

The ‘Feminization’ of Security: Implications for Canadian Strategy in the Post - Cold War era

Orrick White
Queen’s University

Introduction

As addressed in the Strategic Assessment, there has been both significant change and persistent patterns apparent in the post-Cold War world context. Since the late 1980s the notion of security is seen to entail more than the attainment of military capability needed to defend a state from external attacks. Furthermore, an expansion of issue areas has occurred to include those issues such as mass migration, drug trafficking, environmental degradation and terrorism as part of the broadening security agenda. On the other hand, if one looks at current events in the international community, things have not changed all that much: wars continue, military capabilities of states continue to grow (despite severe financial constraints in many countries) and inequality amongst states and peoples continues to widen. What is now different in relation to the latter points above, however, is the context in which these traditional challenges prevail. With the end of bi-polarity, the rules of the game seem to have changed and, debatably, have become more complex. But while the ‘certainty’ of the bipolar world has been lost, the prospect of avoiding major wars and achieving international cooperation by encompassing a broader security agenda does seem more favorable in the post-Cold War period. Why is this the case? Some suggest that it is due to the expansion of the democratic zone of peace based on the notion of common values, representative democracies and collective identity expression. While I agree with this interpretation, within the zone of peace, I believe we are also seeing a ‘feminization of security’. Therefore, while many pertinent issues are raised in Canada’s Response to the New Challenges of International Security, the assessment does not address one key feature of the post-Cold War security environment that I feel is worthy of investigation: the feminization of security and more specifically, the feminization of NATO.

Background

The ideas advanced in my paper have been formulated in response to a provocative article, written by Francis Fukuyama in Foreign Affairs, which argued that the feminization of politics has been occurring among liberal democracies and that this development has resulted in more peaceful relations among democracies due to the increased numbers of women involved in government. Fukuyama’s argument is based on the belief that there is an essential difference between the nature of men and women that is rooted in biology whereby women are naturally more peaceful while men are seen to be aggressive in nature. Given that developed democracies tend to be more feminized than authoritarian states, in terms of the female franchise and their participation in political decision-making, the article argues that it should be no surprise that the shift in sexual basis of politics should lead to a change in international relations. While the outcome of that hypothesis is probably correct, I believe the author bases his findings on an incorrect assumption. Rather than biology, the differences between men and women are rooted in social construction. Therefore, the reason democracies are more peaceful with one another is

because their relations are premised upon shared rules, norms and principles that stress empathy and cooperation – not simply because there are more "peaceful" women in power.

Apart from 'essentializing' the differences between men and women, there is another issue that is even more troublesome about the article. The author missed the most interesting example of feminization that would have strengthened his argument: the feminization of NATO.

Main Argument

The main argument that will be put forth herein is that the feminization of NATO is occurring in the post-Cold War era. What does this mean? It means that the evolving cooperative security approach among members of the North Atlantic Community is consistent with feminist reconceptualizations of security found in International Relations theory. Feminist reconceptualizations critique Realist's accounts for being based on a masculine world view whereby the key concepts of power and security are centred around notions of self-interest, objectivity, domination and the 'political man'.

I will attempt to show that NATO is coming to embrace a cooperative security approach based on reassurance rather than deterrence. This evolution signals a major reformulation of key norms and identities amongst NATO members that draws, although not consciously, from feminist theoretical insights which have been shaping the system for years. These insights stress an empathetic quality whereby there is an appreciation of the "other" as a subject whose views are seen as legitimate as our own. While some will argue that the use of military means by NATO in both Bosnia and Kosovo negates my feminist hypothesis, I will argue that by looking at the intentions and normative motivations of the interventions, a case can be made for applying a feminist perspective.

This thesis involves two connected hypotheses: 1) the shift of NATO from a collective defence alliance to a cooperative security organization reveals the emerging importance of political over military strategies in the post-Cold War era. The shift correlates well with the emphasis that feminist theorists place on political as opposed to military approaches to security; and 2) neither Structural Realism nor Neo-liberal Institutionalism can adequately explain NATO's shift from a collective defence alliance to a cooperative security alliance. Since both theories stress the rational self-interested nature of the state, they are unable to address the shift in states' identification from the national to the international level. A Constructivist approach, however, which examines the role of international norms, rules and identity creation, can help overcome this deficiency in traditional I.R. approaches by allowing us to problematize interests and their change over time. Moreover, by examining the formation of norms using constructivism it will be possible to establish a link with those norms and the norms advocated by many feminists. It should be noted that this paper is derived from my Ph.D. dissertation that is still in the preliminary stages. Therefore, I am not attempting to make any grand conclusions but rather am introducing propositions for further contemplation.

Because the linkage between feminism, security and NATO's shift has not yet been made, it is an interesting subject to pursue in an effort to establish possible policy implications for member countries such as Canada. Why does NATO serve as a good choice as an empirical referent for

my study? First and foremost, because NATO is an example of a "least-likely case". If it can be demonstrated that a Cold War military defence alliance has become 'feminized', then it is possible that other security arrangements will also become feminized. Does this imply a kinder gentler world? Based on NATO's humanitarian intervention in Kosovo, maybe not. Ironically, the emphasis placed on 'human security' and international human rights – principles consistent with feminism—may necessitate the use of military force. Therefore, given these propositions, the linkage between feminism and security deserves further exploration.

The 'Feminization' of Security

As pointed out in Canada's Response to the New Challenges of International Security, "[w]ith the sudden end of the Cold War, and collapse of its accompanying bi-polar framework, the world has entered a watershed of uncertainty." Significantly, along with the collapse of structural bipolarity has also come a challenge to core assumptions upon which International relations theory has been built. One of these challengers comes in the form of feminist critiques.

Before we turn to address the central proposition of this paper it is necessary to understand, at least in some sense, how feminism relates to international relations. The central problem for feminist theorists of International Relations is that international and economic processes are gender silent and based on androcentric assumptions. This is reinforced by the virtual absence of women in key decision-making positions in national and international defence, foreign affairs and economic institutions. The absence of women is coupled with the belief that women are not well suited to the demands, pressures and responsibilities associated with security issues and crisis management. However, it should be noted that while this general theme is identifiable amongst feminist I.R. theorists, there are many feminist perspectives including radical, socialist, liberal, Marxist, psychoanalytic and post-modern perspectives. Depending on the perspective, the underlying source of androcentric bias will differ, along with the prescriptions of how to rectify the bias. For example, radical feminists place patriarchy at the root of a universal oppression of women. This oppression penetrates every aspect of life including social, economic, and psychological aspects. Liberal feminists believe that androcentrism has resulted from an error based on erroneous and misogynous beliefs about women that can be traced back to the Enlightenment. However, they feel that these errors can be corrected by bringing more women into high levels of government, universities and business. In contrast, radical feminists argue that we need to challenge the masculine ideology that these institutions perpetuate. However, while recognizing that there are differences among feminist perspectives, it is still possible to identify trends in feminists' reformulations of core I.R. concepts that correlate with emerging security approaches amongst liberal democracies. Therefore, it is necessary to establish the identifiable qualities that I feel provide evidence of this transformation. This will entail a brief discussion of 'Gender in International Relations' literature. Specifically, we will discuss the feminist reconceptualization of core concepts including power, sovereignty and security. Lastly, the issue of individual security in relation to the state will be discussed in an attempt to demonstrate why, in my mind at least, the state is still a key actor in the post-Cold War security environment.

The common conception of power with which we are familiar is the characteristic relationship between A&B in which A has the ability to get B to do what it would otherwise not do. In other words, power is viewed as control. But this understanding of power evokes a zero-sum game in

which one side's gain is another side's loss. This notion of a zero-sum game is relevant to our discussion of security since realists suggest that security is 'relative' in the sense that increasing the security of one state results in a decrease of security for another. This is what is typically known as the security dilemma. By understanding power as the ability to act in concert in order to deal with collective problems -- economic interdependence for example -- feminists argue that this zero-sum game does not need to occur. The role of international institutions would be key for creating the ability-to-act-in-concert: the other way to understand power, as suggested by Hannah Arendt.

As suggested by Robert Keohane, the reconceptualization of power leads us to rethink another core concept – sovereignty. The idea that there is a final and absolute political authority in the political community can be seen to reflect traditional male thinking with its emphasis on control and its emphasis on the dichotomous (inside/outside) categories of territorial authority. If power is viewed as the ability-to-act-in-concert however, then the notion of sovereignty can be changed. Sovereignty, which can come to embrace the recognition of collective obligations to achieve certain common goals, would be based on social norms and a widespread pattern of obligation based on an 'ethic of care'. Therefore, instead of sovereignty being based on rational self-interests, sovereignty could be based on reciprocity in an effort to achieve mutually beneficial outcomes. In light of the above, feminist insights can help to formulate "...an institutional vision of international relations – a network view, emphasizing how institutions could promote lateral cooperation among organized entities, states or otherwise." This vision is significant for our discussion of security in the post-Cold War era.

The concept of security may lend itself well to a feminist interpretation because despite the central importance of security in international politics, scholars have found the concept difficult to define. Like so many concepts in International Relations, security is "essentially contested". The notion of contestable concepts arose during the 1960s and 1970s due to political theorists' interest in identifying, analyzing and contributing to politicized contests over the discursive meaning of core political values. Because of the inevitable ideological nature of language, the idea of essentially contested concepts reminds us of the instability of existing political arrangements and those sensibilities that reflect and perpetuate them. By understanding political concepts in this way, the possibility of change is maintained. This notion of change is especially pertinent given the transformations of the post-Cold War environment.

Feminists are skeptical of finding a universal and objective foundation for knowledge because knowledge is recognized as being socially constructed. Language transmits knowledge and the use of language itself and its claim to objectivity must be continually questioned – this is where the notion of essentially contested concepts becomes very useful. In our culture, objectivity, which is associated with masculinity, tends to be very highly valued at the expense of feminine qualities such as emotion, empathy and care. This is due to the fact that there has been an emphasis placed on the need to establish control over events and outcomes; hence, power and domination become valued. Realists, who dominate I.R. de-emphasize elements of cooperation and focus, instead, on the conflictual aspects of international relations between states. Moreover, because realists are concerned with conflict in the realm of 'high politics' they have difficulty dealing with the new challenges to security; including economic interdependence and environmental degradation. In practical terms, these foci leave many realists hard pressed to

provide a convincing explanation for the continued and enhanced role of NATO after the demise of the Soviet Union. Indeed many scholars, such as Kenneth Waltz, predicted that NATO would slowly fade away. This is a point to which we return later.

Feminists have very different definitions of security, explanations of insecurities and suggestions for increasing security than conventional approaches. Very simplistically, conventional approaches define security in political/military terms as the protection of boundaries and integrity of the state and its values against the dangers of the international environment. States tend to be seen as unitary actors whose internal characteristics, beyond the assessment of their relative capabilities, are not deemed to be necessary for understanding their vulnerabilities and their attempts to increase or balance power in the international system. In contrast to the two views above, many I.R. feminists define security broadly in multidimensional and multilevel terms to include many forms of violence such as physical, structural and ecological violence. Since women are marginalized from the power structure of most states and since feminist perspectives on security take the individual's security as their central concern, most start with the individual or community rather than the state or international system.

Their definitions of security grow out of the centrality of social relations, particularly gender relations. This is due to the perception that structural inequalities, which are central contributors to the insecurity of individuals, are built into the historical legacy of the modern state and state system. Calling into question the realist boundaries between anarchy and danger on the outside, and security and order on the inside, many feminists believe that state-centric or structural analyses miss the interrelation of insecurity across levels of analysis. Therefore, feminists are often quite suspicious of boundaries that make states security providers.

While being sensitive to the critiques about the state as a security provider, I believe, nevertheless, that the state has an important role to play. It appears that even some more 'radical' feminists agree with my view as indicated by V. Spike Peterson's comments,

... contemporary changes in the nature of the state sovereignty, political identity, and the inter-state system pose complicated issues for women and disempowered groups. State-making historically institutionalized the exclusion of women from political agency and the autonomy, authority, rationality and empowerment it implies. Yet, the important question, as always, is 'Compared to what?' In the context of unbridled global capitalism, women – and other disempowered groups – can ill afford to dispense with whatever 'protection' states provide, whether that provision is due to the state's interest in securing social reproduction or political legitimation.

At the same time it should be acknowledged that tension between the individual and the state are recognized by not only 'critical theorists' but also classical realists such as Barry Buzan who recognizes that for the purposes of achieving security the state is both friend and foe to the individual.

While many feminist scholars argue that one cannot look at gendered concepts of international relations within the traditional framework, I argue that benefit can come from incorporating feminist critiques and perspectives into the current body of international relations theory. Instead

of advocating the abolishment of the state and international institutions, due to their patriarchal nature, it is possible to work with them in order to advance the goals of gender equality through the process of 'learning' and agent-structure reflexivity as suggested by social constructivists. (The role of norms, identity and ideas will be explored in the next section of this paper when we discuss the formation of national interests in relation to NATO missions.)

The Utility of Social Constructivism

Social constructivism serves as a more useful approach for explaining state behavior than other approaches in I.R. Unlike realist and neo-liberal theories that portray states' national interests as 'fixed', social constructivism suggests that interests shift in response to ideational forces ranging from culture and ideology to aspiration, principles and beliefs. In other words, norms are socially constructed and they change over time. Norms associated with democracies become very important for demonstrating why democracies do not go to war with each other. They also are very important for demonstrating why democracies may have a higher propensity to go to war with non-democracies.

Democracies rarely fight each other because they perceive each other as peaceful, based on the democratic norms and values that govern their decision-making processes. For the same reason, they form pluralistic security communities of shared values. Because they perceive each other as peaceful, they are likely to overcome obstacles against international cooperation and to form international institutions such as alliances. In turn the norms regulating interactions in these institutions will reflect shared democratic values of the members. On the other hand, democracies may have a higher tendency to go to war with non-democracies because there is a lack of shared identity, norms and values.

While the empirical claim that democracies tend not to go to war with each other has been challenged, it would seem that this is one of the few significant generalizations which can be made about international politics that holds some merit. But while norms are a key component of the explanation, as Fukuyama suggests the argument needs to be taken further to include another variable, women: "developed democracies also tend to be more feminized than authoritarian states in terms of the female franchise and participation in political decision-making." The politics of advanced liberal democratic countries may demonstrate more 'feminine' aspects such as empathy, cooperation and reconciliation, than authoritarian regimes, as discussed previously, because women play a larger role in ideational formation. The link between the role of ideas and state behavior is found in the constructivist conviction that ideas shape norms. Therefore, instead of taking states' interests for granted and assuming that states simply want to survive, we should view the interests and identities of states as highly malleable products of specific processes and we should look at the prevailing discourses in society because discourse reflects and shapes beliefs, interests and established norms of behavior. The focus, then, should be on how discourse shapes actor's self-identity and thus modifies their behavior.

If the discourse is more 'feminized', the identities, norms and values of the actors will likely reflect this influence and the policies of these states will also be shaped by this discourse. I suggest that 'human security' is one such policy. While human security is a contentious policy within some circles, it has been argued that promoting human security not only promotes values it

promotes Canada's national interests based on the view that soon or later, directly or indirectly, others insecurity becomes our problem. At a practical level, however, the problem that remains is how to determine a force structure based on a policy of 'Human Security'.

(It seems that this constructivist view of the state fits well with the view outlined in the Strategic Assessment which suggests that the state should not be seen as a unitary actor. Indeed as the assessment points out, as the globalization of economies and financial affairs moves ahead, the 'information revolution' is increasing both the role of individuals and the prominence of international corporations. These manifestations can be seen in Canadian Foreign Policies in the emphasis placed on 'Team Canada' trade missions and the 'human security' agenda which encourages the use of the internet for to educate people on a wide range of security issues.)

The Feminization of NATO?As suggested at the outset of this paper, I believe a case can be made which demonstrates NATO's transformation in the post-Cold War era is consistent with feminist reformulations as discussed above. Therefore, the following section will examine NATO in the post-Cold War era based on two security approaches – cooperative security and human security – in order to draw out the similarities with feminist reformulations. Once this has been done, I will attempt to deduce what the possible implications are for the use of military force while suggesting that Canadian strategy is necessarily linked by way of being a member of NATO. It should be noted, once again, that I am not attempting to devise any grand conclusions. Rather, I am offering an alternative way of interpreting security approaches that are emerging in the post-Cold War era.

Cooperative Security

At every level of Alliance activity a process is underway which is designed to deliver to the population of the Euro-Atlantic area, the conditions which allow stability and security to be taken for granted, so that they can be free to focus on economic development, eradication of poverty and increased prosperity.

It [the Alliance] is building on the foundation it has created in order to promote stability based on democratic values and respect for human rights and the rule of law throughout Europe.

These two quotations above help to demonstrate that in the words of Javier Solana, NATO is dedicated to "the wider goal of building cooperative security throughout the Euro-Atlantic region." Upon examination, the connections between NATO's cooperative security approach and feminist approaches appear to be numerous. As mentioned earlier, critical feminist theorists, such as J. Ann Tickner, Robert Keohane, Rebecca Grant and Fred Halliday, suggest that more gender neutral interpretations of what constitutes security and power must be brought into the field in order to achieve a non-gendered, inclusively human way of thinking about achieving security in the future. They argue that women treat conflict differently and place a premium on achieving consensus and reconciliation. Interestingly, NATO has adopted many of these principles above including consensus building, achieving positive-sum gains, flexibility, the promotion of multilateralism and the broadening of its issue agenda to include not only "high politics" but also "low politics". Moreover, NATO's cooperative security approach is not based

on assumptions of strategic global relations in a zero-sum world. As demonstrated by its recent expansion, it is not *a priori* restrictive in membership.

While keeping the points made in the previous section on feminism and I.R. in mind, suggestions that NATO is becoming feminized are predicated upon several further observations of the changing context in Europe and NATO's evolution. First and foremost, the face of European security has changed dramatically over the past ten years. The ideological divide that separated Eastern and Western Europe has been overcome and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe seem to be continuing along the road towards democratic transition, manifested by free elections and the rule of law.

However it must be recognized that despite these very positive developments, challenges to European security remain. These challenges include ethnic conflict, refugee flows and human rights violations. Moreover, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is also of great concern. In light of these security challenges, NATO has, since 1991, been adapting by adjusting its internal structures and taking on new missions. NATO has also been establishing cooperative relations with countries across Europe in order to shape the environment and create a framework of stability across the region as mentioned above. The emphasis is placed, therefore, on political security consultation and cooperation. All of these efforts suggest a shift in thinking among member states as to what is necessary to achieve security in the post-Cold War environment and indeed the emphasis that is being placed on consensus and reconciliation amongst members and partnership countries would seem to lend support to the feminist hypothesis.

As NATO has adopted its new security approach that embraces the principles of cooperation with non-member countries and other institutions such as the OSCE, EU and WEU, it has changed beyond recognition. I believe these initiatives reflect a shift from confrontation to cooperation, from suspicion to transparency, and from blocs to inclusiveness. Moreover, these characteristics can be interpreted to reflect the essential quality of feminist reformulations. The manifestation of NATO's commitment to an inclusive Europe is found in the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (now the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council) which established a new institutional framework in 1991 for political security, consultation and cooperation between NATO and the former communist states of the Eastern bloc. The NACC linked the sixteen allies with Eastern Europe and the successor states of the Soviet Union. Two years later, these countries joined a "partnership for peace" (PfP) which created institutionalized ties between NATO's integrated military command structure and the East European and Russian militaries. This partnership would have been unthinkable a decade earlier.

In 1997 the NATO-Russia Founding Act was signed and it signaled an extensive relationship of consultation and cooperation that would have been unimaginable during the Cold War. The Permanent Joint Council is now a key forum in which views can be exchanged on current security issues, where military and defence experts can meet and where discussion on deepening the areas of practical cooperation can be explored. While one could argue that Russia will never realistically become part of the North Atlantic Community, the efforts demonstrated by NATO to include a former adversary are significant for further exploration. These efforts may lend support to the value of fostering an 'inclusive approach' to security in an attempt to overcome the

security dilemma as discussed earlier -- reformulation that feminists would encourage based on efforts to overcome insider/outsider distinctions.

The transformation of NATO is also manifest in the expressed willingness to lend available resources and expertise on a case-by-case basis for peacekeeping activities outside NATO territory under the auspices of the OSCE and UN. Bosnia became the first example of this development. With the Kosovo conflict, it would appear that a precedent has been set that demonstrates NATO is willing to intervene in conflicts outside its area even without UN Security Council approval. One could argue that NATO, far from withering away as some realists predicted, has become an even more relevant security organization than before. The alliance has shown, with its role first in Bosnia and then Kosovo, that it is adaptable to the changed conditions of the post-Cold War period and is both ready and able to deal with new challenges. Therefore, based on the above, it would appear that significant normative changes are occurring within the North Atlantic Community.

Human Security

NATO's intervention in Bosnia and Kosovo are both examples of military actions whose primary goal was humanitarian. As indicated by Foreign Affairs Minister Lloyd Axworthy, although strategic issues played some part " ...the decision to act [in Kosovo] was not motivated by a threat to Alliance territory, but an affront to Alliance values and a belief – perhaps more explicit in some capitals than in others – that human security matters." According to Assistant Deputy Foreign Minister, Paul Heinbecker, human security takes individuals and their communities, rather than states as the measure of security. It recognizes that the security of states is important but not sufficient to ensure the well-being of individuals. It considers threats from both military and non-military sources and it considers the safety and well-being of individuals as integral to achieving global peace and security. Human security complements but does not substitute for national security and it brings new tools, such as the internet and NGOs, to the repertory of diplomacy. Notice the resemblance of these goals and values to feminist ones. Indeed, it has often been suggested that feminists have been one of the motivating forces behind the promotion of human rights. Therefore, given the similarities between the values being pursued by NATO in Kosovo and the feminist agenda, perhaps one could make an argument that the feminization of NATO is supported by its humanitarian intervention into Kosovo.

The motivation for NATO's intervention into Kosovo, which was based on human rights, is significant because it raises doubts about the utility of traditional approaches in international politics. It could be argued that no obvious national interest was at stake for states that intervened, therefore, realist and neo-realist theories do not provide us with good explanations of states' behavior given their focus on geostrategic and economic motivations. It may be that social constructivism is a more useful tool in this respect because it allows us to problematize states' interests, values and norms based on identity formations. This is an area for further research.

Implications

If we accept the proposition that security is becoming feminized, one should ask what the implications of this feminization are for the future of conflict and the use of force. Should we expect peace to prevail because feminist qualities are associated with 'peacefulness'?

As previously discussed, an emphasis on cooperation and consensus building is occurring among NATO countries and former adversaries, as demonstrated by programmes such as the Partnership for Peace, the Russia-NATO Founding Act and Ukraine-NATO cooperation. While these developments are positive, based on insights devised from democratic peace theory, this does not mean that conflict will not arise amongst countries within the democratic zone of peace and those outside the zone because a strong sense of community and collective identity has not yet developed. In the long-run, however, if the principles consistent with feminism prevail and the democratic zone of peace expands, encouraged by processes of cooperative security as many NATO leaders believe, then peace will likely follow. But we are not at that point yet.

Perhaps unexpectedly, then, it would seem that the feminization of security may encourage war. This expectation is based partly on the emphasis that feminists place on the protection of the individual and on human rights which, when blatantly violated as we saw in Kosovo, probably requires that military means be employed to protect the victims. Indeed, it does appear based on NATO's humanitarian role in Bosnia and the 'humanitarian' military intervention in Kosovo that, increasingly, changes in international norms, which entail the redefinition of sovereignty, raise the likelihood of military intervention. If the state is no longer held to be the highest authority in the international system, then the principles of international human rights and 'human security' come into the foreground. It should be remembered that humanitarian intervention might entail going to war. This, it is posited, is what the feminization of security will likely lead to in the short-run.

NATO's response to the situation in Kosovo highlights the fact that human security (arguably a 'feminized' security policy) has not only provided a rationale for concerted action, it serves to demonstrate that the instruments for pursuing human security are diverse and not all are peaceful. Norms based on the recognition of human security have moved forward through different means based on negotiation and cooperation, building coalitions with like-minded governments and with civil society. Sometimes, however, hard power has been needed to achieve human security goals. As stated by Lloyd Axworthy, NATO's air campaign "... should serve to dispel the misconception that military force and the human security agenda are mutually exclusive."

In this light, if Canada is going to continue to play an important role in international politics in the post-Cold War era, it will have to be prepared and capable of using not only soft power but also hard power. This implies that there is indeed a need to maintain combat capable armed forces even if security is becoming more 'feminized'. Therefore, perhaps ironically, the feminist hypothesis would seem to lend support to increases in the defence budget, as suggested in the Strategic Assessment, so that the Canadian Forces have the means to embrace a security policy that can meet the domestic and international security challenges of the post-Cold War era. In connection with defence spending and NATO, it has been suggested elsewhere that due to the emphasis placed on burden sharing, the benefits of NATO's cooperative security approach for middle powers such as Canada could be significant because we are able to 'do more with less'.

Could it be, then, that 'feminized' approaches to security are also the most prudent ones? It remains to be seen....