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GLOSSARY AND ACRONYMS

BMS  United Nations First Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the UN Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All its Aspects (2003)

CEDAW  The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (1979)

DPKO  United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations

ECOSOC  United Nations Economic and Social Council

Gender  Socially constructed roles and socially learned behaviour and expectations associated with females and males. Women and men are biologically different, but all cultures interpret and elaborate these innate differences into a set of social expectations about what rights, resources and power they possess.

Gender Equality  Gender equality is defined in terms of equality under the law, equality of opportunity (including equality of rewards for work and equality in access to human capital and other productive resources that provide opportunity) and equality of voice (the ability to influence and contribute to the development process).
Gender Mainstreaming

“Mainstreaming a gender perspective is the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in all areas and at all levels. It is a strategy for making women’s as well as men’s concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres so that women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal is to achieve gender equality”. (ECOSOC, 1997/2)

IANSA International Action Network on Small Arms

NGO Non-governmental Organization

PoA Programme of Action, established at the United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects (2001)

SALW Small Arms and Light Weapons

UN United Nations

UNDDA United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs

UNIFEM United Nations Fund for Women
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This monograph presents an overview of how gender language is used at meetings and in documents of various United Nations (UN) fora on the topic of small arms and light weapons (SALW). The monograph begins with an overview of relevant definitions and the emergence on the global agenda of norms on SALW and gender mainstreaming at the United Nations. The authors then scan statements from official meetings and documents from the Security Council and the General Assembly from 2001–2003, as well as the 2001 SALW Conference and the Biennial Meeting of States on SALW in 2003. A list of ‘gender reference indicators’ is used to assess the frequency and context of references, and to evaluate points of convergence and divergence between international norms on gender and SALW.

The authors conclude that UN debates on SALW do not yet address gender in the SALW context in a way that encompasses the differing social, economic and political effects of these weapons on men and women. The final section of the monograph offers concluding observations and some recommendations in anticipation of the 2006 Review Conference on Small Arms and Light Weapons.

Observations

- The evolution of norms on gender and SALW at the UN occurs in cycles, through a lengthy process of consensus-building.

- Gender mainstreaming is more than a theory; it has material implications for the implementation activities of the UN.

- Although non-governmental organizations and member states have an inter-dependent relationship at the UN, they have varying constraints in how they deal with these issues, resulting in differences in approach.
Recommendations

- Experts on the gender perspectives relevant to small arms and light weapons should engage in education and awareness-raising exercises with representatives of member states well in advance of UN meetings on SALW.

- The gap between those who have gender expertise and those who make policy on SALW can be bridged through focused workshops, seminars and dialogues that encourage a common understanding of this issue.

- If messages on gender and small arms from gender experts, civil society, UN specialized agencies and interested member states are co-ordinated and streamlined, they are more likely to make an impact.

- Analysis of the agenda-setting value of UN meetings and documents should be complemented by the monitoring and evaluation of the effect that gender mainstreaming has on the implementation of UN activities on SALW.

- The 2006 Review Conference on Small Arms and Light Weapons represents a golden opportunity for NGOs, UN agencies and gender experts to insist on the inclusion of gender language on SALW in statements and outcome documents. In this way they will better reflect the needs, experiences and perspectives of both men and women.
INTRODUCTION

Tracing the evolution of new political conversations can be a complex endeavour. This complexity becomes compounded when a norm is relatively new on the global agenda, does not yet have a universal definition, and has been historically marginalized. Such is the case with ‘gender mainstreaming’ in discussions of illicit small arms and light weapons (SALW) at the United Nations (UN).

The issue of gender mainstreaming at the UN has been a norm in development since the 1975 World Conference on the International Women’s Year in Mexico City. A useful definition of this term within the UN came from a UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) resolution issued in 1997:

“…[t]he process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in all areas and at all levels. It is a strategy for making women’s as well as men’s concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres so that women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal is to achieve gender equality.”

By making reference to both men and women, this definition provides a crucial framework to keep in mind when discussing SALW, because of the difference in impact of SALW on men and women. This monograph aims to identify failures within the UN system to consider the dimensions defined above, and investigates their ramifications by examining the language used within UN meetings to see where such failures may lie.

As global norms promoting gender equality emerge, others aimed at thwarting the illicit trade in SALW are also being formulated. With gun violence causing over half a million casualties per year, and over 600 million guns in worldwide circulation, the problem has assumed huge proportions. In response, international organizations, UN member states and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have begun to develop a norm infrastructure that combats gun
violence. Progress was accelerated when the UN Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects was held in July 2001.²

Bearing in mind the definitions and good practices of gender mainstreaming, the authors of this monograph analyze the intersection of the UN’s conversations on SALW with gender. The aim is to assess the extent to which strategies designed to reduce the effects of SALW are gender aware. To date, there has been no comprehensive study that examines the debates, resolutions, reports, and other documents of the UN on small arms through a gender lens. This study undertakes that challenge.

Gender discourse within the context of SALW has been noticeably neglected in discussions at the UN, even though “a disproportionate percentage of the aggressors (whether in conflict or in peace) are male, while a significant proportion of victims are women”.³ Any sort of discussion that includes a gender component at the UN tends to focus mainly on the context of women and children as victims of war, without taking into account gender mainstreaming, which is an effort to include the situations of both men and women in such discourse. In addition, the discussions at the UN on gender and armed violence have traditionally been limited to the context of war, rather than including more holistic discussions of the impact of SALW on men and women in society in both peace and wartime situations.

This monograph surmises that despite some progress, gender perspectives have not become systematically incorporated into all UN fora on SALW, and examines reasons why this might be. The first section of the monograph provides an overview of the definitions and the emergence on the global agenda of both the issues of SALW and of gender mainstreaming at the UN. The second section scrutinizes the frequency and content of references to gender in the UN, and assesses how these have changed over time within debates and documents addressing SALW in the UN General Assembly and the Security Council between 2001–2003. The third section contains a similar analysis of the statements, reports and other UN documents issued by the 2001 UN Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects and the 2003 UN First Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the UN Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All its Aspects. The final section offers observations and conclusions on the current status of gender mainstreaming within the UN’s management of the SALW issue. It offers recommendations on how to promote the incorporation of gender perspectives on SALW into UN decision-making processes more actively.
CHAPTER ONE
GENDER MAINSTREAMING AND SMALL AND LIGHT WEAPONS: NORM EMERGENCE AT THE UN

Most of the deaths, injury and destruction caused during conflicts since the end of the Cold War have resulted from the use of small arms, but the response of the global community to this growing crisis has been slow. In January 1995, the UN Secretary-General, Boutros Boutros-Ghali was the first major figure to alert the world to the spread and misuse of SALW. In 1997, a UN Panel on SALW made a recommendation that a UN conference be held on the illicit trafficking of small arms, and in July 2001 the Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects took place. This conference adopted a Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in SALW in All Its Aspects by consensus. The General Assembly also decided to convene a Meeting of States on a biennial basis, commencing in 2003, to consider the national, regional and global implementation of the Programme of Action (PoA).

The first Biennial Meeting was convened in July 2003. In addition to these two meetings, the UN General Assembly First Committee on Disarmament and International Security and the UN Security Council have each held annual discussions on SALW, and further reports have been submitted by the Secretary-General each year on the same issue. The next Biennial Meeting of States (BMS on the Implementation of the PoA) will take place in 2005, while the first SALW review conference is scheduled to occur in 2006.

Gender mainstreaming norm evolution at the UN

The first UN statement that linked gender equality, development and peace was made at the UN Conference on Women, held in Mexico City in 1975, which brought together nearly 6,000 women and men, thousands of NGOs and 133 government delegations. The discussion and activism initiated in Mexico, and the subsequent conference held in Stockholm (1980), were to develop into a coherent plan of action. This was put forward during the Third World Women’s Conference in Nairobi, Kenya and the parallel NGO forum. It provided gender mainstreaming advocates with the first foundations of a
policy platform from which to put pressure on government agencies and states. In 1979, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), adopted by the UN General Assembly, defined what constituted discrimination against women. It also set up an agenda for national action to end such discrimination. Another key document approved in 1995 at the UN Fourth International Conference on Women was the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, which identified many effects of armed conflict specific to women and girls. In a general sense, the language used to link violence and women evolved from mere passing mentions in earlier years, to more contextually specific accounts in more recent years that referred to the impact that violence had had on women.

While these elements were crucial to the broader role of gender mainstreaming within the UN, in 2000 more specific norms were developed that applied to programmes geared toward helping women who were facing armed conflict. On 31 May 2000, the Windhoek Declaration and Namibia Plan of Action on “Mainstreaming a Gender Perspective in Multidimensional Peace Support Operations” proposed that “the principles of gender equality must permeate the entire [peace] mission, at all levels, thus ensuring the participation of women and men as equal partners and beneficiaries in all aspects of the peace process”. In practice this could include a range of different elements, including ensuring gender balance in peacekeeping personnel; training peacekeepers in the different ways in which conflict affects men and women; and planning disarmament, demobilization and reintegration processes so that they benefit men and women equally.

This was followed by the adoption of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security in October 2000. This ground-breaking resolution recognized the concept of women making a direct contribution to disarmament, and emphasized the need to incorporate gender perspectives in all areas of peacekeeping operations. Resolution 1325 was a significant achievement in that it provided a conceptual shift. It was first time that the Security Council had recognized women as active agents in peace building and development, rather than merely as victims of war. In the three years since the adoption of the resolution, the Security Council has held four debates on Women, Peace and Security. In addition, two presidential statements and a Secretary-General’s Report have been devoted to the subject.

The goal of gender mainstreaming is to promote and provoke a “revolutionary change” in the international and domestic policy process. This would make
gender issues a core concern, not only for specific departments or bodies dealing with women’s issues, but for all actors across various subject areas, and at all stages in the policy process, “from conception and legislation to implementation and evaluation”. Just as discussions of the specific requirements of women and the likely effects on them of policies have been missing from the discourse between policy makers, so any discussion of the implications of policy for men has been missing from planning for mainstream development. In addition, men are largely ignored in institutional efforts to operationalize and promote gender mainstreaming, perpetuating the inscription of ‘gender’ as the domain and the concern of women. Therefore, gender stereotypes (such as the perceptions that ex-combatants are all men, and that women are the only victims of conflict) pervade the assumptions on which policies, projects and programmes continue to be based. The issue of small arms and light weapons is no exception.

Convergence of norms?

In examining the major UN documents on SALW to assess their response to women’s specific experiences of the misuse of SALW, Vanessa Farr, a gender specialist, observes: “Although weapons proliferation is often culturally sanctioned and upheld by the manipulation of gender ideologies, gender goes entirely unremarked in all documents which were not explicitly conceived to focus on gender mainstreaming”. When women have been mentioned, UN statements and documents systematically characterize them as the primary victims of gun violence. Not only is this characterization false (as men are, in fact, most commonly the victims of gun-related deaths), but it fails to acknowledge the various manifestations of victimization that women often endure as a result of gun violence. These include psychological trauma, economic hardship and sexual assault.

Also neglected in the discourse are women’s more complex roles in conflict areas as peace-builders, care-givers and combatants. Gender stereotyping and the refusal to discuss the impact of gender ideologies within the context of SALW violence holistically diverts attention from human rights violations made possible by guns, such as gender-based violence. It also ignores various forms of community-building in which women can be significant and productive actors. As long as gender and SALW remain exclusive to one another in policy making discussions, strategies to tackle the problem of gun violence will continue to ignore crucial pointers that help to identify both the root of the problem and suggest comprehensive solutions.
In recognition of the need to explore the context of gender mainstreaming in disarmament issues at the UN, the UN Department for Disarmament Affairs (UNDDA), along with the Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and the Advancement of Women of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, issued a special collection of Briefing Notes in 2001, entitled “Gender Perspectives on Disarmament”. This resource packet was one of the first tools developed to explore the relationship between gender and disarmament.

Although fairly general in nature, the Briefing Notes provided the groundwork for the incorporation of gender considerations into the SALW issue. They also emphasized the importance of implementing Security Council Resolution 1325. These efforts, under the leadership of the former Under-Secretary General for Disarmament, Jayantha Dhanapala, resulted in the development of the DDA Gender Action Plan, which was released in 2002. This document aimed to provide “a concrete working tool” for mainstreaming gender perspectives within DDA mandates. It was the first gender action plan produced by a UN Secretariat unit, setting an example upon which other departments and agencies within the UN could build. However, while this advance is important, such building blocks have not so far modified UN discourse, as this analysis will demonstrate.

Methodology

The overwhelming quantity of relevant UN bodies, meetings, documents and reports that contribute to the formation of norms on gender and armed conflict or gender and SALW makes covering every relevant forum and document impossible. Considering these limitations, the authors have selected the Security Council, General Assembly, 2001 SALW Conference and 2003 Meeting of States on SALW for examination, on the grounds of their visible and weighty roles in norm-building on peace and security issues.

This study scans the Security Council and General Assembly statements, documents, Secretary-General reports and resolutions for key words that reference gender disaggregations. The key words are ‘gender’, ‘women’, ‘men’, ‘female’, ‘male’, ‘girl’ and ‘boy’. The contexts within which the key words arise determine the ‘gender reference indicators’ that this study utilizes to form a framework through which to compare gender reference frequency and contextual diversity within and between UN SALW fora. As the Security Council debates on women, peace and security primarily address gender issues, it is not necessarily as useful to evaluate gender reference indicators
based on the same values as it is to examine meetings that have a ‘difference’ focus. Therefore, these documents are first scanned for language referring to small arms. Only then are they examined according to the gender reference indicators utilized for the other meetings.

The other key events held under the auspices of the UN that the authors assess are the 2001 Conference and 2003 Biennial Meeting of States on SALW. These meetings are analyzed in Section III, using the same methodology as that applied for the General Assembly and the Security Council. This section also looks at other factors that may have played a role, such as civil society meeting schedules during these larger events, to observe the thematic priorities of participant civil society actors. Whether gender is a low, medium or high priority among these organisations might affect the policy of advocacy for gender mainstreaming among state delegations, either positively or negatively.

The data collected on these UN bodies and their events offer tools with which to compare the efforts of member states, UN agencies and NGOs toward incorporating gender perspectives into SALW global governance structures and processes. Although this analysis aims to determine the extent to which the UN focuses on gender in SALW discussions, it remains sympathetic to the varying levels of expertise on gender matters in different member states, UN agencies and NGOs. It also bears in mind that different levels of expertise in gender analysis may cause some actors to refrain from commenting on gender, and others to devote more vigorous and directed attention to it. While sympathetic to the limitations imposed by any lack of expertise, this analysis identifies such deficiencies as an issue that indicates the need for better collaboration between those actors with expertise in matters relating to gender and those without it.

Further studies beyond the scope of this monograph could look at the consequences, in terms of gender, of the policies implemented by the UN, and the extent to which the language used at the UN has encouraged the achievement of certain agreed-upon criteria for good practice in gender mainstreaming. The next step would be to link the language used in UN official documents and mandates to the degree of gender awareness demonstrated on the ground in UN policy implementation.

The comparison of various official UN documents and statements, therefore, offers clues as to where gaps in expertise may lie, and also exposes potential entry points for further investigation. It paints a picture of the ways in which
systematic gender mainstreaming in UN SALW conferences and meetings has
evolved, by mapping out the gender language that is used within the discourse.
Although it does not provide direct information regarding the effect of such
language on actual gender awareness amongst actors, it does allow inferences
to be drawn as to how gender has been prioritized in the thematic hierarchy
of UN meetings and conferences on SALW.
CHAPTER TWO

Under the United Nations (UN) Charter, the UN Security Council has primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Unlike the General Assembly (GA), the Council has 15 members—five permanent members and ten elected by the General Assembly for two-year terms. While other organs of the UN make recommendations to governments, the Council alone has the power to take decisions that member states are obliged under the Charter to carry out. By examining the deliberations, resolutions and related documents of each body, one can ‘take the temperature’ of the international mood on various issues of concern. This can give a sense of where an issue stands in the realm of norm emergence, development, agreement or disagreement among member states, as well as that issue’s level of priority.

The General Assembly

Prior to the 2001 SALW Conference

The UN General Assembly as the organisation’s main deliberative organ, includes representatives of all UN member states. Through its politically binding resolutions, the General Assembly makes recommendations on the principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security. These include the governance of disarmament and arms regulations. It adopted its first resolution on the issue of illicit trade in SALW in 1994, when it welcomed an initiative from Mali raising the question of the illicit circulation and stockpiling of small arms in various states of the Saharo-Sahelian subregion. In 1995, the GA adopted another resolution requesting that the Secretary-General convene a panel of qualified government experts to explore the types, nature and causes of the excessive accumulation and transfer of SALW, and ways and means to prevent such activities. It was in the report of this panel that gender references arose in the context of SALW for the first time. Women were twice mentioned (probably inaccurately) as the primary victims of SALW, “with women and children accounting for nearly 80% of the casualties”. The frequent reference to this number by UN member states is not useful,
in that it may or may not be true: little data related to small arms has been disaggregated by gender. As noted by a study on small arms undertaken by the International Committee of the Red Cross:

“These estimates [of 80% of civilian casualties of SALW] are almost always provided with no indication of how they have been arrived at. Most commonly, a reference is given which merely refers to an earlier report quoting the same figure. Thus, in recent years, a large number of documents by NGOs, international organizations, and even articles in the peer-reviewed medical literature have cited figures which are increasingly being used as ‘evidence’ by those concerned with weapons availability and misuse, but which are difficult, if not impossible, to substantiate.”25

In 1999, when the Secretary-General submitted his report to the General Assembly on the subject of small arms, he mentioned women twice in the context of their being victims. His statement, “…We would welcome the inclusion of the following items in conference agenda: (b) the political, economic and social consequences...[of] the role played by small arms and light weapons in...exposing women and children to violence”, brought to the forefront the importance of understanding the differentiated impacts of SALW violence on women, although it remained in the ‘women as victims’ pigeonhole.26

In another report made by the Secretary-General a month later, entitled “The Illicit Traffic in Small Arms”, three references were made to women. He called on the UN to include “women’s organizations” to participate in civil society’s efforts to combat the illicit trade in small arms.27 It was the first time in which a Secretary-General’s report had referred to women as actors rather than victims. Although mentioned in passing, these references introduced to the GA the idea of including the informal sector in which women operate into ways of addressing SALW. The report also included one reference to the importance of collecting information on the effects of illicit trafficking of SALW on women and children.28

Of all nine resolutions and decisions adopted by the GA between 1995–2000, however, none included gender language indicators.29 Evidently the gender mainstreaming goals of the ECOSOC resolution of 199730 had not yet penetrated the GA’s walls. In 2000, the report submitted by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly on “Illicit Traffic in Small Arms” contained no reference to gender, indicating a regression in the prioritization of gender as a consideration in SALW issues.31
While examining the GA documents concerning small arms to find evidence of gender mainstreaming, the authors found it useful to extend their analysis to thematic meetings focused on women’s issues, to see if the problem of language used in discussing small arms issues has been raised in those fora. In 2000, the GA held a Special Session, entitled “Women 2000: gender equality, development and peace for the 21st century.” This meeting considered three thematic areas: how armed conflict affected women; how women responded to conflict, peace processes and post-conflict reconstruction; and how the UN incorporated gender equality into the strategy of peace operations. The key recommendations that ensued were:

- to address the different impact of armed conflict on men and women;
- to devote specific attention to forms of rehabilitation and reintegration that take into account the needs of women and girls;
- to improve women’s capacity by encouraging their involvement in humanitarian activities during times of armed conflict;
- to promote the participation of women in peace processes;
- to support women serving as stabilizers in conflict situations; and
- to release resources for social and economic programmes geared towards the advancement of women.

Another recommendation concerning disarmament attempted to create a link between reduced military spending and developmental benefits, in that the former would allow for increased spending on improving the situation of women. Although it did not reappear again in subsequent statements or documents, and does not clearly spell out the connection between gender and small arms, the use of language specifically linking the cost of small arms to gender concerns is interesting at such an early stage of norm development on small arms.

The General Assembly general debate, 2001

At the beginning of each regular session, the GA holds a general debate, often addressed by heads of state and government, in which member states have the opportunity to express their views on pressing international issues. The 2001
debate was important for two reasons: it was the first to take place following the SALW Conference, and it was also the first meeting after the 11 September 2001 attacks on the US.

In 2001, approximately 17% of the statements in this general debate made a reference to gender, a measurement arrived at based on key words. (See Appendix I.) However, only three (1.6%) of all statements referred to small arms and light weapons specifically in combination with gender language, and all mentioned women only. Those three statements referring both to SALW and gender touched on four gender language indicators, characterizing women as “the most vulnerable in society” and as the “primary victims” of SALW violence. One statement included references to the importance of “empowering women as partners in socio-economic development.”

Out of 17% of all statements addressing the issue of gender in the context of armed conflict, 28% of the references were made in the context of women as victims of armed conflict. With the war in Afghanistan just beginning, ten references were made to protecting women’s rights in that country, including various suggestions for the empowerment of Afghani women, so that they could “once again become the makers of their own fate and future.” Thirteen references were made to the importance of the role of women in peace-building, nine to gender equality, eight to women’s rights as human rights, three to Security Council resolution 1325, one to gender mainstreaming in peacekeeping operations, and one to the activism of women in civil society.

The two Secretary-General’s Reports to the GA, “Illicit Traffic of Small Arms and Light Weapons” (A/56/182) and “Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them” (A/56/296), did not contain any language referring to specific groups (women, men, children or the elderly).

**The General Assembly general debate, 2002**

In 2002, the number of gender references decreased. By then, only 14% of the 187 reports made some gender reference in the context of armed conflict, while 1.1% (two statements) included language on both small arms and gender. Considering that the 2001 Conference on SALW had taken place the previous year, this number is surprisingly low. In the context of small arms, one reference was to women as a “vulnerable group” in society, while the other was to the “exploitation of women” as a pressing global issue that needed to be addressed along with SALW. This language, indicating the belief that women
are more vulnerable to SALW violence than anyone else, merely serves to reinforce the misuse of a stereotype that women (and children) make up the greater proportion of victims of SALW.

In the broader context of gender and armed conflict, there were 49 instances of gender language, although all focused exclusively on women. Eighteen of these references were to women as victims of war; nine to women’s participation in peace building, with the main emphasis on equal political participation. Eight references were made to women’s rights as human rights. Six illustrative examples were used in relation to gender issues (all references to women, none to men). Five references were to gender equality; one to the role of women in civil society; one to gender mainstreaming in the UN generally; and one to Security Council Resolution 1325.

In contrast to 2001, the general debate of the GA in 2002 was considerably less politically charged. In response to the events of 11 September 2001, most states taking part in the earlier debate deplored terrorism. There was also a general focus on empowering and upholding the rights of the victimized and oppressed, especially Afghan women. There were no equivalent focal points to which states could direct their rhetoric at the 2002 debate. It also appeared that gender mainstreaming was still not an important feature of GA discourse. Only one country, Chile, mentioned gender mainstreaming as a goal. However, one improvement on 2001 was that the Secretary-General’s report to the GA on small arms made six references to gender, in the context of women as both the majority of victims and as peace-builders. Again, no attention was drawn to men. In particular, the report highlighted two United Nations Fund for Women (UNIFEM) projects related to SALW in Albania and Somalia.37

### The General Assembly general debate, 2003

While the number of statements alluding to gender, or at least to women, increased in 2003, the number of measurable gender language indicators fell to 56 references.

One report out of 196 identified the threat of SALW to women as a top priority.38 In the context of gender and armed conflict, 16 references were made to women as victims, while 13 were made to the role of women in peace building. This almost equal balance of reference contexts is one encouraging sign indicating the possible development of a conceptual shift towards viewing
women in situations of armed conflict as active agents rather than simply as victims. This is in contrast to the debates in 2001 and 2002, in which more than twice as many references occurred that emphasized the victimization of women rather than acknowledging the variety of important roles, such as peace building, that women play in times of conflict.

In 2003, both of the reports submitted to the GA by the Secretary-General made seven references to gender. This time only one of these was to women as victims. The other references were to gender equality, women’s rights as human rights, mainstreaming gender in peacekeeping and in disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, Security Council Resolution 1325, and one reference to the negative impact the violation of women’s rights had on development. This increased frequency of gender language references in the Secretary-General’s reports on small arms is encouraging.

**The disconnection between the First Committee and the general debate of the General Assembly**

The discourse in the GA First Committee on Disarmament and International Peace between 2001–2003 seemed to be completely disconnected from that of its counterpart, the debate in the GA, in that language used when talking about gender and SALW by the two bodies did not correspond. References in the First Committee to the gendered implications of small arms proliferation appeared only nine times in the course of meetings from 2001–2003. Every single mention of gender occurred in the context of women being the primary victims of SALW. The observation that unless the discussion is specifically focused on women, gender issues will go virtually unremarked, is very clearly demonstrated within the GA. The same phenomenon manifests itself in the Security Council.

**The Security Council’s thematic debates on SALW**

The Security Council has held an annual one- or two-day debate on the item “small arms” since 2001. Given their exclusive focus on this issue, the debates when examined in terms of this study’s gender language indicators proved revealing of the extent to which gender mainstreaming featured in the SALW discussions.
Security Council thematic debate on small arms, 2001

In 2001, 22% of the statements in the annual debate on small arms made reference to gender, each of them to women as the victims of SALW proliferation. Various different words were used to describe this victimization, including mention of the “increasing suffering of women and children in armed conflict” and the “defenseless[ness of] women and children”, as the preliminaries to a call for the “protection of civilians, women, and children in armed conflict”. Yet mechanisms of protection, or the role of women as active agents in early-warning and peace-building, were left out of the discussion.

The Security Council Presidential Statement on Small Arms of 2001 made one gender reference, which included the following: “The Security Council expressed grave concern at the harmful impact of small arms and light weapons on civilians in situations of armed conflict, particularly on vulnerable groups such as women and children…”. Again, this emphasis on the stereotype of women and children as the only vulnerable groups does not serve to advance the quality or the empirical accuracy of the discourse on gender and small arms.

Security Council thematic debate on small arms, 2002

In 2002 the frequency of references to gender in the small arms debate increased significantly, to 34%. While the rise in gender references indicated relatively greater attention to gender perspectives, all of them described women as the primary victims of SALW proliferation. Country representatives stated, “80% of civilians killed are women and children”. As already noted, this statistic is often cited by NGOs, UN agencies and governmental officials, although its origin is unclear, and it excludes the huge numbers of combatants, both male and female, who are killed by small arms. This statistic, seemingly more urban legend than factual, is often challenged. However, actual data on those affected by small arms (such as civilians, combatants or war refugees) that is disaggregated by gender have yet to be collected.


In 2003, the debate on small arms focused on the West Africa region. The frequency of references to gender dropped to 31%. However, not every gender reference concerned women as victims. Instead, mention was made of the role of the “grassroots movement taking their fate in[to] their own hands and
trying to come to terms with the problems of the reckless and irresponsible use of small arms and light weapons”. In this context, the activism of the women of the Mano River Union was particularly commended.

In the resolution adopted by the Security Council regarding Small Arms and Light Weapons in West Africa (S/RES/1467), no reference was made to gender. In contrast, Security Council Resolution 1509 (S/RES/1509) of 2003, establishing the UN Mission in Liberia (UNMIL), mentions women four times. The provision in operative paragraph (3) point (f), describing UNMIL’s mandate, is particularly relevant to this monograph, as it calls for the development of the mission’s disarmament, demobilization, reintegration and repatriation (DDRR) programme to pay “particular attention to the special needs of child combatants and women”. In addition it reaffirms the importance of implementing Security Council Resolution 1325 to integrate a gender perspective into peacekeeping operations and post-conflict peace-building. While the inclusion of gender mainstreaming in the mandate is important, in practice it is not yet clear that consideration of both men and women has been systematically or institutionally included in the DDRR process in Liberia.

The Security Council’s thematic debates on women, peace and security

This section conducts a thorough examination of the language of the Security Council debates on women, peace and security. The aim is to trace the emergence of norms on gender and armed conflict during a total of four debates occurring between 2000–2003. All four debates were open, allowing UN member states not currently serving on the Security Council to make statements.

The small arms issue was not mentioned in the 2000 Security Council debate on women, peace and security. There was no debate on the topic in 2001. However, in the debate in July 2002, 22% of the statements referred to SALW. Two of these references fell into the women as victims context: the ‘threat’ of SALW to women and children and how women were ‘harmed’ by small arms. One-third of the references concerned the need to mainstream gender in disarmament activities. In this vein, the representative of Colombia stated that his country was “informally examining the feasibility of doing some kind of work on the gender issue” during Colombia’s presidency of the Security Council in December. In the end, the Colombian presidency did not convene a special focus meeting on the issue.
The third context employed with reference to women and small arms was the recognized role of women already taking part in disarmament activities. For example, the Secretary-General’s Special Advisor on Gender Affairs, Angela King, spoke of two cases, in Albania and Cambodia, in which women’s groups had been involved in weapons collection and destruction.

The statements in the 2002 debate generally referred to women as victims, although one statement gave women an expanded role: “One factor that increases the risk of domestic violence and violence against women in post-conflict period is the proliferation of small arms. For this reason, women and girls often participate actively in arms collection programmes”, for example in the weapons collection programmes in Albania and Mali, where women have played active roles as mobilizers for disarmament and peace-building.

In the 2003 debate, the number of uses of gender language increased slightly, to 13.5% of the statements made by national representatives. Again, two referred to women as victims of SALW proliferation. One state mentioned NGO support for Security Council Resolution 1325 as a “tool for promoting gender issues”. In addition, the representative from the Philippines mentioned the role of women in weapons collection campaigns in Albania.

This analysis has shown that over the four years of Security Council debates on women, peace and security, small arms are a minor focus in the wider context of armed conflict. However, it is interesting to note that the language on gender and small arms that various countries use in one thematic debate held by the Security Council would not recur in the national statements made in different thematic debates within the same body. It would be useful if the other debates held in the Security Council included references to gender in disarmament activities, and recognized that women are already very active in this domain.

These meetings provide a platform to articulate certain principles, norms, and recommendations. At times certain issues become more popular than others, but they may then fade from view, depending on where the attention of the member state is focused at that moment. Therefore, the role of ‘norm-setting’ documents, such as Security Council Resolution 1325, is instrumental in pushing forward issues like the gender implications of small arms and light weapons on the international agenda. The concluding section of this monograph suggests ways in which this norm cycle can be used to encourage increased awareness and education on the issue of gender and SALW for policy-makers.
CHAPTER THREE
GENDER LANGUAGE AT THE 2001 UN CONFERENCE AND 2003 MEETING ON SALW

In order to assess the full scope of the UN’s gender mainstreaming efforts within SALW governance on a global level, it is necessary to look at the gender language used within the various fora of UN world conferences and meetings. Because SALW as an issue have only recently emerged on the international agenda, the UN has held only two meetings geared toward addressing the problem of SALW proliferation. These are the 2001 UN Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects (2001 SALW Conference), and the 2003 First Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the UN Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Lights Weapons in All Its Aspects (BMS). An examination of the gender language used in the official statements and reports coming out of both of these international events offers valuable information that assists in determining the extent to which discourse at these events incorporates gender perspectives.

Gender language and the UN Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects

The framework for the 2001 UN SALW Conference developed as the international community began to realize that illicit trade in SALW and the violence resulting from it was a pervasive problem that affected the global community because it was not inhibited by national borders. Therefore the UN needed a global forum through which to establish a global governance regime that would address the SALW problem. In September 1999, the UN developed a set of guidelines for the conference, using a group of governmental experts on small arms, and then set up a Preparatory Committee (PrepCom) to plan the conference events and draft the preliminary objectives. While these aimed to combat the illicit trade in SALW on a technical level, another question soon became apparent: To what extent were they creating a conference culture that allowed the participants to address the human elements affected by, and active within, SALW issues? This included the consideration of gender perspectives.
To prepare for their analysis, the authors needed to research all uses of gender language in statements from national delegates, NGOs, international organizations, the conference report and press releases. Then they identified the frequency of gender language used throughout the formal proceedings of the 2001 Conference before attempting to understand the context in which gender references were used. Between the document categories overall, women as victims of violence made up the majority of contexts within which references to gender were used. Approximately 72% of the gender references employed in all of these documents referred to women as victims in some capacity. Such an overwhelming majority of references in one category over the other 12 gender reference indicators raises the question: Why did member states at this conference focus on women as victims rather than on some of the other ways women participate in SALW issues? And why did the fact that men, who as the main users of SALW are the greatest victims of SALW misuse, go unmentioned?

Some of the authors’ findings are as follows. Member states delivered 132 national statements, 30% of which contained at least one reference to gender. NGO statements had slightly fewer instances of gender references at 26%, while international organization statements captured the lowest percentage at 22%. The conference statements as a whole invite investigation of the reason behind such low frequencies of gender reference. One potential explanation might be that many conference participants either made gender a low priority on their agendas or, as a whole, possessed poor levels of knowledge about gender issues. In either case, the low gender reference frequencies exposed a lacuna within gender awareness in the UN, which could suggest clues as to where gender advocacy should be directed in the future.

Perhaps the most significant finding was that the 23-page official conference report contained only one sentence referring to SALW’s effects within a gender context which limited women to roles as victims of gun violence. All of the references to gender in the 2001 Conference statements and documents examined, addressed the plight of women as victims. They failed to disaggregate the different consequences for men and women of SALW proliferation, or to acknowledge the roles other than that of victim that many women adopt to deal with SALW. Although it is difficult to measure the direct effects that such a limited representation of gender perspectives might have, it is safe to speculate that by not taking into account the complexity that gender issues bring to SALW, participants in these UN meetings and conferences cannot understand the entirety of the SALW problem. As a result, they are unlikely to find convincing solutions.
Of the 177 NGOs requesting accreditation to the conference, approximately 23% gave statements, out of which only ten made references to gender. However, of all the documents and statements issued at the conference, those produced by the NGOs used the widest range of gender contexts and indicators. This is no surprise, considering that many NGOs make gender issues their main focus (although some still do not take gender components into consideration in their work). Naturally, some of the NGOs focusing on women will have some level of expertise on gun-related violence, while other NGOs specializing in SALW will have had practical experience of the differentiated effects of these weapons on men and women. Therefore, it is to be expected that their use of gender references would incorporate a wider selection of contexts for gender perspectives on SALW issues. Nonetheless, not one reference was made that focused on the unique experiences of men within SALW situations. Their refraining from discussing gender represented an enormous opportunity lost, considering that NGOs work on the ground and therefore have acquired relatively higher levels of gender expertise, in general, than member state delegates. Gender received less attention at the conference because of the failure to fully capitalize on this awareness-raising resource. Opportunities to advocate the improvement of the standing of gender perspectives on the UN agenda were also lost, for the same reason.

While the majority of the NGOs referred to women as victims in some capacity, five references were made that coincided with stereotypical gender roles for women in conflict, two to non-stereotypical gender roles of women in war situations, and one each to gender equality, gender mainstreaming, women as refugees or internally displaced persons (IDPs), illustrative examples, and women in peace-building. As an example of a reference to non-stereotypical roles of women, the Leitana Nehan Women’s Development Agency of Papua New Guinea remarked that “there was an increased number of single mothers and female headed households”, in espousal of the theory that SALW violence has forced women to adopt leadership roles. Gender references such as this broke with the more common stereotypes of women’s victimization by emphasizing the diversity of roles that women play within society, including leadership. These roles could help to bring about solutions to the SALW problem. The variety of contexts within which NGOs refer to women could be signifiers of civil society’s readiness to evolve new ways of thinking about gender. Therefore, unlike the representatives of the UN member states, the civil society representatives had evidently made strides toward considering a diverse spread of gender perspectives as relevant to SALW.
Press releases from the UN that summarized the proceedings of each daily event had the highest percentage of gender references (43%). The relatively higher frequency in comparison with other conference documents, however, may have been because each release summarized the proceedings of an entire day, in which multiple gender references could have been made. Because these summaries covered statements from national, NGO and international organizations, it was logical that references to gender should be made at least once in each press release. Therefore the high percentage of gender references found in the press releases contributed little towards the authors’ attempt to assess mainstreaming efforts at the UN.

During the 2001 Conference, NGOs scheduled a series of daily meetings for the week of 9–13 July for round table discussions, panel presentations, information sessions, caucuses and planning meetings. Out of 25 or so scheduled thematic meetings, only two specifically addressed gender. Both meetings occurred on the afternoon of the last day, which meant that the only conversations focusing on gender occurred at the end of the conference week. This gave little to no opportunity for gender themes to be brought to the forefront. The low visibility of gender-related themes throughout the week limited the influence that gender advocacy efforts could have on conference proceedings. When NGOs convened two years later at the 2003 Biennial Meeting of States, non-governmental representatives, particularly in the umbrella organization International Action Network on Small Arms (IANSA) Women’s Network (formerly the IANSA Women’s Caucus), reported that they had made a conscious effort to distribute the thematic meetings on gender more evenly throughout the week. This was done to create better opportunities to incorporate gender components in the advocacy strategies of the NGOs. They also hoped that giving more attention to gender issues earlier in the week would create more pressure on UN officials to incorporate gender perspectives in the final report. This decision by the NGOs in 2003 demonstrated an improved awareness of the need to devote significant attention to gender in the entirety of the UN sessions, not just in isolated instances.
Gender language and the UN First Biennial Meeting of States

The 2003 BMS was a reporting forum in which member states were encouraged to disclose the status of their implementation of the Programme of Action (PoA) decided at the 2001 Conference. It aimed to identify the successes and failures of these national initiatives in order to design more effective strategies for the future. The forum, however, did not mandate the development of next-step strategies, the negotiation of new agreements or any decision-making, leaving such tasks to the review conference in 2006. The outcome of the meeting was a procedural report and a chairperson’s summary.

In 2003, member states submitted detailed reports outlining their implementation of the PoA, delivered national statements and produced co-ordinated regional statements. Nine regional bodies made presentations. Near the end of the BMS, states also engaged in a series of thematic debates designed to address specific areas of focus, including themes such as human development, public awareness and promoting a culture of peace. The sixth debate focused mainly on children, women and the elderly. Although having a thematic debate with women as part of the focus seemed to be a positive move, the lumping together of women, children and the elderly implies their continued marginalization within UN discourse. Nonetheless, in the thematic debates gender was referred to within five different contexts, including women as victims, peace educators, peace-builders and agents for change. However, despite this encouraging step towards acknowledging women’s more aggressive roles in situations of SALW violence, the debates made no reference to the specific experiences of men in the context of SALW. Unless the experiences of men and women are aligned side by side in UN discourse, the proceedings of the UN will continue to exclude the relevant experiences of both groups.

As did the 2001 Conference, the documents produced at the 2003 BMS included statements from national representatives, NGOs, international organizations, a meeting report and press releases. The 2003 BMS, however, also included national reports and regional statements. Again, the most frequent use of gender references (46%) in all of the document categories pointed to women as victims in some capacity. A statement from Nepal, for example, read, “Women and children have been the most vulnerable victims of the pervasive use of these weapons”. The national report from Canada mentioned the importance of the “protection of vulnerable groups, in particular women and children”. The 2003 BMS, however, showed more diversity in its use of gender reference indicators than the 2001 meeting. These included 11
references to gender mainstreaming, seven to women’s roles in peace-building, and seven to non-stereotypical gender roles played by women in conflict. Among the national statements, all ten gender references used identified women as victims, whereas the national reports reflected a more diverse array of gender contexts. These included the roles of women as victims, civil society activists, proponents of gender justice and gender mainstreaming, refugees or internally displaced persons. They also gave illustrative examples.61

There were some discrepancies in participation between those states that submitted reports and those that delivered statements at the conference. Some countries submitted only reports,62 some delivered only statements,63 while others presented both. One hundred and two member states submitted national reports; and 100 delivered national statements outlining their countries’ implementation of the PoA. Canada, Chile, Guyana, Kazakhstan, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, the Philippines, Thailand and Turkey were the only countries out of 91 to use gender language in their national statements.64 Burkina Faso, Canada, the Central African Republic, Gambia, Sri Lanka, Argentina, Equatorial Guinea and Niger were the only countries to use gender language in their national reports. That so few countries used gender references implies that either gender perspectives had again become low on the list of priorities, or that the majority of member state delegations were lacking in awareness of gender mainstreaming.

An interesting finding made when the authors compared the national statements of the 2001 Conference and the 2003 BMS was that in 2001, gender references occurred nearly three times more frequently than in 2003, with 29.5% in 2001 and 10% in 2003. A tentative explanation of this apparent regression in gender awareness may be that fewer countries delivered national statements in 2003, in this way reducing the overall chance that gender language would arise. Another partial explanation is that some of the 32 member states that did not submit statements at the 2003 BMS might have referenced gender if they had done so. Needless to say, whatever the reason, this reduction has a disturbing implications for gender mainstreaming efforts.

NGOs again presented statements at the BMS. However, instead of giving individual statements, as in 2001, civil society presented 15 co-ordinated statements addressing thematic issues. The frequency with which gender reference indicators were used in the NGO statements was virtually identical with the 2001 meeting. The statements from both also contained similarly diverse contextual ranges of gender reference. One provocative finding was that the 2003 NGO statements referenced stereotypical gender roles of women
in conflict only once, versus five references in 2001. Instead, the NGOs made references to gender that were atypical of the majority of references made in the other UN presentations during the 2003 BMS. For instance, the portion of the International Action Network on Small Arms (IANSA) statement given by Chamila Hemmagathema in 2003, entitled “Community Impacts, Community Action”, reads: “Women cannot simply be seen as the victims of conflicts: they also participate as combatants, and in support roles providing information, food, clothing and shelter”.65 Language such as this paints a picture of women’s roles in SALW matters as active participants rather than as passive victims.

The NGOs, however, did not ignore the common perception of the victimization of women: they made reference to sexual violence, trauma, intimidation, enslavement, robbery and rape as among the various effects of SALW violence on women.66 By painting a holistic picture detailing the different ways in which gendered reactions could emerge in violent situations related to SALW, the NGOs brought to the discourse on gender ideas hitherto ignored at both the 2001 conference and the 2003 BMS.

The statements made by international organizations (IOs) in 2003 showed a 57.1% improvement in relative occurrences of gender language coming up at least once, over those of the 2001 conference. Needless to say, the four statements that referred to gender were from IOs whose mandates either focused on, or included, gender perspectives.67 Each of the statements referenced gender more than once and within various contexts, demonstrating a more advanced level of gender awareness relative to that displayed in 2001, certainly by the member states.

The IOs also demonstrated a relatively well-diversified range of gender reference indicators, achieving the greatest number of references in all the document categories. Examples are: “Their [SALW] use and misuse leads to psychosocial trauma, obstructs humanitarian relief and development programmes, weakens traditional family and community structures, and exacerbates gender-based violence”, and “[f]urthermore, the carrying or handling over of a weapon must not be a precondition for participation in DDR programmes, as many children who are otherwise associated with armed forces and armed groups, particularly girls, are often left out as a consequence”.68 These demonstrate the breadth of gender awareness among the IOs.

Another discrepancy between the 2001 Conference and the 2003 BMS was that there were nearly 50% fewer references to women as victims in 2003. Furthermore, there were 11 specific references to gender mainstreaming in
the entire 2003 BMS versus only one during the 2001 Conference. This, along with other uses of gender references at the 2003 BMS, indicated an overall widening of scope in the ways in which gender perspectives were considered in SALW issues. One reasonable explanation for this apparent evolution was the improved co-ordination between NGOs.69

The final 2003 BMS report, also containing the chairperson’s summary, encouragingly included more than the one reference made to gender in 2001. However, it continued to propagate the statistic that women and children made up 80% of war-related deaths resulting from the use of SALW.70 Inaccuracies such as this in high-level UN documents could hinder effective policy-making and debilitate interventions, because they are not based on the actual situation. To say, for example, that the primary victims of gun-related deaths are women and children draws the focus away from male victims (who are far more numerous), men being both the greatest perpetrators and victims of gun-related deaths. It also puts women into a passive category, which takes their alternative roles as caretakers, leaders, perpetrators and peace builders out of the policy-making equation. It also denies them acknowledgement of their participation in both creating the problem posed by illicit trade in SALW and contributing to the solutions. The report’s failure to refer to men further encourages the tendency to equate gender with women only, and to equate men with an equally stereotypical norm that does not warrant mention. This expression of unconscious prejudice is a hindrance to gender mainstreaming efforts because it neither promotes nor reinforces the equal consideration of men and women within UN discourse. Even more worrisome is the influence on policy decisions that such misconceptions could have at the 2006 Review Conference.

In summary, examination of the gender reference indicators used in documents from the 2001 Conference and the 2003 BMS exposes areas where gender mainstreaming efforts have made progress, regressed or stayed relatively the same over time. The analysis of the formal statements and reports by member states demonstrated that the use of gender references actually diminished between the 2001 Conference and the 2003 BMS, while those of NGOs and IOs publicly demonstrated increased gender awareness. By examining the language used throughout the various statements and reports in these meetings 2001 and 2003, the authors hoped to make more apparent the degree to which gender is a priority in SALW discourse at the UN.
CONCLUSION
CONVERGENCE AND DIVERGENCE IN GENDER LANGUAGE

If the findings on gender language used in relation to small arms and light weapons in the various UN meetings and fora are compared, it is noticeable that common phrases are often repeated by most bodies, usually as some formulation of “women and children are the most vulnerable victims of the pervasive use of SALW”. Yet, as this monograph has demonstrated, there seems to be little consistency, within different debates, meetings and bodies, on when such language is used in member states’ statements or in other contexts related to SALW. On the other hand, the language used in the thematic debates of the Security Council specifically on women, peace, and security give salience to various important norms regarding gender and armed conflict. These include changing the misconception that women are merely victims of SALW violence, and replacing it with more holistic perspectives that instead present women as active agents in disarmament and peace processes, and even sometimes perpetrators of SALW violence.

It has been observed that UN debates on SALW do not yet address gender in the SALW context in a fashion that encompasses the differing social, economic and political effects that SALW have on men and women. However, it is important to remember that these issues are fairly new on the international agenda, even if the gender implications of SALW have existed since the invention of guns. Therefore patience and persistence are required to develop a working language, with operational implications, for the UN. The following observations and suggestions are intended to indicate how an environment conducive to the development of norms on gender and SALW may be fostered. Clearly, the evolution of norms requires many supportive conditions, including a ripe political environment and a measure of political will, a network of dedicated individuals and organizations pursuing that particular issue, and adequate resources to back up the effort. This study does not focus on those aspects, but rather makes particular observations arising from the analysis of gender references at the UN.
Observations

Observation One: Norm evolution at the UN is a lengthy process. Haphazard as it may seem, a pattern of inclusion of certain kinds of language can be noted within the bodies of the UN. First, the delegates from member states make statements on an issue at meetings or debates, in which common themes can be identified. Second, negotiations take place, often behind closed doors, to find a common language for resolutions, presidential statements or meeting reports on which member states can agree. Often the language that finds its way into such documents represents the lowest common denominator among different terms. This language is then repeated by member states in subsequent debates or meetings, and additions are suggested or refinements made. The process continues in cycles, further solidifying, clarifying and focusing norms. Therefore norm-setting documents such as Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security are of great value to efforts toward improving the inclusion of gender perspectives within UN decisions on SALW governance.

Observation Two: Member states are aware that their role as regards gender mainstreaming is greater than formulating appropriate language. The issue of implementing Security Council Resolution 1325 was mentioned by 33% of states in July 2002, 24% in October 2002, and 49% (a significant increase) in 2003. Many states recognize that “we need to say that gender is important enough times for it to become second nature”.71 In other words, states recognize that gender mainstreaming is more than a theory, but also involves the development of applied implementation procedures that will guide the activities of the UN.

It is important to remember that gender mainstreaming, as a process, is not an end in itself. Rather, it is a means through which justice and equality can be achieved. It is not enough to commit oneself in principle to this endeavour; concrete actions are needed to make the concept a determinant of action. This includes the conscious incorporation of accurate and contextually diverse gender language in UN meetings. The more gender mainstreaming pervades the discussions of the UN, the more it will become natural and acceptable to include this mindset in all its activities. For example, the UN Department for Disarmament Affairs plans to consider ways to develop training programs on the SALW Programme of Action and its gender implications. In addition, UN peacekeeping missions assisting disarmament should be obliged to “pay special attention in carrying out [their] mandate to all aspects relating to gender perspective, in accordance with Resolution 1325 (2000)”.72
Observation Three: Member states and NGOs use gender language differently. This paper has noted that NGOs tended to use a wider selection of gender language indicators than member states at both the 2001 SALW Conference and the 2003 BMS. There are several explanations for the more nuanced references to gender by NGOs. First, they have more focused expertise on the issue, whether from first-hand experience of armed conflict, extensive research, or from preparing advocacy positions. NGOs therefore tend to tailor their statements in public fora to articulate policy goals that they see as appropriate for the member states (as representing both the law and the policymakers) to consider. On the other hand, representatives of member states are often more constrained than NGOs from pronouncing publicly on politically difficult issues before widespread consensus has been reached. In addition, the scope of representatives of member states is often limited, as diplomats must obey their superiors or are so much occupied with other pressing items on the international agenda that they are unable to consider one issue in detail. It follows that NGOs and member states serve particular functions that are separate but interdependent in influencing policy-making at the UN.

Recommendations

Recommendation One: Experts on gender perspectives of SALW should engage in education and awareness-raising exercises with representatives of member states well in advance of UN meetings on SALW. Better dissemination of information outlining the gendered impact of SALW to representatives of member states could help to foster a higher level of government expertise on this issue. This information could be communicated by raising talking points or suggesting recommendations for practical tools and strategies. This would help to demystify gender mainstreaming goals by providing clearly mapped-out reasoning and policy suggestions regarding SALW and gender considerations. This information could also be presented so as to include particular recommended gender language use that diplomats can incorporate in their statements at relevant meetings. This will promote the automatic consideration of gender perspectives in decision-making. Examples of existing materials include a checklist developed by UNIFEM on practical ways for UN peacekeeping missions to incorporate gender mainstreaming in disarmament processes, and the IANSA Women’s Network’s fact sheets on gender perspectives of small arms. The Department for Disarmament Affairs’s “Gender Mainstreaming Action Plan” is a concrete tool for the inclusion of gender perspectives in the work of any UN entity.
Recommendation Two: Bridge the gap between gender expertise and policy-making. Gender information needs to reach those that do not already have a background in gender issues, to foster the growth of gender knowledge among those making decisions. Awareness-raising can be brought about by various methods, including expert meetings, round tables and workshops, to educate UN agencies, NGOs and national delegations dealing with SALW issues and encourage an exchange of views on gender. These information sessions and dialogues could take place between one country’s representatives or between those of a number of member states. They should take place well in advance of official UN meetings concerning small arms, so that by the time such meetings take place, the appropriate delegates will be well versed in the issue.

Discussing gender and SALW in a focused manner will assist the development of common understandings. Experts on the topic can encourage and influence the consensus-building process among member states, as noted earlier. This would also facilitate greater communication, co-ordination and the development of a common language for gender and SALW. These interactive meetings would provide an opportunity for diplomats to delve into the issue in greater detail, and may help to increase the prioritization of gender in UN activities. This in turn will cause the relevant parties to think about gender automatically when considering the SALW issue.

Recommendation Three: Focused messages. When providing recommendations to national delegations on gender and small arms, NGOs might find it useful to consolidate the message to make their points easier to digest. With the plethora of NGOs focusing on this issue, an umbrella organization such as the IANSA is a useful vehicle for streamlining messages. In addition, specialized UN agencies such as UNIFEM and the Department for Disarmament Affairs could co-ordinate recommendations on gender and small arms with relevant NGOs and interested member states. If fewer recommendations are repeated more frequently, they may have more of a chance of sinking in.

Recommendation Four: Connecting agenda-setting to practical implementation. The statements made by member countries and the outcome documents of UN meetings are useful to the assessment of where issues such as gender mainstreaming stand on the agenda-setting priorities of member states. The focus on official UN proceedings may not, however, be particularly useful for measuring actual change in behaviour. Therefore the monitoring and evaluation of how gender mainstreaming is being implemented in activities related to small arms must be done concurrently with the analysis of gender language used in the UN. The UNIFEM Independent Assessment on Women and Armed Conflict is a step in this direction. Collecting, compiling and
assessing both anecdotal and numerical data on the inclusion of gender considerations in UN activities on small arms would provide a foundation for persuading member states that this issue is not one to be marginalized.\textsuperscript{76}

\textit{Recommendation Five: Looking towards a convergence of norms in 2006.} While the next BMS on SALW will take place in 2005, the next opportunity for member states to negotiate language in SALW norm documents, and therefore to bring about change, will occur only at the 2006 Review Conference. The preparatory stages and proceedings of the 2005 meeting therefore present a golden opportunity for NGOs, UN agencies and departments to advocate that member states use gender language in their statements and outcome documents. Considering the patterns of norm-emergence observed in the thematic debates in the Security Council on women, peace and security, the use of gender language in 2005 could increase the likelihood that such language would reappear in 2006. For example, the PoA could be analyzed for opportunities to include relevant gender references. Gender advocates should begin now to build relationships with delegates that foster the productive exchange of information and views, with future negotiations in mind.

\textbf{Concluding remarks}

A participant at the 2003 BMS made an insightful comment that seemed to encompass the concept of gender mainstreaming directly: “Gender should be pervasive, but highlighting the issue also compartmentalizes it, limiting the mainstreaming goal”.\textsuperscript{77} This point has been the subject of a long-standing and inconclusive debate among public policy-makers. However, in defence of gender mainstreaming, women currently enjoy less participation, representation and consideration in decision-making than men in the public policy world. This justifies the drive to bring women’s issues to international attention. Unfortunately, in order to achieve the ultimate gender-mainstreaming goal of having gender perspectives so pervasive that they no longer have to be defined specifically as ‘gender’ perspectives, activists have had to emphasize gender issues as exclusive, in order to gain the attention they need to make systemic changes. This approach also runs the risk of allowing the terms “gender” and “women” to be used interchangeably, when the actual goal is to focus equally on both men and women, while respecting different perspectives and outcomes. Therefore, it is important to ask: When we talk about gender mainstreaming in the context of small arms, how much closer have we come to that so-called pervasiveness of gender perspectives? Are we getting closer? And how will we know when we have reached it?
APPENDIX I
GENDER REFERENCE INDICATORS

Role as victims, adverse affects of conflict
   Vulnerable
   Suffering
   Disproportionately affected
   Targets
   Protection
   Rape, sexual violence, gender-based violence
   Traumatized
   HIV/AIDS
   Trafficking in women, prostitution
   Refugees or IDPs
   Threatened security
   Socio-economic effects
   Exploitation

Gender equality
   Reference to specific gender equality norms

Stereotypical roles of women in conflict
   Family (roles: caretakers, wives, mothers, daughters, widows)

Non-stereotypical roles of women in conflict
   Combatants
   Protectors
   Economic contributors
   Providers
   Heads of households

Civil society activism
   Community-builders
   Founders of, or participants in, women’s NGOs

Gender justice
   International humanitarian law
   International human rights law
   ICC
**Gender mainstreaming**  
Peacekeeping: influencing code of conduct, appointing more women as personnel, training  
UN gender balance: appointing more women as ambassadors, SRSGs, personnel and staff  
Establishing gender units  
DDR: paying special attention to women’s needs  
Gender sensitive humanitarian assistance  
Gender education/training  

**Peace building**  
Supporting women’s leadership roles, from grassroots to peace table  
Building the capacity of women to be active participants in conflict prevention, early warning systems, conflict management and resolution and peace education  
Promoting women as assets for change  

**Illustrative examples**  
National efforts to address gender and armed conflict  
Political rhetoric on conflicts affecting women, using women’s suffering to illustrate points  

**1325**  
Need to implement  
SG’s Study on Women, Peace and Security, as called for in 1325  

**Research**  
Collection of gender-disaggregated data  
Study of the effects of armed conflict on women
## APPENDIX II

### TABLES ON FREQUENCY OF GENDER REFERENCES IN UN FORA ON SALW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Categories</th>
<th>Role as Victims/Adverse Effects of Conflict</th>
<th>Gender Equality</th>
<th>Stereotypical Gender Roles of Women in Conflict</th>
<th>Non-Stereotypical Gender Roles of Women in Conflict</th>
<th>Civil Society Activism</th>
<th>Gender Justice</th>
<th>Gender Mainstreaming (Peacekeeping)</th>
<th>Refugees or IDPs</th>
<th>Illustrative Examples</th>
<th>Gender Disaggregated Research</th>
<th>Peace Building</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001: National Statements-all</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001: National Statements-referring to SALW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001: SG Report to the GA</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002: National Statements-all</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002: National Statements-referring to SALW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002: SG Report to the GA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003: National Statements-all</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003: National Statements-referring to SALW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003: SG Report to the GA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>202</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Relative Occurrence of Gender References in General Assembly Statements and Documents 2001–2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Category</th>
<th># Documents with Gender Language</th>
<th>Total # Documents in Category</th>
<th>% of Document Category with Gender Language (approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001: National Statements: all</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001: National Statements referring to SALW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001: SG Report to the GA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002: National Statements: all</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002: National Statements referring to SALW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002: SG Report to the GA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003: National Statements: all</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003: National Statements referring to SALW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003: SG Report to the GA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Security Council Debate on SALW, 2001–2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Categories</th>
<th>Role as Victims/Adverse Effects of Conflict</th>
<th>Gender Equality</th>
<th>Stereotypical Gender Roles of Women in Conflict</th>
<th>Non-Stereotypical Gender Roles of Women in Conflict</th>
<th>Civil Society Activism</th>
<th>Gender Justice</th>
<th>Gender Mainstreaming</th>
<th>Refugees or IDPs</th>
<th>Illustrative Examples</th>
<th>Gender Disaggregated Research</th>
<th>Peace Building</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001: National Statements</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001: Security Council (SC) Presidential Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002: National Statements</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002: Secretary-General’s Report to the SC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002: SC Presidential Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003: National Statements</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003: SC Resolution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Relative Occurrence of Gender References in Security Council Statements and Documents, 2001–2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Category</th>
<th># Documents with Gender Language</th>
<th>Total # Documents in Category</th>
<th>% of Document Category with Gender Language (approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001: National Statements</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001: SC Presidential Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%&lt;sup&gt;80&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002: National Statements</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002: Secretary-General’s Report to the SC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%&lt;sup&gt;81&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002: SC Presidential Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%&lt;sup&gt;82&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003: National Statements</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003: SC Resolution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Categories</td>
<td>National Reports</td>
<td>National Statements</td>
<td>NGO Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Justice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society Action</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Frequency of Gender References in Conference Document Categories at 2001 SALW Conference
Table 6: Relative Occurrence of Gender References at 2001 SALW Conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Category</th>
<th># Documents with Gender Language</th>
<th>Total # Documents in Category</th>
<th>% of Document Category with Gender Language (approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Reports</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Statements</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Statements</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO Statements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Statements</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Releases</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Frequency of Gender References in BMS 2003 Document Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Categories</th>
<th>Role as Victims/Adverse Effects</th>
<th>Gender Equality</th>
<th>Stereotypical Gender Roles of Women in Conflict</th>
<th>Non-Stereotypical Gender Roles of Women in Conflict</th>
<th>Civil Society</th>
<th>Gender Justice</th>
<th>Gender Mainstream-ing</th>
<th>Refugees or IDPs</th>
<th>Illustrative Examples</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>1325</th>
<th>Peace Building</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Reports</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Statements</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Statements</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO Statements</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Statements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Report</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Releases</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8: Relative Occurrence of Gender References in 2003 BMS Statements and Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Documents with Gender Language</th>
<th>Total # Documents in Category</th>
<th>% of Document Category with Gender Language (approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Reports</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Statements</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91(^a)</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Statements</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO Statements</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Statements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Releases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This number may be misleading, since there were only two documents in this category.
2. This number may be misleading, since there were only two documents in this category.
3. This number may be misleading, as there is only one document in this category.
4. This number may be misleading, as there is only one document in this category.
5. This number may be misleading, as there is only one document in this category.
6. Note: This 100% indicator is misleading in terms of judging gender mainstreaming efforts. Considering that the document is 23 pages long and gender is mentioned only in one brief sentence referring to women as victims, the 2001 SALW Conference report cannot be said to address gender comprehensively.
7. A hundred official national statements were given during the 2003 BMS. However, nine statements (two in Russian and seven in Arabic) were omitted owing to the language limitations of the researchers.
8. This 100% is misleading for judging gender mainstreaming efforts. Considering that the document is 20 pages long, and that gender is mentioned only in one brief sentence referring to women as victims, the 2003 BMS report cannot be said to address gender comprehensively.
APPENDIX III

UN DOCUMENTS ASSESSED FOR REFERENCES TO GENDER

UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Resolutions

• Resolution of the General Assembly entitled “Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them” (A/RES/54/54 J), 1 December 1999.
• Resolution of the General Assembly entitled “Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures” (A/RES/54/54 H), 1 December 1999.
• Resolution of the General Assembly entitled “Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them” (A/RES/55/33 F), 20 November 2000.
• Resolution of the General Assembly entitled “Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures” (A/RES/55/33 G), 20 November 2000.
• Resolution of the General Assembly entitled “Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them” (A/RES/57/70 U), 22 November 2002.
• Resolution of the General Assembly entitled “Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them” (A/RES/58/58), 8 December 2003.
• Resolution of the General Assembly entitled “Promotion at the regional level in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe of the UN programme of action on the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects” (A/RES/58/55), 8 December 2003.
Reports of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly

- Report of the Secretary-General in pursuance of GA resolution 53/77 E entitled “Small Arms” (compilation of views re: international conference on the illicit arms trade in all its aspects), (A/54/260), 20 August 1999.
- Report Of The Secretary-General entitled “Illicit Traffic In Small Arms And Light Weapons” (A/57/160), 2 July 2002.
- Report Of The Secretary-General entitled “Assistance To States For Curbing The Illicit Traffic In Small Arms And Collecting Them” (A/57/209), 12 July 2002.
- Note by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly entitled “Illicit Traffic In Small Arms And Light Weapons” (A/58/138), 11 July 2003.
- Reports of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly entitled variously “Assistance to States for Curbing the Illicit Traffic in Small Arms and Collecting Them”, “The Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons In All Its Aspects”, “Consolidation of Peace Through Practical Disarmament Measures” (A/58/207), 1 August 2003.

General Assembly Special Session


General Assembly General Plenary Debates


General Assembly First Committee Debates


UN SECURITY COUNCIL

Security Council Resolutions and Presidential Statements

• Presidential Statement on Small Arms (S/PRST/2002/30), [no debate], 31 October 2002.
• Resolution on Small Arms and Light Weapons in West Africa (S/RES/1467), 18 March 2003.
• Resolution on the Situation in Liberia (S/RES/1509), 19 September 2003.

Security Council Debates on Small Arms and Light Weapons

• Debate on Small Arms (S/PV.4355, S/PV.4355), 2 August 2001.
• Debate on Small Arms (S/PV.4623 and resumption), 11 October 2002.
• Debate on Small Arms and Light Weapons in West Africa (S/PV.4720, resumption), 18 March 2003.
Security Council Debates on Women, Peace and Security

• Debate on Women, Peace and Security (S/PV.4208, resumption 1, resumption 2 on 25 October), 24 October 2000.
• Debate on Women, Peace and Security (S/PV.4589, and resumption), 25 July 2002.
• Debate on Women, Peace and Security (S/PV.4635, resumption same day, 2nd resumption on 29 October), 28 October 2002.
• Debate on Women, Peace and Security (S/PV.4852, resumption), 29 October 2003.

Reports of the Secretary-General to the Security Council


UN CONFERENCE ON THE ILLICIT TRADE IN SMALL ARMS AND LIGHT WEAPONS IN ALL ITS ASPECTS, NEW YORK, 9–20 JULY 2001

• Note verbale from the Permanent Mission of Chile addressed to the Department for Disarmament Affairs of the UN Secretariat, transmitting the communiqué of the Rio Group on The Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects (A/CONF.192/3), 8 May 2001.
• Note by the Secretary-General, transmitting to the Conference the Report of the Group of Governmental Experts established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 54/54 V of 15 December 1999, entitled “Small arms” (A/CONF.192/2), 11 May 2001.
• Reports of the Preparatory Committee for the UN Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects (A/CONF.192/1), 11 May 2001.

FIRST BIENNIAL MEETING OF STATES TO CONSIDER THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION, 7–11 JULY 2003

• Report of the UN First Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade of Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects (A/CONF.192/BMS/2003/1), 18 July 2003.
1 Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), Agreed conclusions, United Nations, July 1997, p 28.


9 Hafner-Burton and Pollack, op cit.

10 Ibid.


14 Ibid.


17 Other bodies or meetings whose publications would also be worth assessing could include the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) meetings, the relevant Department for Peacekeeping Operations Reports, Security Council debates on Civilians and Armed Conflict, the meetings of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), and those of the Third Committee of the General Assembly on Social, Humanitarian and Cultural Affairs.

18 For a full list of UN documents analyzed, see Appendix 1.

19 For a complete list of indicators, see Appendix I.

20 The charts of meetings and the percentages of occurrence of gender language references can be found in Appendix II.

21 The UN Inter-Agency Committee on Women and Gender Equality (IACWGE) asserts that good practice in gender mainstreaming requires that policy-making result in measurable improvements in gender equality and gender relations; the empowerment of women in the policy-making environment; and the introduction of replicable, sustainable approaches towards gender equality. See the UN Inter-Agency on Women and Gender Equality (IACWGE), UN resources on gender: guidelines and criteria for good practices, February 1999, http://www.un.org/womenwatch/resources/goodpractices/guideline.html.


See definition of gender mainstreaming in the ECOSOC resolution on page 3 of this paper.


For tables on the frequency of gender-language in the GA General Debate see Appendix II.


The First Committee has focused discussions on disarmament, including on small arms, as opposed to the General Debate, which covers a wider range of relevant issues at the UN. For all First Committee documents, statements and NGO analysis, see http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org.

Farr, op cit, p 17.
The same gender language indicators used to analyze the GA debate were also used for this debate (see Appendix I).


Germany, Debate on Small arms and light weapons in West Africa (S/PV.4720), 18 March 2003.


The mandate for the 2001 conference was as follows, “The primary focus of attention should be on small arms and light weapons that are manufactured to military specifications. Other types of firearms used in conflicts may, however, also have to be considered in dealing with the problems in the most affected regions of the world. In this overall context, ammunition should also be considered”. UN Department for Disarmament Affairs, *About the conference*, http://disarmament.un.org:8080/cab/smallarms/about.htm.
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