: *Understanding Environment* (New York: UNEP).
- 39 UNESCO, 2002: *Medium-Term Strategy for 2002-2007. Contributing to peace and human*
40 *development in an era of globalization through education, the sciences, culture and*
41 *communication* (Paris: UNESCO).
- 42 UNFCCC, 2007: *Framework Convention on Climate Change. Investment and financial flows*
43 *necessary to respond to climate change*, Vienna, Austria, 23 August, at: <[http:// un-](http://unfccc.int/ghg_emissions_data/items/3800.php)
44 [fccc.int/ghg_emissions_data/items/3800.php](http://unfccc.int/ghg_emissions_data/items/3800.php)>.
- 45 UNFPA, 2004: *The State of World Population 2004: The Cairo Consensus at Ten: Population,*
46 *Reproductive Health and the Global Effort to End Poverty* (New York, UNFPA):
- 47 UNICEF, 2000: *The State of World’s Children 2000* (New York: UNICEF).
- 48 UNIFEM, 2007: *Di no al violencia contra las mujeres*, at: <www.saynotoviolence.org>.
- 49 United Nation Population Division, 1997: *Urban and Rural Areas, 1950-2030. The 1996 Revision*
50 (New York: United Nations).

- 1 UNMDG [United Nations Millennium Development Goals] 2000: Resolution adopted by the
2 General Assembly, 55/2. United Nations Millennium Declaration (New York: UNO) at: <
3 <http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm>>.
- 4 UNMP [United Nations Millennium Project], 2005: *Investing in Development: A Practical Plan to*
5 *Achieve the Millennium Development Goals*, Report to the UN Secretary-General, (London –
6 Sterling: Earthscan).
- 7 Valenzuela, Maria Elena, 1991: “Women under Dictatorship and Military Regime: The Case of
8 Chile”, in: Boulding, Elise; Brigagao, Clovis; Clements, Kevin (Eds.). *Peace Culture and*
9 *Society. Transnational Research and Dialogue* (Boulder: Westview Press): 229-240.
- 10 Vaughan, Genevieve, 1997: *For-Giving: A Feminist Criticisms of Exchange* (Austin: Plain View
11 Press).
- 12 Vaughan, Genevieve, 2004: *The Gift; Il Dono* (Roma: Meltemi/University of Bari), New Serie 8.
- 13 Vía Campesina, 2005: *Agreement on Gender in Via Campesina* (San Paulo: Via Campesina).
- 14 Villagrán de León, Juan Carlos, 2006: *Vulnerability. A Conceptual and Methodological Review*,
15 UNU-EHS, Source 4 (Bonn: UNU-EHS).
- 16 Wæver, Ole, 2000: “The EU as a security actor“, in: Kelstrup, Morten; Williams, Michael C. (Eds.):
17 *International Relations Theory and the Politics of European Integration. Power, Security and*
18 *Community* (London: Routledge).
- 19 Wæver, Ole, 2008: “Peace and Security: Two Evolving Concepts and Their Changing Relationship”,
20 in: Brauch, Hans Günter; Oswald Spring, Úrsula; Mesjasz, Czeslaw; Grin, John; Dunay, Pal;
21 Behera, Navnita Chadha; Chourou, Béchir; Kameri-Mbote, Patricia; Liotta, P.H. (Eds.):
22 *Globalization and Environmental Challenges: Reconceptualizing Security in the 21st Century*.
23 Hexagon Series on Human and Environmental Security and Peace, vol. 3 (Berlin – Heidelberg –
24 New York: Springer-Verlag): 99-112.
- 25 Wæver, Ole, 2008a: “The Changing agenda of Societal Security”, in: Brauch, Hans Günter; Oswald
26 Spring, Úrsula; Mesjasz, Czeslaw; Grin, John; Dunay, Pal; Behera, Navnita Chadha; Chourou,
27 Béchir; Kameri-Mbote, Patricia; Liotta, P.H. (Eds.): *Globalization and Environmental Challen-*
28 *ges: Reconceptualizing Security in the 21st Century*. Hexagon Series on Human and Envi-
29 ronmental Security and Peace, vol. 3 (Berlin – Heidelberg – New York: Springer-Verlag): 581-
30 593.
- 31 Warren, Kay B., 1998: “Indigenous Movements as a Challenge to the Unified Social Movement
32 Paradigm for Guatemala”, in: *Culture of Politics, Politics of Cultures, re-visioning Latin*
33 *American social movements* (Boulder, Col. – Oxford: Westview Press).
- 34 Weber, Max, 1987; *Economía y Sociedad* (Mexico, D.F.: FCE).
- 35 WECF, 2006: Gender and Climate Change. Input from Women to Governments, Feb. 2006; at:
36 <http://www.wecf.de/cms/download/2006/g+cc_article3.9.pdf>.
- 37 Whitehead, Ann; Lockwood, Matthew, 1999: “Gender in the World Bank’s Poverty Assessments:
38 Six Case Studies from Sub-Saharan Africa”; at: <[http://www.blackwell-sy-](http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/links/doi/10.1111/1467-7660.00128/enhancedabs/)
39 [nergy.com/links/doi/10.1111/1467-7660.00128/enhancedabs/](http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/links/doi/10.1111/1467-7660.00128/enhancedabs/)>.
- 40 Wilkinson, Claire, 2007: “The Copenhagen School on Tour in Kyrgystan: Is Securitization Theory
41 Useable Outside Europe?”, in: *Security Dialogue*, .38,1 (March): 5-25.
- 42 Wolfers, Arnold, 1962: “National Security as an Ambiguous Symbol”, in: Wolfers, Arnold:
43 *Discord and Collaboration. Essays on International Politics* (Baltimore: John Hopkins
44 University Press): 147-165.
- 45 World Bank, 1992-2007: *World Bank Development Report 1992-2007* (New York: Oxford
46 University Press).
- 47 Zimmerman, Michael E., 1987: “Feminism, Deep Ecology, and Environmental Ethics”, in:
48 *Environmental Ethics*, 9, 3 (Fall): 195-224.

49