

Against Argumentation: Rhetoric and Embodiment in IO Negotiations

I. Introduction

Gender has become a more prevalent concern in conventional international relations scholarship. Aolain, Haynes, and Cahn's *On the frontlines* and Barbra Lukunka's (2011) research on humanitarian interventions study the importance of considering gender in IO policymaking and implementation; Patterson-Markowitz, Oglesby, and Marston (2012) , as well as Baaz and Stern (2010), focus on the importance of gender when studying transitional justice and international criminal law; and Hudson, Ballif-Spanvill, Caprioli, and Emmett's (2013) *Sex & World Peace* connects micro-level incidents of gender-based violence to macro-level consequences like conflict and war. Still, gender remains a difficult concept to study and incorporate into conventional international relations scholarship, as it is tough to measure and isolate. Moreover, those who do study gender typically focus more on women than on men, disregarding that the study of gender requires a twofold approach with attention to both men *and* women. Because gender is socially constituted, what constitutes a woman is definitionally related to what constitutes a man—each definition is related to the other. Woman represents a particular gender in a given context, and man represents woman's obverse. As such, to effectively study gender, I maintain that one must consider and analyze it as a binary variable. In this paper, I aim to demonstrate that gender is a binary variable that can be revealed and understood through delegates' language in deliberation.

To study gender through language in contemporary negotiations, this paper turns to ancient Roman rhetorical theory, particularly drawing on the concept of *habitus*. Turning to

Ancient rhetorical treatises provides a means of understanding how the body, via the *habitus*, is connected to rhetoric. The *habitus* is a means of understanding how individuals' identities are revealed through rhetoric, that is, the arguments an argument puts forth using their words *and* their bodies. Of specific interest for this paper is the fact that, in ancient thought, rhetoric is a component of one's performance of gender. In ancient rhetorical treatises, we see that orators are taught that they can only successfully persuade if they alter not only their physical presentations of gender, but also the *habitus* that molds the physical. Orators are compelled to perform in both body and speech so that their speeches conform to acceptable social norms of masculinity. The gendered body is intrinsically connected to not only what is understood to constitute rhetoric, but also what makes an orator successful. Using ancient rhetorical theory, then, we have a mode of understanding the connection between one's gendered body and one's policy suggestions, both what the suggestions are and how the suggestions are presented, in negotiations.¹

This paper proceeds in four parts: First, I consider current IR scholarship and political theory scholarship related to gender and rhetoric. While IR scholarship has failed to provide an adequate rhetorical theory, political theory scholarship has pointed to ancient rhetorical theory as a critical resource for studying rhetoric and persuasion. Interestingly, calls to turn to rhetorical theory among theorists does not provide ancient rhetorical theories' focus on the body-rhetoric relationship as a critical reason for studying and using ancient rhetorical theory today.

¹ It is important to note that gender and sex are not the same thing. Valerie Hudson, et. al (2012) identify this difference, noting that "*sex* refers to the biological differences between men and women," and "*gender* refers to the socially defined differences between men and women" (6). While the distinction made by Hudson, et. al, is indeed helpful and useful, feminist scholarship from outside conventional IR research provides a better understanding of the difference between sex and gender, and, for the purpose of this paper, a better understanding of what gender is. While Hudson proposes gender is something that is passive for the individual, because it is defined by social norms, I suggest that gender is inherently active insofar as one constantly chooses to be a certain way in various contexts. Gender is not merely imposed on the individual, but rather chosen depending on past experiences and current contexts.

Acknowledging the potential for political theory work on the body in ancient rhetoric to inform research on gender and rhetoric, I go on to explain and define the concept of *habitus* in ancient Roman rhetorical theory and how it helps us understand the gendered body's relationship to rhetorical training and practice. Reading Cicero's *De Oratore* with attention to the concept of *habitus* provides a means of understanding the basic relationship between the body, gender, and rhetoric. Moreover, Bourdieu's theory of *habitus* provides contemporary insight into the relevance of the *habitus* today. Focusing on Cicero's rhetorical treatise, and supplementing it with Bourdieu's scholarship, it becomes clear that the *habitus* is not a distant or irrelevant concept when thinking about rhetoric's connection to gender. Rather, Bourdieu helps us understand that the *habitus* is a key consideration when studying gender in deliberative settings. The *habitus* determines how one speaks and persuades, and it differs for men and women.

Having established the relationship between the body and rhetoric through the concept of *habitus*, it is then possible to evaluate how language reflects an individual's *habitus*. As I am interested in gender, particularly in the context of IOs, I study discussions in the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) preceding the finalization of UNSCR 1325, which occurred between October 24 and October 25, 2000. Understanding the *habitus* as fundamentally differing for men and women, I make several predictions about the kind of language that delegates will have used when discussing gender. I predict that it will be revealed through reading the transcripts that women in the UNSCR 1325 discussions on "women and peace and security" used more inclusive language than men and that women were more likely to identify women as agentic than men were. I analyze these hypotheses by noting when delegates used phrases related to gender. I conclude that one's body, particularly one's performance of gender via the body,

influences language used in negotiations and that transcripts provide valuable insight into IO processes. Overall, this paper implements transcripts as a new way of studying gender and its consequences, and it points to ancient rhetorical theory as a useful means of interpreting these transcripts.

II. Rhetoric in IR and Political Theory Scholarship

International Relations Scholarship

The roles of argumentation and rhetoric have been widely considered in conventional international relations (IR) literature in recent years (Grobe 2010; Cohen 2001; Müller 2001; Risse 1999, 2000; Goldsmith and Posner 2000; Beer and Harriman 1996). The majority of this literature draws on the work of Jürgen Habermas (Risse 1999, 2000; Müller 2001). And most of this scholarship explicitly focuses on the idea of discourse in relation to argumentation (e.g., Risse 1999, 2000; Müller 2000, Joerges 2001; Joerges and Neyer 1997). That is, rather than considering what actors say and how it is received, they only consider what can be understood as ideal atmospheres for political conversations that yield the most open and effective discourse. In a sense, then, their application of Habermas misses what rhetoric is entirely. Given this nonrecognition of rhetoric and language and general assumption of impersonality, some IR scholars (e.g., Goldsmith and Posner 2000; Johnston 2002) have taken issue with Habermas' theory and chosen to engage with theoretical approaches that more rigorously consider the role of rhetoric and character in an international context. Still, their understanding of rhetoric remains limited and inadequately rooted in a theoretical understanding of not only what constitutes rhetoric, but also the possibilities of rhetoric.

Some IR scholars have recognized these problems with a Habermasian approach, but none sufficiently considers rhetoric.² Frank Schimmelfennig (2003) especially has tried to resolve these problematic alternatives to Habermasian discourse theory in his theory of rhetorical action. He maintains that rhetorical action "draws on a strategic conception of rules that combines a social, ideational ontology with the assumption of rational action; it postulates that social actors use and exchange arguments based on identities, values, and norms institutionalized in their environment to defend their political claims and to persuade their audience and their opponents to accept these claims and to act accordingly" (Schimmelfennig 2003, 193). He stresses that arguments exchanged are based on identities and norms that are institutionalized into their organizational environment, rather than on consensual, shared aims. While Schimmelfennig's focus on persuasion as a subjective enterprise that is context-specific, his theory of rhetorical action still fails to identify whether his theory of rhetorical action applies to actors who are nation-states or diplomats. That is, the question remains: Is persuasion based on nation-state identities, or individual diplomatic actors' identities? Thus, while some IR scholars make clear that we need to move away from Habermas, they have yet to provide us a coherent, adequate theory of rhetoric that entails the complexities of IOs and the participants within them.

² This inadequacy is particularly evident in the scholarship of Goldsmith and Posner (2000), Johnston (2002), and Grobe (2010), all of which break from Habermas-centered scholarship. Goldsmith and Posner argue that states and their leaders consider the atmosphere in which they present their arguments and structure their rhetoric and argumentation accordingly (2000 132-3). Despite their stress on persuasion's importance, though, their research remains very particularized and fails to provide an adequate or generalizable theory of rhetoric. Likewise, Alastair John Johnston (2002) stresses the importance of understanding persuasion as a component of socialization in IOs, but fails to sufficiently consider the role of rhetoric in persuasion. Although Johnston's article raises the issue of persuasion in international institutions, he in no way provides a theoretical foundation to seriously consider persuasion in institutions. Similarly, Grobe's scholarship develops different types of persuasion and presents their consequences for communication and cooperation, but he provides no theoretical foundation for why persuasion has these consequences. Moreover, Grobe does not consider at all how character, or personality, affects persuasion.

They especially fail to integrate theories of power, hierarchy, and individual diplomats' identities into their theories. None provides an adequate and systematic way of addressing rhetoric in IR.

Feminist IR literature has avoided some of these downfalls. Whereas mainstream IR theory has engaged with questions of argumentation, rhetoric, persuasion, and rhetorical action, feminist IR theorists, including Laura Shepherd (2008), Andy Davison (1998), Karen Fierke (2013), and Annick Wibben (2011), have considered discourse in IR. Fierke, Wibben, Davison, and Shepherd all stress that meanings are relational and intersubjective. To grasp and understand this interrelatedness, they maintain it is essential to evaluate the (re)constitution of meaning in a particular context. They differ, however, on method, proposing that one can do so through discursive theoretical analysis, hermeneutic studies, narrative analysis, or dialogical analysis, all of which deal with questions of power and hierarchy more than conventional studies do.

Feminist IR scholars' methods, unlike conventional IR work on language in argumentation and persuasion, explicitly focus on context and remain open to the possibilities of power and individual experiences affecting language. Moreover, the hermeneutic enterprises of Davison and Wibben acknowledge the importance of the interpreter in analyzing meanings, whereas conventional IR scholarship neglects the role of the analyzer in doing interpretive analysis. However, while these discursive and hermeneutic analyses of meaning more clearly recognize and consider context, they do little with rhetoric. Even though the methods employed in feminist IR scholarship are useful, their unit of analysis (final documents and agreements) excludes perhaps the most obviously dialogical component of discourse in IR—negotiation transcripts that precede, and proceed from, the very agreements they are concerned with. Both

conventional IR scholarship and feminist IR scholarship fail to consider the relationship between embodied orators and the arguments they make, as well as the policies they create.

Political Theory Literature

While the attention to discourse and deliberative democracy has been undeniably popular in recent years in political theory and IR literature alike, political theorists have raised concerns with such an attention to discourse, indicating that there should be a focus on rhetoric rather than on discourse. Bryan Garsten (2011) summarizes the debate between advocates of deliberative democracy and rhetoric, indicating that the disagreements between deliberative and rhetorical theorists arose only when the Habermasian view came to dominate theorists' understanding of deliberation (165). Garsten demonstrates that the debates between advocates of Habermasian deliberation and rhetoric are seemingly at odds over what constitutes reason, freedom, and speech (167). Garsten and others (Abizadeh 2002, Allen 2004, Beiner 1983, Farrell 1995, Fontana et al. 2004, Garsten 2006, Garver 1994, Nichols 1987, Nieuwenberg 2004, O'Neill 2002, Rorty 1996, Yack 2006) writing on rhetoric while most theorists were using Habermas point to ancient rhetorical theory as a means of making rhetoric and deliberation compatible.

Thus, recent scholarship concerned with the unrealistic nature of Habermasian deliberation points to ancient rhetorical theories as a means of introducing the rhetorical importance of emotions and character in deliberation and the formation of judgments. While ancient rhetorical theory's relevance has been prevalent among scholars trying to resolve the modern divide between deliberation and rhetoric, their research is primarily concerned with rhetoric's importance in nation-state settings, particularly those of liberal democracies. So, the question arises as to whether ancient rhetorical theory can respond to the rampant use of

Habermas in international relations theory concerned with deliberation among delegates in IO settings. More specifically, the question arises as to whether ancient rhetorical theory can help us think through questions of gender and rhetoric.

III. My interjection: The *Habitus* in Ancient Rhetoric

The Habitus in Ancient Rhetorical Theory

Building on recent political theory that has taken the rhetorical turn described by Garsten (2011), I maintain one can extract a robust theory of rhetoric for understanding the persuasion used in negotiations within IOs. Particularly, ancient rhetorical theories can help us understand the connection between the individual's embodied existence and the opinions she advocates and how she advocates for them. This focus on embodiment is something that feminist IR scholars have somewhat dealt with in their discourse analyses, but it is a generally novel question in the area of IR. Moreover, the insight into the connection between body and persuasion that can be gained by studying rhetoric is a reason for studying rhetoric, rather than discourse, that political theory scholars have yet to explore.³

The goal of Roman rhetorical theory, as Gunderson, Fögen, and Connolly indicate, is to alter the *habitus* of an individual so that it aligns with cultural norms and, therefore, allows the individual to be an orator and the audience to be persuaded by him. Recognizing the body, and how one uses one's body, as the locus of gender performance, rhetorical manuals were designed

³ This is not to say that scholars have never considered the connection between the body and rhetoric. Most scholarship on embodiment and rhetoric addresses Roman rhetorical theory rather than Greek, as Greek rhetorical treatises do not include as much on the body as Roman treatises do. Research on the body in ancient Roman rhetoric is vast, with scholars like Aldrete (2003) writing extensively on the importance of the role of gesture in ancient Roman rhetorical manuals, Enterline (2000) studying the connection of the voice to the body in Ovid, and Roller (2006) studies how bodily posture while dining reflects social hierarchies. Most related to what I am interested in, though, scholars including Fögen (2009), Connolly (2009), and Gunderson (2000) have studied the role of masculinity specifically, and gender more broadly, in ancient rhetorical manuals, especially those of Cicero and Quintilian.

to train orators to be as masculine as possible. Fögen explains, "Signs of effeminacy and effeminess in men were associated with a lack of self-control and a tendency towards excess, and could be used by political enemies to expose them to ridicule" (Fögen 2009 37). Likewise, Gunderson writes, "Watching an orator, one ought to behold the performance of the dominant, masculine subject and one ought to hear the voice of legitimate authority. Where virility or social station is in doubt, a performance fails: the orator has not been a good man, and whatever experience he has in speaking has gone for naught" (Gunderson 2000 8). Thus, scholars understand the performance in rhetoric to only be successful and persuasive if the orator presents himself as hyper-masculine, because that is the only way that the audience will respond and the only way for one to truly be an orator at all.

As Gunderson writes, "Rhetorical theory both observes and changes rhetorical practice and the *habitus* of the elite male" (Gunderson 2000 10). Understanding the *habitus* as the individual's dispositions to behave in a certain way as shaped by her society, culture, and context, the *habitus* becomes the main concern of rhetorical theories (see Connolly 2009 135). Cicero and Quintilian do not merely aim to teach individuals what to say, but also *how* to say it. For the orator addressed by Roman rhetorical theory, the goal is to alter his *habitus* so that it aligns with cultural norms and, therefore, allows the orator to persuade and the audience to be convinced by his rhetoric.

Evidence for the relationship between the gendered body and rhetoric is made very clear in Cicero's *De Oratore*. Cicero indicates that both the voice and the eyes are important to train and be aware of when persuading (3.221-223). He writes, "This [the eyes], indeed, is the only part of the body that can effectually display as infinite a number of significations and changes, as

there is of emotions in the soul; nor can any speaker produce the same effect with his eyes shut, as with them open. Theophrastus indeed has told us, that a certain Tauriscus used to say, that a player who pronounced his part gazing on any particular object was like one who turned his back on the audience" (3.221). Thus, the body, specifically the eyes, can convey more of a message than words alone. Moreover, Cicero stresses that how words are delivered must be carefully calculated:

I would not have letters sounded with too much affectation, or uttered imperfectly through negligence; I would not have the words dropped out without expression or spirit; I would not have them puffed and, as it were, panted forth, with a difficulty of breathing; for I do not as yet speak of those things relating to the voice which belong to oratorical delivery, but merely of that which seems to me to concern pronunciation. For there are certain faults which every one is desirous to avoid, as a too delicate and effeminate tone of voice, or one that is extravagantly harsh and grating (3.41).

Cicero indicates that attention both to the eyes and to the voice, two bodily components of rhetoric, is critical to persuasion. If one is too effeminate, then one is not taken seriously and fails at being an orator. One must internally regulate oneself to adopt the cultural norms of masculinity so that one can convey the masculinity essential to persuade. One must study the cultural norms of manliness and deploy the outward signals of manliness to successfully persuade. Thus, in ancient rhetorical theory gender is itself an active project central to the study of rhetoric. Gunderson explains, "The body cannot be left alone to mean what it may say. Instead the body and its relationship to the self and world needs to be constantly thought and rethought..." (Gunderson 2000 85). As Cicero's concerns with the body and masculinity demonstrate, rhetoric is not merely a temporal art of words, but rather a constant art of gender performance that is both internal and external. To successfully deploy one's gender, one must

absorb cultural norms internally and then reflect them in one's body, i.e. one's face, gestures, and voice.

Contemporizing the Habitus

To better understand the relevance of the ancient rhetorical concept of *habitus*, it is helpful to turn to Pierre Bourdieu's more contemporary work on *habitus*. Reading Bourdieu's theory of *habitus* in light of the ancient ideal of an orator's *habitus* being shaped and perfected through learning about rhetoric, it becomes clear that the individual's *habitus* evolves both consciously and unconsciously with one's experiences. Moreover, Bourdieu clarifies the ancient presentation of the individual's *habitus* as determined by social understandings and divisions of the masculine and feminine.

Bourdieu defines *habitus* in *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (1977): "As an acquired system of generative schemes objectively adjusted to the particular conditions in which it is constituted, the *habitus* engenders all the thoughts, all the perceptions, and all the actions consistent with those conditions, and no others" (Bourdieu 1977, 95). He further explains that the *habitus* is constitutive of one's social and material conditions, particularly one's class condition, meaning that one's *habitus* is not something that is inventively created but rather something that exists as a reproduction of the social conditions that exist during one's life (72, 95).

One's *habitus* is a consequence of, and response to, existing systems that surround an individual's existence, through which one's actions and expressions are made possible. It is not just a habit, but rather a result of one's exchange of self-identity within the system that one resides (Bourdieu 1977, 218, n. 47). Residence in a system is not only mental or emotional, but also physical. As ancient rhetorical theorists like Cicero express, Bourdieu similarly notes that

the *habitus* is bodily. This is made clear when he explains linguistic practices' relationship to the body. Bourdieu writes on the linguistic *habitus*,

The sense of acceptability which orients linguistic practices is inscribed in the most deep-rooted of bodily dispositions: it is the whole body which responds by its posture, but also by its inner reactions or, more specifically, the articulatory ones, to the tension of the market. Language is a body technique, and specifically linguistic, especially phonetic, competence is a dimension of bodily hexis in which one's whole relation to the social world, and one's whole socially informed relation to the world, are expressed (Bourdieu 1991, 86).

One's linguistic *habitus* is not merely a reflection of mental activities, but a matter of bodily activities as well. Language is distinctly bodily, and therefore tied to one's physical experiences, especially one's location in space. How one uses language is formed by one's exposure to systemic norms, as well as one's physical experiences.

Bourdieu stresses that one's physical experiences and dwelling spaces are influenced by the division of sexes, such that spaces have distinctly female and distinctly male locations within (e.g., women in the kitchen/household space, men in the workspace/outside the home). Bourdieu explains, "The opposition between the centrifugal, male orientation and the centripetal, female orientation, which, as we have seen, is the true principle of the organization of domestic space, is doubtless also the basis of the relationship of each of the sexes to their "psyche," that is, to their bodies and more precisely to their sexuality...." (Bourdieu 1977, 92). Thus, how one understands one's body, one's sexuality, is determined by the spaces in which one exists. And since one's language is a component of one's bodily existence, one's language is logically determined by physical spaces, as well. One can understand one's linguistic *habitus*, therefore, to be tied to one's development of gender.

Bourdieu, therefore, highlights the same ideas of the *habitus* found in ancient rhetorical theory. His application of the *habitus* to understand human societies lends credence to the ancient assertion that one's *habitus* is intricately related to gender and, moreover, that this relationship is revealed and understood through language, or persuasion. One's *habitus* generally, and one's linguistic *habitus* specifically, depend on one's experience as a man or a woman and the systemic and spatial norms associated with sexuality. Thus, one's particular approach to situations, rooted in one's history as present in one's *habitus*, is determined by one's gender. This means that one's rhetoric, one's language and gestures to persuade, is a direct result of one's *habitus*, one's experiences in a system spatially determined by divisions based on sexuality. The words one uses will depend on her experiences as a gendered person and the kind of gender that she wants to perform.

III. Predictions

Having established rhetoric and gender performance as related entities, and accepting that men use different language from women, it is now possible to consider how recognizing this connection between bodies and rhetoric is important in IO contexts. As IR scholars have been predominantly interested in final agreements and general ideas because of their focus on discourse, using a rhetorical approach presents actual meetings, i.e., transcripts from meeting negotiations, as an important place at which to study rhetoric. In particular, a rhetorical approach helps us understand the connection between the individual speaking and what she advocates, yielding a focus on the complexities of language and diplomacy that, as I mentioned, most IR literature fails to address.

As I am primarily concerned with the effects of gender on rhetoric, I focus on participant gender and the language used throughout UNSCR 1325 talks to understand how the *habitus* affects the language used. I want to know how the individual shapes her gender performance via language to persuade. I understand that this inherently limits my understanding of gender as something that can be identified and specified to a degree that is theoretically undesirable and practically unrealistic. However, investigating in an IO context requires accepting the fact that gender is understood as a binary characteristic, made evident in the formal titles of “Ms.,” “Mr.,” and “Mrs.” given to delegates and the addressing of adult individuals as “men” or “women.” Because of this binary simplicity, the UNSC itself groups individuals as similar based on gender identification. Accepting the unique context of the UNSC, then, I investigate the transcripts of interest as existing in a context where gender is a binary variable and where everyone operates under the assumption that gender similarities create groups of men and women delegates within the Council.

To recognize the impact of the gendered body on rhetoric, I turn to recent social psychology research to support my expectations for how woman and man delegates’ language varies depending on *habitus*. Reading the transcripts with attention to how men and women talk about gender, I expect that the kinds of language used by men and women will be revealed to vary, as men's and women's *habitus* differ. Generic language and the victimization can be expected to vary depending on the speaker's performed gender arising from her *habitus*.

Generic Language

Social psychologists have found that the use of masculine generic forms have different meanings and interpretations depending on context. Spender (1980) finds that masculine words

tend to make men think of themselves (i.e., men) and women are more likely to use masculine terms in a more genuinely generic way, insofar as it is understood as the sole means of including themselves in the reference group. Here, a "generic" means inclusive language, i.e., language that is *not* gender specific and is intended to represent both men and women. Spender's research is consistent with Moulton, Robinson, and Elias's (1978) finding that women use fewer masculine generic forms and more true generics than men. Moreover, Martyna (1980) found that women were more likely to generically interpret "he" than men were. In sum, psychological studies find that women are more likely to use and interpret language as generic, i.e., inclusive of *all* people regardless of gender, than men are. Women's unique *habitus* as women yields a tendency toward inclusion, which is evident in their language. Given these findings, I propose the following hypotheses on language used by men and women in negotiations:

H1a: Women will be found to use more inclusive, generic (gender-neutral) language in talks, as they aim for a more universal understanding of problems and consider women's issues to not be special concerns but rather universal, human issues. They will more often refer to gender issues rather than "woman" issues.

H1b: Men will be found to use more exclusive (gender-specific) language in talks, understanding women's issues as a particular concern that requires special attention, separate from concerns with general human issues.

In the context of UNSC meetings preceding the creation of UNSCR 1325, then, I expect women will have used language that is inclusive, using words like "gender" and "humanity," whereas men will use language that focuses on either men *or* women and not use words like "gender" and "humanity" as much as women do. Despite the meetings' explicit concern with "women and peace and security," women will generally focus on the matter as one that involves all people and

gender matters, and men will generally focus on the matter as one that solely involves attention to women.

An example of generic language is Mr. Heinbecker's statement: "We increasingly recognize the need to craft gender-sensitive measures to ensure that women and men alike benefit fully from efforts to build peace, but we need to go further" (Meeting 1, 24). An example of generic language is Mr. Shen Guofang's statement: "We would be encouraged to see, some day in the future, in a war-torn area, a peacekeeping operation composed entirely of women" (17).

Women as Victims

Scholars have found that women have historically been portrayed as objects, rather than actors in the media. Approximately 10% of media images of women in magazines portray women as victims (MaArthur & Resko 1975). Moreover, it is widely accepted that the victimization of women exists because of deep-seated gender ideologies, specifically the idea that women are inferior to or dependent on men, leads to the toleration and even encouragement of victimization (Berko & Erez 2007). Given women's typical portrayal as victims, we can expect women to be less likely to speak of other women as victims, whereas men can be expected to be more likely to talk about women as victims. The society that shapes all people makes it such that women's *habitus* makes them less likely to portray women as victims than men are. Women's *habitus* shapes their language so that women are defined more as actors rather than victims. I therefore propose the following hypotheses:

H2a: Women will be found to more often portray women as agentic and avoid language that portrays women as victims.

H2b: Men will be found to more often portray women as victims, as people who are stripped of agency.

In the context of the UNSC meetings considered, I expect women will have focused on women as actors and having agency. They will have explicitly denounced the idea of women as "victims," and made a point of stressing the valuable contributions of women to peace and development. Women delegates will indicate the importance of understanding women as actors. Men delegates will, however, focus on women's sufferings and victimization. Instead of focusing on what women can do, and have already done, with respect to peace and security, their arguments will have focused on how women continue to be victims of crimes.

An example of women being portrayed as victims is found in Mr. Ileka's statement during the second meeting: "Women and children are the main victims of this senseless, unjust war, which has done such harm to all aspects of life in the Democratic Republic of the Congo" (6). An example of women being portrayed as actors is evident in Mr. Aboulgheit's statement: "[Women] have rightfully and deservedly proven themselves to be an effective and productive element, taking decisions in our societies" (5).

IV. Method

While conventional IR scholarship maintains that talk is "cheap" (Fearon 1994), McDermott, Cowden, and Rosen (2002) find that language influences outcomes in war game situations. They identify hostile communication precipitated more money spent on weapons and less money spent on industrial production (161). Moreover, they found that those leaders who communicated with friendly language were more likely to negotiate, while those who communicated with hostile language were more likely to either initiate or continue a war

(163-4). Their research indicates that language is an important indicator of future state actions and decisions, especially in the context of crisis. Building on the idea that language is an indicator of future actions, language in negotiations can be an indicator for the final agreement's language and policy recommendations.

I am particularly interested in how the individual's embodied, gendered experiences affect the language used, and how one person's use of gendered language interacts with, responds to, and changes other individual's gendered language. To study language in UNSC negotiations, then, I read through the negotiations and counted and classified phrases/words for each speaker at the meetings leading up to UNSCR 1325 by the kind of example they are or by whether they were inclusive or exclusive of people of all genders.

Although one may suggest that studying gendered language in the context of meetings explicitly dealing with gender issues, i.e., "women and peace and security," is problematic, this is not the case. To study how one's own gendered experiences affect one's understanding of gender, one must investigate the presence of gender frames in a gender-focused conversation. As the meetings' topic is centered on "women," delegates' choice to focus their speeches on human or gender issues is not guided by the meeting or the topic. The topic of "women" may make delegates more aware of the language they use, but this still does not eliminate the fact that one's gender frame is shaped by experiences remembered *and* forgotten that make up the individual's *habitus*. An individual's gender frame is shaped both consciously and unconsciously, which means that analyzing transcripts focused on the matter of gender does not bias results.⁴

⁴ I have recently used time series analysis to test this assertion. There is no difference in patterns of mentioning gender concerns when meetings with either "women" *or* "children" in the agenda.

Another important note about this method is that although delegates are classified as men and women based on titles, I do not impose stereotypes on their language as I read it. Rather, I am open to unexpected findings, such as men predominantly using generic language and women predominantly using gender-specific language. Insofar as gender and *habitus* are processual, the assignment of gender is useful for the purpose of evaluation and for discussion's sake but does not impose any kind of continuity on the delegates considered. I analyze the delegates as men and women based on their titles but am continually aware of their genders' and *habitus*' potentials to change and evolve in the context of the meetings studied. I am open to the possibility of a delegate's linguistic *habitus* revealing challenges to the gender-binary context of the UNSC.

V. Analysis of UNSC transcripts

Three Security Council meetings on "women and peace and security" preceded the finalization of UNSCR 1325. These talks took place between October 24 and October 25, 2000. In addition to the 16 UNSC members at the time, two experts, Angela King, Assistant Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women, and Noeleen Heyzer, Executive Director of the United Nations Development Fund for Women, as well as speakers from 26 other countries that wanted to share their thoughts on the matter. In reading the transcripts, individuals were identified as women, and therefore having a woman's *habitus*, if they had the title "Miss," "Ms.," or "Mrs.," and men, and therefore having a man's *habitus*, if they had the title "Mr." Also, the speakers hold the same diplomatic status for the most part—either Permanent or Deputy-Permanent Representative to the United Nations—with the exception of delegates from Liechtenstein, the United Kingdom, and Norway, whose positions I

could not locate, and the two experts present. As delegates hold equal status in these meetings, then, diplomatic status is level and should not be a determinant for what each delegate proposes.

The speakers, listed by meeting, are as follows:

*Meeting 1*⁵

Speaker	Gender	Country	Diplomatic Position
Mr. Guriab	M	Namibia (UNSC President)	Permanent Representative to UN, UNSC President
Mr. Listre	M	Argentina	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Chowdhury	M	Bangladesh	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Heinbecker	M	Canada	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Shen Guofang	M	China	Deputy-Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Levitte	M	France	Permanent Representative to UN
Miss Durrant	W	Jamaica	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Hasmy	M	Malaysia	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Kassé	M	Mali	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Hamer	M	Netherlands	Deputy-Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Lavrov	M	Russian Federation	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Ben Mustapha	M	Tunisia	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Krokhmal	M	Ukraine	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Grainger	M	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Unknown
Ms. Soderberg	W	USA	Alternate Representative to UN
Ms. King	W	N/A	Assistant Secretary-General and Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women
Ms. Heyzer	W	N/A	Executive Director of the United Nations Development Fund for Women
Kofi Annan	M	Ghana	Secretary-General

⁵ All speakers present at the first meeting are present at all other meetings, with the exception of UN Secretary General Kofi Annan. They only speak at the first meeting, with the exception of Guriab.

Meeting 2

Speaker	Gender	Country	Diplomatic Position
Mr. Patricio	M	Mozambique	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Ileka	M	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Aboulgheit	M	Egypt	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Kumalo	M	South Africa	Permanent Representative to UN
Mrs. Fitsche	W	Liechtenstein	Unknown
Mr. Mahbubani	M	Singapore	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Ahmad	M	Pakistan	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Akasaka	M	Japan	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Zackheos	M	Cyprus	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Sun Joun-yung	M	Republic of Korea	Permanent Representative to UN
Mrs. Bose	W	India	External Relations Officer, UNHCR
Mr. Powles	M	New Zealand	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Muchetwa	M	Zimbabwe	Deputy Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Wiododo	M	Indonesia	Deputy Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Mwakawago	M	United Republic of Tanzania	Permanent Representative to UN
Ms. Wensley	W	Australia	Permanent Representative to UN
Ms. Grčić Polić	W	Croatia	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Ling	M	Belarus	Permanent Representative to UN

Meeting 3

Speaker	Gender	Country	Diplomatic Position
Mr. Guriab	M	Namibia	UNSC President
Mr. Hussein	M	Ethiopia	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Juwayeyi	M	Malawi	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Rosenthal	M	Guatemala	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Hønnigstad	M	Norway	Unknown
Mr. Mutaboba	M	Rwanda	Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Mmualefe	M	Botswana	Deputy Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Bhattarai	M	Nepal	Deputy Permanent Representative to UN
Mr. Samhan	M	United Arab Emirates	Permanent Representative to UN

To analyze these meetings, I read through each meeting individually with particular attention to the predictions about gender's effect on language and style. In reporting the results, I review the findings for each prediction across the three meetings.

H1: Generic Language

H1a: Women will be found to use more inclusive, generic (gender-neutral) language in talks, as they aim for a more universal understanding of problems and consider women's issues to not be special concerns but rather universal, human issues. They will more often refer to gender issues and not "woman" issues.

H1b: Men will be found to use more exclusive (gender-specific) language in talks, understanding women's issues as a particular concern that requires special attention, separate from concerns with general human issues.

In the three UNSC meetings reviewed, the clearest use of generic language occurred when speakers (both men and women) used the language of "gender," which implies "men and women," or used the language of "men and women." Gender-specific language was typically

expressed by only focusing on "women." However, it was rare for speakers to consistently use either generic or gender-specific language throughout their speeches, especially since the noted focus of the UNSC discussions analyzed was "women and peace and security." Five major patterns with respect to speakers' uses of generic and gender-specific language became apparent while reading the transcripts:

- Speakers who first used generic language and then shifted to a gender-specific focus on women;
- speakers who used generic language throughout their speech;
- speakers who first talked about women and then used generic language at the end of their speech;
- speakers who just focused on women in their speech and used predominantly gender-specific language;
- and speakers who focused on women, not as women alone, but part of a larger group: "women and girls."

The only exception was Ahmad's speech during the second meeting, where he talked about general political issues that were not connected to the question of gender or women.

Generic language at start, gender-specific language at end

The only example of a speaker using generic language and then shifting to gender-specific language was in the first UNSC meeting. Kofi Annan's opening statements for the UNSC talk in Day 1 began with a mention of "men and women," but his ultimate call was to focus on "women and girls" (3). Thus, his talk began with generic subjects, indicating an address of human, and not just women's, concerns, but he ends with a call to focus on women and girls in the discussions to come. Annan was the only speaker to begin with a focus on gender and to end with a focus on women and girls.

Generic language throughout

Speakers used generic language in all three meetings. In the first of the three studied UNSC meetings, two women (Heyzer and Durrant) and one man (Heinbecker) focused on gender issues throughout their speeches. Heyzer focused mostly on the language of "gender" throughout her speech, especially at the end, emphasizing the need for gender perspectives in UN actions (8-9). Such a focus on gender is not surprising, given Heyzer's vested interest in women and gender issues. Likewise, Jamaica's representative, Durrant, focused on women and gender throughout her speech, expressing the need to more broadly consider the effects of conflict on civilian populations (9), which consist of both men *and* women. Heinbecker of Canada started and ended his speech with a focus on gender, discussing women and girls as an impetus for thinking more about gender in the middle of his talk (25), which makes gender his speech's central focus.

In the second meeting, two women (Grčić Polić and Bose) and two men (Akasaka and Mahbubani) used more generic language, referring to "gender" and "men and women" throughout their speeches. Grčić Polić, for example, called to have all perspectives present, not just women or just men, to make and implement effective policy (29). Along similar lines, Akasaka proclaimed the need to focus on human concerns: "Japan believes deeply that we should put emphasis on a human-centred approach which gives priority to respect for the life and dignity of every human being in order to achieve in the coming century an international society characterized by peace and stability" (16).

In the third meeting, only one person, Hussein, a man, focused on gender throughout his speech, putting forward that equality is necessary for the good of humankind and not just

women. He painted the issue at hand to be one that concerns *all* people, and not just women (2). In all, four women and four men focused on gender throughout their speeches. As there were 8 woman speakers, and 37 man speakers, this means that approximately 50% of woman speakers and 11% of man speakers used predominantly generic language in their speeches.

Gender-specific language at start, generic at end

In addition to speakers using generic language consistently throughout their speeches, some delegates began with a focus on women and then moved to use more generic language (the reverse of Annan's progression in his opening remarks). In the first meeting, one woman (King) and three men (Krokmal, Hamsy, and Levitte) began their speeches with an explicit focus on women and then moved to use more generic language, referencing "gender" and "men and women." King ended her speech, saying, "As we move forward we should take care that our efforts to further empower women in no way disadvantage men. We should strive for equality, not special treatment" (8). Similarly, Levitte ended his speech, saying, "Social cohesion, which is necessary to stabilize States emerging from conflict situations or threatened by them, is promoted by equality between men and women and respect for their rights" (27). Both Levitte and King focused on women in their speeches, but in the end acknowledged that one cannot work to improve the plight of women without considering men, and the relationship between men and women, as well. Their end concerns, therefore, spoke to more generic, human concerns, despite their opening statements having focused on women alone.

During the second UNSC meeting, only one person, Ling, a man, began by discussing women and ended stressing the importance of "gender issues" (31). In the final meeting, Honnigstad, a man, began his speech by talking about gender concerns and then ended focusing

on matters pertaining solely to women (7). Overall, one woman and 5 men discussed gender at the end of their speeches, meaning that approximately 14% of men shifted to generic language at their speeches' ends and 13% of women did so.

Gender-specific language throughout ("women")

While many delegates used generic language at some point in their speeches, others used gender-specific language throughout. During the first UNSC meeting, one woman (Soderberg) and four men (Lavrov, Hamer, Kassé, and Shen Guofang) focused on women alone. Perhaps the most interesting commentary on women is Shen Guofang's speech during the first session, which excluded reference to any broader human concerns and paints a picture of women as critical to all civilization. He claimed, "We would be encouraged to see, some day in the future, in a war-torn area, a peacekeeping operation composed entirely of women" (17). While Guofang advances an emotionally appealing idea, his statement lacks the awareness of gender interconnectedness between men and women that other speakers who deal with gender acknowledge, as evident in the statements of Levitte and King.

In the second meeting, two women (Fitsche and Wensley) and five men (Mwakawogo, Wiododo, Zackheos, Kumalo, and Aboulgheit) focused only on women in their speeches. In the third meeting, four men (Samhan, Bhattarai, Mutaboba, Rosenthal, and Guriab) focused solely on women in their speeches, and did not use generic language or reference generic concepts. In all, 3 women and 15 men specifically focused on women alone in their speeches, which means that 38% of women's speeches and 41% of men's speeches were gender-specific in their content.

Gender-specific language throughout ("women and girls")

In addition to delegates focusing solely on women, other speakers stressed not women as a group on their own, but mentioned "women and girls," and sometimes "women and children" as the group of interest. In the first UNSC meeting considered, four men (Grainger, Mustapha, Chowdhury, and Listre) discuss the issue of "women and girls." Throughout their speeches, they focus on the need for women and girls, and in some cases women and children, to be a focus of UNSC talks about how to structure peace building efforts moving forward. In the second meeting, five men (Muchetwa, Powles, Sun Jounyung, and Patricio) group together women and girls throughout their speeches. In the third meeting, two men (Mmualefe and Juwayeyi) talked about "women and girls" throughout their speeches. Interestingly, Mmualefe made a point that women and girls/children need to be discussed in concert, saying, "Whenever the issue of women, peace and security is discussed, the painful topic of children in armed conflict, children who are routinely subjected to gang rape, ethnic cleansing and genocide cannot be overlooked" (10). In total, 11 men, or 30% of men's speeches, focused on "women and girls" in their speeches.

Summary: Findings on generic and gender-specific language usage

If one considers all instances of generic language (whether it is throughout, at the start, or at the end of the speech), 10 men and 5 women used generic language at some point. This means that 27% of men's speeches and 63% of women's speeches used generic language. As such, my prediction that women would be more likely use more generic language than men do is proved. Further, my hypothesis that men would be more likely to discuss women's issues is also proved true insofar as most men's speeches focused on women or "women and girls."

These results suggest that women's lived experiences as women impact their rhetoric such that they understand issues of women and security as broad, general issues, whereas men understand issues of women and security as gender-specific issues. The individual's *habitus* as a man or woman affects one's rhetoric, as made evident by women's use of generic language overall, and men's use of gender-specific language overall. The many instances when men grouped together women and girls, when it is very unlikely that they would group men and boys together, emphasizes men's *habitus* leading to gender-specific language. They see women as distant individuals who cannot be generalized with humankind overall, but only generalized with girls and, sometimes, children (Shepherd 2006, 79).

H2: Women as Victims

H2a: Women will more often portray women as agentic and avoid language that portrays women as victims.

H2b: Men will more often portray women as victims, as people who are stripped of agency.

While I predicted that women would be more likely to focus on women as actors than men would, the transcripts provided no support for this prediction. In fact, throughout the talks, man and woman speakers alike noted the problematic nature of focusing on women as victims (see, for example: Durrant, Chowdhury, Heinbecker, Fitsche, Patricio, and Bhattari) and called for the Security Council to move forward focusing on women as active individuals. Durrant claimed, "The recommendations that emanated from that meeting deserve the attention of the Council, particularly because they came directly from women who are victims, as well as

participants in seeking peace," suggesting that because women suffer, they have special insight into how policy should be formed (10).

Similarly, Heinbecker said, "We must also ensure that our focus is not restricted to issues of the victimization of women, vital as it is to grapple with them. We must address ourselves as well to the positive contribution that women—irrespective of their age, class, ethnicity, race or any other status—can and do make to conflict prevention and to post-conflict peace-building" (24). Heinbecker's and Durrant's statements are representative of speakers' claims as a whole, suggesting that women having suffered makes them more valuable actors to have when making and implementing policy. Consequently, my hypothesis was proved wrong, insofar as both men and women intentionally moved away from a language of victimization toward a language of action in their speeches.

Gender, in these discussions, is not correlated with whether women are spoken of as victims or actors. The active recognition of the problematic victimization of women likely happened because of the nature of the discussion. These talks' purpose was to determine how to integrate women in UN policymaking and policy implementation, and speakers held to this topic in earnest. Delegates focused on ways that women have already positively affected policies and imagining new ways that women could get involved. It seems that the topic of the meetings, therefore, dictated the focus on women as actors, and all individuals' frames in the conversation were appropriately adjusted so that they expressed a desire to move away from women being discussed as "victims."

This being said, the fact that many men grouped together "women and girls," while no woman did this, demonstrates that men were more likely to view women as lacking some kind of

agency, in the same way that children lack agency. Thus, although their speeches emphasized the need to focus on women as agentic, their grouping together of women and children demonstrates a tendency to see women as individuals who are acted upon or directed, rather than as actors themselves (Shepherd 2006, 79). Even though a majority of men did not use the language of "women and girls," the fact that some men did group together "women and girls" throughout their speeches, whereas no women did, indicates man delegates' subconscious tendencies to think of women as passive. Man delegate's *habitus*, therefore, informed their rhetoric on gender in these speeches.

VI. Conclusion

While much IR scholarship focuses on the effects of final agreements on international politics and law, this paper has shown that negotiation transcripts are an important and underutilized resource for understanding the role of gender in international relations. Applying the concept of the *habitus* to interpreting UNSC transcripts, this paper investigated the role of gender in three UNSC meetings preceding the creation of UNSCR 1325. It demonstrated that transcripts provide insight into how one's gender affects the language one uses.

By establishing the utility of ancient Roman rhetorical theory for understanding the relationship between gender and rhetoric, I demonstrated that one's gender, as shaped by one's *habitus*, informs individual actions and language. Turning to both Cicero and Bourdieu, it can be understood that women have a different *habitus* than men because women and men have different social and spacial experiences, different expectations, and different understandings of appropriateness. Due to these differences, women and men use different language. Recognizing

gender's theoretical significance in relation to language, I made two predictions based on recent psychology research on gender/language to determine the effects of gender frames in the negotiations. I proposed that, because of gender frames, women would be more likely than men to use generic language and women would use more emotional examples while men would use more rational examples.

The finding that women are more likely to use generic language is significant. It indicates that women have a fundamentally different approach to the world, policy, and security from that of men. Although one may suggest that power politics is at play, rather than gender, I hold that the general equality among delegates undercuts these concerns. The delegates all hold similar positions, making individual differences, most notably gender, the biggest difference present. One may also be concerned with the nature of the women present in the UNSC meetings studied, insofar as women who become UN Ambassadors are likely to have been socialized in a certain way to help them thrive in a testosterone-latent environment like that of international politics.

While it may be the case that these women are anomalous compared to the general population of women, woman ambassadors nonetheless grew up in the same environment. They were subject to the same physical environment and social systems as other women, which means their experiences as women throughout life remain similar to those of other women even though the delegates may have responded differently. In other words, UN woman delegates' *habitus* are shaped by the same systems as other women's, which means their *habitus* remain more comparable to women's than men's. Despite being women of great power who are uniquely able to thrive in an intensely men-dominated field, their gender frames remain shaped by their experiences in the world as women and make them have different approaches to gender than man

delegates do.

Although my prediction that women would be more likely to use generic language than men was proven true, my prediction that women would be portrayed as victims by men and that women was not unquestionably supported by the transcripts studied. Thus, there are a few improvements that could be made in future research. To further explore the idea of “victim” and how gender affects the linguistic victimization of women, it would be helpful to analyze more UNSC meeting transcripts, as the topic of these meetings likely biased delegates’ language such that they focused on women’s agency. It would also be helpful to return to the transcripts considered and consider other linguistic indicators related to victimization, such as suffering. Understanding how often delegates talk about women as suffering would be an indicator of passivity similar to the passiveness entailed in “victim,” and would be less likely determined by the meetings’ topic. Nonetheless, man delegates’ tendency to group together “women and girls” indicates an implicit passivity being assigned to women, which is noteworthy and could only be better understood through the analytical extensions described above. More generally, it would be helpful to do more detailed case studies of the speakers present at the meetings so that we could understand why some man delegates do, for example, use generic language throughout their speeches while others do not.

It would also be worthwhile to study those delegates who deviated from the expected use of generic or non-generic language. Those delegates who did not speak as expected (e.g., the 27% of men who used generic language and the 37% of women who did *not* use generic language) indicate that gender is not completely stable in language within the UNSC. To completely understand deviations from the expected norms, it would be helpful to do extensive

case studies on these individual delegates' life experiences, domestic cultures, and career aspirations. Doing so would provide greater insight into how gender, although presented as a set binary distinction in the UNSC, is challenged by individuals' *habitus* as revealed in their rhetoric.

This paper demonstrates the relationship between gender and rhetoric in IO negotiations through the lens of ancient rhetorical theory. Future scholarship should consider the importance of agreement-formation and take advantage of the vast transcript resources available today as well as ancient rhetorical theory, especially to study gender. As gender becomes an increasingly important policy concern, transcripts will be of great importance to understand how gendered people discuss gender and to possibly correct problematic language prior to resolutions' finalization.

Works Cited

- Aoláin, Fionnuala Ní, Dina Francesca Haynes, and Naomi Cahn. *On the Frontlines: Gender, War, and the Post-conflict Process*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Aristotle. *The Art of Rhetoric*. Trans. H.C. Lawson-Tancred. New York: Penguin, 1991.
- Baaz, Maria Eriksson, and Maria Stern. *The Complexity of Violence: A critical analysis of sexual violence in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)*. Sida, 2010.
- Berko, Anat and Edna Erez. "Gender, Palestinian Women and Terrorism: Women's Liberation or Oppression?" *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, 30.6 (2007): 493-519.
- Borah, Porismita. "Conceptual issues in framing theory: A systematic examination of a decade's literature." *Journal of communication* 61.2 (2011): 246-263.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson, Ed. John B. Thompson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1991.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice" translated by R. Nice*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1977.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble*. New York: Routledge, 2008. Print.
- Carragee, KM, W. Roefs. "The neglect of power in recent framing research." *Journal of Communication*. 54: 214-33, 2004.
- Chong, Dennis, and James N. Druckman. "Framing theory." *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.* 10 (2007): 103-126.
- Cicero, *On Duties*. Ed. M.T Griffin and E.M. Atkins. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. Print.

- Deaux, Kay, and Laurie L. Lewis. "Structure of gender stereotypes: Interrelationships among components and gender label." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 46.5 (1984): 991.
- Druckman, James, LR Jacobs, E. Ostermeier. "Candidate strategies to prime issues and image." *Journal of Politics*. 66:1205-27, 2004.
- Druckman, James, KR Nelson. "Framing and deliberation." *American Journal of Political Science*. 47:728-44, 2003.
- Edwards III, GC, Qood, BD. "The President, Congress and the media." *American Political Science Review* 93:327-44, 1999.
- Entman, RM. *Projects of Power: Framing News, Public Opinion, and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press, 2004.
- Fearon, James D. "Domestic political audiences and the escalation of international disputes." *American Political Science Review* (1994): 577-592.
- Fridkin, KL, PJ Kenney. "Campaign frames: Can candidates influence media coverage?" in *Framing American Politics*, ed. K. Callaghan, F. Schnell, 54-75. Pittsburgh, PA: U. Pittsburgh Press, 2005.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. Trans. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall. New York: Continuum, 1995. Print.
- Gamson, WA. *Talking Politics*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1992.
- Grimshaw, Allen D. "Research on the Discourse of International Negotiations: A Path to Understanding International Conflict Processes?" in *Sociological Forum* 7.2 (1992), 87-119.

Hafner-Burton, Emilie M., Jana von Stein, and Erik Gartzke. "International Organizations Count." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 52.2(2008): 175-88.

Hudson, Valerie M. *Sex and world peace*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

Jerit, Jennifer. "Survival of the fittest: Rhetoric during the course of an election campaign." *Political Psychology* 25.4 (2004): 563-575.

Kray, Laura J., Leigh Thompson, and Adam Galinsky. "Battle of the sexes: gender stereotype confirmation and reactance in negotiations." *Journal of personality and social psychology* 80.6 (2001): 942.

Lukunka, Barbra. "New Big Men: Refugee Emasculation as a Human Security Issue." *International Migration* 50.5 (2012): 130-141.

Martyna, Wendy. "Beyond the "he/man" approach: The case for nonsexist language." *Signs* 5.3 (1980): 482-493.

Matlin, Margeret W. *Cognition*. Crawfordsville: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 2005.

McArthur, Leslie Zebrowitz, and Beth Gabrielle Resko. "The portrayal of men and women in American television commercials." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 97.2 (1975): 209-220.

McDermott, Rose, Jonathan A. Cowden, and Stephen Rosen. "The role of hostile communications in a crisis simulation game." *Peace and Conflict* 14.2 (2008): 151-168.

Moulton, J., Robinson, G.M., and Elias, C. "Sex bias in language use: 'neutral' pronouns that aren't." *American Psychologist*, November 1978: 1032-38.

Pan, Zhongdang, and Gerald M. Kosicki. "Framing as a strategic action in public deliberation."

Framing public life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world (2001): 35-65.

Patterson-Markowitz, Rebecca, Elizabeth Oglesby, and Sallie Marston. "'Subjects of Change':

Feminist Geopolitics and Gendered Truth-Telling in Guatemala." *Journal of International Women's Studies* 13.4 (2012): 82-99.

Riker, WH. *The Strategy of Rhetoric: Campaigning for the American Constitution*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1996.

Scheufele, DA. "Agenda-setting, priming and framing revisited: another look at cognitive effects of political communication." *Mass Communication Sociology*. 3:297-316, 2000.

Shepherd, Laura J. *Gender, violence and security: discourse as practice*. New York Zed Books, 2008.

Spence, Janet T., Robert L. Helmreich, and Joy Stapp. "The Personal Attributes Questionnaire: A measure of sex role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity." *Journal Supplement Abstract Service*, American Psychological Association, 1974.

Spender, D. *Man-made language*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980.

Sternberg, R. J. *Cognitive psychology (2 nd ed.)*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1999.

United Nations, Security Council, *Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) [on women and peace and security]* , 31 October 2000, S/RES/1325 (2000), available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3b00f4672e.html> [accessed 9 December 2013]

United Nations, Security Council, S/PV.4208, New York: 24 October 2000, 10 a.m. Available from <http://www.un.org/en/sc/meetings/> [accessed 20 October 2013]

United Nations, Security Council, S/PV.4208 (Resumption 1), New York: 24 October 2000, 3:15 p.m. Available from <http://www.un.org/en/sc/meetings/> [accessed 20 October 2013]

United Nations, Security Council, S/PV.4208 (Resumption 2), New York: 25 October 2000, 10:30 a.m. Available from <http://www.un.org/en/sc/meetings/> [accessed 20 October 2013]

Walsh, KC. *Talking about Politics: Informal Groups and Social Identity in American Life*. Chicago: U. Chicago Press, 2003.

Weatherall, Ann. *Gender, Language and Discourse*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Wibben, Annick T.R. *Feminist Security Studies*. New York: Routledge, 2011.

Williams, John E., and Deborah L. Best. *Measuring sex stereotypes: A thirty-nation study*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage publications, 1982.

Zuengler, Jane, and Barbara Bent. "Relative knowledge of content domain: An influence on native-non-native conversations." *Applied Linguistics* 12.4 (1991): 397-415.