Gender Dimensions of the National Security and Human Security Problematic: Core Theoretical, Conceptual and Historical Issues

Irene Omolola Adadevoh

Introduction and Problem

All men and women are created equal… yet the history of mankind is a history of repeated injuries and usurpation on the part of man toward woman. (Elizabeth Cady Stanton, July 1848).

This part of the NWG research focuses on the conceptual clarification of the interfaces between gender and national security and the consequences of segregationist policies. It is based on the notion that the discrimination and restriction of women by a male-dominated culture is suggestive of the national insecurity faced by women. In the context of the gender dimensions of security, a theoretician, Alison (2004: 447) has put it succinctly that ‘the question of whose security is being discussed is important. Since security has traditionally been conceptualized in masculinized, military terms and women have been excluded’, then there is a need for a more intensive investigation of the context of women’s security. Alison (2004) does this analysis from an empirical perspective, drawing heavily on the situation in specific countries of interest.

While the above approach is commendable, it requires some intensification and reinforcement, which we have imposed on the discourse on gender and security by seeking to delve into the vital conceptual, methodological and theoretical dimensions of gender security re-conceptualisation. This task is in keeping with our primary vocational philosophical methodology and its fruitful outcomes. Traditional concepts that feature in a putative discussion of women’s security include oppression and discrimination. According to Caprioli (2004: 412), ‘discrimination is a symptom of both the inequality and the structural violence that
undermine women's security'. The fact then is that such a situation can no longer be considered acceptable or even tolerable for the agents, victims and agencies of women's oppression and insecurity.

Women's insecurity is a fact of life that cannot be underestimated. According to Goldstein (1999: 99), we must announce 'repeatedly and in forceful terms that women in Civilization have been severely oppressed and particularly victimized'. This oppression and victimisation have brought about the general insecurity of women. The crisis of national insecurity can be inextricably linked to women's stereotypical traditional roles, which like job descriptions define their membership in the community by requiring them to act in certain ways. With special reference to Africa, the situation of women is the more deplorable. To this extent, we cannot but agree with Uko (1996: 4-5), who insists that 'traditionally the woman in Africa functions as a mother, wife and co-wife. Her psyche is affected by the impact of colonial domination as well as male chauvinism, polygamy, dependence and inferiority complex. She is usually contemplated in the sense of dominated, disadvantaged, exploited and excluded'. Given these realities, these roles entrench the expectations that others have of women within many social organisations in a given nation-state.

The problem, as we conceive it, is, firstly, to determine the extent to which discourses on sexual identities and national security take into account the social behaviour of the sexes in the light of the maintenance of the status of masculinised securities. Secondly, and no less important, is to examine the conditions for the affirmation of security, justice and equity for women within a nation-state. The essay tackles these problems through the redefinition of stereotyping myths, and the evaluation of the changing dimensions of national segregationist policies. Thus the impetus for our work, as stated above, is justified again on the basis of the position of Daly (1996: 137) that 'women who have perceived the reality of sexual oppression usually have exhausted themselves in breaking through to discovery of their own humanity, with little energy left for constructing their own interpretation of the universe'. We must admit also that although there have been recent expositions on the predicaments of women, as seen in efforts by the Committee for the Defence of Human Rights (CDHR 2001) in the 2000 Annual Report on the Human Rights Situation in Nigeria, and the Three-day National Workshop on Gender Violence and Family Poverty for the southwest zone (July 2001) organised by the Special Adviser to the President on Women Affairs. These efforts have shown the near intractability of the phenomenon of the abject disempowerment, oppression and subordination of women. As things stand, few, if any, of these works have systematically opened up the discourse on the national security of women in a more conscious and systematic manner, such as is implied by a fuller conceptual account of the problem. There is, therefore, a
need for a holistic and careful account of the national security dimensions of women's issues as construed in this essay.

Against the above background, we must agree with Alaya (1977) on the focus of our struggle. Our struggle, as we understand it, is to ‘establish a logical basis for the intellectual history of the idea of woman’s “emancipation” and “liberation”’ (Alaya 1977: 261). Granted the logical justification of our project, we need to clarify the means of attaining the goal. In this context we can accept Attig's statement (1976: 156) that examination of the ‘normative questions related to the careful analysis of concepts such as “freedom” and “liberation”, “oppression”, “rights”, “justice” and “equality”, “consciousness” and “self-fulfilment” would be invaluable to the review of gender security in the post-colonial context. The challenge of our work, is therefore, to achieve what Janes (1978: 295) has described as the correction of ‘errors hitherto universally embraced, concerning the female character; and to raise woman from a state of degradation and vassalage, to her proper place in the scale of existence, where, in the dignity of independence, she may discharge the duties and enjoy the happiness of a rational being’. Thus, the challenges to women's security are both universal and particular in nature.

In order effectively to confront the task of segregating the universal and particular aspects of women's security, the paper will be divided into distinct parts. The first part conducts a theoretical analysis of gender roles, segregation and allied notions. It analyses the processes of sex-role differentiation in security schema theory. The aim is to appreciate gender studies and to gain an understanding of the effects of the evolution of gender roles on social interpretations of national security. Secondly, we examine the problem of national security for women from a comparative and thematic perspective that takes care to review the traditional and more contemporary dimensions of the problem. Special emphasis is placed on the empirical consequences concerning the shaping of individual and group identity as well as national security. Lastly, our essay highlights the need to capture and transcend these variables, and provides recommendations for social change that may foster secure and positively developed social relationships between the sexes in a nation-state. The import of this emphasis is to underscore the point that individuals have unlimited potentials or capacities and that, when people's roles are defined according to their sex, human and national development is severely limited.

Retracing the Etymology of Marginality in Security Schema Theory

The reality of non-belonging, marginality and inequality of women is closely involved with national security and human security problems. The fact that women are objectified and regarded as property has helped generate the national security dilemma and its ensuing anarchic constitution which cannot itself be (re)solved.
through the entrenchment of established norms and institutions. The failure of institutional frameworks and the critical security situation compounds the dilemma for women. This is most visibly illustrated by the question of roles. This issue requires philosophical investigation and in fact the view that roles may be related to stereotypes is strikingly analysed in the philosophical works of Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Hobbes, etc.

However, there are deeper problems arising from the specific works of Plato and Aristotle as they relate to the security of women. In both philosophers' works, women's marginality in the scheme of things does not guarantee the security of their human persons. For Plato and Aristotle, women are an extension of material possessions. In fact, 'women are classified by Plato, as they were by the culture in which he lived, as an important subsection of property' (Okin 1977: 349). In a similar vein, the classical sociological theorists such as Auguste Comte and Emile Durkheim, among others, believed that women were best suited for roles outside of the public sphere (Comte 1975; Durkheim 1964; Elshtain 1981; Kleinbaum 1977). The implication of the above view is that women seem to exist in the bounds of what is, literally speaking, a sort of thraldom or slavery. But as Cuffel (1966: 326) has argued, 'the possibilities of communal and personal slavery raised an ethical and moral problem, a problem in which the notion of the action of fate and the idea of personal inferiority were in opposition'. To repudiate the images of slavery of women we must confront the status quo and seek the establishment of a new set of ideas and values. As such we can agree with Lucas (1973: 161) that in questions of women's security, the 'debate turns on the application of certain concepts of justice, equality and humanity'. These ideas are in need of clarification if the notion of security for women is to be fully articulated.

Most gender and feminist scholars have argued that women were marginalised in the domains designed to guarantee the security of the human person. It is asserted that the inferiority of women and their oppression, exploitation and subjection constitute the basis for the denial of personhood to them and thus also of their insecurity. For instance, Wollstonecraft's works (1759-97) such as 'Thoughts on the Education of Daughters' (1787), 'The Female Reader' (1789), and 'A Historical and Moral View of the Origins and Progress of the French Revolution' (1794), and 'A Vindication of the Rights of Women' (1792), were documents that challenged these parochial perspectives, especially Rousseau's ideas regarding female inferiority.

In a similar vein, Margaret Fuller (1810-50), in exposing the error in the idea of organised classes for 'conversations' among women, made an ardent plea for the emotional, intellectual, and spiritual fulfilment and security of women. Sun Yat-Sen in China in 1923 was one of the first Chinese women to bob her hair in radical and revolutionary protest against women's subjugation (Compton 1995). One immediate point to note is the link between the resistance to myths and
representations of women's inferiority and the struggle for the expansion of the conceptual space of security discourses. Thus, there is a fundamental challenge posed to traditional notions of security which demands a re-configuration of the idea of security in more radical and holistic perspectives. Let us now attempt a more detailed analysis of the theoretical discourses surrounding gender and security of women.

Conceptual Security, Ideational Dependency and Segregation: The Problematic of Analytic Juxtaposition

What is needed is a conceptual analysis of the nexus between security, ideology and segregation. The theoretical analysis of sex roles, segregation and security of women is best approached through the critical review of the situation of women as highlighted over the ages. A careful study of security options and the empirical investigations into the manner of interaction between security and gender role activities uncovers evidence of wide-ranging differences of perspective among authors. Grown and Sebstad (1989) attempt a three-tier distinction between what they purport to be stages of women's security. According to these authors (1989: 941), ‘for the poorest, survival is the goal; the poorest women strive to generate income to purchase food, shelter and clothing. For those whose basic survival is assured, the individual or household goal may shift to security; additional assets then are acquired by diversifying the livelihoods mix to spread risk and increase flexibility. Finally, for those who have achieved basic security, the goal may change to growth. Women who feel relatively secure may concentrate their investments in higher return but riskier commercial enterprises dependent on the availability of services and purchased inputs’.

However, we are doubtful with regard to the unwarranted optimism implied in this typological analysis of the stages of women's security. In fact, as appealing as this classification appears to be, it still does not strike at the heart of the conceptual challenge to women's security. The real contexts of insecurity in the world of African women may erode this tripartite analysis. In the face of real social, legal, political and cultural denial, domination, and deprivation that women confront, the stages may unfold into one long track of dehumanisation.

For example, the state of gross disadvantage arising from a vicious combination of life-long unpaid and unappreciated women's labour and the inimical widow-hood and inheritance customs as they operate in some African cultures demonstrates that the line is very thin between survival, security and growth. Thus we can agree with Jaquette (1990: 65) that ‘women are forced by their poverty to participate in a system that generates and intensifies inequalities and makes use of existing gender hierarchies to place women in subordinate positions at each different level of interaction between class and gender’. The poverty we refer to
here must be seen in a more holistic manner that goes beyond mere economic incapacitation to more invidious legal, political and social restriction.

The existence of divergent views on the subject of hypothetical security accurately discloses the gravity of the issues relating to human protection, social development and defence of human dignity. It is for this reason that feminist historians have over the ages fought to preserve and ‘concentrate on transforming and enriching mainstream security history, which has traditionally had so little regard for women’ (Jackson et al., 1993: 107-8). In pursuing this position, we are committed to breaking the silence and tearing the veil of obscurity and of omission in security history. This orientation prides itself on particularly deconstructing the dominant national ideology that socialises women into subordinate roles and the ‘politics of motherhood’ (Lewis 1980).

It is in the light of this pattern of security that our task comes down to the demystification of hegemonic constructs and the erection of a new epistemological edifice that can sustain the theoretical and practical expectations of the transformations of traditional security schemas. The implication of the acceptance of the need for transformation is that, as Frenkel (1964: 338) says, ‘it is clear that in taking a stand for the dignity of humanity and human society it would be better not to rely on naturalness as a basis’. Such naturalness can be defined in terms of conventional or biologically induced features that can entail the denial and deprivation of essential human values for positive development.

Gender role socialisation with respect to ‘conceptual security’ has always been problematic. This is because it tends to be seen predominantly in collective military and defence terms, as opposed to the more viable personal developmental connotation. This is possibly why the Africa Research Bulletin (2000) construes the traditional concept of national security as the avoidance of conflict and the preservation of the lives of people in society. However, this conception of security is restrictive, not only because it reduces security to the mere absence of conflict, but also because women are not even included in the strategies for the avoidance or management of these conflicts. Thus it fails on these two scores.

To put it more concretely, the conflict theory of security fails because it does not establish a level playing field for the consideration of the security of the afflicted, oppressed and vulnerable. In short, neither the planners nor the executors of these conflicts have the full interest of women’s security at heart. The consequence is that women, children and other highly vulnerable segments of a society suffer the most in the event that a conflict (internal or externally motivated) boils over. They are most often pawns in the hands of the perpetrators of violence and conflict. Worse still, this conception of security does not confront the internally induced threats to women’s security, and the perpetrators of this insecurity. Thus the militaristic conception of security fails to secure the protection of women, not just because the principle thrives on insecurity and instability,
but because it is immersed in the hegemonic ordering of the patriarchal and command structures, with their uniquely magisterial posturing.

The point we make is that the theoretical analysis of national security is itself a harbinger of insecurity insofar as it is alienating and restrictive in nature. To this end, the issue of national security for women has not been given the adequate consideration it deserves. Further attempts to deal with the question of national security for women has led scholars such as O'Brien (1995) to offer an inclusive and sympathetic account of national security, construing it as more than just safety from the violence of rival militaries. To this effect, national security is the absence of inhibition, violence or segregation whether social, political, economic or sexual. The strength of the above view is its intellectual fertility and gender sensitivity, which creates room for the conceptual penetration of security hitherto into erstwhile forbidden spaces. Thus if O'Brien's view is correct, then there is no doubt that the national security of women has not been fully taken care of either theoretically or practically.

The ever-present spectre of violence, threats and hatred against women is clear evidence that new options in the quest for security for women are long overdue. Lodge (1995) agrees that any discourse that tends to view national security in predominantly military or defence terms poses a problem for the proper definition and analysis of the concept of security and segregation. This is especially the case as it affects women's security discourses. The silence regarding the position of women is occasioned by the fact that it is the men who are most engaged in the definition, design, and implementation of security programmes, conceived either in the restricted or broader perspective within the nation state.

Beyond the foregoing conceptual analysis of national security, it is necessary to examine the role of segregation in the initial creation and eventual sustenance of the subordination of women's security demands. Borgia (1978: 27) is of the opinion that sexual activity and role allocation play a large part in human association and the national organisation of life. In this hypothesis, males strive to conquer other females. And by virtue of the peculiar construction of this permissive culture, male domination desensitises the females so that they fail to appreciate their own humanity.

This analogy of social ordering of national security as a contest leaves out the general thrust of co-operative treatment of sexuality within the nation-state. It entrenches national security as a competitive dog-eat-dog attitude. The problem of social segregation on a gender basis takes precedence in national policies. It is worth pointing out that this dominance was opposed in the eighteenth century by early feminists who agitated for a 'Declaration of the Rights of Woman' to protest the French revolutionists' failure to mention women in their 'Declaration of the Rights of Man' (Compton 1995).
The threats emanating from prevailing conceptual security and segregationist policies are consequential in women’s attempt to escape the feminine stereotype (Jeffreys 1985). At times, this resistance has led to what has been labelled as ‘sexual inversion’ (Ellis 1927), or indirectly to an ‘accusation of iconoclasm to subvert women’s attempt at emancipation from the fetters of insecurity’ (Jeffreys 1985: 105-6). The struggle for the emancipation of women is situated against the backdrop of the institutionalisation of patriarchy and its numerous consequences. To this effect, the roles of women in national security matters are defined constitutionally by the patriarchal burden of both male domination and female subjugation. Indeed, patriarchy as a major instrument of the subjugation of women creates and celebrates a power structure that bestows more personal, political, social and economic power on men.

The ravaging effects of patriarchal ordering have compelled sexologists in many countries to accede to a tumult of conflicting demands to produce avenues for more rapid development, expanded welfare services and greater gender security. The intellectual shortfalls occasioned by the neglect of this subject by development analysts have inflicted severe constraints on the planning strategies of the authorities in most nation-states. Patriarchal ordering aggravates the security crisis and security dilemma for women insofar as it defines and perpetuates sexual exploitation. Daly (1996: 136) writes that ‘the exploitative sexual caste system could not be perpetuated without the consent of the victims as well as of the dominant sex, and such a consent is obtained through sex role socialization - a conditioning process which begins to operate from when we are born, and which is enforced by most institutions’.

Other scholars argue that there are other vectors of women’s insecurity and marginality besides patriarchy. This may well be the case. Wanzala (1996: 85) suggests that ‘to take a gender or feminist perspective would unduly de-emphasize forms of power that impinge on the conditions of marginalized women and children which are not explained by patriarchy or male dominance’. This particular point is reinforced by Francis (2002), who observes that ‘the concept of “patriarchy” appears unsatisfactory because it cannot account for the multiplicity and complexity of power relations’. At another level of the analysis, there has been an insistence that the stronger factor in the insecurity of women is that of sexism. According to Warren (1977: 241), ‘sexism means unfair discrimination on the basis of sex. Sexism may be due to dislike, distrust, or contempt for women’. Whatever is the case, we must ‘see sexual difference as just one among others that contribute to inequality and domination’ (Nash 2002: 415). Sexism creates a fertile setting for perversion and hate syndromes that cast women in the image of prey to be attacked and harassed at will.

Most of the cardinal problems confronted by women in the arena of security arise due to the flux and tensions emanating from the construction of sex and
allied sex roles in the constitutional framework. As a biological concept, gender refers to a classification used in a distinction between the two sexes and the sexlessness of some human persons. In ancient times, gender roles had been solely about the ways in which people constructed their erotic or sexual relationships, based on discriminatory differences. However, recent conceptions of sexism accommodate the way it governs national attitudes and undermines the uniqueness and realness of the person. Often, the term sex has been used interchangeably with that of gender. In this category the sex-gender identity is depicted in three basic forms, notably, the masculine, the feminine and the neuter. A person's sexuality is extended beyond the biological role and covers a wider range of social relations, political power plays and legal instrumental functions. Accordingly, we can say that gender is used to refer to the non-physiological aspects of being female or male depending on the cultural and national expectations for femininity and masculinity (Lips 1993: 4). The social categories of gender-related security issues integrate a dichotomised ideology of intensive significance in virtually every domain of human experience (Ben 1985: 212). In this way, a number of issues in the national security arena are not treated as sex-neutral, but rather are perceived through the lens of difference and sexual segregation (Sunstein 1995: 5). Central to the analysis of gender therefore is the immediate attention that it draws to the phenomenon of difference as well as to segregation. By virtue of this difference, the idea of gender roles is to be construed as much more than a question of a concept, in that it refers to a social context of stereotypes that go beyond personality traits.

Gender addresses the normative expectations concerning appropriate masculine or feminine behaviour in a particular culture (Appelbaum 1995: 270). These ‘normative expectations’ stretch across security, justice, independence and the violation of rights, liberty, peace, etc. These norms and rules hinder the upward mobility between the sexes on an equal basis. Along the pattern of the normative micro-politics of national expectations and attitudes, there is a dichotomised empowering of agents and agencies along gender lines.

This dichotomisation is linked to the question of agent-neutral attitudes and agent-relative ones. For example, the eradication of insecurity from the gender-related dichotomy is an agent-neutral attitude, whereas the development of the stereotypical roles to suit one’s purpose is at best an agent-relative attitude. By implication, a division of agent-relative values into autonomously distinct forms explains the national ordering that specifies ‘protective relationships’ between each sex either locally or globally. This dimension of security discourse raises questions about the quality of abstract notions such as freedom, justice and person-hood embedded in the specific relations of national protection existing in the real world. It even poses questions about the specific cultural and national contexts that can nullify or reinforce the ideal ordering of protective relations. The significance for
gender and national security lies in the fact that the question of security is an important concern in the life of any person, group or nation. And while Brown (1982) holds that the concern for the security of a nation is undoubtedly as old as the nation-state itself, it is not at all clear how we can measure the extent of its incorporation with regards to the security of women.

Central to our conceptual analysis of national security for women is the rejection of the tendencies to immerse women into the male-configured and segregationist security landscape. It can even be argued that since the nation is composed of individuals, the quest for the security of the human person is a core feature of human personal and social endeavour. However, the question then becomes that of understanding how gender difference affects security propositions in relation to women. The argument of McLennan (1996) here is that the mobilisation of gender disparity in contradistinction to women’s security is such that ‘the economic, political and spiritual world that we inhabit is ruled by feminine violation’ (McLennan 1996: 7-10). The disparity between men and women, which serves as a basis for national insecurity, hinges on the violation of equality in ways that do not favour women. It is for this reason that Appelbaum (1995) says that women have not achieved anything approaching political, economic, legal or social equality with men. Accordingly, many systems of security politics are so ‘extensively based on inequalities that any aspect of inequality jeopardizes the entire structure’ (Okin 1979: 277).

Another key issue that is central to the tyranny of inequality in national security is the conceptualisation of women in the light of their dependency. Most discussions on gender security are approached through an ideology that modifies the other sex. Thus, given that women remain a group that is dominated, marginalised and subordinated, the central feature in the quest for national security cannot just be concern for the mere survival of individuals. Do we require that individuals survive as mere stooges or acolytes, without developing their own sense of proportion and well-being? Do we require that individuals unquestioningly accept their oppressed existence and thank their detractors and taskmasters for a job well done? The answer must be in the negative.

Rather, genuine national security should focus on the concern for the peace and progress of individuals and groups in society. The idea is to devise a conception of inclusive security that can operate on the principles of justice and dignity for the female sex. In this light, popular attention given to security communities focuses on the supposedly profound ‘sense of community’ or the ‘we feeling’, which according to Goldstein (1999: 430) has negative implications for equity for the female sex. Thus a major dimension of the contest for security for women is seen in the tension between the modes of ostracism and integration within the security institutions and the consequences of these for social existence.
It is interesting, yet disturbing, to note that women are portrayed as wilfully security dependent. This dependency is extended to imply the desirability for representation by men in security-oriented spheres of life. Ironically, this is a pervasive and contrary situation, whereby men are perceived as standing-in for women by an implicit but voluntary agreement. Despite the challenge to social and cultural security representation, surveys on national security patterns show that each context legitimises masculine authority and the notion that women who challenge authority deserve to be victimised (Lips 1993: 387). This makes gender prejudice a security struggle that poses an insoluble dilemma for women.

For instance, the facts of the masculine ordering of inheritance and private property, the predominant male role in sexual assault, and the portrayal of girl-woman abuse, and the social context of horrific widowhood rites, and forced marriages are often presented as a service to women. This poses a significant problem for justice, equity and social changes which are a necessary pre-requisite for the enforcement of social security (Lips 1993: 388). The central character of dependency in national life is its capacity to vitiate the security of women through the erection of perverted notions of social ordering. Worse still, this phenomenon raises critical problems about the theoretical underpinnings of human society, especially its so-called modern evolutionary embrace of the social contract principle. The question, then, is how does national insecurity for women undermine the belief in a society founded on mutual respect, tolerance, and consent as the basis of human interpersonal relations for the good of all? This point is the more significant when we review the character of ostracism as a segregationist schema.

Clearly the history of security is replete with suppressive images that ostracise women. Often the depiction of women in the history of security valorises this trend of social ostracism, limitation and subjection by the pervasive helplessness and indirection of silenced accommodation of cultural insecurities (McLennan 1996). Undoubtedly, the disadvantageous hierarchical placement of women on the pedestal of security studies reveals the unequal manifestation of culture, regime and social institutions, embracing classified subject categories such as race, sex, ethnicity, nationality, and indigenous traditions.

Indeed, what has prevailed so far is the propensity to accommodate concrete challenges to the status quo of conscious and egoistic male domination. To this effect, there may in fact be some connection between the absorptive capacity of the hegemonic security culture and the relatively limited protest by women. Feminist gender discourses have therefore revolved round attempts to alter the pseudo-projection of cultural security experiences on the female sex. Despite the confidence mustered by many women in assessing their security posture, it is glaring that they vacillate between the super-women image and a dependence syndrome, both of which are affected by the traditional anti-female bias that grants them
only an assimilative mode of interaction because of the influence of tradition on
gender stereotypes.

The question then is, can tradition ever be legitimately gender-neutral? It is
often implied that the condition of a unified or balanced security operates dis-

tinctively outside the domains of domination and repression. Unfortunately, gen-
der security is constructed as a mystified cult of misleading liberation. Besides,

female sexuality is used to secure repression. The issue is not whether traditional

systems are more secure but rather whether their approaches to security are the

measure of security desired by women. This is a very important point that elicits

not only the analysis of security, but also its foundational assumptions. Ordinarily

the entrenched security disposition towards women has a double dimension. First,
it distinguished them by their shared characteristics and social-economic

situation and more importantly it co-opts their agreement in counter-balancing
the degrees of their insecurities.

Also linked to the theme of security is the correlation of social adjustments
and organisation. The advantages of competitive predispositions encountered in
certain predetermined norms and values of social life create an exclusivist drift
towards divergent roles. The dominant patterns are the material segregation, in-
grained learned malevolence, hatred, and other virulent mythical ‘falsification of

natural and social history’ (Reed 1970: 29) concerning the normal development
of functional security roles for either sex. Segregation along sexual and security
lines is partially congruent and partially opposed in the dilemma between the

sexes (Hirstleifer 1987: 273). This leaves the woman question in a ‘security blan-

ket’, and a dysfunctional situation that stimulates an inadequate and irrational sense
of comfort and protection.

Thus it can be said that the socialisation of sexism and power relations has
given strength and vitality to the security dilemma that women endure. The best
development and security to which women have been exposed, accrue from the
benefit and foresight of professional, educational and economic power. Although
even in these spheres, the conferment of ‘power’ is often misconstrued as the
exercise of ‘the power of man over the minds and action of other men... and the
capacity to impose one’s will on others by reliance on effective sanctions in case
of non-compliance’ (Schwarzenberger 1951: 14). Thus the attempt to broaden
the horizon on segregation and insecurity uncovers a multiplicity of ways in which
women are marginalised. It also underlines the imperative for the enlightenment
of the female mind (Wollstonecraft 1792 cited in Compton 1994). Therefore, we
can construe the problem in terms of what Loic Wacquant (1996: pp ix-xi) calls
the ‘silent riot of every day life’. This phenomenon dramatically illustrates the
reality of the problem of marginality and insecurity that is often fuelled by the
very efforts to gain security. Marginality or insecurity is therefore an imposed
condition, the result of the practices of others, or of the action of the state and society on those who become marginal.

On this note, the imputed gender welfare attitudes, as Fox (1975) observed, combine social and genetic relations of security as an inalienable social endorsement of male superiority. This disrupts the welfare propositions in relationships, particularly in ascertaining or ensuring maximum security for the female sex (Kaldor 1939). An evaluation of the scope of theories on gender welfare and development addresses issues that border on differences and inequalities in social ordering. Such inequalities are classified according to types, as we see in the evidence of racism, sexual profiling, ethnicity in the academia and military, etc. Taken together these modes of otherness impact on the social structure and cultural development of the entire global community.

The dominant classical theorising on national security is therefore difficult to apply to gender studies because its central tenet of neutrality does not often weigh national security against welfare losses. However, new foundational security perspectives have a common starting point in their attachment to the collective pursuit of mutually beneficial goals, such as learning processes and technocratic, social, economic and political welfare rights that will enhance the status of all and sundry. Thus, according to Juliet Lodge (1994: xx), women’s competitive economic and political participation have great potential in mediating in the process of insecurity. In consequence, women become actively involved and become key players in issues of security.

Pivotal Foundations of National Security and the Segregation Schema Theory: the Ancient Era

A survey of early times shows the negative classification of the role of the ‘woman’ in the security segregation theory. A history of prejudice as a pivotal foundation for national security thus pervades all spheres of social life. According to Greek myth, Pandora, or the first woman, is a harbinger of pandemonium. In Roman law, she is a child and is thus in need of supervision. St. Jerome, a fourth century father of the Christian church, said: ‘Woman is the gate of the devil, the path of wickedness, the sting of the serpent, in a word, a perilous object’ (Compton 1995). Forge (2001) puts the historical dimensions of gender in proper perspective with the statement that ‘females have not been treated as equal partners and some argue from a biblical perspective that the woman was created out of the ribs of man. Therefore women should be subordinate to men in all respects’ (Forge 2001: 49).

The biblical injunction regarding this presumed inferiority states that ‘A male shall be valued at 50 silver shekels if it is a female she shall be valued at 30 shekels’ (Leviticus 27: 4). The unbroken link of this chain even at the present time, as shown by the US Census Bureau, is evident in the fact that an average full-time...
A woman in the US earns about seventy cents for every dollar earned by a full-time male worker (US Department of Commerce 1991a, 1992b). This devaluation, here expressed in economic terms, goes a long way to pre-determine women's security in social life, such that despite the epochal gap between the Old Testament and contemporary societies, women's depreciation remains quite pervasive (Appelbaum 1995: 270). Elizabeth Cady Stanton's Woman's Bible (see Elshtain 1981), published in 1895 and 1898, attacked this derogatory female castigation in the Bible. She believed that male-centred religion would have to be abolished before the true security of women could be achieved. Like many in her class, Stanton worked towards the ordination of women as full members of the clergy.

Some parallels have equally been drawn between women's insecurity and the phenomenon of slavery. Women were seen as slaves, because both were expected to be 'passive, cooperative, and obedient to their master-husbands', such that the preference is always for masculinity and the images of control linked to it. At one time in history, it was not considered respectable for women to speak before mixed audiences of men and women. In one instance, women delegates to the World Anti-Slavery Convention held in London in 1840 were denied participation. The exception to this is what McLennan (1996: 24) described as 'sacramental confession used as the whole first vehicle for the first formalized expression by women in western history' against social injustices and insecurities. The same procedure or method of expressive insecurity was used in the sixteenth century by Marguerite De Navarret (1492-1549).

However, historically an exception has often been made for royalty. This is seen in the recognition given to monarchs such as Queen Elizabeth of England, Catherine the Great of Russia, and Queen Victoria of England (Compton 1995). The attitudinal disposition occasioned by concessions of dignity, power and influence of this sort bequeath to women vulnerability and anxiety rather than an assured stability and certainty of freedom from danger. The images of security by imposition or security by proxy only offer what is at best the idea of a 'securitan'. This is someone who dwells in fancied security and who can be seized and directed to suit the whims and caprices of 'others'. Hence, there is no true security within the framework of concession security.

Also, in literary historic narrative this syndrome of silence and marginality as illustrations of illusive security extends the dependency theory. De France captures this violation in her twelfth century poem, which reveals a rare and courageous determination to challenge sexism. According to her, 'whosoever has received knowledge and eloquence in speech from God, should not be silent or secretive but demonstrate it willingly'. In demonstrating the insensitivity of the cultural renaissance of her time to women's plight, her poem titled 'Two Lovers' is illustrative of the point of view that the relational self and the personal self
were confronted with diverse biases and pitfalls, due to the social learning pattern of submission, parental patriarchal model of authority and uncritical feminine patterns of passivity. In her work, a triangular tragedy occurred between an authoritarian king, her princess and another noble (Marie de France, 1155-1170 in Ferrante 1984). This exposition by Marie De France is highly commendable because the socialising agency of the time is identified with the social structure of secrecy rather than expressiveness on the part of the female sex.

There is no doubt that the insecurity of women is linked to a paradoxical and sinister play of the emotional and psychological nature upon both men and women. Its macabre quality is unleashed by the supposition that insecurity is itself a form of security for which the aggressor must be shown gratitude. The disputation with regard to the egocentric pattern of treatment of the feminine role consists in its inextricable connection with flattery. Elizabeth Hands (1789) in The Death of Amnon pointed this out when she maintained that a substantial number of women recall the negative influences experienced as a result of the social and cultural strategies that impose disorder and violence on them. Awareness of the potential problem in the ‘securitan’ relationship, particularly with respect to gender, sex roles have given impetus to the strange and conspiratorial promotion of assault. One area in which insecurity is mainly propagated is the crucial treatment of sexual assault. In Susanna Haswell Rowson’s (1791) Marian and Lydia, the generosity of this type of insecurity consists in its treatment as a social favour. The major in his affectation developed a discourse of sexual depression and victimisation of Marian, whose only respite lay in the hope that her already ‘sinking fragile frame never would have known pollution more’. Okin (1982: 65) has made the point clearly in respect of the political realm. ‘When political theories were built on assumptions of natural hierarchy or of a God-given great chain of being, there was no particular difficulty supporting the idea that women were among the inferior categories of human beings. They could therefore legitimately be excluded from political life, denied legal equality, and relegated to a subordinate position within the family’ (Okin 1982: 65). How will this negative historical situation be altered?

The Institutionalisation of Violence: Rethinking Security for the Modern Woman

This survey of women’s security in former times enables us better to discuss the modern dimensions of the issue. Violence and violations (domestic or otherwise) against women remain the crux of the challenge to women’s security. In any case, the analysis of violence is crucial because ‘there are many different forms of violence in our society, some of which are often taken for granted’ (Alder 1992: 269). It is true therefore that ‘violence follows an ideological continuum, starting from the domestic sphere where it is tolerated, if not positively accepted. It then
moves to the public political arena where it is glamourized and even celebrated ... Women and children are the prime victims of this cult of aggression’ (Bunch and Carrillo 1990: 71). A good point to revisit is to review women as targets of negative social attitudes, who suffer not just social derogation but also become victims of untimely death.

Central to the insecurity of women in this era is the violence that pervades all spaces, public and private. The endemic problem in this regard is domestic violence, which thrives insofar as women are commoditised, privatised and voiceless in the economic, personal and legal realms. According to the Population Reference Bureau (1998), domestic violence is ‘insecurity occurring within the private sphere generally between individuals who are related through intimacy, blood or law’. The effect of it is to devalue the virtue of purity and innocence and thus leave humanity in mourning for the disguised rape of feminism (Adadevoh 1999: 4). Women have become entangled in a yoke of vice which endorses sexual assaults and rape myths, construed not just as a stranger’s ploy but also in the seemingly secure domain of good sense or filial piety (Lips 1993: 264). The correlating insecurities further extend their choking tentacles into the oppressive regimen of full-time housewifery and allied battery.

The real context of the insecurity of women under the domestic ordinance has been given a graphic colouration by Moynihan (1975: 159) who argues that ‘equally dangerous and equally detestable are the cruelties often exercised in private families under the venerable sanction of parental authority’. This is the machinery for consolidating dominance and for extolling the confrontational and tyrannical regime in the home. It is therefore clear that the insecurity of women arises not merely from the natural hostile features of the external environment, but, more importantly, through the wilful and socially constructed acts of men. The most serious threat to women’s security lies in men’s fists (Bourke 1994: 62-64). This point is not lost on theoreticians who have seen the paradox in the insecurity of the security of the family space. According to Chesnais (1992: 222), ‘the family is a place of paradox. A center affection, a refuge against adversity, it is also the foremost center of violence’.

The Women’s International Network claims that despite its hypocritical concealment, family violence is still endemic because adherence to exaggerated sex role behaviour legitimates it. The heightened degree of privacy accorded to domestic violence maintains the culture of victim-hood, simply because a flimsy sentimental approach to the issue, either by the family members or by the police, makes the offender unaccountable to moral or legal sanction. The reason why aggressors elude justice and the victims remain insecure can be traced to an interface of factors. For instance, apart from the emotional, marital or social problems arising from such violence, there are also financial problems, and a ‘lack of resources and decision making powers for community groups and statutory bodies
to detect and intervene in family violence' which perpetuates the whole cycle (WIN: 1988). It is for this reason that we contend that the spectre of insecurity looms large in the lives of women and it unleashes debilitating effects on their total well-being.

Corroborating this view, the United Nations Human Rights Commission states that ‘most domestic violence against a woman affects her mental, physical economic and social well-being. Many women tolerate such abuse because they fear retaliation by their spouse or extended family or both. If they protest, the woman's vulnerability to domestic violence is reinforced by their economic dependence, and worse still, upon men's widespread cultural acceptance of domestic violence and a lack of laws and enforcement to combat it’ (PRB 1998). Therefore, the reality of violence and the pervasive feelings of fear and anxiety are vitally linked to the sustenance of the regime of insecurity for women. The rights and dignity of women have not been adequately guaranteed because they have consistently been molested and brutalised. They face greater insecurity even from within those spaces where it was thought that their safety and sanctity could emerge. One reason may be that women have been perceived as primarily suited to fulfil special 'female' functions within the home.

Thomas Aquinas, the thirteenth century Christian theologian, said that woman was ‘created to be man's helpmeet, but her unique role is in conception since for other purposes men would be better assisted by other men’ (Compton 1995). Hence, the biological violation of women's security has been decoratively re-described to appear as normal. One of the most ironic aspects of this situation is that women are faced with the business of guaranteeing other people's security, particularly in terms of the continuity of society as their basic responsibility towards the child and the man. Yet no one is genuinely committed to the task of assuring security for women. The security of the human system is placed on women. What should be their reward in this context? How do women fit into a domestic ideology that envisions conflict of power, and endorses the under-utilisation of the major half of the human resource? Must we tolerate the ideology that affirms the unstable and over-burdened exploitation of female capital resources, constantly made ‘negligible “via” productive investment’ (Gould 1989: 154)? Can the security of women be assured by the allocation of women to mechanistic job descriptions and redesigns that specify responsibility for simple, fixed and repetitive jobs which require little or no skill development? (Hay, Gray and Smith 1989: 354-355).

Although there were women in significant professions, such as medicine, law, teaching and writing in the twelfth to the nineteenth centuries, these were not regarded as suitable work for women. As the Compton Interactive Encyclopaedia (1995) records:
Indeed, obstetrics was the domain of women. Beginning in the 19th century, the required educational preparation, particularly for the practice of a reputable profession, increased. This tended to prevent many young women, who married early and bore many children, from entering professional careers. Before 1890, women constituted about 5 per cent of the total doctors in the United States. During the 1980s the proportion was about 17 per cent. At the same time, the percentage of women doctors was about 19 per cent in West Germany and 20 per cent in France. In Israel, however, about 32 per cent of the total number of doctors and dentists were women.

In Mitchell's (1987: 178) opinion, social structures generate an attitude of disrespect if status discrepancies in respect of occupation and general social honour remain at variance. Security strategies could therefore not provide much outside formal equality since it has ‘no impact upon the structural causes of sex discrimination which lies beyond the workplace’ (Mazey 1988: 77), and sets the margin for the feminisation of poverty. In more general and global spheres, nowhere are sexual margins of insecurity more turbulent than those marked out by poverty and race.

The Masculinisaton of Security Institutions as the Basis for a Contemporary Challenge to the Nature–Nurture Distinction

Contemporary challenges to the nature-nurture distinction in security studies are perhaps most evident in the military system of security. According to Clementina (1855-1923), militant unionism fuelled the trend of militarisation (see Compton 1994, 1995). The documented history of the exclusion of women in the history of the military and security activities, according to O’Connor (1993), dates back to 1792 when the Militia Act enacted in the United States of America created a universal obligation demanding that able-bodied males participate in the militia. The edict demonstrated a clear gender bias and has led to the assumption that males fight wars, whereas females are to stay at home. This unwarranted distinction has facilitated the erosion of the establishment of genuine security for women. However, the expansionist and destructive tendencies in male-dominated war games led to the emasculation of the male populations and the bearers of the patriarchal order, thus creating in an ironic way the semblance of the type of space that women envisaged.

In the world wars, the sheer force of the destruction, the need to sustain the military industries and the belligerent national economies, compelled the emergence of women in key labour and industrial processes, albeit at times as peripheral workers. Despite the openings created by the wars, women were still marginal to the industrial and security exercises insofar as they were mere executors of the plans created by others. According to Goldstein (1999: 121), warfare in
domestic as well as agrarian and industrial relations is exclusively a male pursuit. The social environment of war retains one specific link to masculinity because of the biological-genetic composition of the male sex with the aggressive deposition of testosterone. In a psychological corroboration of the above view, it can be explained that the propensity of males for aggression acts to counter their inability to procreate. However, because of women’s care roles, it is presumed that they are peace loving rather than warlike in order to safeguard their domestic propensity.

As can be expected, the possibility of ensuring peace, safety and dignity of the women in a traditional setting raises important ethically based questions regarding protection. Protectionism is more problematic in war than in peace. The feminist outcry in war situations extended over all spheres of militarism to include both national and international security processes. The corresponding difference for the diversified source of reinterpretations on security covers an extensive range of militarised disempowerment and dependence. The outcome of this divergence is essentially to allocate defence towards the ultimately unprotected persons, on terms that are not necessarily favourable (Deger and West 1987: 10).

To further explicate this point, it would seem that the agent-neutral reason to avert unhealthy competitiveness places men in a far superior position (Sterba 1985: 2). Goldstein (1999) says that up to the present, women cannot serve in combat infantry roles on a basis comparable to men. Worse still, women in non-combatant or civilian roles are confronted by threats of extermination, because they now constitute the cardinal target of belligerents in most of the wars which either begin or end in cities. Historically therefore, the marginal status of women and their vulnerability as a dominated group has ensured that their security has not been adequately guaranteed.

A basic erroneous theme running through this belief is that security in the context of sex roles refers to the military as opposed to other key areas of security (Thomas 1987: 1). The demilitarisation and de-masculinisation of security for women is concerned with the development of schemas that ensure women’s security and protection. Feminists have tried to influence the prevailing rules, institutions and power structures which determine their socio-political and economic rights. Unfortunately, some women have traded one form of dependence for another, so that security remains elusive. For example, the increase in economic power for women at the level of financial liquidity has not fully translated into greater education and political influence. In this regard, it is worth citing the comment that ‘ultimate security is not the product of the fulfilment of particular military or revolutionary equations simply because the problem of security is political by nature, and as such can be solved only by political means’ (Arbatov 1986: 320).
Also, attention must be paid to the concurrent consolidation of the ethics of security balance and of varieties of pacifism. Perhaps following the cue of the Israeli women’s combat training, rejections of protectionism have led women’s groups in the recent years to use due process mechanisms, such as the courts, to force legislation concerning equality between working men and women (Mazey 1993). There are two advantages that the strategy is intended to achieve. For Brown (1995) such moves aim at avoiding the use of women as cheap and unprotected labour and to secure their competitive advantage.

To specify common conceptions about the life and activity of women in the urban context is often a difficult task. Urban simulations may be based on a structural naiveté that under-estimates security and social mobility. An empirical account of the problem demands an observation of some factors. A look at the major Nigerian markets and their environs shows that women patronise these places far more than men do. However, the problem is that the markets lack basic security infrastructure such as effective pedestrian crossings, parking spaces, toilet facilities, police posts, etc. In the realm of transportation, the fact that traders who are mostly women, have to sit right on top of their goods on over-loaded trucks or lorries, plying roads that are in bad shape, is clear evidence that the security of women as road users is not a major concern for the policy makers in society. Women are the targets of armed criminals, militia groups and the security forces that unleash intimidation, harassment, rape and extortion. Worse still, some women who found themselves holding public office contributed to the insecurity and abuse of women’s rights. There have been cases of wives of former Nigerian rulers pulling guns on people, and exhibiting power drunkenness. Indeed, ‘some other women suspected to be Abacha’s girlfriends were on the instruction of Maryam detained and tortured by Major Hamza Al-Mustapha the chief security officer to the late head of state’ (see Tempo, 4 February 1999).

In a clear case of the alienation of women from security, a former military governor of one of the southwestern states of Nigeria argued in a masterpiece of male arrogance that his Chief Security Officer, a woman, did not need to know of his purchase of security equipment and arms simply because she was the wife of somebody. This military ruler conveniently forgot that the woman was acting in her capacity as a superior military officer of the state. Worse still, the endemic insecurity faced by women is systematically entrenched in society by the culture of poverty and economic hardship that compels girl-children to be pushed onto the hostile streets as hawkers, prostitutes, and so on. They are exposed to the threat of rape, kidnapping, abduction, harassment etc. The desperation of families to make ends meet has led to the selling of their girl-children as house helps, child-wives and slaves. In this way, these children suffer grievous bodily and health hazards such as genital mutilation, VVF, STDs, torture and other inhumanities of unspeakable proportions.
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According to the CDHR (2001: 224-230) *Annual Report on the State of Human Rights in Nigeria* for the year 2000, women are still threatened by acts of violence, hatred and insecurity. The phenomena of forced marriages, domestic violence, intimidation and murder remain prevalent. The rampant cases of maltreatment of women in the house and workplace, rape of children, forced sexual intercourse in marriage, spousal abandonment and neglect of responsibilities are indications that women remain grossly insecure. The incidence of girl-child abandonment, girl-child stealing, and trafficking in young females has been on the increase. There is also the proliferation of spouse battering, child battering, rape, paedophilia, incest, sexual harassment, forced female circumcision, inimical widowhood rites, forced female labour, forced marriage and psychological torture, among other dominant forms of insecurity confronting women of all ages and at all levels. It is on the basis of concrete cases of the violation of women's rights and the threats to women's security that the CDHR document (2001) insists that in the year 2000, the situation regarding women and children had not improved.

**Imperatives for Evolving Gender Mutual Supplementation in National Security**

Physical, intellectual and other social developments are not the exclusive right of masculinity. The struggle to rise above the current challenges has been aptly put by Grenberg (1999: 731), who states that ‘[woman] has the power to choose between the assertion of her transcendence and her alienation as object. Such capacity for choice allows woman, despite her situation, to find a path in which her gender does not limit her’. The functional feminist emphasis on security has a direct spillover effect on the preservation and effective assurance of capabilities of human potential. Since part of the reason for insecurity lies in the relationship between prestige, power and position, the prospects for security then become the collaborative arrangement between individuals and ‘social-legal’ agencies for guaranteeing security. As such, the regulation of sex roles and activities needs to be based on the pragmatic appreciation of the value of the woman. Domesticity is as tasking and labour-intensive as any designated masculine chores. More than this is the fact that physiological tests now suggest that women have a greater tolerance for pain, and statistics reveal that women live longer and are more resistant to many diseases (Compton 1995).

In the light of the numerous problems linked to the quest for the security and dignity of women, there is a need to analyse some of the areas where change for the better is required. We must share the optimism of Daly (1996: 138) that ‘despite the vicious circle, change can occur in society, and ideologies can die, though they die hard’. The zones of operation of the change that we seek are manifold but the psychological and the political are two dominant areas of in-
tended impact. We are forced to agree with Schermer (1980: 180) that we need to insist on ‘the tenet that women need to be treated fairly, have alternatives, explore opportunities and that prejudices and cruelties which prevent that fairness, those alternatives and opportunities from being actualized must be declared unjust, denied as immoral and beaten out of our society and our psyches’. Even when we push the argument of feminism to its extreme, there is at the heart of it an undeniable search for positive self-expression and freedom that women require for attaining a meaningful and productive life. According to Achufusi (1996: 46-47), ‘the essence of (African) feminism is not hatred for men or blaming men, some of whom after all are also agents of oppression. True feminism is the reaction which leads to the development of greater resourcefulness, for survival and greater self-reliance’. Forge (2001: 56) is equally clear on the fact that ‘for society to move away from the strong man rule and inequality to one of deep rooted perception for an interrelated humane society there is a need for valuing freedom with equality, so equality and partnership are the slogans for mapping new futures for gender participation in Africa’s socio-economic transformation. Building peace among the sexes is fundamental’.

The whole point of the search for women’s security is the affirmation of the integrity of women, which in the view of Mama (2001: 67) ‘is actually about popular struggle for material redistribution and justice and related desire for existential integrity and security’. The reason why the imperative of security for women has become non-negotiable is the fact that humanity cannot move forward without the care and consideration of women. According to Zeidenstein (1978: 974), ‘women are the principal consumers of the services that nutrition, health and contraception programmes are supposed to deliver. The truth is that women’s lives are complex. Their roles in multifarious capacities suggest a more forceful and intensive commitment to the task of ensuring justice and dignity in view of a more sustainable security’.

To this effect, there is a need for a re-visioning of identities, capacities and power, in such a way that will allow for equitable stratification of social hierarchies, in terms of political authority, gendered military consolidation, labour, identities, legitimation, all without recourse to exploitative instrumentalist, elitist and masculine ideologies (Peterson 1992: 32) A crucial security concern for many women is the reconstruction of hierarchy and domination as well as the strengthening of procedures through which they may exert greater control over their own social destinies. To this effect, an obvious area to start is by seeking greater childcare or maternity leave programmes for married women.

There needs to be systematic and pro-women approaches to the reform of abortion laws, and increased and more accurate knowledge of birth control, in order to prevent the several hundred thousands of women who die every year from causes related to pregnancy, child birth and abortion. At the level of statis-
tical analysis, the ratio of maternal deaths to live birth varies enormously throughout the world, ranging from fewer than 8 maternal deaths per 100,000 live births in Europe, to more than 1,400 deaths per 100,000 live births in several countries in sub-Saharan Africa (PRB: 1998). This is a form of crusade for the assurance of medical and bio-ethical security for women. In history, one of the most prominent of these crusaders was Margaret Sanger (1910). The point must be made here that genuine security for women cannot but be tied to the question of the definition and sustenance of the rights and duties of all in society. According to Bandman (1978: 215), these rights are ‘the right to work, to social security, to just and favourable remuneration, the right to security, to education’. The quest for the security of women must be tied to concrete things. According to Gewirth (1988: 442), ‘benefits and burdens are palpable, empirically discriminate states or conditions’. In the case of women’s security these features must translate into valuable and positive goods or measures which Gilbert (1994: 30) insists must aim ‘to eliminate wage and employment discrimination against women, develop day-care and other public services that reduce the burden of family maintenance, and stimulate greater participation by men in caring and domestic activities’. These actions are intended to accomplish the vital task of maintaining ‘freedom and justice among human beings, with the expectation that, ultimately, peace and harmony can be achieved among peoples’ (Olonisakin 1998: 95).

At the educational and political levels the bid to ameliorate the insecurity faced by women has led many women’s organisations such as the National Organisation for Women (NOW), Women in Development (WID), SALT (Sisters All Learning Together), WITCH (Women’s International Terrorist Conspiracy from Hell), the Women’s Liberation Union, pioneered by the author of The Feminine Mystique (Friedman 1963) to reiterate that training is essential to women’s security. They emphasise the role of education and capacity building as a guarantee of women’s security. There is an emphasis on the possible roles of the more educated women in the uplifting of the status of women and in the defence of women’s inalienable rights to freedom, expression, self-actualisation, peace and security.

Conclusion

By way of a conclusion we can agree that to guarantee meaningful and enduring security implies, as former US President Bill Clinton (1996: 6) stated, ‘giving all men, women and children the tools of opportunity - education, health care, employment, legal rights and political freedoms’. The features itemised by Clinton when taken together will ensure the protection of the dignity of women and their security at the personal and social levels. The question of dignity has been aptly described by Goodin (1981) to mean a combination of features. This implies a conclusive repudiation of the ‘limits of the patriarchal definition, what we
consider as the functional fallacy of the patriarchal culture, indisputably highlighted by the failure of men especially in Africa to confront the very important age-old question of justice’ (Adadevoh 2002: 169). The question of justice must embrace as never before the issues of the common good and dignity of persons and especially of all marginal peoples. According to Goodin (1981: 98-99), ‘protecting people’s dignity requires more than just prohibiting degrading policy outcomes ... people show each other respect or disrespect through their attitudes and motives whether or not they culminate in action’. This idea of respect is intended to pursue justice and in the view of Owens (1969: 241), ‘to endeavour to create those conditions in which men can live their own lives, pursue happiness and fulfil their destiny’. In seeking a way forward, there must be a de-emphasis on creating ambiguities in sex roles in terms of the quest for freedom and competence. According to Lodge (1995: 316), the repercussion of these ambiguities addresses ‘the question of who has (more competitive) competence for the security matter’. Therefore our aim is to deconstruct the closure of women, and to prevent the erasure of the perceived less competitive person from the guarantee of social security. Our essay therefore, receives its justification from the prevailing and unacceptable situation of hydra-headed insecurities arising as a result of the fundamental crises in the ethical conduct of the individual and the community. In this case, much would depend, as is often the case, on the cessation of the distinction between nature and nurture.

This work has examined in detail the conceptual and historical issues in the clarification of gender, national security and the segregationist schema theory. The work highlighted the reality of non-belonging, marginality and inequality of women as potential contributors to national insecurity. It insisted that gender role socialisation with respect to ‘conceptual security’ has always been problematic, because it tended to be seen predominantly in collective military and defence terms, as opposed to the more viable personal developmental connotation. This restrictive conception of security was inherently defective, not only because it reduced security to the mere absence of conflict, but also because women were not fully included in the strategies for the avoidance or management of conflict. Neither the planners nor the executioners had the full interest of women’s security at heart. The consequence was that women, children and other highly vulnerable segments of a society suffered the most in the event that a conflict (internal or externally motivated) boiled over. In repudiating this conception of security, it was shown that it did not sincerely confront the internally induced threats to women’s security. Rather, it continued the perpetration of this insecurity, because it remained immersed in the hegemonic ordering of the patriarchal and command structures, with their uniquely magisterial posturing.
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