Hierarchies of Violence, Victimhood, and Remedy in the Pursuit of Women's Rights After War

Marie Berry
University of Denver, USA

Milli Lake
London School of Economics, UK

Sinduja Raja
University of Denver, USA

and

Soraya Zarook
Old Dominion University, USA

Recent postwar recovery efforts have paved the way for reforms that advance women's participation in politics, inclusion in the economy, and access to justice. In this article, we show how a singular emphasis on gender reforms after war that are inattentive to other societal cleavages can leave various forms of marginalization in the shadows. Subnational interviews on the reverberations of gender reforms in five postwar countries expose three hierarchies that structure access to rights for war-affected communities. We reveal *which* violence is privileged, *whose* violence is privileged, and which *responses* are privileged from the perspectives of differently situated war-affected women, showing how patterns of access to new rights can reinforce exclusionary dynamics. Importantly, because international and domestic actors tend to privilege top-down, state-based responses to wartime violence (what we term *hierarchies of remedy*), hierarchies of *violence* and *victimhood* frequently also reflect state actors' priorities. Speaking to debates on legal and policy reform, we acknowledge that attention to women's rights after war offers an urgently needed corrective to earlier gender inequalities. Yet, a singular focus on gender reforms that ignores other conflict-related cleavages, particularly those that are amplified by the distribution of political power within the state apparatus, can risk obstructing access for marginalized women, sometimes reproducing grievances that contributed to violence in the first place. For policymakers, we suggest that striving for more equal access to new rights after war will help foster a more inclusive—and therefore more stable and durable—peace.

Los recientes esfuerzos de recuperación que tuvieron lugar en la posguerra han allanado el camino para llevar a cabo reformas que promueven la participación de las mujeres en la política, su inclusión en la economía y el acceso a la justicia. En este artículo, demostramos cómo un énfasis singular sobre aquellas reformas de género después de la guerra que no prestan atención a otras divisiones sociales puede dejar en la sombra diversas formas de marginación. Llevamos a cabo entrevistas subnacionales sobre las reverberaciones de las reformas de género en cinco países de posguerra, las cuales exponen tres jerarquías que estructuran el acceso a los derechos para las comunidades afectadas por la guerra. Revelamos qué violencia resulta privilegiada, quien instiga esta violencia privilegiada y qué respuestas son privilegiadas desde las perspectivas de mujeres afectadas por la guerra en diferentes situaciones, mostrando cómo los patrones de acceso a nuevos derechos pueden reforzar las dinámicas excluyentes. Es importante destacar que, debido a que los actores internacionales y nacionales tienden a privilegiar las respuestas de arriba hacia abajo, basadas en el Estado, a la violencia en tiempos de guerra (lo que denominamos jerarquías de remedio), las jerarquías de la violencia y del victimismo también reflejan, con frecuencia, las prioridades de los actores estatales. Intervenimos en los debates sobre la reforma jurídica y política y, de esta forma, reconocemos que la atención prestada a los derechos de las mujeres después de la guerra ofrece un correctivo que se necesitaba de forma urgente frente a las desigualdades de género anteriores. Sin embargo, un enfoque singular sobre las reformas de género que ignore otras divisiones relacionadas con los conflictos, en particular las que se amplifican por la distribución del poder político dentro del aparato estatal, puede correr el riesgo de obstruir el acceso de las mujeres marginadas y de reproducir, a veces, agravios que contribuyeron a la violencia en primer lugar. Sugerimos a los responsables de la formulación de políticas que los esfuerzos por lograr un acceso más igualitario a nuevos derechos después de la guerra ayudarán a fomentar una paz más inclusiva y, por lo tanto, más estable y duradera.

Récemment, les efforts en vue d'une reprise économique après une guerre ont ouvert la voie à des réformes pour faire progresser la participation des femmes en politique, leur inclusion dans l'économie et leur accès à la justice. Dans cet article, nous montrons que le seul accent sur les réformes portant sur le genre après une guerre, en ignorant d'autres divisions sociétales, est susceptible de laisser de côté différentes formes de marginalisation. Des entretiens infranationaux sur les répercussions des réformes portant sur le genre dans cinq pays après une guerre révèlent trois hiérarchies qui structurent l'accès aux droits pour des communautés touchées par une guerre. Nous dévoilons les types de violence, les auteurs et les réponses privilégiés du point de vue de femmes touchées par la guerre mais à la situation différente. Nous montrons ainsi que des schémas d'accès à de nouveaux droits peuvent renforcer des dynamiques d'exclusion. Fait important, comme les acteurs internationaux et nationaux ont tendance à privilégier les réponses descendantes et fondées sur l'État à la violence en temps de guerre (les « hiérarchies de recours »), les hiérarchies de violence et de victimisation reflètent aussi souvent les priorités des acteurs étatiques. S'agissant des débats sur la réforme juridique et politique, nous admettons que l'attention aux droits des femmes

après une guerre constitue une mesure corrective très attendue aux inégalités antérieures entre les genres. Pourtant, en se concentrant uniquement sur les réformes portant sur le genre et en ignorant d'autres divisions relatives au conflit, notamment celles qui sont amplifiées par la répartition du pouvoir politique au sein de l'appareil politique, on risque d'entraver l'accès des femmes marginalisées et parfois donc, de reproduire les injustices qui ont en premier lieu contribué à l'avènement de la violence. Pour les législateurs, nous suggérons que s'efforcer d'améliorer l'équité de l'accès à de nouveaux droits après une guerre renforce l'inclusivité de la paix, et donc sa stabilité et sa durabilité.

Introduction

Since the wars in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Rwanda in the mid-1990s, gender justice and equality have emerged at the forefront of myriad development and human rights initiatives. Responding to the disproportionate ways that women were affected in these wars, activists around the world effectively advocated for the inclusion and advancement of rights and reforms targeted at redressing gender inequalities in war-to-peace transitions and international human rights instruments, providing a much-needed corrective to earlier omissions. In this article, we explore who benefits from these reforms to understand how new laws and policies contribute to their stated goals.

A large literature on gender and conflict has made important inroads in recognizing that, in addition to serving as a force for destruction, wars can disrupt preexisting social and political hierarchies and reconfigure gendered power relations, sometimes giving rise to rapid and progressive periods of social change (Wood 2008; Viterna 2013; Lake 2018; Berry 2018; Webster et al. 2020). Over the past two decades, donors and activists have capitalized on such openings, using transitions to peace in concerted efforts to rewrite constitutions and overhaul government institutions to place participation, empowerment, and gender-sensitive justice at the center of post-war recovery efforts. Most countries that have emerged from armed conflict in the past three decades have enacted gender-sensitive reforms in areas of criminal and family law, economic policymaking, and the security sector (Berry et al. 2021). Governments and multinational institutions have often spearheaded these initiatives through the United Nations' Women, Peace, and Security (WPS) agenda, which has become a central part of liberal peacebuilding. Increasingly, gender reforms are considered integral to the pursuit of more inclusive, stable democracies in transitions away from violence (Caprioli 2005; Doyle 2011; Sobek, Abouharb, and Ingram 2006).

We set out to understand how differently situated women have benefitted from these efforts.[1] Drawing on subnational research and novel cross-country comparative data from five postwar contexts, we find that gender reforms have transformed legal and policy landscapes. Nonetheless, we find that benefits of these reforms at the local level are unevenly distributed. While there is ample scholarship documenting a decoupling of law and practice (Hafner-Burton and Tsutsui 2005; Goodman and Jinks 2008), alongside a vast sociolegal literature on the ways that legal institutions refract societal inequalities (Kennedy 1982; Santos 2002; Heiner and Tyson 2017), we emphasize two surprising dynamics that emerged from our research. First, we show that a narrow focus on redressing gender inequality without attending to other axes of oppression functions to shore up other intersecting hierarchies in ways that reveal striking continuity.

Rather than disrupting preexisting social and political hierarchies or providing a rupture between the pre- and post-war periods, our research reveals the role that single-axis organizing around gender can play in preserving conflict-era cleavages—and sometimes the power disparities that laid the foundations for war in the first place. Second, in addition to observing continuities between the pre- and post-war periods, we observe some similarities across regime types and conflict experiences. Although we see slightly different patterns in conflicts that ended in a decisive victory versus those that resulted in power-sharing settlements, hierarchies of remedy, victimhood, and violence persist across a diverse array of war-to-peace transitions.

Using original qualitative research, we thus argue that single-axis organizing around gender inequalities that is inattentive to intersecting forms of marginalization and exclusion reinforces other (gendered) structures of power that leave behind those most vulnerable at the end of the war. We explore *which* violence is privileged (which we term "hierarchies of violence"); *whose* violence is privileged (which we term "hierarchies of victimhood"); and which *responses* are privileged (which we term "hierarchies of remedy") from the perspectives of different war-affected populations in each case. Interviews with 283 ordinary women, gender practitioners, activists, women's political representatives, journalists, civil society leaders, and other experts reveal that these three hierarchies of access emerged in all five cases. Importantly, because international and domestic actors tend to privilege top-down, state-based responses to wartime violence (what we term *hierarchies of remedy*), then which violence is privileged (*hierarchies of violence)* and whose violence is privileged (*hierarchies of victimhood)* frequently also reflect state actors' priorities. When conflict-related cleavages are amplified by the distribution of political power either within the state apparatus or through local justice institutions, a singular focus on gender reforms to the exclusion of other facets of women's identities can risk obstructing access for politically marginalized women, sometimes reproducing grievances that contributed to violence in the first place.

We build on existing literature on hierarchies of access in transitional justice efforts (e.g., Schwarz, Baum, and Cohen 2020; Kao and Revkin 2023; Kreft and Agerberg 2024; Krystalli 2024) to identify various theoretical implications that stem from this work. Importantly, we note that progress in some areas (e.g., progressive gender reforms) can mask other forms of private and state-sanctioned violence, reinforcing the continued exclusion of war's most vulnerable victims. While political and conflict-related identities are not the only dimensions that matter in structuring access to new rights, our data reveal how these identities function in tandem with other gendered, classed, ethnic, and racial hierarchies. We show how gendered power and other hierarchies in global politics co-constitute one another, threatening the quality and durability of the peace and compromising progress toward inclusive gender equality.

---

[1]While most of the reforms have focused on women, some have encompassed LGBTQI communities (Hagen 2016; Daigle and Myrttinen 2018; Schulz 2020; Touquet and Schulz 2021).

Section II offers a brief introduction to global efforts to redress gendered harms in war. Section III outlines our unique methodological approach. Section IV draws from our original interviews collected in six subnational locations in each of our five postwar cases to provide evidence of these hierarchies as they emerged for war's most vulnerable women. Section V concludes by examining the structural effects of these hierarchies, devoting attention to the processes through which violence and harm come to be erased in the first place, and what these findings mean for gendered power and the quality of postwar peace.

Gender Justice, Equality, and Transition

Who benefits from gender equality reforms in war-to-peace transitions? Prior to the conflicts in central Africa and the former Yugoslavia in the early 1990s, gender was almost entirely overlooked in post-war recovery efforts. International and domestic institutions had failed to take seriously the ways in which women are disproportionately affected by conflict, and gender-based violence was sorely under-reported, perpetuating a culture of impunity that enabled soldiers and civilians to treat feminized populations as "spoils of war" (Enloe 2000).

Following the scale and brutality of gendered violence in Bosnia and Rwanda in the early 1990s, the unique plight of women and gender minorities attracted global attention. Feminists and human rights activists capitalized on this momentum to push the issue to the forefront of the international agenda. The International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) brought the first international criminal prosecutions of rape and sexual enslavement as crimes against humanity in 1998 (ICTY Case No. IT-96-23-T and IT-96-23/1-T). In the same year, the ICTR became the first court to establish rape as a crime of genocide in the case of the Prosecutor v. Jean-Paul Akayesu (Case No. ICTR-96-4-T, September 2, 1998). The work of these ad hoc tribunals, alongside the entry into force of the Rome Statute, has led many postwar governments to incorporate new legislation into their domestic legal systems, outlawing a broad range of gender inequalities that had previously been tolerated (Lake 2018; Berry and Lake 2021).

The centering of gender in domestic criminal law in the early 2000s found its roots in a long history of advocacy in the international system. In 1995, the Beijing Conference endorsed "gender mainstreaming," encouraging governments to prioritize gender equality. The UN's Women, Peace, and Security (WPS) agenda, launched in 2000, lent support to gender activists globally, but also exerted pressure on postwar governments to enact various legal reforms (Otto 2010; Kirby and Shepherd 2016; Halley et al. 2018).[2]

In addition to newly criminalizing myriad forms of gendered violence after war, a considerable focus of postwar gender reform efforts has been on women's political representation. Existing research has documented how war can catalyze women's movements that demand new rights and political opportunities. Women's mobilization to resist war, challenge its effects, and assert their political voice has been a feature of wars from Korea (Kim 2023) to Timor-Leste (Johnston 2023) to Israel and Palestine (Sharoni

1995; Kayali 2024) to El Salvador (Viterna 2013). Women-led movements such as Las Madres de la Plaza de Mayo in Argentina or the Mother's Front in Sri Lanka have also played a powerful role in demanding new rights, protections, and opportunities for justice (Tickner 1992; Aretxaga 1997; Samuel 2006; Cockburn 2007; Gallo Cruz 2019; Tripp 2015; Kodikara 2021). Donors, international organizations, and women's rights advocates have also sought to establish women's property, land, and inheritance rights alongside changes in women's rights to divorce and custody (Samuel 2006; Arostegui 2013; Hartman, Blair, and Blattman 2021).

Each of these developments delivered incremental but meaningful changes for some women, shifting attitudes and perceptions toward establishing new norms. The incorporation of international frameworks, alongside mechanisms to provide justice, redress, and reparations for conflict-related gendered violence, has served to shape the accountability landscape and create momentum and further activism around previously unrecognized harms.

Recognizing these important advances in women's rights, we sought to more comprehensively evaluate the successes and failures of post-war gender equality reforms and their potential contributions to peace and security by scrutinizing who was best positioned to benefit from them. While many of these developments offered much-needed correctives to earlier neglect, we found that they have often fallen short of reaching those left most vulnerable in war, leading us to observe how single-axis organizing around gender equality leaves various other forms of (gendered) harm intact.

While it is unsurprising that the benefits of reforms are unevenly distributed in ways that reflect other power dynamics in society, patterns of access that fail to reach the most vulnerable women or that reinscribe inequalities linked to conflict grievances risk undermining the quality and durability of the peace (Mamdani 2014). These are the very outcomes gender-sensitive justice and inclusion hoped to address (Shair-Rosenfield and Wood 2017; Best, Shair-Rosenfield, and Wood 2019). Additionally, continuities across different types of cases, conflict experiences, and regime types reveal far less daylight between single-party states and multi-party democracies than we might expect. The literature on post-war gender reforms has long called attention to dynamics of autocratic gender-washing, in which progressive gender reforms can serve as a smokescreen for other forms of ethnonationalist exclusion and political consolidation (Bjarnegård and Zetterberg 2022; Bush, Donno, and Zetterberg 2024). Democracy and gender empowerment, on the other hand, are often understood to be bundled norms (Donno, Fox, and Kaasik 2022). In showing how interlocking hierarchies of access characterize the experiences of war's most vulnerable women in democracies and autocracies alike, this research complicates existing literature.

Our research revealed three hierarchies of access that structured access to rights across regime types and conflict histories. These hierarchies serve to delineate whose bodies and experiences are considered worthy of remedy and repair (Butler 2003), while reinscribing some of the grievances and inequalities that provided the initial fuel for violence. Our interview data clearly revealed that those at the intersections of different axes of marginalization fare the worst. Importantly, we introduce conflict positionality as an important axis of identity (see also Berry 2017), showing that extending rights to women from dominant groups often went hand-in-hand with the obstruction of rights for those from politically marginalized backgrounds.

---

[2]UNSC-R 1325 in 2000, UNSC-R 1820 in 2008, and UNSC-R 1888 in 2009, each recognized the ways in which conflict disproportionately affects civilians, particularly women and children, centered women in conflict prevention and resolution, called for specialized training on the protection of women and children for peacekeepers, and acknowledged rape and other forms of sexual violence as war crimes, crimes against humanity, and acts of genocide.

We thus follow feminist theorists to show *how* gendered power is constituted by other hierarchies in politics, offering a framework to understand interlocking systems of domination (Tickner 1992; Hooper 2001; Enloe 2007; Peterson 2007; Sjoberg 2009). Gendered hierarchy offers an important analytic tool that permits us to make sense of the subjugation of various identity groups—whether by class, caste, ethnicity, race, or otherwise—through their perceived inferiority (or, what gender theorists term their "feminization"). The perseverance and reification of myriad forms of oppression through institutional reforms designed to bolster women's equality demonstrate that gendered power is rarely undone while other systems of political exclusion are preserved.

Additionally, we see how the organization of power in society often reflects (gendered) hierarchies in ways that have profoundly important repercussions for conflict-era grievances. This may be particularly apparent when hierarchies that reflect unequal distributions of power in the state apparatus (what is sometimes referred to as the postwar political settlement) are embedded in systems of supposed repair. Through the elevation of certain women and the centering of particular manifestations of violence, we observe a shoring up of the very hierarchies that legitimized women's exclusion in the first place (Young 2003; Sjoberg and Peet 2011; Richie 2012). Moreover, when unequal access to state-based privileges either intentionally or inadvertently provided the foundations for grievance and mobilization during war, its reincarnation in post-war rights regimes may provide a continued basis for unrest (Cohen and Karim 2022). We posit that acute attention to micro-dynamics of access at the local level is necessary against any recent history of violence, since the exclusion of particular groups—whether real or perceived—can provide further fuel for conflict (Vandermaas-Peeler, Subotic, and Barnett 2024).

Importantly, though, while the preferences and priorities of state actors are amplified through the top-down implementation of state-based rights regime, we do not understand these hierarchies to always or necessarily result from strategic action or intent. In some instances, state actors purposely deny certain populations access to certain rights, or leverage justice and accountability mechanisms to surveil certain communities. Often, though, hierarchies of access result from implicit or uncoordinated action that reflect latent power dynamics in society (Galtung and Höivik 1971; Dilts et al. 2012). The three hierarchies we analyze, therefore, function to compound and reinforce one another. Because international and domestic actors tend to privilege top-down, state-based responses to wartime violence (*hierarchies of remedy*), hierarchies of *violence* and *victimhood* also tend to reflect state actors' perceptions, goals, and priorities, alongside those of global stakeholders and programs. While hierarchies of violence and victimhood are constructed from below *as well as* from above, they work in tandem with hierarchies of remedy to formally structure the de facto rights and opportunities that are available to (some) women after war.

Studying Violence and Gender: A Comparative and Interpretivist Approach

One of our goals in designing this project was to realize an empirically rigorous, multi-sited research project in conflict-affected contexts using a feminist research design grounded in interpretivist, intersectional, and decolonial praxis (Shepherd 2016; Exley, Whatman, and Singh 2018; Cadaval et al. 2023; Krystalli and Schulz 2022). We drew inspiration from decades of feminist scholarship on fieldwork and collaborative knowledge production grounded in an ethic of care and solidarity (Krystalli and Schulz 2022). We wanted to center a genuinely inductive and iterative approach. Importantly, we were interested not in objective or externally defined markers of implementation, but rather in the subjective interpretations of the lived experience of gender equality reforms from the perspectives of differently situated women (Harding 1991, 2004). Our primary goal was to disaggregate any unevenness in accessing rights and protections advancing gender equality, justice, and security, and place this unevenness in the context of other structures of social, political, and economic power.

Resultingly, over 5 years, we worked closely with partners in and from each focus country to design and execute our research. We navigated the complexities of conducting comparative multi-sited research during the pandemic in ongoing dialogue with our country research leads, and with our interlocutors and interviewees. We took our lead from feminist researchers situated within the communities we were studying, both regarding when and how to conduct our research ethically, and also over which questions we should be asking and why.

To understand how postwar gender reforms were experienced by differently situated populations, we approached our comparative research with an ethnographic sensibility (Simmons and Smith 2017). Phase 1 involved collating a database of all post-war gender reforms in each of our country cases. To select our country cases, we first identified a list of all countries that had experienced a termination of armed conflict either immediately prior to or following the Beijing Conference in 1995. From there, we selected cases that took specific legislative and political action to promote women's inclusion and equality, particularly by targeting their social, political, and economic participation. We then selected countries where we could conduct primary research safely, leaving us with five cases of war from the past three decades that captured different conflict endings: Bosnia-Herzegovina, Colombia, Nepal, Rwanda, and Sri Lanka. These cases included two instances of negotiated settlements (Nepal and Colombia), two cases of military victories (Rwanda and Sri Lanka), and one consociational arrangement (Bosnia-Herzegovina). Further details can be found in Online Appendix A.

We then created a comprehensive database of post-war gender reforms in each country across six issue areas: (1) political participation, (2) economic empowerment, (3) family/civil law reform, (4) gender-sensitive criminal justice reform, (5) transitional justice and accountability, and (6) WPS National Action Plans.[3] To categorize the laws and policies designed to promote women's inclusion and gender parity across all focus areas, we utilized publicly available government archives, legal documents, newspaper reports, and inputs from country experts, and we also drew from existing research and datasets (e.g., Kang and Tripp 2018; Tripp 2015).

Across our five cases, gender reforms are spread unequally across the different categories. Most of our project countries introduced similar laws promoting women's political participation primarily through quotas. A number also had extensive reforms to family and civil law, including divorce, property, and inheritance. Criminal law reforms rec-

---

[3]See Post-War Gender Laws Dataset, available via the Gender, Justice, and Security Hub at the London School of Economics: https://thegenderhub.com/publications/dataset-post-war-gender-laws/.

Table 1. Gender reforms in six areas

Country	Reforms to political participation	Criminal reforms	Civil-family reforms	Economic reforms	Transitional justice mechanisms	National Action Plans	Total
Colombia	11	28	33	18	12	0	102
Nepal	11	8	7	4	5	2	37
Rwanda	10	10	19	11	10	2	62
Sri Lanka	6	4	7	10	6	1	34
Bosnia-Herzegovina	8	9	7	5	8	3	40

ognized the particular forms of violence faced by women and sought to improve access to justice. Economic policy is often designed to promote women's increased inclusion in economic activities. Many of our countries have also ratified or adopted international frameworks that promote gender justice. Finally, gender-sensitive transitional justice mechanisms seek to provide accountability and repair for the gendered violence women experience during war. Table 1 reflects a count of laws and policies in each category. While there is some variation across countries, we did not set out to explain variation but to explore patterns in how rights are realized. Despite considerable de jure reform efforts in all countries, and across different regime types and conflict experiences, our research revealed similar patterns across cases.

Phase 2 of the project involved a high-level investigation of women's rights reforms in our five country cases, in order to understand emerging patterns as well as dynamics particular to specific countries or regime types. Between 2019 and 2024, we conducted desk research and in-country interviews with gender activists, politicians, civil society representatives, religious leaders, lawyers, judges, and journalists who could provide a bird's eye view of implementation. We conducted formal interviews alongside dozens of additional informational meetings. Interview questions were directed toward understanding how women's empowerment policies shaped individual and collective outcomes, with a particular emphasis on the specific barriers facing particular groups in society. We also asked about the effects of laws passed, and any obstacles pertinent to their implementation.

Finally, Phase 3 zoomed in on three purposively selected subregions differently affected by the war in each country. In each subregion, we selected two municipalities at random, excluding those municipalities that were inaccessible, usually because they were too difficult for our team to reach safely due to geography or the security environment. This gave us a total of six distinct subnational municipalities in distinct regions of each country. This geographical and political variation allowed us to compare dynamics across regions and different experiences of the war. In each municipality, we conducted interviews with community leaders, political representatives, activists, journalists, and others. We worked closely with local researchers who had ties to the communities to ensure the utmost care for the safety, comfort, and security of all those affected by our presence and work. Most of our interviews were individual, but in some countries (for instance, Rwanda and Colombia), we also conducted a small number of small-group interviews. A summary of these data is presented in Table 2, and a description of each subnational location can be found in Online Appendix B.

In each country, across all three phases of the research, we wanted to understand experiences of gender reforms from the perspectives of the women intended to benefit. We sought to spread our research across three distinct regions of each country since women from different regions might benefit in markedly different ways. We explicitly sought to include regions with different war histories in order to capture a diversity of wartime experiences. In addition to their varied conflict trajectories, our subnational regions represented communities from different political factions, affiliations, parties, religions, or ethnic backgrounds in order to examine how women from different identities experienced efforts to advance women's rights. While we hoped that women from different backgrounds and conflict positionalities would benefit equally, we suspected that those whose identities were marginalized in the postwar settlement may be disproportionately excluded from de jure reforms to law and policy.

It is pertinent to note that interviewees in Bosnia, Colombia, and Nepal were far more open, on average, than interviewees in Sri Lanka and Rwanda, largely in light of the distinct security environments across our country cases. While we were able to conduct interviews with trusted human rights activists in Sri Lanka, the political situation in Rwanda was not conducive to speaking openly about the security environment during in-country interviews. As a result, while we comment on general—and very visible—trends in Rwanda, we rely more heavily on direct quotes from our other country cases.[4]

Hierarchies of Violence, Victimhood, and Remedy

Our research exposed three hierarchies of violence, victimhood, and remedy that emerged and were reinforced by efforts to advance gender justice, equality, and security after war. These data show that single-axis efforts to remedy historical forms of marginalization along one dimension (gender) can facilitate access to new rights and opportunities for some women while inadvertently cementing the structures of power that led to other women's exclusion and erasure in the first place. This can contribute to an ongoing neglect of the foundational manifestations of violence that shape women and sexual and gender minorities' experiences of post-war recovery. Additionally, we observed that women's political and conflict identities provided another axis of marginalization, intersecting with gendered, classed, racial, ethnic, and other hierarchies to undermine the more stable and inclusive transitions to peace that gender reforms hoped to deliver.

We call attention to two distinct continuities that emerged. The first is temporal: continuities between the pre- and post-war were evident in all cases. The second cut across regime type: While we might have anticipated certain

---

[4]See Online Appendix C for details on interview coding and analysis.

Table 2. Summary of data

Country	Interviews (Phase 2)	Interviews (Phase 3)	Group interviews	Total participants
Bosnia-Herzegovina	9	30	0	39
Colombia	19	24	1	55
Nepal	21	23	0	44
Rwanda	13	N/A	18 groups (4–5 in each)	103
Sri Lanka	15	27	0	42
Total participants	69	111	60	283

hierarchies to be more pronounced in autocratic regimes or in conflicts that resulted in a single faction's decisive victory, we observed fairly similar patterns regardless of the regime type, the country's level of democracy, or the nature of the conflict ending. While further research is needed to disaggregate these trends across different types of cases, our research showed that women from marginalized identity groups perceived themselves to be no more able to access their rights in cases of single-party victory than in contexts of negotiated settlements. Although it is likely that women's political identities were most salient in our two cases of decisive victory, it is also true that marginalized women in all cases frequently expressed that they were no better off than before the war. Indeed, for many women, new rights regimes provided new mechanisms for their continued exclusion and marginalization. In the following sections, we draw out key themes, using quotes to illustrate the weight and salience of these patterns.

Hierarchies of Remedy: Reinscribing State Power

In all five country cases, hard-fought efforts to advance women's rights after war have led to criminal and family law reforms, as well as various gender-sensitive transitional justice mechanisms. While these reforms often create new opportunities that improve equality and access to justice for some women, state-based institutions are typically the primary venues for realizing rights.

As a result, identity groups who face persecution at the hands of the state, or who are under-served by postwar distributions of power, are disadvantaged. We term the primacy of state-based institutions in rights regimes, paired with the relative privileges held by different identity groups vis-à-vis the state: *hierarchies of remedy*.

Feminist scholars and activists have long called attention to the fact that the state and its security infrastructure constitute one of the primary sources of *in*security for women and gender minorities, either through overt violence, or through neglect (Sjoberg 2009; Gowrinathan and Cronin Furman 2015; Jayawardena and Pinto-Jayawardena 2016; Zulver 2022). Indeed, a large body of feminist scholarship challenges the assumption that bolstering the capacity, resources, and visibility of the law—particularly through its criminal justice architecture—necessarily contributes to heightened security or possibilities of justice for those already marginalized by status quo structures of power (Tickner 1992; Enloe 2000; Flores-Macías and Zarkin 2021; Kaba 2020; Lake 2022).

Our research confirmed that one of the most significant threats for some women derived from state-based security architecture. In both Rwanda and Sri Lanka, our two cases of decisive victory, state-based avenues for justice or security offered little respite for Hutu, Tamil, or Muslim women who have been targets of government harassment, surveillance,

targeting, or discrimination since both wars' conclusions. One women's rights representative in Sri Lanka highlighted these dynamics:

> Nothing will come in the next ten years, because the perpetrators are back… We have to take safe houses, wash our hands of everything. We have to find safe spaces. We need to get people out of the country now the government is back.[5]

Another told us: *"The conflict isn't over. Yes, there was an end to the war. But so much is unresolved."*[6]

In Rwanda, the Gacaca court system, alongside the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, only tried perpetrators associated with the side of the conflict responsible for the genocide (i.e., the former Hutu regime), even though tens of thousands of Rwandans have been identified as victims of the war between the now-ruling Rwandan Patriotic Front and the former Government of Rwanda during the early 1990s. This restriction on justice proceedings has erased and even criminalized Hutu suffering during the genocide and corresponding war, as Hutus who seek redress for their losses are accused by the government of denying the genocide against Tutsi and of being security threats (Reyntjens 2013; Ingelere 2010). Today, the security apparatus in Rwanda carefully regulates and controls discourse about the genocide and social behavior. Vulnerable populations, including poor women engaged in informal employment like sex work or vending, often pointed to the police as the primary threat to their safety. They noted being arbitrarily arrested, forcibly subjected to blood tests to identify possible communicable diseases, having their heads shaved, or being detained for days and even months without charge (see also Berry 2015). For these women, the idea of turning to formal state systems for rights and repair after violence was impossible. Women who have dared to challenge the authoritarian regime for power—such as opposition political candidates—have been arrested, slandered, and incarcerated, suggesting that access to state-based mechanisms is only available to *certain* women.

In addition to direct targeting, women in Sri Lanka who sought justice found that turning to the law was often disempowering and dangerous for those from already marginalized identities—including lower caste, lower class, or otherwise racialized women, as well as for sexual and gender minorities. This is particularly true for those Tamil and Muslim communities who are broadly accustomed to experiencing violence at the hands of state institutions. An activist involved in seeking rights for those disappeared in the final years of the war reported:

> …When I went to detention centers they wanted to take so many details about me - where do I live; how

[5] Bureaucrat, Colombo, Sri Lanka. January 2020.
[6] Activist. Colombo, Sri Lanka. December 2019.

many people live in my house; when do I go to work. These questions are designed to find out whether they can come for me.[7]

Beyond Rwanda and Sri Lanka, even in sites of negotiated settlements, power sharing, or democratic transition, the state still emerged as a perpetrator of violence rather than an avenue for justice for many women. In Bosnia, an activist explained the ironies of turning to the state when the state has been the primary perpetrator of harm:

> We can cling to some verdicts in The Hague, Strasbourg. Some can, others cannot. I know that some raped women have to face their rapists from time to time because he is, for example, a high-ranking official in the police department in the city where the crime had taken place. And we talk about justice![8]

And in Colombia, police, prosecutors, and politicians sometimes have complex relationships with local cartels. Even though there is no longer one single macro-cleavage characterizing Colombia's civil war, multiple armed factions continue to exert influence over political processes, wielding violence or the threat of violence to advance their political objectives, either against or through the state (Duncan 2014; Idler 2020; Voyvodic Casabo 2021). Interviewees spoke of state inaction or complicity in the areas controlled by cartels, and the resulting climate of fear that overshadows effort at state-based resolutions. One interviewee in Caqueta described:

> In all this zone we've been seeing cases of women being raped on behalf of the Sinaloas, so the girls they find pretty, well they rape them during a week and take them back to their town, and no one is denouncing this because everyone is afraid.[9]

When the state is both the primary avenue for redress and the primary aggressor or source of violence, avenues that prioritize law, policing, prosecution, or criminal justice reinforce the very institutions that led to many women's insecurities in the first place.

Even when the state itself was not a direct perpetrator, its inaction in the face of violence often renders it as culpable as the perpetrators. In Colombia, an activist in Cartagena described how many ordinary women are so often re-victimized in their pursuit of justice for crimes committed against them:

> Also, when filing a claim, for example, sometimes we face prosecutors that instead of helping the woman, they stigmatize her and make her feel guiltier.[10]

In Nepal, another interviewee echoed the sentiment that the state was only there to serve some constituents. Describing the silence with which demands for justice were met, she commented:

> We said about it before, but there has been no hearing. I don't think there has been any hearing now that the local government has come. No matter who you are now, people like you have to go there and raise their voices to say that these people who have been left behind, that they have to be relieved, what are the ways they have to eat, that they have suffered in the conflict?[11]

An interviewee in Bolivar, Colombia, commented on the futility of state-based justice when it is the state that props up the systems that led to women's oppression in the first place:

> We know that violence against women is non-negotiable, but the justice processes available here are basically pardonable, negotiable, reconcilable. So the woman then has to live in the same place her attacker lives, the person that raped her, that beat her, because the state doesn't provide them the services and guarantees what has been granted to them by law… so, what happens? The consequence is that people are disappointed with justice, women do not want to file complaints because the state doesn't do anything.[12]

The expectation that turning to the state should be a viable avenue for remedy when it has so often been responsible for gendered, racialized, and politicized forms of neglect reflects what Audre Lorde presents as a "Masters-Tools" problem (Lorde 1984), in that the same political systems that produced gendered oppression can never be satisfactorily leveraged to eradicate it (see also Brown 2000). J. Ann Tickner (2004, 47) concludes that feminist attempts at justice should thus endeavor to facilitate forms of repair that are more broadly accessible to those marginalized by existing systems. Entrenching systems of state law, power, and violence through rights regimes leaves many of war's most vulnerable women and gender minorities without recourse for the violence they face.

Hierarchies of Victimhood

Because gender reforms after war have privileged state-based remedies, we next call attention to the ways that hierarchies of remedy compound what we term *hierarchies of victimhood*. We identify two patterns in who gets to access the identity of "victim." First, by centering women from particular backgrounds as the war's primary targets of (gendered) violence (Enloe 2004; Baaz and Stern 2013; Mertens and Pardy 2017), governments transitioning from war to peace can cement identity cleavages between "victim" and "perpetrator" groups. Historically, the trope of innocent women in need of saving from barbaric perpetrators has taken both ethnic and racialized forms, being used to legitimize military interventions, counter-terrorism operations, and state violence (Peterson 2007; Abu-Lughod 2002; McClintock 2013; Head 2023). Narratives that essentialize victim and perpetrator identities can invisibilize violence perpetrated by one side, or justify crimes committed by war's victors (Peskin 2005). In Rwanda, for example, Hutu women victimized by RPF forces in the civil war were rarely given the opportunity to have their experiences of violence heard in courts of law and are still denied the status of victim by the state (Longman 2006; Thomson 2013).

By denying certain identity groups the opportunity to lay claim to the identity of victim, similar patterns emerge in other cases. In Sri Lanka, many interviewees reported that their political and ethnic identities precluded the possibility that they could be seen as victims in the war. One activist explained:

> Even if they have appointed women, these are women who support the government…If you ask them: was there rape of Tamil women in the war? If you ask these women that, they will say it is propaganda.[13]

[7]Women's Representative, Pasikuda, Sri Lanka, January 2020.
[8]Activist, Sarajevo, Bosnia, and Herzegovina. May 2022.
[9]Activist, Caqueta, Colombia. September 2021.
[10]Activist, Cartagena, Colombia. February 2020.
[11]Social worker, Kathmandu, Nepal. December 2020.
[12]Member of women's organization (group interview with displaced women), Bolivar, Colombia. February 2020.
[13]Activist. Colombo, Sri Lanka. January 2020.

A Muslim woman's representative in the east of Sri Lanka told us of the challenges people from her region and background faced in accessing justice or remedy for harms they suffered during the war:

> No justice has been achieved for war crimes, and the families of missing persons are still seeking answers. Despite their inquiries, no information about the missing individuals has been provided. Instead, there has been labeling. The government and media are giving attention to these issues, but it's unclear if the affected families have received any compensation. In our area, some individuals who participated in the war have returned, but even after 14 years, there is no information available about the missing people.[14]

She went on to add: "*In the North and East, many people have been neglected.*"

In Bosnia, an association leader spoke about certain areas of Bosnia that are more politically sensitive and which received more international attention, such as Srebrenica:

> All crimes are somehow important and significant to be talked about, in the context of remembering the victims and never to be repeated anywhere or to anyone. But then we have Srebrenica and the Srebrenica genocide seems to me to be one of the most sensitive issues and still a point of contention between attitudes, ideas and opinions.[15]

Many of our interviews referenced the differential treatment of victims by region and ethno-national group. For instance, a women's rights activists in Sarajevo mentioned:

> Sarajevo was under siege, but Prijedor is rarely mentioned, Ahmići is rarely mentioned. The Army of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina committed crimes against Croats and Serbs. I remember how the Serbs from Livno disappeared overnight, many are still looking for their sons' remains. I know only of one Serb family that still lives in Livno. For me, victim is victim. And I would really like to call on all external collaborators working on the topic of BiH to start talking about all the victims.[16]

While a virulent nationalism often shapes calls for recognizing Serb victims of the war, the minimizing of Serb civilian experiences of violence by justice and accountability mechanisms echoes a pattern where people associated with the perpetrator group—such as Hutus in Rwanda—are rarely acknowledged as victims of harm. This discrepancy has fueled nationalists, who cite recent and past injustices against Serbs to fuel secessionist ambitions. As one Serb politician put it:

> The Bosniak people have indeed suffered greatly when it comes to the Srebrenica, and we cannot dispute that. However…when you look at the structure of the accused, you will see that the verdicts were passed for Serbs, but not for Bosniaks or Croats. For example, we have Naser Orić [a Bosniak militia leader], and there are living witnesses who testified of the crimes he committed but it meant nothing. We constantly feel inequality in the treatment of perpetrators of certain war crimes and this is what hurts the Serbian people, especially if we remember that the Serbian people during World War II suffered the greatest sacrifice

in Potkozarje, Jasenovac and down in Prebilovci, Stari Brod and other places, where those crimes have never been characterized as genocide…there is no balance in war crimes persecution.[17]

Differential recognition of suffering according to conflict identity can exacerbate conflict-era grievances, particularly when state-based mechanisms amplify this uneven recognition.

Second, there is already a vast literature on the gendering and racialization of innocence in legal systems (Carpenter 2003; Murakawa 2019; Malik 2020). Some victims may be widely perceived as untarnished because of their age, gender, and perceived innocence and therefore considered more entitled to justice, equality, and security than others. In addition to designating innocence as a function of conflict positionality (and thereby obscuring violence perpetrated by the "winning" party or victims associated with perceived aggressors), other characteristics associated with the victim's gendered and racialized positionality contribute to a social ordering that shapes whether or not they are seen as entitled to justice, rights, or repair.

For example, even in conflicts that did not map neatly onto existing ethnic cleavages, identity nevertheless played an important role in shaping *whose* violence is taken seriously by states, international organizations, and broader publics. In Nepal, a Dalit activist told us:

> After the armed conflict, after the peace agreement, after the transition to the federal system and after the elections, what was expected was that people such as Dalits, women, marginalized communities, their rights would be ensured and guaranteed. But even now, those expectations are not yet fulfilled. Even now, many issues like poverty, violence against women, and criminal incidents are decreasing, while rape of girls, ethnic autonomy are still happening. Various issues still have many provisions in the constitution, laws have also been made, but are failed at the level of implementation, and even now the issues of Dalits, marginalized communities, women have not been addressed.[18]

In Sri Lanka, incidents that provoked a legal or government response tended to reinforce a very particular image of victimhood (Loken, Lake, and Cronin-Furman 2018). Following widespread civil society outrage following the rape and murder of a 16-year-old Tamil schoolgirl by the Sri Lankan military in 1993, the government did pursue criminal charges against members of its own security services. Yet the pursuit of justice in this case was only made possible by virtue of a publicly legible framing by the media of the victim's youth and femininity. This representation stood in stark contrast to other Tamil girls who suffered sexual violence at the hands of the Sri Lankan state, but who were portrayed as combatants and, therefore, framed as legitimate targets, and less deserving of justice. Just as women's victimization in war was historically marginalized, frames of "deserving" and "undeserving" victims can reify class, caste, and gender hierarchies. Those who do not fit an idealized image of a victim, either by virtue of their conflict positionality, their race, their gender, or all of these, can be overlooked, creating perceptions of unequal worth for different identity groups after war.

---

[14]Muslim women's representative, Eastern Province, Sri Lanka. January 2020.
[15]Association Leader, Srebrenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina. May 2022.
[16]Activist, Sarajevo, Bosnia, and Herzegovina. May 2022.

[17]Political representative, Republika Srpska. September 2022.
[18]Activist, Dhangadi, Nepal. December 2020.

Hierarchies of Violence

Finally, we use the term *hierarchies of violence* to capture which types of violence domestic and international actors consider worthy of attention and redress in the aftermath of war. Hierarchies of violence left a range of political and gendered insecurities intact for some of war's most vulnerable women in two ways. The first, highlighted by our interviewees, was the attention directed toward spectacular forms of violence in war, such as violence that left people dead or raped, compared with more subtle or structural violence caused by the war , such as the violences of dispossession, economic insecurity, disability, psychological trauma, or fear. Second, there was the distinction between wartime violence and other more quotidian forms of harm, which constituted an urgent source of insecurity for many of our interviewees. Despite reforms designed to redress women's economic, social, and political marginalization after war, our interviewees called attention to everyday forms of violence and dispossession that persisted from the pre- to post-war periods. They informed us that violence that could not be attributed to the macro-logics of conflict was deprioritized by domestic and international actors.

Without minimizing the symbolic and substantive importance of directing attention toward conflict-related sexual violence, forced displacement, or ethnic cleansing, a focus on the "spectacular" crimes of war (Das 2000; Moses 2012) has sometimes eclipsed injustices that women and other marginalized people themselves perceive as more pressing—and sometimes more harmful and violent—in their day-to-day lives (Annan and Brier 2010; Nixon 2011; Ní Aoláin 2012; D'Errico et al. 2013; Lake, Muthaka, and Walker 2016; Dunn 2017; Lake 2022).

Injustices that are sidelined in state-based efforts at repair may include targeting and harassment by security services, trauma, sickness, famine, abusive working conditions, displacement, reproductive and intimate partner violence, feelings of isolation, loss and dislocation, and a host of other injuries (Berry and Rana 2019). Our interviews across all five cases revealed that violence that fell outside the bounds of the conflict itself was frequently dismissed by actors involved in the post-war transition process in favor of the injuries of war. By deeming instances of everyday insecurity less deserving of attention, forms of harm that disproportionately affected certain populations were implicitly rendered tolerable. Hierarchies surrounding which forms of violence are considered worthy of rights and redress, and which are not, often serve to minimize the insecurities felt by the most marginalized, leading to frustrations, grievances, and perceived neglect.

These patterns were often heavily gendered. In Colombia, a woman displaced from her village by paramilitary violence explained: *"the situation of women in Colombia before, during and after this senseless war that we experienced has not really changed."* She went on to describe how this violence mapped onto her class status, and was constitutive of her experience of war:

> The grassroot woman, the peasant woman who is the one that still experiences war conflicts where she lives, their situation is still the same.…we, the women, have always been repressed by this constant pattern of violence and we have never been able to free ourselves from it. We experienced not only violence at the hands of the armed groups, but also domestic violence, gender-based violence…Due to the conflict we have experienced, it's more obvious and easier to see,

but violence against women is what has kept us, let's say, submissive in every single area of life.[19]

The experiences recounted by this Colombian activist were evident across our other cases. In Bosnia, an activist explained the differences between spectacular war crimes and other manifestations of violence:

> Also after the war a large influx of people came from Goražde. We know what was happening in Goražde, but there were no mass graves and no systematic killings, so there was not much focus on them.[20]

And, illustrative of the hierarchy wherein some forms of violence are deemed worthy of attention at the highest levels and others are not, another Bosnian activist told us of the dismissal of certain forms of disability, noting:

> Here in Konjic, we gave scholarships to several children whose fathers were disabled during the war, and whose disability was not recognized, so they didn't even have a pension, and they weren't physically able to earn. Neither veteran organizations nor political structures protected these people.[21]

Another respondent in Bosnia told us:

> I think that every average citizen will say that justice is not achieved, because everyone sees themselves as victims. However, the judgments only speak about who is the biggest victim.[22]

An activist in Bosnia recounted:

> Women are still marginalized in our society. They are under constant threat of violence, discrimination. If they report it, they are condemned by society.[23]

Research in our other country cases reveals how similarly insipid and everyday forms of gendered insecurity shape women's and men's experiences of war, sometimes more profoundly than overt conflict-related violence. Mohna, an activist in Janakpur, Nepal, talked about the new health problems women were experiencing because of air pollution:

> None of the women are healthy in this region, newborns suffer from different diseases like pneumonia, jaundice, and lip problems or limb problems. Women have gastric problems, cancer, arthritis, blood pressure, diabetes, greying of hair, infertility, cataract problems—these are all happening in the last ten years.[24]

In the discourse on accountability, less spectacular forms of everyday violence, poverty, inequality, and deprivation were systematically, discursively, and legally relegated to "lesser" crimes (Galtung and Höivik 1971; Galtung 1996; Nixon 2011). This relegation happens in spite of their equally devastating consequences for the most vulnerable women in recounting the violence of war. Indeed, many interviewees across our various cases expressed that everyday economic insecurity was by far the most pressing form of insecurity they faced. Additionally, increased intimidation, harassment, and rape by security personnel and other authority figures are among the most frightening manifestation of violence, yet, from the perspectives of our intervie-

---

[19] Community leader. Bolivar Department, Colombia, February 2020.
[20] Feminist organizer, Sarajevo, Bosnia, and Herzegovina, May 2022.
[21] Activist, Kojic, Bosnia and Herzegovina. November 2022.
[22] Activist, Sarajevo, Bosnia, and Herzegovina. May 2022.
[23] Interview, Journalist, Mostar, Bosnia and Herzegovina. December 2022.
[24] Interview, Activist, Madhesi, Nepal. December 2020.

wees, received little attention in comparison to war crimes (Gray 2019).

Our research reveals that a narrow focus on accountability for wartime violence to the exclusion of forms of harm less visibly connected to the war contributes to *hierarchies of violence.* Access to rights is resultingly determined by which forms of suffering are considered grievable by domestic and international actors (Butler 2003, 2004). As documented in recent scholarship (Butler 2003; Berry 2017; Krystalli 2020; Henry 2021), this discursive prioritization renders some of the most pressing forms of suffering in the minds of our interviewees to be inconsequential, in ways that reflect other distributions of political and economic power (Kirby 2015). While a focus on conflict-related sexual violence offers much-needed corrective to the past wherein gender-based crimes were written out of accountability efforts, we echo other scholars' invitations to remain attentive to *which* violence is perceived to matter. When everyday violence is normalized or positioned as less deserving of remedy, the power dynamics that obscured attention to conflict-related gender violence in the first place are left intact.

Conclusion: Gendering Security, Equality, and Justice After War

In this article, we explored access to new gendered rights and opportunities from the perspectives of differently situated war-affected women across diverse regions in five war-to-peace transitions. In doing so, we illustrate how interviewees perceived *which* violence is privileged, *whose* violence is privileged, and which *responses* are privileged. Through the experiences of our interlocutors, we show how emergent hierarchies can reinforce exclusionary dynamics that result in the erasure of women who were left most vulnerable after war. While attention to women's rights after war offers an urgently needed corrective to earlier neglect, we posit that a singular focus on gender that disregards conflict positionality and other axes of existing societal oppression can risk further marginalizing certain groups of women. Where perceived exclusion maps onto conflict-era identities, it can entrench or reproduce grievances that contributed to war in the first place.

Our goal in this article is not to dismiss the central role rights reforms can play in promoting gender equality in transitions to peace. Rather, by examining experiences of implementation for differently situated women across five post-war countries, it became clear that some women have benefitted immensely from the new rights and opportunities afforded to them. Yet, in documenting patterns and commonalities across country cases, we were nonetheless struck by the common threads that emerged. Despite a diversity of conflict endings, we observed similar hierarchies in every country case. For women who were disadvantaged by the political settlement, either because of their political, ethnic, or class background, access to post-war rights reforms was denied.

It would be unrealistic to assume that all women would benefit equally from rights reforms after war. Nonetheless, we suggest that policymakers should be particularly attentive to hierarchies of access that shore up gendered systems of power or compound conflict dynamics. We urge practitioners committed to gender equality to work toward improving rights and opportunities for war's most vulnerable women and gender minorities by attending closely to ethnic, class, political, and other barriers. We suggest that striving for more equal access to new rights and opportunities after war will help foster a more just and inclusive—and therefore more stable and durable—peace over the longer term.

While earlier work has elucidated the various ways that some of the hierarchies we touch on here operate in particular contexts (e.g., Krystalli 2020, 2024), our research draws out these trends in comparative perspective. Space constraints preclude us from fully exploring variations across regime type in this article. However, future work could examine the nature of the political settlement, alongside which categories of rights prove hardest to access for which communities.

We hope that our novel and systematic approach to data, which sought to work with differently situated collaborators, research partners, and interviewees in subnational regions of each country, can provoke more intersectional thinking, both about how rights regimes privilege particular political identity groups after war, and their downstream consequences for durable and inclusive peace. Moreover, our findings offer important lessons about how interlocking structures of oppression co-constitute one another and undermine efforts to overcome inequality, from the perspectives of those most vulnerable during and after war.

Supplementary Information

Supplementary information is available in the *ISAGSQ* data archive.

References

Abu-Lughod, Lila. 2002. "Do Muslim Women Really Need Saving? Anthropological Reflections on Cultural Relativism and Its Others." *American Anthropologist* 104 (3): 783–90.

Aretxaga, Begoña. 1997. "*Shattering silence: Women, nationalism, and political subjectivity in Northern Ireland.*" USA: Princeton University Press.

Arostegui, Julie. 2013. "Gender, Conflict, and Peace-Building: How Conflict Can Catalyse Positive Change for Women." *Gender & Development* 21 (3): 533–49.

Annan, Jeannie, and Moriah Brier. 2010. "The Risk of Return: Intimate Partner Violence in Northern Uganda's Armed Conflict." *Social Science & Medicine* 70 (1): 152–9.

BAAZ, MARIA ERIKSSON, AND MARIA STERN. 2013. "*Sexual Violence as a Weapon of War?: Perceptions, Prescriptions, Problems in the Congo and beyond.*" UK: Zed Books.

BERRY, MARIE E. 2015." When "Bright Futures" Fade: Paradoxes of Women's Empowerment in Rwanda." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 41 (1): 1–27.

BERRY, MARIE E. 2017. "Barriers to Women's Progress after Atrocity: Evidence from Rwanda and Bosnia-Herzegovina." *Gender & Society* 31 (6): 830–53.

———. 2018. "*War, Women, and Power in Rwanda and Bosnia-Herzegovina.*" USA: Cambridge University Press.

BERRY, MARIE E., AND MILLI LAKE. 2021. "Women's Rights after War: On Gender Interventions and Enduring Hierarchies." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 17 (1): 459–81.

BEST, REBECCA H., SARAH SHAIR-ROSENFIELD, AND REED M. WOOD. 2019. "Legislative Gender Diversity and the Resolution of Civil Conflict." *Political Research Quarterly* 72 (1): 215–28.

BERRY, MARIE E., AND TRISHNA R. RANA. 2019. "What prevents peace? Women and peacebuilding in Bosnia and Nepal." *Peace & Change* 44 (3): 321–49.

BJARNEGÅRD, ELIN, AND PÄR ZETTERBERG. 2022. "How autocrats weaponize women's rights." *Journal of Democracy* 32 (2): 60–75.

BROWN, WENDY. 2000. "Suffering Rights as Paradoxes." *Constellations* 7 (2): 208–29.

BUTLER, JUDITH. 2003. "Violence, Mourning, Politics." *Studies in Gender and Sexuality* 4 (1): 9–37.

———. 2004. "*Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence.*" Verso.

BUSH, SARAH SUNN, DANIELA DONNO, AND PÄR ZETTERBERG. 2024. "International Rewards for Gender Equality Reforms in Autocracies." *American Political Science Review* 118 (3): 1189–203.

BUTLER, JUDITH. 2003. "Violence, mourning, politics." *Studies in gender and sexuality* 4 (1): 9–37.

CADAVAL, NAREZO, M., TORRES, G. MÉNDEZ, VÁSQUEZ HERNÁNDEZ, AND J. CASTRO-SOTOMAYOR. 2023. "Contributions to the pluriverse from indigenous women professors of intercultural universities." *Globalizations* 20 (7): 1144–62.

CAPRIOLI, MARY. 2005. "Primed for Violence: The Role of Gender Inequality in Predicting Internal Conflict." *International Studies Quarterly* 49 (2): 161–78.

CARPENTER, CHARLI. 2003. "'Women and Children First': Gender, Norms, and Humanitarian Evacuation in the Balkans 1991–95." *International Organization* 57 (4): 661–94.

COCKBURN, CYNTHIA. 2007. "*From Where we Stand: War, Women's Activism and Feminist Analysis.*" Zed Books.

COHEN, DARA KAY, AND SABRINA M. KARIM. 2022. "Does More Equality for Women Mean Less War? Rethinking Sex and Gender Inequality and Political Violence." *International Organization* 76 (2): 414–44.

DAS, VEENA, ed. 2000. "*Violence and subjectivity.*" USA: Univ of California Press.

DAIGLE, MEGAN, AND HENRI MYRTTINEN 2018. "Bringing diverse sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI) into peacebuilding policy and practice." *Gender & Development* 26 (1): 103–20.

D'ERRICO, NICOLE C., TSHIBANGU KALALA, JOSEPH CIZA NAKAMINA, LUC MALEMO KALISYA, PAULIN BUKUNDIKA, FELICIEN MAISHA, AND BASHIGE NZIGIRE. 2013. "'You Say Rape, I Say Hospitals. But Whose Voice Is Louder?' Health, Aid and Decision Making in the Democratic Republic of Congo." *Review of African Political Economy* 40 (135): 51–66.

DILTS, A., Y. WINTER, T. BIEBRICHER, E.V. JOHNSON, A.Y. VÁZQUEZ-ARROYO, AND J. COCKS. 2012. "Revisiting Johan Galtung's Concept of Structural Violence." *New Political Science* 34 (2): e191–227.

DONNO, DANIELA, SARA FOX, AND JOSHUA KAASIK. 2022. "International incentives for women's rights in dictatorships." *Comparative Political Studies* 55 (3): 451–92.

DOYLE, MICHAEL 2011. "*Liberal Peace: Selected Essays.*" London: Routledge.

DUNCAN, GUSTAVO. 2014. "Drug Trafficking and Political Power: Oligopolies of Coercion in Colombia and Mexico." *Latin American Perspectives* 41 (2): 18–42.

DUNN, HOLLY. 2017. "The Transitional Justice Gap: Exploring 'Everyday' Gendered Harms and Customary Justice in South Kivu, DR Congo." *Feminist Legal Studies* 25 (1) 71–97.

ENLOE, CYNTHIA. 2000."*Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives.*" University of California Press.

———. 2004. "*The Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire.*" USA: University of California Press.

ENLOE, CYNTHIA H. 2007. "*Globalization and Militarism: Feminists Make the Link.*" USA: Rowman & Littlefield.

EXLEY, B., S. WHATMAN, AND P. SINGH. 2018. "Postcolonial, decolonial research dilemmas: Fieldwork in Australian indigenous contexts." *Qualitative Research* 18 (5): 526–37.

FLORES-MACÍAS, GUSTAVO A., AND JESSICA ZARKIN. 2021."The Militarization of Law Enforcement: Evidence from Latin America." *Perspectives on Politics* 19 (2): 519–38.

GALTUNG, JOHAN. 1996. "*Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization.*" UK: SAGE.

GALTUNG, JOHAN, AND TORD HÖIVIK. 1971. "Structural and Direct Violence: A Note on Operationalization." *Journal of Peace Research* 8 (1): 73–6.

GALLO-CRUZ, SELINA. 2019. "Nonviolence beyond the state: International NGOs and local nonviolent mobilization." *International Sociology* 34 (6): 655–74.

GOODMAN, RYAN, AND DEREK JINKS. 2008. "Incomplete Internalization and Compliance with Human Rights Law." *European Journal of International Law* 19 (4): 725–48.

GOWRINATHAN, NIMMI, AND KATE CRONIN-FURMAN. 2015. "The Forever Victims? Tamil Women in Post-war Sri Lanka."

GRAY, HARRIET. 2019. "The 'War'/'Not-War' Divide: Domestic Violence in the Preventing Sexual Violence Initiative." *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 21 (1): 189–206.

HAFNER-BURTON, EMILIE, AND KIYOTERU TSUTSUI. 2005. "Human Rights in a Globalizing World: The Paradox of Empty Promises." *American Journal of sociology* 110 (5): 1373–411.

HALLEY, JANET, PRABHA KOTISWARAN, RACHEL REBOUCHÉ, AND HILA SHAMIR. 2018. "*Governance Feminism: An Introduction.*" USA: University of Minnesota Press.

HARDING, SANDRA, ed. 2004. "*The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies.*" UK: Routledge.

———. 1991. "Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?—" *Thinking from Women's Lives.*" USA: Cornell University Press.

HARTMAN, ALEXANDRA C., ROBERT A. BLAIR, AND BLATTMAN CHRISTOPHER. 2021. "Engineering informal institutions: Long-run impacts of alternative dispute resolution on violence and property rights in Liberia." *The Journal of Politics* 83 (1): 381–9.

HAGEN, JAMIE J. 2016. "Queering Women, Peace and Security." *International Affairs* 92(2): 313–32.

HEAD, NAOMI. 2024. "'Women Helping Women': Deploying Gender in US Counterinsurgency Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan." *Security Dialogue* 55 (2): 160–78.

HEINER, BRADY, AND SARAH TYSON. 2017. "Feminism and the Carceral State: Gender-Responsive Justice, Community Accountability, and the Epistemology of Antiviolence." *Feminist Philosophy Quarterly* 3 (1): 1–36.

HENRY, MARSHA. 2021. "On the Necessity of Critical Race Feminism for Women, Peace and Security." *Critical Studies on Security* 9 (1): 22–6.

HOOPER, CHARLOTTE. 2001. "*Manly States: Masculinities, International Relations, and Gender Politics.*" USA: Columbia University Press.

IDLER, ANNETTE. 2020. "The Logic of Illicit Flows in Armed Conflict: Explaining Variation in Violent Nonstate Group Interactions in Colombia." *World Politics* 72 (3): 335–76.

INGELAERE, BERT. 2010. "Peasants, power and Ethnicity: A Bottom-up Perspective on Rwanda's Political Transition." *African affairs* 109 (435): 273–92.

JAYAWARDENA, KUMARI, AND KISHALI PINTO-JAYAWARDENA, eds. 2016."*The Search for Justice: The Sri Lanka Papers.*" Zubaan.

JOHNSTON, MELISSA. 2023. "*Building Peace, Rebuilding Patriarchy: The Failure of Gender Interventions in Timor-Leste.*" New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

KABA, MARIAME. 2020. "*We Do this 'Til We Free Us: Abolitionist Organizing and Transforming Justice.*" USA: Haymarket Books.

KANG, ALICE J., AND AILI MARI TRIPP. 2018. "Coalitions Matter: Citizenship, Women, and Quota Adoption in Africa." *Perspectives on Politics* 16 (1): 73–91.

KAO, KRISTEN, AND MARA REVKIN. 2023. "Retribution or Reconciliation? Post-Conflict Attitudes toward Enemy Collaborators." *American Journal of Political Science* 67 (2): 358–73.

KAYALI, LIYANA. 2024. "Transformative Incrementalism: Palestinian Women's Strategies of Resistance and Resilience amid Gendered Insecurity and Neoliberal Co-Optation." *Security Dialogue* https://doi.org/10.1177/09670106241226653.

KENNEDY, DUNCAN. 1982. "Legal Education and the Reproduction of Hierarchy." *Journal of Legal Education* 32: 591.

KIM, SUZY. 2023. "*Among Women across Worlds: North Korea in the Global Cold War.*" USA: Cornell University Press.

Kirby, Paul. 2015. "Ending Sexual Violence in Conflict: the Preventing Sexual Violence Initiative and its Critics." *International Affairs* 91 (3): 457–72.

Kirby, Paul, and Laura Shepherd. 2016. "The Futures Past of the Women, Peace and Security Agenda." *International Affairs* 92 (2): 373–92.

Kreft, Anne-Kathrin, and Mattias Agerberg. 2024. "Imperfect Victims? Civilian Men, Vulnerability, and Policy Preferences." *American Political Science Review* 118 (1): 274–90.

Krystalli, Roxani. 2020. "*'We Are Not Good Victims': Hierarchies of Suffering and the Politics of Victimhood in Colombia.*" *PhD Dissertation.* USA: Tufts University.

———. 2024. "*Good Victims: The Political as a Feminist Question.*" Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krystalli, Roxani, and Philipp Schulz. 2022. "Taking love and care seriously: An emergent research agenda for remaking worlds in the wake of violence." *International Studies Review* 24 (1): viac003.

Kodikara, Chulani. 2021. "Reading the Southern Mothers' Front." *Polity* 9 (1&2): 69–75. https://polity.lk/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/Polity_Vol.9_16ChulaniKodikara.pdf

Lake, Milli. 2018. "*Strong NGOs and Weak States: Gender Justice and Human Rights Advocacy in the Democratic Republic of Congo and South Africa.*" USA: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2022. "Policing Insecurity." *American Political Science Review* 116 (3): 858–74.

Lake, Milli, Ilot Muthaka, and Gabriella Walker. 2016. "Gendering Justice in Humanitarian Spaces: Opportunity and (Dis) Empowerment through Gender-based Legal Development Outreach in the Eastern Democratic Republic of Congo." *Law & Society Review* 50 (3): 539–74.

Loken, Meredith, Milli Lake, and Kate Cronin-Furman. 2018. "Deploying Justice: Strategic Accountability for Wartime Sexual Violence." *International Studies Quarterly* 62 (4): 751–64.

Longman, Timothy. 2006. "Rwanda: Achieving Equality or Serving an Authoritarian State?" In *Women in African Parliaments*, edited by G. Bauer and H.E. Britton. USA: Lynne Rienner.

Lorde, Audre, ed. 1984. "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House." *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches.* USA: Crossing Press.

Malik, Aditi. 2022. "Ending Gender-Based Violence: Justice and Community in South Africa. By Hannah Britton. University of Illinois Press." *Perspectives on Politics* 20 (2): 748–50.

Mamdani, Mahmood. 2014. "*When victims become killers: Colonialism, nativism, and the genocide in Rwanda.*" Princeton University Press.

McClintock, Anne. 2013. "*Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest.*" UK: Routledge.

Mertens, Charlotte, and Maree Pardy. 2017. "'Sexurity' and its effects in eastern Democratic Republic of Congo." *Third World Quarterly* 38 (4): 956–79.

Murakawa, Naomi. 2019. "Racial Innocence: Law, Social Science, and the Unknowing of Racism in the US Carceral State." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 15 (1): 473–93.

Moses, A. Dirk. 2012. "Raphael Lemkin, Culture, and the Concept of Genocide." In *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies.* (2010; online edn, Oxford Academic). (eds), Donald Bloxham and A. Dirk Moses. 18 Sept. 2012.

Nixon, Rob. 2011. "*Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor.*" USA: Harvard University Press.

Ní Aoláin, Fionnuala. 2012. "Advancing Feminist Positioning in the Field of Transitional Justice." *International Journal of Transitional Justice* 6 (2): 205–28.

Otto, Dianne. 2010. "Power and Danger: Feminist Engagement with International Law through the UN Security Council." *Australian Feminist Law Journal* 32 (1): 97–121.

Peskin, Victor. 2005. "Beyond Victor's Justice? The Challenge of Prosecuting the Winners at the International Criminal Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and Rwanda." *Journal of Human Rights* 4 (2): 213–31.

Peterson, V. Spike. 2007. "Thinking through intersectionality and war." *Race, Gender & Class* 10–27.

Reyntjens, Filip. 2013. "*Political Governance in Post-genocide Rwanda.*" UK: Cambridge University Press.

Richie, Beth E. 2012. "*Arrested justice: Black women, violence, and America's prison nation.*" USA: New York University Press.

Samuel, Kumudini. 2006. "*A Hidden History: Women's Activism for Peace in Sri Lanka 1982–2002.*" Sri Lanka: Sri Lanka Social Scientists' Association.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2002. "*Toward a New Legal Common Sense: Law, Globalization and Emancipation.*" UK: Butterworths.

Schulz, Philipp. 2020. "Towards Inclusive Gender in Transitional Justice: Gaps, Blind-Spots and Opportunities." *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* 14 (5): 691–710.

Schwarz, Susanne, Matthew Baum, and Dara Cohen. 2020. "(Sex) Crime and Punishment in the# MeToo Era: How the Public Views Rape." *Political Behavior* 1: 1–30.

Sharoni, Simona. 1995. "*Gender and the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: The politics of women's resistance.*" USA: Syracuse University Press.

Shair-Rosenfield, Sarah, and Reed Wood. 2017. "Governing Well after War: How Improving Female Representation Prolongs Post-Conflict Peace." *The Journal of Politics* 79 (3): 995–1009.

Shepherd, Laura J. 2016. "Making War Safe for Women? National Action Plans and the Militarisation of the Women, Peace and Security Agenda." *International Political Science Review* 37 (3): 324–35.

Simmons, Erica S., and Nicholas Rush Smith. 2017. "Comparison with an Ethnographic Sensibility." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50 (1): 126–30.

Sjoberg, Laura. 2009. "Introduction to Security Studies: Feminist Contributions." *Security Studies* 18 (2): 183–213.

Sjoberg, Laura, and Jessica Peet. 2011. "A(nother) Dark Side of the Protection Racket." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 13 (2): 163–82.

Sobek, David, M. Rodwan Abouharb, and Christopher G Ingram. 2006. "The Human Rights Peace: How the Respect for Human Rights at Home Leads to Peace Abroad." *The Journal of Politics* 68 (3): 519–29.

Tickner, J. Ann. 1992. "*Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security.*" USA: Columbia University Press.

———. 2004. "Feminist Responses to International Security Studies." *Peace Review* 16 (1): 43–8.

Thomson, Susan. 2013. "*Whispering Truth to Power: Everyday Resistance to Reconciliation in Postgenocide Rwanda.*" USA: University of Wisconsin Press.

Tripp, Aili Mari. 2015. "*Women and Power in Postconflict Africa.*" USA: Cambridge University Press.

Touquet, Heleen, and Philipp Schulz. 2021. "Navigating vulnerabilities and masculinities: How gendered contexts shape the agency of male sexual violence survivors." *Security Dialogue* 52 (3): 213–30.

Vandermaas-Peeler, Alex, Jelena Subotic, and Michael Barnett. 2024. "Constructing victims: Suffering and status in modern world order." *Review of International Studies* 50 (1): 171–89.

Viterna, Jocelyn. 2013. "*Women in War: The Micro-Processes of Mobilization in El Salvador.*" UK: Oxford University Press.

Voyvodic Casabo, Clara. 2021. *Local Order in Conflict Dissertation Manuscript.* University of Oxford.

Webster, Kaitlyn, Priscilla Torres, Chong Chen, and Kyle Beardsley. 2020. "Ethnic and Gender Hierarchies in the Crucible of War." *International Studies Quarterly* 64 (3): 710–22.

Wood, Elisabeth Jean. 2008. "The Social Processes of Civil War: The Wartime Transformation of Social Networks." *Annual Review of Political Science* 11 (1): 539–61.

Young, Iris Marion. 2003. "The Logic of Masculinist Protection: Reflections on the Current Security State." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 29 (1): 1–25.

Zulver, Julia. 2022. "*High-Risk Feminism in Colombia.*" USA: Rutgers University Press.