

Trade Policy Mechanisms: Gender Mainstreaming vs. Diversity Mainstreaming

Sarah HOUGHTON

Trade policy changes are often coupled with shifts across economic sectors, creating both economic opportunities and challenges. Those groups traditionally marginalized by a particular society are often less capable of rapid adjustment to new economic environments and therefore receive less of the material gains resulting from the trade policy change. This dilemma, which often results in the marginalization of women, was largely noticed by women's rights advocates who began campaigns for the integration of policy mechanisms into trade agreements, under the umbrella of gender mainstreaming, to ensure more equitable participation of women in the opportunities developed through trade policy. Other groups traditionally marginalized within a particular society on the basis of culture, race, ethnicity, ability, religion and sexual orientation have not, however, enjoyed the same policy protection, of being *mainstreamed* into trade policy. This research note explores the development of the policy tools of gender mainstreaming and diversity mainstreaming and will explore if potential exists to integrate the two policy mechanisms to influence trade policy impacts.

The concept of gender mainstreaming (GM) has become widespread in recent years as a rights issue but gained particular traction as the economic benefits of the full economic participation of both genders has become increasingly apparent (Sinah et al., 2007). Microfinance and entrepreneurial programs aimed at women have demonstrated an economic incentive to mainstream gender into economic policy. Gender mainstreaming, women's economic rights, and the explicit inclusion of gender in trade agreements are not new concepts. They emerged with second-wave ideologies of the feminist movement, which were frustrated by the perceived shortcomings of Women in Development (WID) projects in the 1970s and 1980s. The lack of success of such projects was thought to result from the marginalization of a gender perspective from such projects; therefore, gender mainstreaming was promoted as a policy mechanism to bring issues of both genders into the center of policy making. GM was first widely endorsed by the Beijing Platform for Action in 1995 (United Nations, 2006) and further developed by the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC)'s conclusions in 1997/2 (United Nations, 2007).

Many definitions for gender mainstreaming exist, however, the most widely accepted definition is the ECOSOC definition: "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" (1997).

The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) further defines GM in trade policy, as "assessing which impacts trade policies could have on men and women and making them responsive to gender considerations" (2009). Key components to GM in trade policy promoted by the UNCTAD include: 1) ex ante assessment of the impacts of trade agreements; 2) the negotiation of the trade agreements; and 3) cooperation and capacity-building after the entering into force of the trade agreements" (2009). These policies have been adopted both as domestic policies and integrated into international trade agreements. An example of an international trade agreement that incorporated a gender perspective is the Cotonou Partnership Agreement in 2000. This trade and development agreement between the European Union and the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) group of nations highlights several gender provisions. For example, Article 1 notes, "Systematic account shall be taken of the situation of women and gender issues in all areas? political, economic and social," and article 31 observes gender as "thematic and cross-cutting" (Gibb, 2008). Such clauses demonstrate strong state commitments to gender mainstreaming in trade policy.

Significant criticisms of GM have emerged since its widespread acceptance in the mid-1990s. One of the main criticisms is by those who feel that the adoption of the term gender has again marginalized women. This split between those who advocate for gender and those who advocate for women has been institutionalized in such a way that many organizations, such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) work from a *two-pronged mandate* of both programs and policies addressing *gender mainstreaming* and *women's empowerment*. Hannan (2008) argues the failings are more bureaucratic than systemic or theoretical. Stating, "while there are now many good policies and strategies (GM) in place, there remains a huge gap between policy and practice which must be addressed through development of concrete action plans, with clear time frames and adequate resource allocations" (2008).

The other widespread criticism, however, provides the foundations for arguments to promote diversity mainstreaming and actually incorporates the first criticism. The theory behind this

policy tool has significant contributions from thinkers who identify with the Black Feminist movement in the United States including: Alice Walker, Angela Davis and bell hooks. They argue that sexism, racism and classism cannot be separated. The term *Womanism*, from Alice Walker's book, came to describe the experiences of *women of color*, particularly in the US, and how the elements of sex, race and class are inherently intertwined. The thrust of this criticism is that all identities of women must be considered and engaged within political, economic, and social struggles.

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak developed the term "strategic essentialism" to describe a process engaged in by many feminist groups, to temporarily ignore differences for a common cause. However, many of the feminist groups which first united on the policy tool of mainstreaming in 1995 are now beginning to see their differences grow. Furthermore, some feminist groups are beginning to find greater strength through alignment with empowerment movements across geographic, occupational, ethnic, religious or racial lines.

Diversity mainstreaming has not been integrated into domestic and international policy to as broad an extent as gender mainstreaming and few efforts have been made to mainstream diversity into trade policy. There is growing criticism of GM, based on a diversity framework which encompasses the notion of a combined relationship between gender and other various identities. Increasingly scholars and activists alike are arguing that other social factors such as class, race, religion, ethnicity, ability, sexual orientation, age and geographic location play essential roles in the construction of gender. Furthermore, multiple identities cannot easily be separated and it is even argued that it is disempowering to do so. From an economic perspective marginalization as a result of a trade policy change has much to do with high rates of participation in particular sectors of the economy, resulting from barriers to full participation in other economic sectors. Barriers to participation in all economic sectors, however do not necessarily result from gender biases, they also frequently result from such factors as geographic location, race, class, religion, age and physical ability.

Hand-in-hand with such criticisms are those, which call for greater participation (Cornwall, 2005) and the need for gender mainstreaming initiatives to adapt to the local context (Daly, 2005; Williams, 2003). Oxfam (2005) has begun to argue for more participatory approaches to GM which incorporate a more holistic identity stating, "transformation starts from a gender analysis of inequalities between women and men, which understands gender relations as intersecting with relations of race and class, to create context-specific locations of inequality"

(Oxfam, 2005). Hankivsky (2005) further argues that “contemporary feminist developments in understanding gender and the interface between gender, race, class, nationality, ethnicity, sexuality and power are not adequately reflected in the concept of GM or in the strategies and tools that have been developed to engender public policy.” (2005) Despite the growing critique of GM and arguments to incorporate diversity, or change the GM paradigm to one of diversity mainstreaming, mechanisms to mainstream diversity into trade policy have yet to be widely researched.

In conclusion, the policy tools for mainstreaming gender exist and are currently being implemented; however, they may become more effective if they are adapted to incorporate a multi-faceted identity of both men and women. Participatory methodologies may be an avenue through which groups may design and implement their own policies to best ensure their full economic participation within a constantly changing economic climate. However, further research should be conducted to identify opportunities for modification of GM policy tools to foster more equitable economic participation of all despite continual trade policy changes.

References

- Bacchi, C., & Eveline, J. (2010). *Mainstreaming politics: Gendering practices and mainstreaming theories*, South Australia: University of Adelaide Press.
- Collins, P.H. (1991). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Cornwall, A. (2001). *Making a difference? Gender and participatory development*, IDS Discussion Paper, 378, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence, *Stanford Law Review*, 43, 1241-1299.
- Daly, M. (2005). Gender mainstreaming in theory and practice, social politics: International studies in gender, *State and Society*, 12 (3), 433-450.
- Database of instruments for gender mainstreaming. Retrieved August 2010, from <http://db.amazone.be/digma/en>
- Davis, A. (1981). *Women, race and class*. New York: Random House.
- Frey, R. (2008). *Institutionalising gender mainstreaming: Tools in Berlin and Germany*. Gender Studies and Policy Review. Korean Women's Development Institute. Seoul, Korea, 1, 146-54.
- Gibb, H. (2008, May). *Gender and regional trade agreements*, Paper produced for the 13th Meeting of the APEC Women Leaders Network. Ottawa, Canada: The North-South Institute.
- Hankivsky, O. (2005). Gender vs. diversity mainstreaming: A preliminary examination of the role and transformative potential of feminist theory, *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 38 (4), 977-1001.
- Hannan, C. (2008). *United Nations gender mainstreaming strategy: Achievements and challenges*, GSPR, 36-45.
- hooks, B. (1984). *Feminist theory: From margin to center*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- International Labour Organization. (2007). *Manual for gender audit facilitators: The ILO participatory gender audit methodology*. Geneva: ILO, Bureau for Gender Equality.
- Mainstreaming gender in development: A critical review*. (2005) . Oxfam: Oxford.
- Mehra, R., & Rao Gupta, G. (2006). *Gender mainstreaming: Making it happen*. International Center for Research on Women (ICRW), 30th Anniversary. The Cotonou Agreement, from <http://www.acpsec.org/en/conventions/cotonou/accord1.htm>

- Sinha N., Raju D., & Morrison, A. R. (2007). *Gender equality, poverty and economic growth*. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper, 4349.
- Squires, J. (2005). Is mainstreaming transformative? Theorising mainstreaming in the context of diversity and deliberation, *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society*, 12 (3), 366-388.
- The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) (2008). *Moving towards gender sensitization of trade policy*. UNCTAD/DITC/TNCD/2008/2.
- UNCTAD. (2009). *Mainstreaming gender in trade policy*. UNCTAD/TD/B/C.I/EM.2/2/Rev.1
- United Nations. (1997, September). Report of the Economic and Social Council for 1997, A/52/3.
- Verloo, M. (2005). Displacement and empowerment: Reflections on the concept and practice of the Council of Europe approach to gender mainstreaming and gender equity, *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society*, 12 (3), 344-365.
- Williams, M. (2003). *Gender mainstreaming in the multilateral trading system: A handbook for policy makers and other stakeholders*. Commonwealth Secretariat.

通商政策機関—ジェンダーの主流化 VS 多様性の主流化

サラ・ホートン

本研究はジェンダーの主流化（メインストリーミング）と多様性の主流化の間の論争について考察する。この議論は、主導権を率先することを通じた通商政策転換による公平な利益を促進する試みに関連付けられる。ジェンダーの主流化と多様性の主流化をそれぞれ通商政策に統合する可能性は、特に、参加型の方法論を用いることで明らかになる。本研究ノートは将来の研究と通商政策ツール開発への基礎となることを目指す。

Keywords:

ジェンダーの主流化、多様性の主流化、通商政策