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Abstract

Armed conflict and its consequences do not discriminate according to gender. It affects all people. During an armed conflict, women are the majority of civilian victims: they are forcibly displaced, their family members are killed, and they suffer sexual abuse and torture. However, most peace processes have been exclusively controlled and led by men, while women and women’s issues are usually not included in peace negotiations or resulting agreements. In the last 30 years, there have been 35 comprehensive peace accords signed across the world of which only eight included women’s issues in their agreements. It is crucial that women’s issues are included to engender institutions and policies focused on improving women’s status in society as well as to ensure a sustainable peace. This project tackles the important question, why are women’s issues included in some peace negotiations and peace agreements and not others. I study this process by analyzing the peace processes and agreements in three cases: Guatemala, El Salvador, and Colombia. I use secondary sources for Guatemala and El Salvador, and a mix of primary and secondary sources (30 interviews) for Colombia. I find that a mobilized women’s movement and frame alignment are necessary conditions for the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace agreement. These findings contribute to the scholarly literature on peace agreements and on women’s rights in conflict-affected areas and have implications for practitioners in the areas of conflict management and peacebuilding.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Armed conflict does not discriminate according to gender. It affects all people. During an armed conflict, women are the majority of civilian victims: they are more susceptible to violence, especially sexual violence, torture, and psychological attacks, they are also victims of forced displacement, their family members are killed, and they experience an increase in poverty (Khaminwa, A., & Malek, C. 2004). Nearly 90% of the civilian victims in armed conflict are women and children (UN Women, 2000). For example, since the armed conflict started in Syria “more than 3.9 million people have fled, and approximately 79% of these are women and children” (UNHCR, 2014). In Guatemala’s armed conflict, approximately more than 30,000 women were victims of sexual violence and torture during the conflict, and of those 89 percent were indigenous women (Yoc Cosajay, 2014).

Also, there is an inherent assumption that in armed conflict women are the victims while men are the ones that fight in conflict. And while it is true that women are the majority of victims, they can also be combatants. However, due to the above assumption, most peace processes have been exclusively controlled and led by men, while women are usually kept from the table, and their issues are not included in the peace negotiation agreement. Women are half of the population, they are the majority of victims of the armed conflict, and there is also a higher chance for sustainable peace if women’s issues are included, as women are prominently involved in reconstruction and peace building efforts. This is why it is important to understand how women’s issues are included in some peace negotiations and peace agreements and not others.

In 1989, I was 11 years old when the M-19, one of the most powerful guerrilla groups in Colombia entered peace negotiations with the government. They had been active since 1970, and
throughout my life I had heard and experienced some of the horror acts they had committed. I remember seeing the news about the peace process, especially when the M-19 members gave up their weapons. When the news reported the process, I saw women dropping their weapons. That shocked me, I did not understand why there were women in the guerrilla group. In my young mind, only the men fight wars. Soon after the peace agreement was signed, many members of the M-19 integrated into society and started participating in politics. One of them was a woman, Vera Grabe, who got elected to congress. Again, I thought it was weird that she was a member of a guerrilla group, and soon I learned that she was actually one of the main group commanders.

Decades later, as I continued my education and I started to pursue the Ph.D., this “fascination” with women and war remained in my mind and her name kept popping up in my mind. During my entire existence (and my parents’ and grandparents’ too), my country has been going through armed conflict, against guerrillas’ groups, paramilitary forces, and drug traffickers. Every man and woman in Colombia has been affected by the conflict. However, whenever there has been a peace process, women were not being considered as part of the negotiation teams. Such conflicts are more prevalent in patriarchal societies, where women seem invisible; for the same reason, their role in conflict, as combatants, victims, and perpetrators of violence, has received little attention from the government or society in general (Schwitalla & Dietrich, 2007).

**Purpose of the Study**

In the last 30 years, there have been 35 comprehensive peace accords in the world and out of those only eight included women’s issues in their agreements. The inclusion of female leaders in official peace negotiation processes has been almost non-existent, as has been the inclusion of gender issues in the agreements negotiated. Thus, even though women can be victims or
combatants in the conflict, they are usually excluded from the table at peace negotiation processes, and their issues are not included in the peace negotiation agreement.

It is important to point out that armed conflict does not discriminate between genders. Since women make up approximately half of the world’s population, this means that when conflict arises, both men and women are affected. Both men and women can belong to any of the conflicting parties; they can be victims of conflict without direct participation; and they can be involved in the conflict resolution process. In the cases that I have selected for this study—Guatemala, El Salvador, and Colombia—women participated in the conflict as combatants in the guerrilla groups, but also were victims of the conflict between the government and the guerrillas.

This study utilizes a qualitative research design. My primary research goal here was theory development and theory testing. My purpose was to answer questions of how women’s issues made it to the peace agreement by using multiple case studies as part of a most similar systems design. I ask if it is the partnership between women and men on the negotiation teams that allows the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace agreement. In my main hypothesis, the independent variable is the partnership between the women and men on the negotiation teams, while the dependent variable is the addition of women’s issues to the agreement. For the purpose of this study, “partnership” is defined as a formal arrangement in which two or more parties have a collaborative relationship. Using Picciotto’s (2004) definition of partnership, in this study the partnership is between the women and men in the negotiation teams that are pursuing mutually agreed common objectives, they are responsible for outcomes, they have different jobs and responsibilities, they share duties and that they rely on each other to secure the peace agreement.

H: The partnership between women and men on the negotiation team allows the addition of women’s issues to the agreement.
In this study “women’s issues” refers to the list of points that could be included and discussed in peace negotiation agreements, specifically to issues that promote equality of women and men. My primary methodology was process tracing. Through this method I identified what I believe are the causal mechanisms connecting the independent variable and the dependent variable using case studies. These causal mechanisms will be tested using three cases as part of a most similar systems design. I have selected the cases of Guatemala, El Salvador, and Colombia, which are similar in regional location, language, and history, but have variation in the main dependent variable: whether or not women’s issues are in the peace agreements.

**Organization of the study**

This dissertation is organized in nine chapters. Chapter 1 is the introduction to this study. Chapter 2 reviews the relevant literature about peace negotiations, specifically the pre-negotiation phase, the negotiation phase, the actors that are involved, Social Movement Theory, and the post-negotiation phase. I also provide the operational definitions for many of the terms that are being used in the study, such as comprehensive peace agreement and women’s movement. As I hypothesize that the collaboration between women and men is the main factor that led to the inclusion of women’s issues in the agreement, it is key to analyze the role that women and the women’s movement had pre-negotiation, during the negotiation, and post-peace agreement.

Chapter 3 explains the particulars of my goals and theoretical framework. My purpose in conducting this research is theory development and testing, to explain how women’s issues get added to peace agreements. By developing and testing the hypotheses derived from this explanation, I will also eliminate alternative explanations. Most importantly, through this theoretical explanation, I will carefully lay out what I consider to be the causal mechanisms explaining the inclusion of women’s issues in peace negotiation agreements.
Chapter 4 discusses the methodology of my research. It explains why I use case studies in a most similar system design. This chapter describes the qualitative methods, how I measured my independent and dependent variables; also, it presents the population and sampling of the study, as well as the ethical issues and limitations of the study.

Chapter 5 presents the historical background of the three cases—Guatemala, El Salvador, and Colombia—before starting with the analysis of each individual case. It provides some historical information about Latin America, especially during the 20th century, how the socioeconomic structures were important, as well as the role of the church and the military. It also provides a background about the role of women before the conflicts started.

Chapters 6, 7, and 8, explore the cases of Guatemala, El Salvador, and Colombia, respectively. Each of the chapter cases provides a background to the conflict, and then looks at the pre-negotiation and negotiation stages of their peace talks, and the role of the women’s movement in each case, with the applications of Social Movement Theory.

Chapter 9 is the concluding chapter. It presents the main findings of the project, and it discusses the limitations of the study. It also provides the recommendations and suggests the areas for future research.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

As indicated previously, in the last 30 years, there have been 35 signed comprehensive peace accords in the world (including Colombia), and out of those only eight included women’s issues in their agreements (Appendix A). The literature on the status of women’s issues in post-conflict situations indicates that women have become more active in the last 30 years, especially in peacebuilding, meaning rebuilding the institutions and infrastructures that protect human lives from current or future conflict (Owen, 2008).

As also previously indicated, the purpose of this study is to analyze how the inclusion of women’s issues in peace negotiations agreements took place. The existing literature also reflects that female participation in peacemaking activities is still very limited (Jordan, 2003). For the purpose of this study, “peace negotiations” refers to diplomatic negotiations where the parties involved try to reach an agreement that will stop a conflict (Gawerc, 2006). “Comprehensive peace agreements” refers to the agreements that address the causes of the conflict, intend to find a mutual agreement to deal with the needs and interests of the parties involved, and when properly signed, officially end the conflict between the parties (Yawanarajah & Ouellet, 2003). In this study, “women’s issues” refers to the list of points that should be included and discussed in peace negotiation agreements, specifically issues that promote equality of women and men.

This section reviews the existing literature on the various phases of peace negotiations, women’s involvement in each phase, and their impact on women’s status in society. The review is divided into the following subsections: pre-negotiation phase, actors involved, negotiation phase, the post-negotiation phase, and social movement theory. This literature review illustrates that there has been an increased scholarly examination of the role of women in conflict during the last 30
years; however, within this literature there is little research on the inclusion of women’s issues in peace negotiation agreements.

**Pre-negotiation Phase**

The negotiation process starts before there are people sitting at the table. This is usually known as the pre-negotiation phase, and it is during this phase that the purpose, participants, format, timetable, and agenda setting are defined (Wolff, 2013). It is during the pre-negotiation phase that parties agree to talk and determine what issues each of them will be willing to negotiate (Bell, 2013). Zartman (1989) indicates that during this phase the parties work on identifying the problem(s), commit to negotiate a solution with each other, and organize the negotiation process; the pre-negotiation phase ends with the start of negotiations or with one of the parties refusing to continue the process. Fisas (2004) refers to this phase as an exploratory stage, where there are conversations to determine if it is possible to move towards future negotiations.

During the pre-negotiation phase, the setting of the agenda will take place, as the parties prioritize their goals and analyze what they will be willing to concede or compromise on. According to Balakrishnan et al. (1993) the negotiation agenda contains the issues to be discussed and the order in which they will be addressed regarding a particular situation during the negotiation talks; the purpose of the agenda is to structure the talks between the groups at the negotiation table. Defining the issues that make it to the agenda can be difficult, especially when the conflict has continued for several years.

Generally, the parties will disagree as to which issues must be included because each party involved has a different version of or opinion about the conflict, and about the issues that need to be negotiated (Wolff, 2013). If the parties are unable to agree on an agenda, the negotiation process stops (Lewiki et al., 1999). Pendergast indicates that this is because “the agenda is one of the most
important structural aspects of any negotiation as well as significant determinant of power and influence” (1990, p. 135). During the agenda-setting phase, issues that will be discussed are introduced, and these will be the central points of focus for the negotiations (Alfredson & Cungu, 2008).

During the process of setting the agenda, the parties will bargain for different issues to be introduced and express their different needs and positions. Once they agree on what needs to be discussed, the agenda will be set (Bell, 2013). There are different purposes for agenda setting, such as: indicating that the issues are the ones both parties agreed to discuss; developing policy-making through discussion of the issues; and developing implementation plans for the issues that were discussed and accepted for review (Alfredson & Cungu, 2008). It is also during this phase that the parties involved will transform their relationships to learn more about each other and know more about what type of negotiation environment they are entering if the negotiations move forward (Fisas, 2004)

According to Pendergast (1990), the agenda will influence different aspects of the negotiation such as “the pacing and flow of the negotiation; the dominance and control of the parties; the preparation and coordination of negotiation team members; the intricate linkages among negotiation issues; the ability to construct ‘efficient’ agreements; and success in achieving acceptance for preferred outcomes” (p. 135). Women could bring a different agenda to the table, which might involve not only gender and equality issues, but issues that concern the entire community, as related to basic human needs such as economic recovery (Naraghi Anderlini, 2000).

It is also during this pre-negotiation stage that the actors who will be negotiating the agreement are identified. The main problem for women is gaining access to the pre-negotiation and negotiating phases, because male elites generally control this access (Bell, 2013). This is due
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to the patriarchal system that exists in many societies. Patriarchy within this study will refer to the structural system where men control the political, scientific, social, religious, cultural, and economic life, while the female presence has been limited or ignored (Mirkin, 1984). Men have justified this control by portraying themselves as protectors of women and by defining the role women should play in the pre-negotiation, negotiation, and post-negotiation phases (Crane-Seeber & Crane, 2010). This leads to the question of how women get involved in the process, and if they do not, why they are unable to do so.

**Actors Involved**

As previously stated, it is during the pre-negotiation phase that the parties who will participate in the negotiation phase are selected. Just as in agenda setting, where not all issues can be included, it is also impossible to include everyone at the negotiation table; at this point, the parties that were excluded, need to choose to either form an alliance with one of the parties sitting at the table, or choose not to participate at all (Zartman, 1989).

If women are represented, it is usually by civil society organizations, as hardly any of the women are part of the extant power structure, and for this reason, women’s issues are presented by civil society actors involved in the negotiation phases as it is the only avenue women have to participate (Boltjes, 2007). These different women’s organizations often work for labor equality, sexual and domestic violence prevention, economic rights (such as land inheritance), and political rights. In this research, I am using Tine Destrooper’s definition of the women’s movement, “the women’s movement is defined as all the organizational spaces which women create to acknowledge, confront and resolve practical and strategic gender needs and interests of women” (2014, p. 14). Civil society groups can push, lobby, influence, introduce topics, and assure that the peace negotiations have a people-focused agenda as opposed to an only economic or institutions
agenda (Brenk & van de Veen, 2005). The participation of civil society groups in the peace process also indicates that the negotiation is considering all sectors of society and not only the parties involved in combat or only the elites (Wanis-St.John & Kew, 2008). Peace negotiations that allow the participation of civil society groups tend to be more transparent and legitimate (Pfaffenholz et al., 2006). However, there could be other groups that support women’s issues such as the government, international organizations, or guerrilla groups.

It is important to look at what type of actions exist or have been taken to help women secure a place at the negotiation table and/or have their issues included in the agreement. Research shows that women have different roles in armed conflict. While they are always the wives, mothers, sisters, daughters, etc. of the fighters, they can also participate as nurses, cooks, and even often as combatants themselves (Gumru & Frits, 2009; Karam, 2001). However, most of the varied roles that women play in armed conflict are usually overlooked, and only one is dominant: women and girls are regarded as victims. This is classic stereotyping because it sees women only as victims and men only as perpetrators. Being a victim means that women may suffer the loss of their loved ones; they can also be raped, tortured, displaced, or trafficked into slavery (Gumru & Frits, 2009).

Scholars point out that it is imperative to move away from seeing women just as victims, not only because this limits their participation in peace negotiations, but also because they may be responsible for the conflict as well. By seeing women as part of the conflict rather than as victims only, there is an argument for including them in the peace negotiation process (Golan, 2004). Additionally, moving away from being victims allows women to become agents of participation and engage in activities on an equal basis with men (Jordan, 2003). It is true that much of the time women are victims, but limiting them to this role reduces their agency, discouraging their
participation in peacemaking and peacebuilding processes, and allows society in general to ignore their concerns, requests, and needs (Corrin, 2008; Karam, 2001).

The main research gap in the literature is the failure to indicate what specific issues each of the actors brought to the table, specifically women’s issues, and what role women played in each of the phases. On the other hand, the literature does indicate that men often control the decision-making and the political, economic, and social resources, which is reflected in the “lower levels of educational achievement and literacy for women, fewer women holding political offices, lower earnings for women in formal sector employment and less property ownership, and high levels of gender-based violence and maternal mortality” (USAID 2009, p. 4). As Abom (2004) indicates, patriarchy and gender discrimination are recurring obstacles to female participation in societal activities; there is the misperception that female participation on committees will lower the value of these committees and will make men look weaker in their homes.

**Social Movement Theory.** As part of the analysis of which actors were involved in the peace process, it is important to look at social movement theory and, more specifically, the women’s movement in each of the cases. Social movement theory started to develop in the 1960s. Sidney Tarrow’s definition states, “social movements are not expressions of extremism, violence, and deprivation, they are better defined as collective challenges, based on common purpose and social solidarities, in sustained interaction with elites, opponents, and authorities” (2011, p. 9). Social movement theory has produced primarily three different theoretical perspectives: resource mobilization, framing, and new social movements. Framing and resource mobilization are the most applicable for this research.

Social movement scholars such as Blumer (1969), Mauss (1975), Tilly (1978), and Pullum (2014) indicate that social movements have a life cycle made up four stages: emergence,
coalescence, institutionalization, and decline. Emergence refers to the period in which part of society feels discontent, but there has been no real organization or mobilization against this discontent. People may talk to each other about their feelings, and even propose solution, but they are not organizing because they are only complaining about their situation and do not see these complaints as something that needs to be addressed collectively (Pullum, 2014).

During the second stage, coalescence, there is reflection about whether to mobilize. If this happens, people usually organize, use resources, and act collectively to make their complaints heard (McCarthy & Zald, 1977). It is in this stage that the group starts forming and people start joining to work together towards fixing what they see as the problem. The group may develop strategies, participate in collective action, seek financial and human resources, and organize themselves as a formal group with leadership (Christiansen, 2009). Activism is used during this stage, not only to make others hear the group’s grievances, but also to recruit, and to make the group believe that their cause is valid and needs to be heard. It is here that the process of framing starts taking place (Pullum, 2014).

The third stage is institutionalization. In this stage, the social movement group gets organized with a “hierarchical leadership structures … they hire paid staff … and they may also have a considerable degree of access to policymakers” (Pullum, 2014, p. 1382). What started as a grassroots movement may grow into a national movement or may affiliate with a larger group at this stage (Pullum, 2014). The fourth or last stage is decline, and according to Giungni (1998) it can happen for different reasons, such as the movement failed, it had little success, it had accidental outcomes, or it was successful. According to Pullum (2014) decline does not mean that the movement disappears; it means that new strategies may be necessary, especially if the movement was not successful.
**Framing.** This is one of the theoretical perspectives of social movement theory. This framing attempts to explain why and how social movement ideas are understood by the populations involved, how people construct their reality, how they interpret their problems and grievances. According to Snow and Soule (2010) framing originated from the theory of social constructionism, which explains that objects, events, situations do not have an inherent meaning; it is only through social interaction that they are given a meaning. Sociologist Erving Goffman (1974) defines frame as a social framework and as a mental schema that allows users to organize experiences and understand the world they live in. It is important to note that Goffman is writing about how a person, not a group constructs reality.

Sidney Tarrow’s *Power in Movement* (2011) focuses on contentious collective action as the basis of social movements because “collective action is the best resource that people possess against better-equipped opponents, especially when it is used by people who lack regular access to institutions … and behave in ways that fundamentally challenge others” (p. 7). Tarrow (2011) also indicates that opportunity and threats are components of how a group mobilizes and how it can succeed or fail. The important contribution that Tarrow makes to framing is indicating that symbols are part of every social movement, however, it is difficult to frame contention because there are multiple actors that can frame the issue, such as the members of the movement, the media, the opposition, so the members of the movement must adapt their symbols to reflect the movement and not their own personal values.

Other important scholarly work on framing has been produced by Robert Benford and David Snow, who reviewed all the research that had been done on framing and its impact on social movements. According to theses scholars, “collective action frames are action-oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire and legitimate the activities and campaigns of a social movement
organization” (2000, p. 614). Social movement framing is a continuous process, where the members and leaders of the movement revise and update the purpose of recruiting new members and reaching more audiences (Benford & Snow, 2000). A collective action frame provides a foundation to help the group understand a situation, who is to blame for that situation, and how they can fix it. In social movements, the activists are those who decide the framing of the group by developing a diagnostic framing, which states a message that explains what the problem is; a prognostic framing, where there is a proposed solution for the problem; and a motivational framing, stating why people should join the movement, a call to action (Benford & Snow, 2000).

Snow et al. (1986) indicate that many groups have similar diagnostic frames, and for that reason they decide to unite in order to maximize their influence by merging into a single group with unifying goals, with the purpose of recruiting more diverse participants.

According to Snow et al. (1986) this frame alignment involves four aspects: linkage, amplification, extensions, and transformation. Linkage links people who share similar views or grievances, but who lack an organizational base (p. 467). Amplification is "the clarification and invigoration of an interpretive frame that bears on a particular issue, problem, or set of events" (p. 469) with the purpose of expanding the movement. Extensions “are a movement's effort to incorporate participants by extending the boundaries of the proposed frame to include or encompass the views, interests, or sentiments of targeted groups” (p. 469). This means that the different groups involved will promote each other even if their main goals are not the same. Transformation happens when the frames that existed "may not resonate with, and on occasion may even appear antithetical to, conventional lifestyles or rituals and extant interpretive frames" (p. 473). In other words, it is a revision of goals.
Francesca Polletta and M. Kai Ho (2006) did an analysis of frames and their consequences. They agree that frames are relevant to social movements because this is how the message is delivered, and how assists it with recruitment, with mobilization, and with fighting political battles. However, they indicate that even though frames are important, the problem is explaining how and when they are useful and what their resulting effects are. Polletta and Ho consider framing so important that “activists’ selection of strategies and tactics, their choice of organizational form, movement competition and alliance-building, movement success, and movement collapse are all subject to framing” (2016, p. 191).

New Social Movement. Another theoretical perspective of social movement theory is New Social Movement. This perspective does not focus on traditional class location behind social movements, but on social, identity, and quality of life issues such as gender, race, sexuality, environmentalism, and human rights (Melucci, 1994). The majority of the social movements that took place during the 1960s and 1970s were not class/labor related, but were related to quality of life, and were led by middle class people, not the working class (Ozcurumez & Cengiz, 2011). According to Ronald Inglehart (1990) the reason for this change was that political parties and the previous social movements concentrated on achieving success with labor and class goals, while social and identity issues, or traditional issues, were ignored, and people who cared about those issues started new social movements. Women’s movements are considered to be new social movements, because they do not follow Marxist theory where class/labor is the principal reason for collective action. Participation in women’s movements is based on the common identity of gender (Safa, 1990).

Alberto Melucci explains that as the world changes, new movements will be formed that are related to everyday life, especially issues related to aspects of modern life. This will require
the construction of a social collective identity, which must be the purpose and accomplishment of the new social movement (Melucci 1988). According to Melucci (1995), the construction of collective identity is a process that includes different cognitive elements understood by a specific segment of society or group. It also involves activists’ participation who are in constant communication and interaction. Additionally, there is an emotional investment from the individual that would lead to make him/her feel a part of the group and have more of an emotional involvement.

Intersectionality. I selected an intersectionality approach for my research about actors involved in the peace process. The concept of intersectionality was first developed by Kimberle Crenshaw in 1989, in her study about dimensions of work discrimination against women of color. Intersectionality was originally used to analyze the different experiences of black women who were not being acknowledged by either feminists or anti-racist scholars, to indicate how gender and race interact to structure the job experiences of black women (Crenshaw, 1989). Intersectionality refers to the different interactions that exist between gender and other categories, such as race, social status, economic placement, ideologies, and the results of the interactions between these categories in terms of power (Davis, 2008).

Mary Hawkesworth indicates that this is “an analytical tool developed by feminists of color in their continuing struggle to correct the omissions and distortions in feminist analysis caused by failure to investigate the structuring powers of race, class, ethnicity, sexuality, and nationality” (2006, p. 207). In other words, women’s lives were being analyzed under only one category, gender, without considering that the experiences of black women were different than the experiences of white women. Because many other categories are involved, scholars should not analyze one category without considering all the categories that may exist. Intersectionality helps
to give a clear image or location of the experiences of a particular group and the categories that interact and overlap with each other to oppress women; when researching and discussing women’s issues, scholars should take these categories into consideration in order to more fully understand and advocate for those issues (Emba, 2015).

Intersectionality indicates that women tend to be situated within more than one group, such as rural and poor, and that creates tension as to which group to identify with, or which group will best represent them. In the cases of Guatemala, El Salvador, and Colombia, intersectionality is useful to understand why different women’s groups formed, their purpose and agendas, and why they unified in a movement during the peace negotiations. The different women’s groups’ perspectives such as being either from government or guerrilla, or from rural versus urban, mean their experiences were completely different, making it important to analyze them in their own right (Menjívar, 1999). This concept is particularly important in the analysis of the different actors who participated in the negotiation process, especially looking at how different women’s groups overcome their intersectionality and formed a women’s movement, as there is no literature that applies this concept to a peace process analysis.

**Negotiation (Peacemaking) Phase**

Once the agenda is set and the actors are defined, the next phase is the negotiation phase, a process usually known in this context as peacemaking. In this paper, peacemaking, as explained by Gawerc (2006), refers to diplomatic negotiations where the parties involved try to reach an agreement and stop a conflict. According to Pruitt (1981), negotiation is defined as “a form of decision making in which two or more parties talk with one another in an effort to resolve their opposing interests” (as cited in Lewiki et al., p. 3). According to Wolff (2013), in order to start a negotiation, the parties involved must agree that there is a need and purpose to sit down and talk,
and decide what they want to achieve. The parties have acknowledged that there is a common problem (or problems) and they want to solve them together (Lewiki et al., 1999). During the negotiations, there are multilateral conversations taking place with the purpose of expressing a commitment to the process from all parties involved, not only between the main negotiators, but other actors who are not at the table (Guelke, 2003).

Some of the literature explains that, in order to understand the role women could have in increasing visibility for their issues and changing patriarchal structures in post-conflict situations, it is important to have them participate in these crucial peacemaking processes (Aoláin, 2010). According to the literature, it is important that women sit at the negotiation table and actively participate in the process (Lockett, 2008). There are scholars who point out that in most peace negotiations not only are women absent from the table, but there are no women’s issues in the agreement (Karam, 2001). Addressing gender and participation issues could be the first step in promoting women’s participation at all political and legal levels, especially after a conflict is settled (Bell & O’Rourke, 2010). According to Bell (2013) it is very difficult for women to have access to peace negotiation talks during a conflict, and it is also difficult for them to form alliances with those who are included in the talks.

Women’s participation is paramount because, as Golan (2004) explains that women are as much a part of conflict and of the county as men, and therefore should be involved in peacemaking, because they not only seek equality, but provide diverse perspectives and ideas which could be beneficial to peacemaking efforts. According to the literature (Kandiyoti, 2007; Aoláin, 2010), the process of developing and implementing programs that benefit women after a conflict starts at the peace negotiation process. However, in terms of representation at the table, or inclusion of their
issues in official peace negotiations, their participation is almost nonexistent because men control this process (Naraghi Anderlini, 2000).

Research on women’s issues in peace negotiation agreements and the effect of this on women’s post-conflict status is extremely limited. In fact, most of the literature on this topic is about the lack of participation of women at the negotiation table, not about the inclusion of women’s issues within the agreement, or the impact of these issues and their influence on women’s status in society after the conflict is over. It is important to determine not only if there was an influence (of lack of it), but also the extent and effectiveness of the programs implemented. A part of the problem is, “that once women make it to the table, the most salient and important issues will have already been discussed in backroom, male-only, negotiations” (De Alwis, Mertus, & Sajjad, 2013, p. 184). This is why it is so important that women are brought in early during the pre-negotiations phase so they can be a part of the agenda setting and the negotiation team, so that it is not only men making decisions for women on what is to be discussed and done.

**Post-negotiation**

If the negotiations are successful, an agreement is signed by the parties. However, having a signed peace agreement does not signal the end of the peace process. The post-negotiation phase is where the issues that were agreed upon are implemented. As Newman and Richmond indicate (2006), the agreement means little if there is no implementation or if this implementation is too difficult to achieve. As previously stated, it is during peace negotiations that state institutions are changed and programs are created and arranged to take effect once the agreement is in place. Also, peace negotiations provide unique breaks in patriarchal structures, and opportunities to reconfigure society unlike other periods of peace (Zur & Glendinning, 1987). It is during the post-negotiation phases that changes, reforms, and/or programs will be implemented. Having an agreement means
that all parties involved in the process have compromised to solve the conflict in a peaceful way, understanding the difficulties that could arise after the agreement is signed (Fisas, 2004). Implementation is where actions and changes that were agreed upon in the negotiations will take place.

Any of the reforms, programs, or changes will be affected by the patriarchal structures that exist in society. According to Omwami (2011), women are excluded from participation in political and economic areas; males are dominant agents with decision-making power over issues related to women. Most societies where conflict has erupted and peace agreements have been signed are very patriarchal, and women face discrimination and have few, if any, political or economic rights. Before the conflict started, women had limited or no economic and political power, usually emphasized by conservative gender ideologies such as religion, and limited opportunities to generate empowerment and progress (Blumberg, 2001); after the conflict is over and the peace agreement has been signed this situation has barely changed in such societies.

During conflict, women become more powerful in the household, since they tend to become heads of the household and breadwinners while men go away to fight. These roles end once conflict is over and the men go back to “normal life” expecting women to do the same (MacKenzie, 2009). Bell (2013) indicates that during the implementation phase, women find themselves with more challenges, not only in social, political, and economic reforms, but also in their personal lives, with the reintegration of their husbands, fathers, brothers, and sons. Some must also deal with relocation after they were displaced by the conflict. This makes studying this phase all the more important in understanding the effects of these peace negotiations on women’s lives.
The negotiation and signing of a peace agreement illustrate the beginning of a difficult process of implementation of programs, and policy changes on, issues that were agreed upon during the negotiation (Boltjes, 2007). As Goldie (2012) notes, the agreements will stipulate what changes in government and other institutions need to be made in order for the agreement to be successful and prevent the reoccurrence of conflict. The implementation stage can be as difficult, or even more difficult, than the negotiation stage. According to Fisas (2004), it is necessary to have clear rules on how the agreement is going to be implemented, as well as methods to evaluate the implementation, and the possible the repercussions for not implementing the agreement.

Peace negotiations and peace agreements are not separate from what happens after the negotiations are over and the peace accord has been signed. It is important “to understand how to “do” change in established governmental settings where the organizational history is not conducive to promoting the rights, equalities, and social relations on which peace agreements are founded” (Goldie, 2012, p. 534). According to Bell (2013), implementation of the agreement takes place with some of the actors who were involved during the negotiation, but also with different actors who were not involved, and for this reason peace agreements are very difficult to implement. Saunders (2001) points out that the implementation is a long-term process because its main purpose is to change the political and social structures and relationships.

The literature indicates that there has been progress in recognizing the different roles women (and their issues) play in conflict since 2000. One key step was the promulgation of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 (UNSCR 1325) in October 2000. The UNSCR 1325 illustrates the different roles that women played in armed conflict and peace processes (Gumru et al., 2009), and stresses the importance of equal participation of men and women in peacemaking (Bell et al., 2010). The resolution encourages states to include women at the
peacemaking negotiation table (Nakaya, 2003), but also to include “a gender perspective in any planning or implementation of peace operations and peace negotiations” (Tryggestad, 2009, p. 540). While all signatories are responsible for upholding their obligations under 1325, the existing patriarchal structures make implementation problematic, and the implementation of the resolution should be done through the development of National Action Plans, which only 24 states in the entire world have developed (USIP, 2014). There is no literature on peace agreements that included women’s issues and what happened during the implementation (post-negotiation) phase in those cases.

The involvement of women during negotiations and the inclusion of women’s issues in peace agreements are extremely important, especially during the post-negotiation phase. Women work not only to restore society after a conflict, but to change and address the issues that were the causes of the conflict along with issues related to women specifically, such as sexual violence, property rights, and resettlement (Kaufman & Williams, 2010). The absence of women in the pre-negotiation and negotiation phases, as well as the absence of their issues in these phases, will lead to a peace agreement that ignores women, including the post-negotiation phase (Bell, 2013).

To get women’s issues included in the agreement, the pre-negotiation stage is the most important stage. This is the stage where the women’s movement works in collaboration with other actors who are part of the negotiation table, to put women’s issues on the agenda and, therefore, in the agreement. However, this is not the only part of the process that is important. The second part, the post-negotiation stage, is where implementation of the agreement takes place. I believe it is in the implementation stage that changes in women’s status should, could, and would take place.

Additionally, in order to analyze how women’s issues made it to the peace agreement, it is important to look at the actors who were involved, and what role they played in this process. As I
I hypothesize that collaboration between women and men is the main factor that led to the inclusion of women’s issues in the agreement, it is key to analyze the role that women and the women’s movement had pre-negotiation, during the negotiation, and post-peace agreement. In order to address these questions theory development is necessary because this is a gap I have identified in the existing literature.
Chapter 3

Research Goals and Theoretical Framework

My purpose in conducting this research is theory development and testing, to explain how women’s issues are added to peace agreements. The fact that women are not fully involved in any given conflict but that they also tend to bear more of the post-conflict repercussions makes it all the more important that issues be included in negotiation agreements. By developing and testing the hypotheses derived from this explanation, I will also eliminate alternative explanations. Most importantly, through this theoretical explanation, I will carefully lay out what I consider to be the causal mechanisms explaining the inclusion of women’s issues in peace negotiation agreements. The hypotheses that I want to test are:

H1: Cases in which there is an active women’s movement are more likely to include women’s issues in the peace agreement.

H2: Cases in which the women’s movement used a frame alignment are more likely to include women’s issues in the peace agreement.

H3: Cases in which there is collaboration between women’s organizations and negotiation teams are more likely to include women’s issues in the peace agreement.

Are women’s issues included in peace negotiation agreements? Why or why not?

The inclusion of women’s issues can take place during pre-negotiation and negotiation phases. As mentioned in the literature review, the pre-negotiation stage is where the agenda is set and where the actors who will participate at the peace negotiation table are chosen. It is during this phase that the purpose, participants, format, timetable, and agenda are defined (Wolff, 2013). It is during the pre-negotiation phase that parties agree to talk and determine what issues each of them will be willing to negotiate (Bell, 2013). Zartman (1989) indicates that during this phase the parties
work on identifying the problem(s), commit to negotiate a solution with each other, and organize the negotiation process; the pre-negotiation phase ends with the start of negotiations or with one of the parties refusing to continue the process. It is in this first stage that I argue that women’s movements frame their issues in a particular way that is key to getting them included in the peace negotiations and the resulting accord. Second, and related to the first point, I argue that there must be a strong well-organized women’s movement in order to access the negotiation teams. Third, I argue that it is the collaboration between the negotiation teams and the already active women’s movement that allow the inclusion of women’s issues, or lack of the same in peace negotiation agreements. In the following sections, I elaborate on each of these arguments, explaining why each is essential to understanding why women’s issues are included in some peace negotiations and peace agreements and not in others.

A Key Variable: Frame Alignment

In attempting to illustrate the birth of women’s groups, and the women’s movement, it is important to look briefly again to Social Movement Theory, previously addressed in the literature review, and more specifically the framing perspective. Social Movement Theory depicts social movements as having a life cycle made up of four stages: emergence, coalescence, institutionalization, and decline. These stages can be illustrated with the women’s organizations in the cases in this study. The emergence stage refers to the period in which part of society feels discontent, but there has been no real organization or mobilization of this discontent. People may talk to each other about their feelings, and even suggest a solution, but they are not organizing; they are only complaining about their situation and do not see these complaints as something to be addressed collectively (Pullum, 2014). I argue that in post-civil war cases, the emergence stage takes place during both military rule and armed conflict, as women feel the discontent of seeing
their lives disrupted, especially when people die, disappear, or are displaced. There is no formal organization among the women, only a general discomfort in response to the situation that is discussed in small communities, or in places like the churches and universities.

During the second stage, coalescence, there is reflection on whether to mobilize or not. If people decide to mobilize, they will usually organize, use available resources, and act collectively to make their complaints heard (McCarthy & Zald, 1977). It is in this stage that different groups start forming and members start joining to work together towards fixing what they see as the problems. They develop strategies, solicit resources, participate in collective action, and organize themselves as a group with leadership (Christiansen, 2009). Activism starts during this stage, not only to make others hear the group’s grievances, but also to recruit, to persuade people to support their cause, and to make the group believe its cause is valid and worth being heard. It is here that the process of framing starts taking place (Pullum, 2014). During the coalescence stage, the women start to organize, unify, and pool resources through different methods, such as joining rebel groups, creating groups through their neighborhoods or communities, and joining union groups. It is here where the given the individual country case the women’s movement starts taking shape. The different groups and organizations start looking to other groups that share similar goals, vision, or mission and organize under networks or platforms to make their cause more visible.

In the third stage, institutionalization, the social movement group organizes with “hierarchical leadership structure, they hire paid staff, and they may also have a considerable degree of access to policymakers” (Pullum, 2014, p. 1382). What starts as a grassroots movement with different groups grows into a national movement, or may affiliate with a larger group at this stage (Pullum, 2014). In this stage, the women have more experience working in different groups, but have recognized that there is a need to have women’s issues included on the peace agenda and
agreement. They will frame their cause and in some cases will grow into a women’s movement. It is also during this stage that the collaboration between women’s groups and negotiation teams will take place.

I expect to find that the inclusion of women’s issues in peace negotiations and peace agreements was possible because the women’s groups united under a women’s movement, and framed their issues in a particular way. In Social Movement Theory, the framing perspective attempts to explain why and how social movement ideas are understood by the populations involved, how people construct their reality, and how they interpret their problems and grievances. As will be explained through the cases in this study, the women in all of the cases came together and formed groups such as those for indigenous women, middle class educated women, rural women, urban women, victims, combatants. However, within these different groups, they understood that the unifying element was how the conflict had affected them differently than men.

I expect to see a specific framing alignment in the women’s movement, which pressed for the inclusion of women at the negotiation table, and for adding women’s issues to the peace agreement. I expect to see a clear framing as to why women needed to be present at negotiations and included in peace agreements. I expect to find a very specific framing used by the women’s movement. This framing explains not only to the different groups that are part of the movement, but to the public in general, what the problems, needs, and grievances are. I predict the framing they use indicates that even though women are the majority of victims, they are also half of the population, and that women’s issues must be in peace agreement. The women’s movement framing will indicate that women must have representation at peace negotiation’s table, and have their issues included in them.
The leadership of the women’s movement understood that the different women’s groups (such as rural and urban) shared similar grievances because of the conflict, and came together into a frame alignment. As Snow et al. (1986) explain, a frame alignment happens when there are many groups that have similar diagnostic frames, and for this reason they decide to join in order to maximize their influence, by merging into a single group with unifying goals, and the purpose of recruiting more diverse participants. This frame alignment is important because it helped women from different groups to come together under one movement and express their needs and demands during the peace process. This frame illustrates the women’s perception of conflict and how conflict has affected women differently than men. It helps women from different areas to have their voices heard under one movement, with a specific agenda.

According to Snow et al. (1986) this frame alignment involves four aspects: First, linkage brings together people who share similar views or grievances but who lack an organizational base (p. 467). In the cases in this study, there were women in different sectors of society who were being affected by armed conflict, but they were not organized at that point. Second is amplification, "the clarification and invigoration of an interpretive frame that bears on a particular issue, problem, or set of events" (p. 469) with the purpose of expanding the movement. Here, women started to organize in different groups in which they expressed the grievances caused by conflict. Women framed their causes by indicating that the violence of the conflict was changing their lives. They were forced to join the labor force and provide for the family; they often became victims of sexual violence, were displaced (more than men), and had their families destroyed by the deaths of the men in their lives.

Third, extensions “are a movement's effort to incorporate participants by extending the boundaries of the proposed frame to include or encompass the views, interests, or sentiments of
targeted groups” (p. 469). This means that the different groups involved will promote each other even if their main goals are not the same. There are many women’s groups with different agendas that only had in common their wish to end the conflict and improve women’s lives post-conflict. This is where I expect the women’s movement to become stronger and develop a frame that shows they are the largest population affected by conflict and for the same reason it is necessary that their issues are included in peace agreements.

The frame alignment starts to develop when the different groups share their grievances over the effects that the conflict had on them. The different groups understand that the conflict affected women differently than men, and that women had been the majority of victims. The groups start to incorporate more participants that share that same understanding and acknowledge that while they are different groups with different goals, they can come together under a movement where they agree they have one thing in common: women are half of the population, and they are the majority of victims of the armed conflict, and for the same reason their issues must be included in the peace agreement. I predict that the way they will achieve this framing is by using different mechanisms such as forums, summits, and talks within the different groups, and by the use of news media. This is where the women’s groups will come together under one umbrella and will agree that they will be represented as a unit, even though many groups form that unit. It is important that the groups agree that the movement has a specific purpose, with specific demands. The women’s movement will present the demands as a unit, meaning that all the groups that participate in the movement have agreed to the frame alignment, and that they will present their demands as a movement and not as individual groups.
A Key Variable: Presence of an Active Women’s Movement

In order to understand how women organized and were able to generate a united women’s movement, or not, it is important to look at the societal structure before conflict. In patriarchal societies, men control most, if not all aspects of life. Women in these societies have less influence, and often their issues are ignored. Mostly, the top leadership for the parties involved in conflict is made up of men. Before the conflict, women’s roles were defined under a patriarchal structural system, where men control the political, scientific, social, religious, cultural, and economic life, while the female presence has been limited or ignored (Mirkin, 1984). Men have justified this control by portraying themselves as protectors of women and by defining the role women should play (Crane-Seeber & Crane, 2010).

However, when conflict arises, this pre-conflict social equilibrium where the male is “superior” is disturbed, mainly because men go away to fight wars, and women must fill the void left by their absence. When a conflict takes place, women have to step out of their traditional roles, and then are able to see this disturbance as an opportunity to be heard. Because of the men’s absence during a conflict, women become more powerful in the household, since they become breadwinners and heads of the household (MacKenzie, 2009). However, women also have diverse involvement in conflict (as victims or combatants), and have increased leverage in changing that original equilibrium in a post-conflict era, and hence, in negotiations.

During a conflict, many pre-conflict groups become more vocal, and collaborate with other groups. At the same time new groups may emerge as a consequence of the conflict, and these groups may go on to cooperate with other civil society organizations to effect change in the later stages of the conflict. Examples of these groups are the Salvadoran Women’s Association (AMES) in El Salvador; Ruta Pacífica in Colombia; and CONAVIGUA in Guatemala. According to Helen
Safa (1990), women’s movements formed as a response to military dictatorships in Latin America throughout the 20th century. When a conflict starts, women from all parts of society start to organize and form agendas. The number of women’s organizations increased with armed conflict, and the consolidation of a women’s movement started to happen as the conflict intensified.

Safa (1990) explained that, first, the family nucleus was threatened or destroyed in many cases by military regimes or by guerrillas when the men or other family members like children or loved ones were killed, destroying women’s private lives. Second, during these decades there was an increase of women in the labor force, due to two reasons. First, the men were out fighting and women had to become the primary breadwinners. Second, the economic crises forced women to get jobs to help support households that could not survive on one income. These changes made women conscious of the oppression they were suffering and led them to organize in groups and networks to demand protection and recognition of their rights. The social movement was the response to the hardships created by the conflict and the economic crises that affected the lower and middle classes the most (Safa, 1990).

These conflicts led to the incorporation of women into rebel groups as direct participants, which also led to a change of thinking regarding the role of women during conflict, by seeing them as combatants and not just victims (Stoltz Chinchilla, 1991). It is important to point out that joining a revolutionary group did not mean that gender roles were equal. Many of the patriarchal structures were also in place within the rebel forces, and some roles such as cooks or “nurse” were considered to be for women. However, the visible role of women in revolutionary war, as well as in human rights groups, encouraged more women to change their traditional roles in society, and prompted them to get involved with more feminist ideas, by creating women’s caucuses and commissions, to increase their leadership in society (Stoltz Chinchilla, 1991). Women not only mobilized for
human rights, but also for political participation opportunities, and rights as workers in unions; these issues made women come together and organize, exchange information, create networks, and become activists for their issues (Safa, 1990; Montecinos, 2001).

Nonetheless, conflict is obviously not, by itself, a compelling explanation for why women’s issues were or were not included in negotiations or agreements. Women’s issues were, after all, not included in the majority of the peace agreements. In the last 30 years, there have been 35 comprehensive peace accords in the world and only eight of those included women’s issues (Appendix A). I argue that conflict either creates more, or increases, the number of existing women’s organizations and contributes to the creation of a women’s movement. The women’s movement fights for the inclusion of women’s issues in peace negotiation agendas and peace agreements, and they are successful in including these issues through collaboration between the women’s movement and the actors at the table during the peace negotiation process.

It is important to note that there were some women’s groups before the conflicts began, (such as suffragist groups), but once the armed conflicts started, the women’s groups increased, due to the fact that even though most women were not the ones fighting, they were the majority of the victims in a conflict. These groups began to form as a support system for women who lost family members, were displaced, or were sexually abused during the conflict. I argue that these groups have one thing in common which is to help other women during and after a conflict. This does not mean that all women’s groups share the same visions, goals, or agendas. What they do have in common is that they advocate for women’s issues caused by conflict and wanted an end to conflict.

Most of these organizations have different ways to operate, different ideas on how to meet their needs, and different ideologies. However, when they come together under a women’s
movement, they agree on the purpose of the movement, even if coming together is not easy and has its own struggles. I expect to see organizations that do not agree with other organizations that are part of the movement, but decide to work together in order to fight for the inclusion of women’s issues in peace agreements. Under the women’s movement, these organizations, networks, and platforms, will be working together even when working apart individually. This means that being part of the women’s movement does not mean losing their initial identity or disappearing as an organization.

I expect to see tension between the different groups as they come together under one movement, but in the end, they will be able to gain their demands—if they do come together—. It is in the different groups that make up the movement where intersectionality is more evident. Each of the women’s groups have their own identity besides being women, for example, being rural women, or being indigenous women. All these different women’s groups come together in one women’s movement. Becoming a movement is overcoming intersectionality and its many categories (rural, urban, poor, rich, indigenous, educated, uneducated, and so on). The one commonality between all these groups is being women, and as such unequal in terms of rights and in terms of victimization. The different women’s groups unite with one purpose and agenda shared by the movement. I also expect to see collaboration between other civil society groups, such as LGBTI groups, victims’ groups, and displaced groups. Even if the groups have high levels of tension due to their different backgrounds, I expect them to be able to come together and unify for one goal: the inclusion of women’s issues in peace negotiations and agreement.

I expect to find that the way the women’s movement is able to present a unified agenda that pressures for the inclusion of women’s issues, using political action, advocacy, and activism that they agreed to do. I also expect to see that the women’s movement that is successful in their
goal of the inclusion of women’s issues is because they were able to come together, understanding that it is a movement made up of different groups, and these groups were able to prevent a division between them that could stop them from achieving the movement’s goal. A united women’s movement is key because it brings together all the women’s groups and represents their main demands in one voice and not hundreds of voices. All the groups that are part of the movement agree about these demands, needs, and goals. Additionally, being a united movement helps them to recruit more members and attract financial support from other sectors; more importantly, it makes their voices stronger and harder to ignore, and it gets the attention of the negotiation teams.

A Key Variable: Collaboration

It is important to remember that armed conflict took place in patriarchal societies where there was a perception that war was only a men’s issue hence peace was only a men’s issue. It did not matter that there were women combatants, or that women were the majority of the victims in the conflict. For the same reason, women’s groups alone were less effective in introducing these issues onto agendas, without help from broader groups/negotiating parties that included men. I must therefore, examine the role of both men and women in placing women’s issues into peace negotiation agreements. I expect that in the cases where women’s issues were included in negotiations and peace agreements (Guatemala and Colombia), there was collaboration between the women’s movement and the negotiation teams.

To analyze the collaboration process, it is important to see which parties made it to the table, who was involved, who was left out, and how the agenda was set up, meaning what issues were included or not. Meintjes (2001) indicates that when a conflict ends, women are left behind, as is reflected by their absence from peace negotiations. I expect to find that collaboration between the negotiation teams and the women’s movement was necessary to get these issues to the table.
This collaboration starts taking place in the second-tier of negotiators with both parties involved in the peace process. The ideal situation is that the collaboration starts with the women who are part of that second-tier of negotiators who have listened to the demands or ideas from the women’s movement. They also have to be willing to cooperate with each other in bringing proposals to the top-tier negotiators. It does not matter that there was a women’s movement that raised their voices, because if they were ignored by the negotiation teams the movement could not be successful.

The composition of the negotiation teams reflects the patriarchal society, where mostly only men have decision-making power in the top tier, while most women are part of the second-tier teams. Most of the women in the second-tier teams have been working in government positions or have a leadership rank in the guerrilla groups, and often hold a college degree. By the late 1970s, society in Latin America started to change, as feminist and socialist ideologies were expanding. These ideologies found a bigger middle-class group of women who had, or wanted, more education, were looking for women’s rights and equality, and were parting from some of the structures that kept them oppressed (Stoltz Chinchilla, 1991). Middle-class women were expanding the women’s movement, not only by fighting for their cause, but by studying, analyzing, and illustrating the problems that women had, from the poor to the upper class, in areas of domestic violence, health services, and education. They were also establishing centers and action projects in these areas that could help women (Safa, 1990).

As more pressure started to accumulate for ending military regimes and moving towards a democratic space during the 1980s, many of the women’s organizations became more vocal about ending the conflicts. By the time the peace negotiations started, many of the women on the negotiation teams, as well as the leaders of women’s groups and women’s movements, were influenced by the feminist movement, and had a different perception of what the role of women in
society should be. There was a change not only in advocating for human rights, but also for gender equality, and especially for union participation, political representation, and for women’s health and reproductive rights (Safa, 1990).

It is also important to determine if there were women in the top negotiation tier, meaning women who were able to make decisions on the negotiation teams in each of the cases. In order to be heard, the women’s movement had to reach either in person or by appropriate representation the top tier of the negotiation teams, where men are the majority members. In cases where the men were willing or were convinced to listen, this collaboration was successful. So, it is important that either women gain access to the negotiation tier themselves through seats on the negotiation team, or that the women in the second tier have allies in the negotiation tier so they can have indirect influence and help in introducing women’s issues to the agenda.

When a negotiation takes place, there are a limited number of people who sit at the table, usually representing the parties and having the power of making decisions; however, the negotiation teams tend to be larger groups with different people working on them. The top tier is where the plenipotentiaries are. A plenipotentiary is “a person invested with the full power of independent action on behalf of their government, typically in a foreign country” (Oxford, 2018). They have the power to make decisions and agree or disagree with the points being negotiated. The second-tier negotiators are part of the team and their job is to communicate between the top party negotiators from their group and the civil society groups, provide administrative functions, and provide support with research and information that is needed by the top tier. The second-tier does not have the power to make decisions or agree on any points. It is among these second-tier negotiators that I expect to see collaboration between men and women in the cases I am using for this study. This collaboration refers to the work done together between the women’s movement
and the negotiation’s teams. I expect to find evidence of meetings between the women’s movement and the negotiation teams, especially the second-tier, that the women’s movement submitted recommendations and proposals, and that they work together to include women’s issues in the peace agreement. This is where I expect to see women’s networks and organizations being able to collaborate with negotiation teams and where they express their needs and concerns that lead to the inclusion of women’s issues on the agreement. As indicated before, top-tier negotiation teams are usually made up of men, but women usually are included on the second-tier as the support team for the top-tier negotiators. These women held government positions, or held leadership positions within the guerrilla groups before joining the negotiation teams. For example, in Guatemala 10 percent of the negotiation teams were women, in El Salvador 13 percent, in Northern Ireland 10 percent, in Kosovo 3 percent (Castillo Díaz & Tordjman, 2012). I expect the collaboration more likely in teams where the second-tier negotiators on both sides have agreed to present an issue to top-tier negotiators, after they had collaborated with a united women’s movement.

In conclusion, I predict that in cases where women’s issues were successfully included in peace agreements, it is the result of an active unified women’s movement (not just women’s groups), that used a specific frame to fight for the inclusion of women’s issues on these agreements, and that there were women on the negotiation teams (supported by the women’s movement) who started to collaborate with men at the negotiating table. The women’s movement articulated women’s issues, needs, and concerns, within the movement’s frame, and got the attention of the women on the negotiation teams, specifically the second-tier negotiation teams. Then, women in the second-tiers of each negotiation team made alliances with each other to be able to bring the issues to the top-tier negotiations, by first debating the points between each other, and agreeing to
present these points to each of the parties. I expect that the women in the second-tier of negotiations, meaning the women on the negotiation teams that did not have decision-making power, are the ones who helped start the process of collaboration between the women’s movement and the men at the table. The women on the negotiation teams were more educated and understood that it was not only about ending a conflict, but also about changing the status of women after a conflict.

**Alternative Explanation**

Part of my research also included analyzing any possible alternative explanation for my research questions. The alternative explanation that I expect to find is the pressure from international actors. In all three cases used in this study, international actors were involved in the peace process, some more directly than others. For the same reason, it is important to look at what role they had in each peace process, and if they had any influence in the inclusion (or lack of) women’s issues in the peace agreement.

The main international actors I want to analyze are the United Nations; the countries that were part of the “Group of Friends”; and the countries that also supported the peace process for different reasons, such as being involved in conflict resolutions (Norway and Sweden). Each of these actors could have an impact on the inclusion of women’s issues in peace agreements. It is important to analyze what type of influence they could have, what the extent of that influence was, did they support or oppose the inclusion of women’s issues, and did they pressure or ignore the negotiation actors for the inclusion of women’s issues.
Chapter 4

Methodology and Procedures

This study utilizes a qualitative research design. My primary research goal here was theory development and theory testing. My purpose was to answer questions of how women’s issues made it to the peace agreement, by using multiple case studies as part of a most similar systems design.

Case Study Selection

My primary methodology was process tracing. Process tracing “involves the examination of ‘diagnostic’ pieces of evidence within a case that contribute to supporting or overturning alternative explanatory hypotheses. A central concern is with sequences and mechanisms in the unfolding of hypothesized causal processes” (George & Bennet, 2005, p. 208). First, I identified what I believe are the causal mechanisms connecting the independent variable and dependent variable, using case studies. By using process tracing, I analyzed if the independent variable caused a variation on the dependent variable, by establishing whether there is a causal chain of steps connecting the variables and examining other variables that could have caused that change (George & Bennet, 2005). These will be tested using three cases as part of a most similar systems design. As noted I have selected the cases of Guatemala, El Salvador, and Colombia, which are similar in regional location, language, and history, but have variation in the main dependent variable: whether or not women’s issues are on the peace negotiations agreements.

Guatemala, El Salvador, and Colombia are located in Latin America; all of the states were colonies of Spain and achieved their independence at almost the same time in the early 19th century. The primary language of these countries is Spanish, and their societies have similar social and economic stratification. In all of these countries, civil war started as opposition to the government
and the rich families who controlled the political and economic systems. For example, land ownership in Guatemala has long been dominated by small numbers of wealthy and powerful groups although accurate details are difficult to discover, and according to the study by the Land Tenure Center at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 2003, in Guatemala, 2 percent of the population owned 98 percent of the land and around 22 families controlled all the wealth of the country, and maintained this status by accessing the government and the military (Kessel, 2003). The situation in El Salvador was not much different than the one in Guatemala. There was a strict class structure, where most of the land and income distribution, over 2/3, went to the very small upper-class group, and 1/3 to the rest of the population, and any attempts of land reforms were met with military action, such as “La Matanza” (The Slaughter) in 1932 (Vargas, 2003). In Colombia, most of the victims of “La Violencia” during the 1940s and 1950s were rural peasants, and by the decade of the 1960s, the land distribution was one of the most unequal in the world, with more than half of the arable farms in the hands of just 1.15 percent of landowners, making inequality and land distributions the number one source of conflict (Berry, 2004).

In the cases of Guatemala and El Salvador, the conflict lasted at least a decade, and ended with cease-fires and peace agreements signed. In Colombia, the conflict ended in 2016 with the signature of the peace accord. In the case of Guatemala, the peace negotiations agreement included women’s issues, while in the case of El Salvador no women’s issues were included. I use Colombia as a third case because it provided an excellent opportunity to talk with the people involved in these recent negotiations first-hand; it gave me the opportunity to analyze the causal mechanisms as the process is taking place, and it allows me to make predictions about the inclusion of women’s issues in future peace processes.
Table 1.

Most Similar System Design Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
<th>El Salvador</th>
<th>Colombia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>South America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonized by</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Conflict</td>
<td>Civil war</td>
<td>Civil war</td>
<td>Civil war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Reason for Conflict</td>
<td>Political &amp; Economic</td>
<td>Political &amp; Economic</td>
<td>Political &amp; Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Religion</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year conflict Started</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's issues included</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This table illustrates the control variables, independent variables and dependent variable for the selected cases.

Qualitative Methods

The use of qualitative methods (process tracing) allowed me to test the causal mechanisms directly using primary and secondary sources: interviews and published materials in the selected cases. For Guatemala and El Salvador, I used mostly secondary sources that described the conflict in each of the cases as well as the negotiation processes. These sources are well-studied already and have scores of written scholarly accounts of what happened around the negotiation process. In the case of Guatemala, I also used a primary source. I interviewed a key person in Guatemala’s peace process and I used this information to fill in the blanks and verify the information from secondary sources. In the case of Colombia, I used primary sources and secondary sources. Colombia being such a recent case and one shrouded in some secrecy really needed interviews to understand the process. The qualitative design allows me to understand how the peace agreement was created, who was involved in this process, and the effects of this involvement and the inclusion of women’s issues on women’s status. Also, by using qualitative methods I was be able to understand the key factors influencing the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace agreement
directly from the experiences of the people that were involved. Qualitative data sources captured the different experiences, opinions, attitudes, and feelings from people. For example, by using interviews I was able find out why men’s and women’s experiences of this participation were different.

As this research question focuses on the puzzle of how women’s issues get to the table and into the agreement, this is essentially a qualitative question for which little data is available and which really requires talking to the parties involved to understand and parse through this process.

I ask if it is the partnership between women and men in the negotiation teams that allows the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace agreement. The independent variable is the partnership between the women and men on the negotiation teams, while the dependent variable is the addition of women’s issues to the agreement. Here, I used process tracing to identify and analyze what I consider the causal mechanisms: the women’s movement frame alignment; the presence of an active women’s movement; the collaboration between the women’s movement and the negotiation teams.

I measured the independent variable in two ways: First, I conducted process tracing by examining existing scholarly sources for the cases of Guatemala and El Salvador. I used these secondary sources that described the conflict in each of the cases as well as the negotiation processes. These sources also describe the women’s organizations and the women’s movement (if there was one), and the interactions with other actors before the peace negotiations and during the peace negotiations; however, how women’s issues were or were not included in the peace agreement is not specifically explained. In the case of Colombia, I used primary sources and
secondary sources. I conducted process tracing using secondary sources: the two most important newspapers, *El Tiempo* and *El Espectador*, as well as a widely-read and respected political magazine, *Semana*, and how they covered the peace process, and when they started mentioning women’s activism, and participation in the peace negotiations, from August 2012 to December 2016. I also analyzed all the communication announcements from the women’s movement and other organizations such the UN during the same period of time.

Second, I did research on each of the women’s movements (in the cases that have a women’s movement), that pushed for the inclusion of women’s issues in the negotiations and peace agreements. I looked at how the different women’s groups organized into a women’s movement (if they did), how they operated, and the issues that the movement pushed for, and how successful each movement (if there was one) was in getting the issue included in the agreements despite the patriarchal structure that surrounded the negotiations. I analyzed how the women’s movement in Guatemala and Colombia framed their purpose and if this was a factor that affected the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace agreement. By conducting process tracing, I hoped to find patterns that indicated whether women’s issues were discussed during the pre-negotiation and negotiation stages. It was important to analyze the actors that participated in setting the peace negotiation agenda, and which of those actors were the ones that demanded women’s issues be added to the peace negotiations agreement. As previously indicated, the negotiation process begins before there are people sitting at the table, and here I indicate that the most important actor was the women’s movement as it profoundly influenced the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace agreement.

The second causal mechanism is related to the women’s movement. I indicated that it is important to see how the women’s movement framed their cause in order to attract more supporters and the attention of the negotiation teams. For the same reason, I analyzed the main issues the
women’s movement wanted to be included, how the women’s movement communicated their goals, and specifically what issues were eventually included in the peace agreement. I examined whether the way the women’s movement framed their cause was a reason for women’s issues to be added to the peace agreement.

The dependent variable is the addition of women’s issues to the peace agreement. In order to explain this dependent variable, it was important to look at how this process was debated, specifically how was the negotiation peace agenda created, when did women’s issues become part of the negotiation process, and what types of programs were discussed, created, reformed, and implemented that particularly benefit women. I examined the peace negotiation agreements for the two cases that included women’s issues (Guatemala and Colombia), to determine if there was a discussion about specific programs that benefit women after the conflict is over.

In the case of Colombia, I used primary sources. I interviewed the people involved in the peace negotiation processes to get their point of view on why this inclusion was important, and what the process was like, but also to analyze the partnership between men and women. I also interviewed members of different women’s groups that were part of the women’s movement, international actors that provided support to the negotiation process in some way, journalists that covered the negotiation process, and scholars that followed up the negotiation process. The third causal mechanism is the collaboration between the women’s movement and the negotiation teams. This process can happen with the plenipotentiary women directly, or with the second-tier negotiation’s teams. I argue that the women’s movement had more access and communication with the women on the negotiation teams and were able to reach out to these women. They also make alliances with each other to be able to bring the issues to the top tier men negotiators because of this collaboration, by debating the points first between each other, and agreeing in presenting it to
each of the parties they belonged to. I expect that the women in the second tier of negotiations are the ones that helped start the process of collaboration between the women’s movement and the men at the table.

The perspectives from each of the actors involved outside of the negotiation table were different from those held by elites that control the peace negotiations. For the same reason, I conducted in-depth interviews that allowed me to ask questions that led the subject to give detailed answers and opinions about a particular issue; subjects felt free to speak due to the confidential nature of the interviews. Additionally, since qualitative research will be used to explain how and why, the answers to these questions are often easier to obtain through in-depth interviews. The interviews with members of the negotiation teams, of the women’s groups that were part of the women’s movement, of the international actors that provided support, of the journalists that covered the negotiation process, and of the scholars that followed up the negotiation process, allowed me to analyze my causal mechanisms more clearly, but also to identify if, indeed, my independent variable is causing the variation in my dependent variable.

**Population and Sampling**

The people I interviewed came from a non-random purposive sample. I used snowball sampling, where I used the contacts I have in Colombia to recruit through their networks other subjects that were involved in the peace process at all the different levels. As previously mentioned, they included the directors and employees of women’s groups, political and community leaders, scholars, international actors, and journalists. An interview guide was constructed (Appendix B), so that the same questions were used for each subject. Each interview lasted between 25 and 40 minutes.
All the subjects that I interviewed received a consent agreement form (Appendix C). No minors were involved in this research; all the participants were 18 years of age or older. For the interviews that I conducted via Skype and/or phone, I asked them to give verbal consent. All the interviews were recorded and transcribed, and the transcriptions and recordings were safely kept on a limited access computer and I am the only one that had access. No third party had access to the data. Before each interview, the participants had time to read the consent agreement, which included the purpose of the study, and if they asked, they also read the questions for the interview in advance. All the interviewed people agreed to participate on a voluntary basis. Each of them was notified of the right to interrupt or stop the interviews at any time. In order to ensure anonymity, I removed all identifying details, and their real names were replaced with pseudonyms.

I conducted 30 interviews in total, where I made every effort to ensure equal representation for men and women as well as representation for diverse perspectives through the inclusion of academics, journalists, government officials, former guerilla combatants, women’s organizations leaders, and international actors. The majority of the interviews (28 of them) were conducted in Spanish, and two of them were conducted in English as those two people speak English as their first language.

In the end, I was able to use only 29 interviews, as one organization (Organization of American States) agreed to the interview, but indicated that I could not use any information from it, or quotes, so I decided not to use the interview. Because the FARC was still going through the process of reintegrating into society, and they still have their own procedures, I was only able to conduct two interviews with them. Most of the ex-guerrilla members do not have public email accounts or accessible phone numbers. However, many of them have Twitter, which I used to contact them. In a couple of cases of potential interviewees, the ex-guerrilla wanted to participate
by sending the answers to the questions, but they needed permission from their press office, which was not granted. Below is the list of pseudonyms used and their broad affiliation. This is simply to demonstrate the diversity of sources and every effort has been made to protect the original identity of those interviewed.

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>Government Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Government Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>Government Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>Government Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Government Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty</td>
<td>Government Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Government Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bea</td>
<td>Guerrilla Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellie</td>
<td>Guerrilla Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>International Actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>International Actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen</td>
<td>International Actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>International Actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy</td>
<td>International Actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liam</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reese</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel</td>
<td>Scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greta</td>
<td>Scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanna</td>
<td>Scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allyson</td>
<td>Women's Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Women's Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Women's Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Women's Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Women's Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Women's Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Women's Movement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* This table illustrates the subjects that were interviewed, their affiliation, and their sector at the time of the negotiations.
Table 3.

Demographic Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>% Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>% Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guerrilla</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Actor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table illustrates the demographics and the total number of the people interviewed.

The interviews were conducted in three ways: First, face-to-face when I went to Colombia in July of 2017, and met with several people. Second, via phone/Skype with the people that were still in Cuba with the negotiations, or who preferred that method, as many of them were still busy wrapping up the process, or it was easier to do it at night or during the weekend where their work day was not going to be interrupted. A third method involved sending the questions directly to the person and they emailed back with their answers. This happened specifically with three of the people I interviewed.

Ethical Issues

This research project followed all the guidelines and policies of the Institutional Review Board of Kennesaw State University, IRB Study #17-150 (Appendix D). There was minimum risk to the participants. For the government officials, there was no risk because speaking about issues such as the peace negotiations is part of their job. The same applies to journalists and academics. However, in cases where some of the people that I interviewed happen to be former combatants, and there is any potential harm due to any possible repercussions for their role during the war, their identity will also be protected by using pseudonyms in order to protect their lives, and I will store
their names and interviews separately on a single computer, password protected, and where I am the only person that has access to it.

All participants worked in a women’s organization or held a significant political position; they also were involved in community development, and they had knowledge about the conflict and participated in the peace negotiation process. The results of this participation will be confidential and will not be released in any individually identifiable form without the prior consent of the participant unless required by law.

Limitations

In Guatemala and El Salvador, the conflicts had been over decades ago, so many of the people that I originally wanted to interview may not remember exactly how the negotiation process took place, and for the same reason, it was better for my research to use secondary sources for these cases. However, there are limitations associated with secondary sources, such as the authors could have missed information about the process. The way I addressed these limitations was that I ensured I used a variety of sources that have been accredited and published, by authors and scholars who are experts in the fields and have studied and published on the conflicts to a great extent. I used the information to reconstruct the process of how the collaboration of women and men influenced the inclusion (or not) of women’s issues in the peace agreement, and none of these sources has specifically done that work.

In Colombia, the armed conflict was still taking place while I was conducting some interviews, and even after the peace agreement was signed, people did not trust other people because they do not know who they were talking to, and whether that person was really who she/he was saying she/he was. The reason for this lack of trust is that people are afraid that the person conducting the interview is going to betray them, and again, they do not want to risk their lives or
jobs. I addressed this limitation by guaranteeing the participants that no identifiable information was going to be provided. In all the interviews I was told (verbally) that they did not care about that, that I could use their name and identification if I wanted, but I preferred to keep their identities confidential.

Another limitation is the gender bias that can occur in the selection of subjects. In order to prevent this situation, I tried to include at least 50 percent men in the study so as to analyze all points of view and all perspectives without interjecting bias into the study. Even though I tried to have an equal number of men and women, as I was conducting the interviews, it was evident that most of the people were going to be women. During my contacts, I was not able to get any guerrilla men to participate, as most of the men who were involved in the peace process were very busy, or too highly positioned for me to be able to reach them. However, I was able to interview two key leadership members that were directly involved in the process. Also, all the women’s organizations that I contacted were led mostly by women, and even in the cases where there was a male director, I was referred to talk to a woman in charge of the gender component.

Another limitation was the access to some of the people I wanted to interview, in particular the members of the government and guerrilla teams that did the agenda setting before the negotiations started. Working on a country that was still actively in conflict while the negotiations were taking place was a dangerous option. However, the negotiation teams were in Cuba, and I was able to reach them while they were over there. By the time I started conducting the interviews, the process was nearing the end, and once the peace agreement was signed, I was able to contact more people and do more interviews. I wanted to talk to the people on the tier-one and tier-two teams that could provide their first-hand experience about the process. I also wanted to talk to the people involved in the gender sub-commission.
Related to the previous point, I wanted to talk with the people that set the agenda in the secret phase six months before the negotiations officially started. A month before I ended this research I was still trying to reach these people. For the government, the High Commissioner for Peace (Sergio Jaramillo) was too busy (as indicated by his assistant), and the other person, Frank Pearl (former High Commissioner for Peace) never answered my request. With the guerrillas, in both the agenda setting and the interviews, it was extremely difficult to find a contact or to get an answer. This was due mainly to three facts: First, many of the guerrilla members that were involved in the negotiations were still in Cuba, where there are very limited phone and internet connections. Second, there were a couple of FARC-EP members that agreed to answer the questions in writing, but they could not send the answers to me until their press office approved it, and that never happened. Third, most guerrilla members do not have a public email account, and even though some have Twitter, they did not reply to my attempts to contact them. Despite these limitations, in the end I had 30 quality interviews with people who were directly involved in the peace process.

In terms of validity and reliability, these two issues have been discussed for qualitative studies. According to Golafshani (2003) reliability refers to the precision of the instrument that is being used, and due to the nature of qualitative studies, reliability is a concept that usually is not taken into consideration. In many cases, in order to increase the reliability and validity in qualitative methods, triangulation (using different instruments) helps improve these concepts in the study. I used triangulation by checking primary sources, the people on both negotiation teams, against secondary sources, the journalists, scholars, international actors, and women’s organizations. In addition, I checked the information by examining newspaper and magazine articles, and any type of communication that any of these diverse groups produced.
Chapter 5

Three Cases: Historical Background

It is important to give a historical background to the cases before I start with the analysis of each case. As previously indicated, Colombia, El Salvador, and Guatemala were colonized by Spain in the early 16th century. For centuries, they were dominated by Spain, until the independence movements in the 19th century succeeded, first, Colombia in 1810, then El Salvador in 1821, and last Guatemala in 1821 (Gürtner, 2012). During the colonial period, the economy, politics, and social life were dominated by the upper class, who were from Spain, or direct descendants from the Spanish conquerors, while the native indigenous had few rights. In the century after independence much of the social and economic structure of the colonial period continued and Guatemala maintained its agricultural economy and exploitation over the largely indigenous majority. Guatemala appeared to progress little during the time of the industrial revolution, and during the 19th century “Guatemala lacked both a stable state, as opposed to a series of more or less long-lived strongmen, and a stable elite structure with clearly articulated goals” (McCreery 1994, p. 335). According to Guardia (2002), until the 19th century women in Latin America were portrayed as having beauty, family oriented, and heroic (this last quality especially in the indigenous life). Women were expected to talk little or not at all, live an honest and pure life, remain confined to the house, be under the power of a male figure, and follow the morals and values of the Catholic Church (Hampe Martinez, 2002).

For the purpose of my research, I provide a background that illustrates the political, economic, and social situation in Latin America during the 20th century. Civil society groups usually tend to emerge before the conflict. For example, in Latin America the feminist movement became stronger especially during the first part of the 20th century, mainly due to the formation of
suffragists’ groups, that were able to achieve women’s right to vote, starting in Ecuador in 1929 and ending with Paraguay in 1961 (Martin and Martin, 2000). As Stoltz Chinchilla (1991) explains, the women that were involved in the suffragist groups were mostly elite, educated, and had some type of job. In addition, there were other women’s groups that formed in a more informal setting, which helped later with the formation of more organized groups and eventually the organization of a women’s movement. These groups began on a small scale in the middle class and lower socioeconomic neighborhoods where women were helping each other with their families, and usually developed in communal kitchens (Safa, 1990). Impoverished women tended to organize themselves through the Catholic Church in Ecclesiastic Based Communities to help each other with their problems and needs, and eventually to fight for human rights (Álvarez, 1989).

Since independence from Spain or Portugal, most countries in Latin America (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Nicaragua Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay, Venezuela,) were at some point ruled by military regimes, and in the three cases I used in this study, the military ruled the countries before the armed conflict started. The military dictatorships were also combined with poor economic policies that led to civilian unrest and protest (Montecinos, 2001). In some cases, such as Colombia, the dictatorship did not last long (less than four years), but in others, such as Guatemala, they lasted decades. According to Verónica Montecinos (2001), military rule and the economic crisis in these countries led to the formation of opposition groups, and conflict erupted in the region.

For centuries, the role of women in Latin America’s society was considered to be in the family and not in public life. This was in part due to the influence that the Catholic Church had in Latin America’s society, specifically when the church saw women as self-sacrificing towards being the center of the family, morals, and virtues of society, and saw feminism as a threat to these
values. However, in the 1960s, liberation theology had developed in Latin America, and the role of some segments of the Catholic Church changed into advocating for social justice for the poor. In many places, especially in rural areas the church started to support women’s indigenous groups that were formed at the grassroots level that fought for human rights (Stoltz Chinchilla, 1991).

However, this family role was quickly undermined by the military regimes, the armed conflict, and the economic crises that occurred in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s. According to Safa (1990), first, the family nucleus was threatened or destroyed in many cases by the military regimes or by the guerrillas when the men were killed or other family members like children or other loved ones were also killed, destroying women’s private lives. Second, during these decades there was an increase of women in the labor forces, due to two reasons. First, women had to become primary breadwinners while the men were out fighting, and second, the economic crises forced women to get jobs to help support their households that could not survive on one income. These changes in women’s lives made women conscious of the oppressions they were suffering and led them to organize in different groups and networks to demand protection and recognition of their rights. The social movement was the response to the hardships created by the conflict and the economic crises that affected the lower and middle classes the most (Safa, 1990).

Although the Church maintained significant influence in the 1970s, a larger middle class group of women had emerged, who had more education, and who were looking for women’s rights and equality, and were parting from some of the structures that kept them oppressed (Stoltz Chinchilla, 1991). Middle-class women were also making the women’s movement bigger, not only by fighting for their cause, but by studying, analyzing, and illustrating the problems that women had from the poor to the upper class, in areas of domestic violence, health services, education, and they began creating centers and action projects in these areas that could help women (Safa, 1990).
Also, women in Latin America influenced by the second wave of feminism had an impact on the formation of the women’s movements in the 1970s in Latin America. In 1975, the United Nations Conference on Women took place in Mexico City, opening the door for discussion about women’s issues. At the same time, there was pressure from the international community, where development organizations were also pushing for more gender-inclusive programs tied to funding and resources (Montecinos, 2011).

It is important to note that even though there are many women’s groups that are feminist groups, that does not mean that the women’s movement is a feminist movement. Scholars such as Lamas (2001) and Monzón (2015), indicate that there is a clear distinction between the feminist movement and the women’s movement: the feminist movement fights for women’s freedom, equality of gender, and change in gender relations, especially changing a social structure that oppressed and exploited women in a patriarchal society. What is important is that during the peace negotiation process, many feminist groups joined the broader women’s movement, to fight for the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace negotiation and the peace agreement.

In addition, these conflicts led to women joining rebel groups (voluntarily or in some cases involuntarily) as direct participants, which in turn led to a change of thinking in the overall role of women during conflict, eventually acknowledging their contributions as combatants and not viewing them as just victims (Stoltz Chinchilla, 1991). It is important to point out that joining a revolutionary group did not mean that gender roles were equal. Many of the patriarchal structures were also in place in the rebel forces, and some roles such as cooks and/or “nurse” were all that was considered to be appropriate for the women. However, the visible role of women in revolutionary war, and in human rights groups, encouraged more women to change their traditional role in society, and it prompted women to get involved with more feminist ideas, creating women’s
caucuses and commissions, to increase women’s leadership in society (Stoltz Chinchilla, 1991). Women not only mobilized for human rights, but also for women’s political participation opportunities, rights as workers in unions, and women’s poverty in these countries; these issues made women come together and organize, exchange information, create networks, and become activists for their issues too (Safa, 1990; Montecinos, 2001).

During the 1980s, as more pressure started to accumulate for ending the military regimes and moving towards a democratic space, many of the women’s organizations had become louder and started a change throughout the continent. There was a change in not only advocating for human rights, but also for gender equality, especially union participation, political representation, and for women’s health and reproductive rights (Safa, 1990). They achieved this through different ways, such as women getting involved in politics at different levels (Alvarez, 1989). Also, women’s groups and organizations found a space at the local and national levels, using academic institutions, activism and action groups, and developing women’s research, women’s centers, and women’s studies programs that expanded their feminist agenda, where gender, not labor, was the unifying factor in the women’s movement (McGee Deutsch, 1989).

In my research, the cases I am studying have very similar characteristics in the creation and organization of women’s groups and the women’s movement. In each of the different women’s groups that originated, the women became members of a group because they identified with the experience of the other members, and they shared oppressions. It is not just women, it is a multitude of women’s groups, with each group having a different claim to oppression. Just being a woman was not the only source of oppression, there were other factors, such as being indigenous or socioeconomic circumstances, life as combatants, lack of education, and refugee status.
In the next three chapters I analyze the process of how women’s issues get added to or excluded from the peace negotiation and agreements in Guatemala, El Salvador, and Colombia. I start with Guatemala and El Salvador, as these two cases are further along in the implementation of their peace processes. Guatemala’s peace negotiation started in 1991 and it ended in 1996 with a peace agreement. El Salvador’s peace negotiations started in 1990 and ended in 1992 with a peace agreement. These cases have also been covered extensively by scholars, as explained in the Methods section previously. Then I analyze the case of Colombia where I was able to use primary sources, as the peace process just took place, starting in 2012 and ending with the signature of the peace agreement in November of 2016.

As I previously indicated, my purpose in this study is to answer questions of how women’s issues made it to the peace agreement, by using multiple case studies in which my primary methodology is process tracing. Through this method, I identified what I believe are the causal mechanisms connecting the independent variable and dependent variable. In order to test the causal mechanisms, the following three chapters provide an overview of the conflict and the peace process in the cases I used in this study and testing the three causal mechanisms: an active women’s movement, the women’s movement frame alignment, and the collaboration between the women’s movement and the negotiation teams.

In the course of conducting this study, I did not find existing work that examines the partnership between women and men and the inclusion of women’s issues on the peace agreement. Most of the scholarship has concentrated on why it is important to have women present at the peace negotiations, or why women lack representation at the negotiations and peace agreement. But I did not find any work on why or how women’s issues came to be included in peace agreements. The causal mechanisms between the partnership of men and women, and the inclusion
of women’s issues in a peace agreement have never been explored. I started with Guatemala as it was the first case that included women’s issues in the peace agreement. In chapter 7, I use the case of El Salvador for contrast, as its peace agreement did not include women’s issues. In chapter 8, I use the case of Colombia, which is the most recent peace process, and it included women’s issues in the peace agreement.
Chapter 6

Guatemala

The Conflict

The history of the conflict in Guatemala started with colonization from Spain, followed by centuries of oppression of the indigenous population, especially through the labor of the land taken by the elites. After independence from Spain in 1821, the conditions of the indigenous population did not improve, and frequent violent clashes erupted between farmers and the wealthy landowners (Chang et al., 2015). It is important to indicate that approximately 60 percent of the population in Guatemala is indigenous, from 22 different ethnic groups, including the Mayan, the Garifunda, and the Xinca which are the three predominant groups (Alvarez & Palencia Prado, 2002). Although some Guatemalans prefer to identify as Hispanic, the Guatemalan population is usually recognized as being indigenous or being mestizo (ladino); the Hispanic/ladino population continued the structure of oppression that had been imposed during colonial times, controlling politics, the economy, and social structures in Guatemala, over the indigenous population (Chang et al., 2015).

The upper class in Guatemala controlled most of the land in the country, while the rest of the population, especially the indigenous population, lived in poverty, and the state was divided by deep inequality. Also, the government was controlled by the military, business, and ladino elites, with little democracy (Chang et al., 2015). There was a democratic period in the country, from 1944 to 1954, that ended with the overthrow of President Jacobo Árbenz. This was supported by the United States because it feared an expansion of communism due to the agrarian reforms Árbenz’s government was conducting (Jonas, 2000). At the same time, the landowners, the military, and the business elites had the majority of the wealth, while the majority of the population lived in poverty (Reilly, 2009). From the 1970s until the middle of the 1980s, the government was
controlled by the military, and it launched several attacks against the guerrilla groups. At the same time, a group of exiles decided to form a counter-revolutionary force, which originated in the ranks of the military (Alvarez & Palencia Prado, 2002). They were also joined and influenced by people from the Communist Party.

In 1982, the four main guerrilla groups (Fuerzas Armadas Rebeldes, Ejercito Guerrillero de los Pobres, Partido Guatemalteco del Trabajo, and Organizacion del Pueblo en Armas) united forces against the powerful military and created the Unidad Revolucionaria Nacional Guatemalteca (URNG), formed mostly by the indigenous and lower middle-class populations, with the goal of overthrowing the government and establishing a Marxist government (Jonas, 2000). The military, under the command of General Efrain Ríos Montt, reacted to the formation of the URNG by conducting a death campaign, especially in the rural areas and the highlands, where most of the indigenous population lived. This military action resulted in the death of approximately 150,000 people and more than a million refugees and internally displaced people. It also made the URNG weaker (Alvarez & Palencia Prado, 2002). At the same time, the country fell into an economic recession, and pressure from the international arena started to build up, calling for the end of the conflict and a transition to democracy. Due to these conditions, the military agreed to have elections in 1984, which were won by Vinicio Cerezo Arevalo from the Guatemalan Christian Democrat party. For Guatemalan society, this was the first step towards democracy and the end of the conflict.

There were also global developments that influenced Guatemala’s transition to peace, such as the formation of the Contadora Group, name after the island where the presidents of Colombia, Mexico, Panama, and Venezuela first met, that looked at the origins of the conflict in Latin America and the possible solutions without the intervention of the United States (Alvarez &
Palencia Prado, 2002). This first group led to the Esquipulas (1986) and Esquipulas II (1987), the Guatemalan city where all the presidents from Central American countries discussed economic cooperation, but, more importantly, agreed that democracy was the mechanism that needed to be used to end the conflict (Alvarez & Palencia, 2002). In the Esquipulas I agreement (Appendix E), presidents from Central America met in Guatemala and agreed on economic cooperation between the states and the need to have a peaceful resolution for ending the civil wars in different countries; the Esquipulas II agreement (Appendix F) focused more towards a specific plan for ending the conflict and moving towards democracy with the help of the international community (Accord, 1997). The conflict was still taking place in Guatemala during Esquipulas II, and even though the URNG was weak, the military powerful, and a democratic president had been elected, violence had never ended. According to Alvarez and Palencia Prado (2002), the URNG knew it was not possible for the group to defeat the military, and it was willing to negotiate as long as there were no more attacks on the group.

In 1989, the Catholic Church increased its role in favor of negotiations and ending the conflict. It was able to influence the government to create the National Reconciliation Commission (CRN) that oversaw the implementation of the Esquipulas agreements, but also led to the creation of the Grand National Dialogue, which were talks that included participation from different groups of the civil society (Alvarez & Palencia Prado, 2002). In March of 1990, the Oslo Accords were announced and signed, in which the URNG and the CRN agreed to negotiate the end of the conflict and the beginning of the peace. They also agreed to include civil society, where main representatives would have consultations with the two parties. In May of 1994 the Civil Society Assembly was created, which included the women’s movement; these negotiations lasted six years
and led to the signature of a comprehensive peace agreement, the Agreement on a Firm and Lasting Peace, on December 29, 1996.

In order to test how the inclusion of women’s issues came about in Guatemala’s peace process, I used the four-stage life cycle of Social Movement Theory: emergence, coalescence, institutionalization, and decline. Using this life cycle, I explored the women’s movement in Guatemala before and during negotiations because this allowed me to examine the mobilization of the women’s movement, the framing of issues by this movement, and whether there was collaboration between the women’s movement and the negotiation team.

**Pre-negotiation**

The first stage took place during the pre-negotiation stage. According to Bendelac Gordon (2015) the violent environment (massacres, forced displacement, etc.) from the war in Guatemala had strong repercussions on the social and economic lives of Guatemalans that led to a women’s movement with capacity to intervene in the conflict and the negotiations; it was the violence, the conflict, the military dictatorship, that made women fight because it affected them in a different way than it did men.

The pre-negotiation stage is where the emergence of the women’s movement takes place. The emergence stage is the period in which part of society feels discontent, but there has not been a real organization or mobilization of this discontent, people are just complaining about their situation and do not see these complaints as something that needs to be addressed collectively (Pullum, 2014). Most of the women’s groups in Guatemala had started to form, but there was no women’s movement yet because there groups were not coming under one umbrella; they were working individually. Even though there were few women’s organizations, women did participate in mixed organizations, especially within the revolutionary groups, fighting for socioeconomic
changes in the rural and indigenous areas (Destrooper, 2014). Again, this was actually not a women’s movement, but different women’s groups that the conflict had birthed. This is where the different groups talked about their discontent with their situation, meaning how the conflict was affecting them.

The coalescence stage followed as the next step. Women created new spaces for political participation where they could act as agents of change and were able to organize, no matter what the age, social status, ethnic groups, religion background, with their common agenda moving towards democracy, protecting human’s rights, providing justice, economic equality, and peace (Bendelac Gordon, 2015). It is important to remember that during the coalescence stage, the women started to organize, unify, and pull resources through different methods, such as joining the rebel groups, creating women’s groups through their neighborhoods or communities, and joining union groups. It is here that the women’s movement starts taking shape.

As Chang et al. (2015, p. 54) explained “women, in many ways, bore the brunt of the direct, structural, and cultural violence. They were subjected to targeted attacks, including mass rape, forced impregnation, imprisonment, torture, and sexual abuse by military personnel, and members of the authoritarian regime. At the same time, they were secondary victims as wives, mothers, sisters, and daughters of disappeared male family members.” Also, for the male leaders of the guerrilla’s movements, women’s rights were not part of the conflict, and they ignored or made little effort to acknowledge the role of women in the fight, but also how the conflict had affected women differently (Destrooper, 2014). In Guatemala, by the mid-1980s, ethnicity, social class, and geographic location were decisive factors and categories in how women’s groups changed and organized. The feminist organizations that were made up by ladino women and upper middle-class were located in the urban areas, while the less feminist groups with less education were located in
the rural areas, the vast majority of which were indigenous (Bendelac Gordon, 2015). It was in this decade that the women’s movement consolidated, and it started to voice women’s demands, needs, and priorities (Monzón, 2015).

It is important to remember that the indigenous population in Guatemala was the most affected by the conflict. As previously mentioned, three-fifths of the country’s population was indigenous, and they were the most vulnerable when attacked by the military forces. It is estimated that more than 30,000 women were victims of sexual violence and torture during the conflict, and of those 89 percent were indigenous women (Yoc Cosajay, 2014). Also, the indigenous population was almost three times poorer that the non-indigenous, the life expectancy was 13 years less than the ladino, and only about five percent of the college population were indigenous (Stephen, 2017). The indigenous survived the violence of the conflict, but there were deep transformations in their communities. For example, the men were killed during the conflict, forcing the women to become the breadwinners, and forcing the women to become refugees in other countries.

During the 1980s, the women’s movement experienced high activism. According to Aguilar (1997), there were two sectors within the movement that started to become really active, and demand respect for human rights, a peace process, and the demilitarization of society. The first sector consisted of groups that had thousands of female victims of the conflict. Some of the women’s organizations during this period were CONAVIGUA (Coordinadora Nacional De Viudas de Guatemala—National Coordination of Guatemalan Widows) and GAM (Grupo de Apoyo Mutuo—Mutual Support Group), both groups looked for people that disappeared and were mainly formed by indigenous women (Bendelac Gordon, 2015). The GGM (Grupo Guatemalteca de Mujeres—Guatemalan Women’s Group), the GRUFEPROMEFAM (Grupo Femenino Pro Mejoramiento de la Familia—Women’s Group for the Betterment of Family Life), the
COMFUITAG (Comité de Mujeres FESTRAS-UITA-Guatemala—Women’s Union of Food and Workers) were groups that they dealt with specific women’s issues that were caused by the war (Berger, 2006). The second sector were the feminist groups that had a different experience of the conflict, they usually had an academic background, joined unions and political parties (Aguilar, 1997). Some of the organizations were Tierra Viva, Grupo Guatemalteco de Mujeres, and the COAMUGUA (Coordinadora de Agrupaciones de Mujeres de Guatemala—Coordinator of Guatemalan Women’s Groups) (Monzón, 2015). In the indigenous communities, new women leaders emerged such as Rigoberta Manchú who were dedicated to promoting indigenous rights, and Rosalina Toyuc, who led the widows from the violence movement (Camus, 2000).

At this point in time, the Guatemala’s women’s movement combined these two sectors, where it was women organizing women to fight for gender equality and social justice. It had the arduous task of combining different women’s groups that had different ideologies. This is where the different women’s groups started to overcome intersectionality. Besides being women, each group had other identities, such as being indigenous, ladino, rural, urban, and such. This is what the women’s movement was made up of, different women’s groups, with different backgrounds, needs, experiences, but with one thing in common: they were all women that had been affected by the conflict. Berger (2006) explains that many of the leaders of these groups had been part of different women’s groups in the previous decades; also, they had different experiences of the conflict and came from different sectors of society, such as being an elite, or exile, or educated women that did not identify with the indigenous women’s movement that was already organized.

Women’s groups in Guatemala had become active, and the women had learned skills and methods, and had acquired tools to help them organize, mobilize, and create more women’s groups and increase their activism (Destrooper, 2014). Here is where the women’s movement started to
become active and present, especially when the peace negotiations were announced and started to take place. According to Berger (2006) and Montes Solís (1999), the different types of women’s organizations, such as refugee-based women groups, human rights activists, guerrilla fighters, women’s unions, indigenous women’s groups, found that gender was the common denominator that they could use to unify. For example, in 1990, the Guatemalan’ refugee women in Mexico organized under the Mamá Maquín group, with more than 9,000 members. The indigenous women that were part of this group started to change from the traditional roles that indigenous women had in their communities; they began to incorporate themselves into projects, they stopped being isolated from their communities, and started to become literate and participated in new educational programs (Camus, 2000). Mamá Maquín worked together with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to bring services for the refugee population, and expand some of the traditional roles that Guatemalan indigenous women had (García, 1995). By the time the peace negotiations started, it was evident that the indigenous women had lost their fear to express themselves, to organize, march, and protest the conflict, and to talk about the issues that previously were ignored (Centro de Estudios de Guatemala, 2016).

The different women’s organizations were able to indicate and illustrate the needs, experiences, interests, and expectations that women shared as a result of their shared gender. In 1991, the assassination of Dinorah Perez, director of a women’s institute and political activist, led to the creation of the Red de la No Violencia Contra la Mujer (Network of No Violence Against Women). The women’s movement took this as the opportunity to illustrate and point out to the rest of society the type of violence that women suffered in Guatemala during the conflict due to the inequality between women and men (Monzón, 2015). The different groups that were part of
the women’s movement understood that they needed to frame their cause to present their demands as a unifying movement.

In Social Movement Theory, the framing perspective attempts to explain why and how social movement ideas are understood by the populations involved, how people construct their reality, and how they interpret their problems and grievances. For the women, the severity of the conflict, the conditions in which women were victimized, and the way in which each women’s group experienced the conflict differently, made it possible for the women’s movement to energize, grow, expand, and become active during the conflict (Chang et al., 2015). For the women’s movement, it was important to explain to the rest of Guatemala’s society, and the world, what the women’s reality was during the conflict, what the conflict had done to women, and how it had affected them.

The Negotiations

This phase started in April, 1991, with the peace negotiations between the government and the URNG without any participation from civil society, but the negotiations stalled when President Serrano attempted a self-coup d'état (Page et al., 2009). In January, 1994, the United Nations and a group of supporting countries (Colombia, Mexico, Norway, Spain, Venezuela, and the United States) restarted the peace process between the two parties (Page et al., 2009). This group of friends had two functions in the peace process: first, to support the UN to make the process go as smoothly and quickly as possible; second, to be witnesses of the points agreed to by the parties and making the overall agreement process safe for all (Centro de Estudios de Guatemala, 2016).

By the time the peace negotiations started, an active women’s movement was present in Guatemala. As previously indicated, there were multiple women’s organizations with different agendas. The women’s movement was based on the different women’s groups’ experiences from
the war, and they had different purposes such as looking for the missing or disappeared people, fighting for human’s rights, and demanding an end to the conflict. According to Mélanie Gonin (2004), there was a clear division in the movement by what each of these different organizations within the women’s movement did based on social class. The organizations with upper and middle-class members typically had university degrees, and had focused on reproductive rights and sexual preferences; and the organizations with lower social class members had little or no education, and were mostly poor and indigenous women focusing on human rights (for victims of conflict/combatants).

Continuing with the social movement’s life cycle in the third stage, institutionalization, the social movement group gets organized with “hierarchical leadership structure, they hire paid staff, and they also have a considerable degree of access to policymakers” (Pullum, 2014, p. 1382). What usually started as a grass-roots movement with different groups may have grown into a national movement or may have affiliated with a bigger group at this stage (Pullum, 2014). In this stage, the women had more experience working in all the different groups, but also recognized that there is a need to have women’s issues included in the peace agenda and agreement.

According to Palencia and Holiday (1996), during the peace processes there was an evident need to establish the relationship between the government and the civil society, especially because the government needed to become a public force with all the citizens, and the citizens were only able to express themselves through the different nongovernmental organizations that made up the civil society. On January 10, 1994, the government and the URNG encouraged the creation of the Civil Society Assembly (Asamblea de la Sociedad Civil, ASC) to help the negotiation table with suggestions, proposals, and recommendations from different civil society groups, but originally it excluded women’s organizations (Costello et al., 1997). The ASC originally represented different
sectors of Guatemala’s civil society, such as business groups, trade unions, political parties, human rights organizations, religious groups, indigenous peoples, academics, nongovernmental organizations, research centers, and media, but they did not have a seat at the table, they just presented suggestions and recommendations from these groups to the negotiation teams (Berg, 2006).

Bendelac (2015), indicated that when the women’s organizations (such as Tierra Viva, Convergencia Cívica Política de Mujeres, and CONAVIGUA) realized that women’s organizations and women’s issues had been excluded from the ASC, they organized a movement that demanded participation within the ASC, which was granted in May, 1994. The different women’s groups organized in the ASC as the Women’s Sector (Sector de Mujeres). Cross (2004) explained that the groups in the Women’s Sector formed alliances, participated with all the other groups in the ASC, and formed their own common agenda. For example, the indigenous movement, worked with the Women’s Sector for the inclusion of the indigenous women’s rights, especially in the areas of land and violence against women (Centro de Estudios de Guatemala, 2016). The Women’s Sector emerged when the formation of the women’s movement, made up of different women’s organizations with different backgrounds, came together under one umbrella with a common purpose. According to Berg (2006), the creation of the Women’s Sector helped the women’s movement because it made it stronger, but also made it look united with one purpose even though it was made up by different groups, but they represented all the different sectors of Guatemala’s society.

Susan Berg (2006) indicated that there were 32 women’s groups composing what is now known as the Women’s Sector (Sector de Mujeres) in the ASC from all areas of society, such as unions, human rights, refugees, students, feminists, etc. The women that led the Women’s Sector
were “Mariel Aguilar, María Eugenia Mijangos, Fermina López, Sonia Escobedo, María Dolores Marroquín, María Eugenia Lemus, Olivia Pelicó, Maritza Velásquez, and Yolanda Pérez” (Mendez & Barrios, 2010). The Women’s Sector demanded diversity and gender representation in the ASC and peace accords (Sector de Mujeres, 1997). The Women’s Sector focused on fighting for the inclusion of women’s needs and interests in the peace negotiation talks and in the final agreement (Monzos, 2015). It is important to indicate that this Women’s Sector did not push for gender equality, but concentrated on broader social justice issues, such as the return of refugees, land distribution, reparations to victims especially for women (Chang et al., 2015). The Women’s Sector expressed their recommendations about women’s living conditions and the decay of the family structure, as well as some specific economic demands looking for alternatives especially when gender inequality was present, such as in land ownership (Palencia & Holiday, 1996).

Chang et al. (2015), indicated that the Women’s Sector had to fight with patriarchal structures within the ASC, due to the fact that they were not being taken seriously by the other sectors and that the leadership was composed of men; and for the same reason it was necessary to form alliances with the other sectors in the ASC. By working together on proposals and recommendations over time there was a collaborative feeling between all the sectors. The ASC had its own negotiation table where all the different groups talked and agreed on the most important issues that they wanted to present to the peace negotiation table; this is where the Women’s Sector was able to organize and submit their recommendations (Méndez & Barrios, 2010; Bendelac Gordon, 2015). The Women’s Sector created alliances with other women that were part of the different groups of the ASC, which was key for the support they needed when presenting their recommendations to the ASC (Page et al., 2009). For the first time in the history of Guatemala,
women were able to present their demands and recommendations to help build up a new democratic Guatemala that included women (Navarro Miranda, 1996).

According to Luz Méndez (2015), there were the only two women in the delegations as plenipotentiaries, and actually, she [Méndez] was the only woman that participated since the beginning of the talks, while Raquel Zelaya joined the government’s delegation in 1996. There were other women on the negotiation teams, but they were only support to the negotiators; in other words they were part of the second-tier negotiators. These individuals were Teresa Bolaños, member of the National Commission of Reconciliation (1991-93); Arlena Cifuentes, advisor for the mediator (1991); Aracely Conde, advisor for the peace commission of the government (1992); Rosa María Wantland, Margarita Hurtado, Judith Erazo, and Olga Pérez, URNG advisors (1996) (Méndez & Barrios, 2010). The Women’s Sector role within the ASC was to make sure that women’s issues were included in the ASC’s negotiation process, and once these were accepted by the ASC, then, the head of the ASC, Monsignor Quezada Toruño, presented the recommendations to the peace negotiation table (Page et al., 2009). Most of the women that were part of the second-tier had also been members of different women’s organizations before the conflict and promoted the inclusion of the recommendations that the Women’s Sector submitted (Méndez & Barrios, 2010).

However, there was only one woman that really pushed for the inclusion of women’s issues, and that was Luz Méndez; in her own words, she indicated

that at the very beginning I was not aware of a gender dimension … one year after the negotiations began, I had had enough time to realize, and enough experiences to realize, that something was wrong, that I was not equal to my colleagues … that they did not look at me as an equal, but also the rest of the men taking part in the peace negotiation. (Cross, 2004, p. 23)
Luz Méndez felt that she needed support from other people outside the negotiation and joined the National Union of Guatemalan Women (UNAMG). This was an organization that started during the conflict to promote women’s rights, however, most of its members were killed or exiled in Mexico where the peace negotiations were taking place (Méndez, 2015). By joining the organization, she began to develop a feminist perspective, and to understand the patriarchal structures of the negotiations and of Guatemala’s society, which according to her was a turning point in her life (Cross, 2004; Méndez 2015).

At the same time, the ASC was created, and once the Women’s Sector recommendations arrived at the negotiation table, Méndez felt the need to make sure those women’s issues were included as much as possible. In the end all the recommendations that the Women’s Sector made were accepted and included in the peace agreement (Page et al., 2009) (for a detailed list, see Appendix G). Also, in 1995, the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women took place in Beijing, China, and Méndez attended the conference. During a workshop in Beijing she met a former woman commander of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN) who told her that even though women actively participated in the armed conflict in El Salvador and there was a woman as a negotiator in the peace talks, they did not include anything about women’s issues or women at all; this made an impact on Méndez who did not want that to happen to Guatemalan women too (Cross, 2004).

The way Méndez explained the importance of including women issues was addressed “with my own colleagues in internal meetings, then the moderator, and in some cases, I could address the governmental delegates through plenary meetings” (Women’s UN Report Network, 2015). Méndez did not have a direct contact with the Women’s Sector, as the peace talks were taking place in Mexico, and the ASC was in Guatemala. Still the recommendations from the Women’s
Sector made it to the table, “and I began to work on them, improved them, added some other ideas that I thought were necessary” (Cross, 2004, p. 25). She indicated that “while I was sensitive to women’s issues, the ASC provided me with concrete recommendations to present at the negotiations” (Page et al., 2009). This was not an easy process at all, as explained by Méndez:

Several negotiators initially were reluctant to accept that specific commitments in favor of women, such as the penalization of sexual harassment or the creation of an office for the defense of the indigenous women, to be included in the peace accords. They said they had never seen such types of issues included in peace agreements … during the last round of negotiations I spoke in the plenary meeting to defend the content of the women’s chapter to be included in the accord. I had to provide convincing and strategic evidence … at the end, the government accepted the whole proposal. (Méndez, 2015)

Susan Berg (2006) indicated that the Women’s Sector work in the ASC expanded the women’s movement work to a national and international level, attracting more women to join the movement, organizing themselves into a more established structure, and providing a platform for change. In the end, the Women’s Sector was able to include their recommendations to the peace agreement in five areas: Agreement on Identity and of Indigenous Peoples, Agreement for Resettlement of the Populations Uprooted by the Armed Confrontation, Agreement on Socioeconomic Aspects and Agrarian Situation, Agreement on the Strengthening of Civil Power and Function of the Army in a Democratic Society, and Agreement on Chronogram for the Implementation, Compliance and Verification of the Peace Agreements (Méndez & Barrios, 2010). Also, the National Women’s Forum (Foro Nacional de la Mujer), an official institution made up by all different women organizations and State institutions, was created as a result of the peace agreement. Its mission is to help with the implementation of the commitments contained in the peace agreement, and any other conventions and international treaties related to women and ratified by Guatemala’s government (Berg, 2006).
Table 4.

**Guatemala’s Women Sector recommendations included in the peace agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peace Agreement Section</th>
<th>Women’s Sector Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Agreement on Human Rights</td>
<td>Guaranteed rights for women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminate discrimination against women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure women’s rights to participate in civil power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement for the Resettlement of Population Displaced by the Armed Confrontation</td>
<td>Guarantees for the resettlement of the displaced populations, to make particular emphasis on the promotion of families headed by women, particularly women and orphans have been most affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement on the Identity and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples</td>
<td>Criminalize the sexual harassment of the indigenous women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combat the discrimination against women in agrarian reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement on the Strengthening of Civil Power and the Rule of the Military in a Democratic Society</td>
<td>Strengthen women’s organizations in rural and urban settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement on Socioeconomic Issues and the Agrarian Reform</td>
<td>Equality of opportunities and conditions, promoting women’s access to study, training, credit, land, productive and technological resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation of women in economic and social development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognize the obligation of the state to promote the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognize the undervalued contribution of women in all aspects of economic and social activity, particularly her work in favor of improving the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* This table illustrates the sections in Guatemala’s peace agreement that included the recommendations made by the Women’s Sector. *Sources:* Morale, Trujillo “Las obligaciones legislativas”; and Waugh, “Gender issues in the special objective” Inside Kumar 2001.

It is important to remember that even though there was a women’s movement, that does not mean that all the organizations that were part of this movement agreed with each other. Most of the organizations had different backgrounds, goals, and working methods, so a women’s movement is not a homogeneous group, but a compound of many different groups (Destrooper,
Towards the end of the peace negotiations, the movement started to fragment and each group started to push for their own agendas (Bendelac Gordon, 2015). At the same time, what made them successful in achieving change were these diverse groups coming together and uniting behind some collective goals and using their leverage effectively to have these included.

Throughout the case of Guatemala’s peace process, I walked through what I believe are the causal mechanisms connecting my independent variable and my dependent variable. There was an active women’s movement during the peace process. As previously indicated, an active women’s movement means that the movement is participating with advocacy, mobilization actions, demanding change, and becoming activists for the movement’s goals. As illustrated, the women’s movement became very active during the 1980s, and by the time the peace negotiations started they took action when they were not invited to the ASC and demanded the participation of the women’s movement under what they called the Women’s Sector. Guatemala’s women’s movement was active and demanded their participation in the peace negotiations and succeeded because they framed their message where they made all the groups that formed the movement, as well as other sectors of Guatemala’s society, understand what women had gone through during the conflict and how the armed conflict had affected women differently than men.

However, one of the causal mechanisms is collaboration between the women’s movement and the negotiation teams. Here, I find that the collaboration was informal, or really did not exist. Even though Luz Méndez did work to include the Women’s Sector’ recommendations, there is no evidence that the Women’s Sector and Méndez collaborated. I did find evidence that the Women’s Sector never met with the negotiation table, and that they never had direct contact with the negotiators. There was barely any communication between the Women’s Sector and the
negotiation teams. All interaction between them was done through submitting the proposals to the ASC and the ASC took them to the table.

It is true that Luz Méndez was the person who took the recommendations from the Women’s Sector and fought to include them, but this was not because there was a collaboration between the Women’s Sector and Luz Méndez. Luz Méndez had become empathic to the Women’s Sector proposals, because of her own realization of not being seen as equal by the men on the negotiation teams, because of her joining into a women’s organization, and because of listening to the experiences of women in El Salvador’s peace process. However, this was not a collaboration between her and the Women’s Sector, but a individual person who realized it was important and decided to help.

Also, I did not find evidence that the men inside the negotiation teams were opposed to the inclusion of women’s issues. The Women’s Sector submitted few proposals, and that is probably why there was no opposition by the men on both negotiating teams. I was able to speak with Raquel Zelaya, the other plenipotentiary woman at the table on the government’s team during the last year of the negotiations (1996). She indicated that while they had to explain some things to the men, such as that women were now the heads of the household [jefa de hogar] there was no opposition from the men to include women’s issues.

**Alternative Explanation**

It is important to analyze alternative explanations for the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace agreement. The other alternative explanation is the pressure from international actors. Bendelac Gordon (2015), explained that the women’s movement was stronger and sought support from international organizations, specifically nongovernmental organizations that support women’s issues and provided them with financial aid. Nongovernmental organizations had been
working in Guatemala for decades, especially in the areas of development and human rights, focusing on the indigenous population. During the conflict they were able to report to the world the crimes committed by the military repression, at the same time as providing support to the population affected (Costello et al., 1997).

The armed conflict started in Guatemala almost at the same time that the Third Wave of feminism started. The Third wave started in the 1960s, and is still taking place, but it also had a power surge in the 1990s when sexual harassment and sexual violence against women became more public; at the same time, feminists demanded change in patriarchal systems in the world (Monzón, 2015). Many Guatemalan women’s groups participated in 1975 at the United Nations Conference on Women in Mexico City. The women’s movement in Guatemala was not strong at the time, but with the Conference taking place, Guatemalan women were influenced by the international context, and they took this opportunity to reflect on their situation (Bendelac Gordon, 2015). Even though international organizations supported women’s groups in Guatemala, there were strings attached to this support. Many international organizations pushed for the inclusion of women and women’s issues in the peace process and agreement; however, they also pressured them by withholding funding, while trying to submit their own agenda, and Guatemalan women’s groups did not welcome that influence (Booth, 1998).

Also, it is important to look at the role of the United Nations in Guatemala’s peace process. Initially, in 1991 the UN just had an observer role and helped create trust between the parties (Centro de Estudios de Guatemala, 2016). In 1993, this role changed, and the United Nations named Jean Arnault as the mediator for Guatemala’s peace process; however, this did not mean that he had decision-making power, nor power to change the agenda that was being negotiated already. His role was to moderate the talks and make suggestions for the parties (Costello et al.,
1997). It is important to note that Jean Arnault supported Luz Méndez’s discussions about gender issues (Méndez & Barrios, 2010). However, he did not have power to negotiate, nor to include issues on the agreements.

There was also the role of the group of friends: Colombia, Mexico, Venezuela, Spain, Norway, and the United States. As previously indicated, the group of friends had two goals: first, help and support Jean Arnault so the negotiations keep taking place, and second, be witnesses that could provide strength and security to the points that the parties had agreed on (Centro de Estudios de Guatemala, 2016). Also, once the ASC was formed, the United Nations and the group of friends helped the ASC with monetary donations and training so the ASC members could dedicate themselves to their work and present the recommendations to the negotiation tables (Page et al., 2009). However, there is no evidence that any of these countries had suggested to include women’s issues, or even pushed for the inclusion of women’ issues. While they did provide some financial support, it was to the ASC and not to one particular group.

Even though there was an influence in the peace negotiation talks by different international actors, there is not enough evidence to indicate they could be one of the reasons why women’s issues were added into Guatemala’s peace agreement. I could not find any evidence directly from the UN, or the group of friends, or any international organization that indicated how they supported the Women’s Sector or the inclusion of women’s issues in the negotiations or the peace agreement. While Chang et al. (2015) indicated that Jean Arnault was supportive of the inclusion of women’s issues, they do not present any evidence, nor have I found any evidence about how he was supporting the inclusion of women’s issues. That does not mean he did not do it, just that there is not an explanation of how he did it.
While there is no evidence about what the international actors did to help for the inclusion of women’s issues in Guatemala’s peace agreement, even if that evidence existed, it is important to point out that they could not have been successful to push for the inclusion of women’s issues without the presence of an active women’s movement and the specific frame alignment used. The men and women on the negotiation teams cooperated to include women’s issues in Guatemala’s peace agreement because there was an active women’s movement using a frame alignment that explained why women’s issues needed to be included, and not because there was pressure from international actors.

**Conclusion**

Throughout the analysis of Guatemala’s peace process, I indicated through process tracing the causal mechanisms that worked (or did not work) in this case. I followed the sequence of events to find how women’s issues made it to the peace agreement, looking at the actors that participated, and who pushed for the inclusion, when they pushed for that inclusion, and what the response to the demand of including women’s issues was. The causal mechanisms that I analyzed were the active women’s movement, the frame alignment used by the women’s movement, and the collaboration between the women’s movement and the negotiation teams. To sum up:

**H1:** The cases where there is an active women’s movement are more likely to include women’s issues in the peace agreement. This was a necessary condition for the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace agreement.

As explained in Guatemala’s case, the different women’s groups realized they were being excluded from the peace process, so they organized under a movement, the Women’s Sector. The Women’s Sector made proposals and recommendations, and those proposals made it to the negotiation table. The work of the women’s movement was key to have women’s issues added in the peace agreement.
H2: The cases where the women’s movement used a frame alignment are more likely to include women’s issues in the peace agreement. This was also a necessary condition.

The women’s movement would not have been successful if they did not have a frame alignment that indicated why it was important to have women’s issues included. The different women’s groups that came together under the movement knew it was important to make others understand why it was necessary to have women’s issues in the peace agreement. For the women’s movement it was important to indicate that women have been the majority of victims in the conflict. Again, for the women’s movement, it was important to explain to the rest of Guatemala’s society, and the world, what the women’s reality was during the conflict, what the conflict had done to women, and how it has affected them.

In Guatemala’s case, the active women’s movement and the women’s movement frame alignment were necessary conditions, but also together they were sufficient for the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace process. The third causal mechanism, the collaboration between the women’s movement and the negotiation team, did not exist.

H3. The cases where there is collaboration between women’s organizations and negotiation teams are more likely to include women’s issues in the peace agreement. This was not a necessary nor sufficient condition.

As indicated in the analysis of Guatemala’s conflict, there was no evidence of a collaboration between the women’s movement and the negotiation teams. Even though Luz Méndez indicated that she made it her personal goal to include women’s issues, there was no evidence of collaboration between her and the Women’s Sector. She indeed was able to fight for
the inclusion of the proposals made by the Women’s Sector because she was empathic to their cause, and not because there was a collaboration between them.
Chapter 7

El Salvador

While El Salvador’s conflict occurred over a shorter period of time than Guatemala’s and Colombia’s conflicts, and its peace agreement was the first agreement signed of the three cases, the conflict was similar and as brutal as the other two cases. In El Salvador, there was a birth of women’s groups before and during the conflict; there was a big participation of women in the guerrilla forces. However, women’s issues were not included on the peace agreement.

The Conflict

The civil war lasted from 1979 to January 16, 1992, when a peace accord known as the Chapultepec Peace Agreement was signed between the government and the FMLN (Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional—Frabundo Martí National Liberation Front). The war left more than 70,000 people dead, approximately 10,000 missing, and over 1 million internally displaced of the 5 million people who lived in the territory at that time (Stephen, 1995; Silber, 2004). Most of the rural areas were abandoned, as many villages were attacked, the crops destroyed, and the people killed, leaving El Salvador’s highlands and rural areas mostly empty (Weiss Fagen & Yudelman, 2001).

Different scholars (Call, 2002; Viterna, 2006; Silber, 2004; Fenly, 2009) explain that after independence from Spain in 1839, El Salvador was ruled by 14 elite families in alliance with the military; however, the majority of the population was increasingly growing in opposition to this type of control. During the 1970s, different groups started to unite against the military rule and its attempts to overthrow the elected governments (Fenly, 2009). The Communist Party of El Salvador (PCS), the Nationalist Democratic Union, and the National Opposition Union joined in supporting the presidential candidate Jose Napoleon Duarte for the 1972 elections, as well as Ernesto
Claramount Roseville for the 1977 elections; both candidates won the elections, but in both cases the military and the government party (Party of the National Coalition) rigged the elections, responded with violence, and killed the activists that were protesting the frauds (Chavez, 2015). As a response to the frauds, the military violence, and the corruption, in 1979, five groups began armed resistance. These groups were the PCS Partido Comunista de El Salvador (Communist Party of El Salvador), the FPL (Fuerzas Populares de Liberacion Farabundo Marti—Popular Liberation Forces Farabundo Martí), the ERP (Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo—People’s Revolutionary Army), The RN (Resistencia Nacional—National Resistance) and the PRTC (Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores Centroamericanos—Revolutionary Party of Central American Workers) had begun a violent armed resistance and later organized into one group in 1980 under the name Farabundo Marti Front for National Liberation (FMLN) (Fenly, 2009). The organizations that united to form the FMLN were leftist groups with communist ideologies, formed mostly by trade union members and university students that were willing to go fight the elites and the state’s main political party, the Nationalist Republican Alliance (ARENA) (Chavez, 2015). This new unified group illustrated the different groups coming together to fight the government and the military, demanding changes in both urban and rural areas.

The military responded to the insurgency groups and attacked civilians in different parts of the country, especially indigenous peasants. One of the main issues in the conflict was the high level of inequality, reflected in land and wealth distribution, where the “richest 20 percent of Salvadorans controlled 66 percent of the wealth” (Stephen, 1995, p. 810). During the 1970s, the country suffered high rates of unemployment, which soon became the key point used by groups opposing the government to start conflict. While the United States backed El Salvador’s military and government, the FMLN was never defeated, and the conflict expanded to both rural and urban areas.
areas; in these areas the FMLN used its political networks, put several fronts in different parts of the country, and used combative strategies that the military did not expect (Chavez, 2015). According to Golden (1991), about 40 percent of El Salvador’s rural population was landless, and in a total population of 5 million people, 2 million lived in extreme poverty.

The FMLN leadership was made up of educated intellectuals, professionals, and academics that understood that the conflict was changing and adapted their goals and purposes according to those changes, and they realized that they needed to conduct peace talks to end the conflict (Chavez, 2015). According to Chavez (2015) during the early 1980s, the FMLN failed to conduct peace negotiations mainly because the military, the elites, and the U.S. government rejected any attempts to negotiate the peace; for the same reason, the FMLN decided to conduct an international diplomatic strategy, meeting with different leaders from Europe, Latin America, and Canada, who supported the need for peace talks.

The FMLN had two main objectives when they sat down to negotiate: “to undo militarism and to promote a transition to democracy in El Salvador. The rebel leadership did not demand structural socioeconomic reforms as a precondition to end the conflict” (Chavez, 2015, p. 1788). In 1989, Alfredo Cristitani, the candidate for the ARENA party, was elected president of El Salvador, and he was willing to negotiate directly with the FMLN to end the conflict, even though each side still thought they could defeat the other (Samayoa, 2002). However, even during the preliminary meeting, the conflict was still taking place, and due to a series of attacks from the military on rural farmers, union leaders, and priests, the FMLN conducted a large offensive against Cristiani’s government focused on the capital San Salvador. This illustrated the inability of the military to win the war, and the FMLN found itself in a position of strength to negotiate, while the government understood that it did not have any international support to continue with the war
By 1990, after a decade of civil war, with pressure from international actors, the withdrawal of U.S. support, and the fall of the Soviet Union, the two groups sat to negotiate the peace under the United Nations mediation that ended with the signature of the Chapultepec Agreement in January 16, 1992 (Samaya, 2002).

**Pre-negotiation**

Ready et al. (2001) explained that women’s groups in El Salvador can be tracked to 1932 when a strike led to a massacre, and later on when the Liga Femenina (Women’s League) organized to fight for women’s right to vote. According to Hipsher (2001), women in El Salvador had participated in political events since the early 20th century, encouraged especially by the urban middle class, who wanted women to join the cause for political reform towards a democratic government. However, even though the men wanted the women to join their cause, they also wanted women to keep the traditional role of mother and wife. Most of El Salvador’s rural villages followed a gender division of labor, where men worked the land while the women took care of the family, and in the cases where there was not enough money, the women may find small jobs like cooking for others to provide an extra income (Viterna, 2013).

As previously indicated, the emergence stage in Social Movement Theory is where different groups start to emerge, where they feel discontent about the conflict and how it is affecting them. By the 1960s and 1970s, the military rule in El Salvador had led to the formation of resistance groups, which were highly influenced by the liberation theology from the Catholic Church, which advocated for the poorest and more oppressed groups in society, with the goal of helping and educating them (Kampwirth, 2002). The groups (both rebel and religious) that promoted better economic reforms and that taught that poverty was a condition that could be avoided were the first targets of military attacks (Roggeveen, 2003).
As everywhere, all the women in El Salvador were affected by the armed conflict. Some of the women in El Salvador started to organize against the government forces, especially because they were feeling the effects of the war: the family unit was destroyed, the men went and took up arms while the women became the main breadwinners, were displaced, and lived in an unstable situation; at the same time the women that supported the military (mostly upper-class women) were afraid to leave their houses because of kidnapping threats (Ready et al., 2001). In El Salvador, there was a variety of women that joined the rebel forces, some had participated in union movements, some were teachers with university degrees that were part of the middle class and from urban areas (Roggeveen, 2003). Others came from the rural areas as a way to escape from the military oppression and the fear of being raped (Viterna, 2013).

Following the emergence stage is the coalescence stage, where different groups start to organize, unify, and pull resources through different methods, such as joining the rebellious groups, creating groups through their neighborhoods or communities, and joining union groups. It is here that the women’s movement starts taking shape, and the possibility of creating a movement starts to arise. By the 1960s and 1970s, there was an increase of grassroots women’s groups throughout El Salvador, combining different groups. According to Golden (1991), in the 1970s, women started to join or create organizations that were fighting to improve people’s lives, especially those that were living in poverty, such as the teacher’s union (ANDES) and the Association of Salvadorian Women (AMES) that helped with child care and women’s health care. Montgomery (1995), explained that with the presidential frauds in the 1970s, the organization of guerrilla groups took place mostly in the urban areas, in the universities of the capital, while getting support in forces in the country side, but they also allowed women to join if they were willing to fight.
Luciak (1999) and Montgomery (1995) indicate that out of the 15,009 combatant FMLN forces, 4,492 were women, which amounts to about 30 percent of the combatant forces, and about 20 percent of the FMLN leadership were women—almost double the women’s forces compared to Guatemala’s which is estimated at only 15 percent. The reasons women became more active in the FMLN as combatants was their migration to urban areas, their family participation in opposition groups or forces, and their membership in labor unions or student networks and activism, where the women found themselves as part of pre-existing networks that would lead them to have a more public and political participation in El Salvador. It is important to mention that most urban women that lived and worked in urban areas were members of a labor union before they joined the guerrillas (Kampwirth, 2002). Once the guerrilla groups organized under the FMLN, they understood that women’s organizations helped them not only as combatants, but in other roles such as creating women’s groups that supported the cause and providing training for the women, especially in political skills and professional organizing even if the women were still being seen as mothers or wives (Roggeveen, 2003).

The women that joined the FMLN did so mostly for the greater social cause and not really for women’s rights; however, once they were part of the guerrillas, they started to develop a clear picture of the gender inequality and gender struggle inside the FMLN. Even as they were gaining independence from the patriarchal structures of the family environment, the women realized that gender inequality was not part of the FMLN campaign against El Salvador’s conflict, nor was it empowering women (Kampwirth, 2002). As previously indicated, the FMLN supported the formation of women’s organizations that were not actively combating the government and used these organizations to get international funding, such as the Association of Progressive Women of El Salvador AMPES (Asociación de Mujeres por El Salvador -Association of Progressive Women
of El Salvador), AMES (Asociación de Mujeres del Salvador—Asociation of Salvadorian Women), and ANDES (Asociación Nacional de Educadores—National Teachers’ Union), were women organized based of their professional backgrounds (Kampwirth, 2002). Most of the women’s organizations that were created or supported by the FMLN were made up of a majority of men, and they only existed with the purpose of getting international aid (Roggeveen, 2003).

As Ready et al. (2001) explained, towards the end of the conflict, many of the women’s groups, such as the Committee of the Mothers Monsignor Romero (CO-MADRES) and The Organization for Dignity and Life (Asociación de Mujeres por la Dignidad y la Vida - Las Dignas) started to change their framework, advocated for human rights, and added a gender discourse into their goals, specifically in inequalities of labor, land acquisition, domestic violence, and other women’s issues. Ready et al. (2001) indicated that many of these women’s groups decided to unify in sectors that helped their cause, such as the National Coordinating Committee of Salvadoran Women (CONAMUS) which combined women’s unions from different sectors such as hospitals, teachers, and artists. CO-MADRES worked specifically to make public all the atrocities from the war and how it had affected women, such as the assassinations and disappearance of women’s family members, using different tactics of activism, such as newspaper ads, street marches, and reaching for international support (Ready et al., 2001). These were networks, but not a women’s movement as they never decided to reach out to other women’s groups or networks to come together and indicate how the conflict had affected all Salvadorian women, no matter what background they came from. They failed to unify around common goals or agendas.

The Negotiations

The negotiations between the government and the FMLN started back in 1984 with president Duarte, but were interrupted many times because the conflict continued, and it would
not be until 1990 that peace talks would take place (Portillo Gonzales, 2012). According to UCDP (2017), Cristián’s government invited the FMLN to sit down for peace negotiations, and with the intervention of the UN as a mediator, the negotiations started in January of 1990; the government left the agenda setting to be done by the FMLN because it was the group that had the complaints about the government, and once they put those complaints on paper, the government could respond to them. The peace negotiations and accord focused on five issues: the cease-fire and demobilization; military and intelligence reform; police reform; human rights and judicial issues; and socioeconomic issues (Call, 2002).

The third stage of the social movement’s life cycle, institutionalization, happens when the social movement group gets organized with “hierarchical leadership structure, they hire paid staff, and they may also have a considerable degree of access to policymakers” (Pullum, 2014, p. 1382). However, this did not happen in El Salvador. There is no clear evidence that El Salvador had a women’s movement before or during the peace negotiations. According to Ready et al. (2001) these early women’s organizations were created more as a way to survive the war and its consequences and economic issues, and it would be during the peace negotiations and the post-conflict that they would turn towards gender equality. As previously indicated, by the time the peace talks started in El Salvador, many of the women’s organizations—such as Co-Madres and Las Dignas—that were supported or created by the FMLN, did not originally have a gender agenda, but this changed and they started to advocate for and women’s rights, not only within the FMLN but in El Salvador’s society in general (Luciak, 1999). According to Anderson (2011), the women’s groups started to focus more on social justice, which hoped to achieve a society with equal rights. This social justice was meant to be for all people, men and women. Ready et al.
(2001) indicate that these were not feminist groups, but women’s groups that wanted to break from the FMLN influence.

Another reason for the lack of a women’s movement that could advocate for the inclusion of women’s issues is the lack of unity among the different groups and the women themselves. Many of the women’s groups could not even identify with different women’s groups. For example, some of the rural women that were part of some organizations felt that the women who had more education saw them as less capable because of their socioeconomic background (Kampwirth, 2002). Also problematic was the fact that most of the women’s organizations that were created during the war were organized by the FMLN men trying to look for international funding, as many international organizations were interested when they saw women as part of the guerrillas, but there was no indication that the men were concerned with improving women’s life or had any idea of gender inequality (Kampwirth, 2002).

Even though there was a shift in how some of the women’s groups started to change from supporting the FMLN to working for gender issues, it was just a few groups, and they did not come together under a women’s movement with a clear agenda highlighting women’s issues that could unify the different voices and fight for the inclusion of these issues in the negotiations and agreement. For the same reason, when both the government and the FMLN agreed to sit down for peace talks, both parties disregarded women’s issues as part of the negotiations, as they believed they were irrelevant to the conflict (Näslund, 1999).

The agenda that the FMLN presented to the government and that the government accepted did not include any women’s issues. Even though there was a high participation of women during the conflict there was only one plenipotentiary woman on the FMLN team (Maria Marta Valladares)—and no women on the government team—there were some women on the negotiation
teams with administrative support roles (Morgan, 1993). Luciak (1999) indicates that the women who were part of the negotiation teams did not support nor advocate for the inclusion of women’s issues and did not have any discussions about including more women at the negotiation table or women’s rights in the peace agreement. The women that had joined the FMLN felt discontent and disappointment when they realized the FMLN was not going to acknowledge their participation and any possible contribution in the peace agreement (Näslund, 1999). Even with this discontent, there is no evidence anywhere that different women’s groups tried to form a movement and be vocal about the need to included women or women’s issues on the peace agreement.

Pampell, Conaway, and Martinez suggest (2004) that the women that participated in the negotiation team of the FMLN indicated that they were negotiating the issues that the FMLN had presented in the agenda, that they were not part of a women’s movement, that they were not representing a women’s group, and for these reasons they did not address any women’s issues, needs, rights, or demands at the negotiation table, nor made any suggestions that could improve women’s life after the conflict in El Salvador. What is more surprising about the lack of women’s representation in the peace negotiations and inclusion of women’s issues in the peace agreement, is that by the beginning of the peace agreement there were more than 100 women’s groups working at all levels, both in rural and urban areas, managing different projects, and yet they did not unify to demand the inclusion of women’s issues (Ready et al., 2001).

In the end, the peace accord failed to include any women’s issues at all. In fact, it does not mention women at all in the entire agreement. For the negotiation teams, women’s issues were not an urgent issue, and for the same reason, addressing those issues could wait until after the conflict ended, during the implementation phase (Morgan, 1994). The women that had joined the FMLN felt that even though they joined to be part of the fight and to carry out the FMLN ideas, but when
the peace negotiations started, the FMLN male leaders and the government kept the FMLN women away and did not provide any information about the negotiations (Ching, 2016). Even though the participation of women in the FMLN had provided women with new skills, taught them how to organize, and given them some type of independence, the FMLN was a military-like organization that followed hierarchical structures in a country where patriarchy was entrenched in society (Kampwirth, 2002).

As previously mentioned, women are the majority of victims in a civil conflict, especially forcibly displaced ones. Aguilar Zisner (1991) indicated that the majority of displaced people by the conflict in El Salvador, around 60 percent, were women and children. By not including women’s issues in the peace agreement, women were not able to benefit from implementation programs. For example, many of the reintegration programs in the peace agreement, such as land allocation programs and agricultural credits, were allocated to heads of household, landowners (and women before the peace process could not own land), and businessmen (Näslund, 1999).

As indicated, in El Salvador there was no women’s movement before the peace agreement or during the negotiations. An active women’s movement means active participation, mobilizing actions, demanding change, becoming activists for the movement’s goal. However, in El Salvador, there was not a movement. There were many women’s groups, especially organized within the FMLN, but as explained, their cause was not women issues. As Viterna (2013) explains, “a social movement’s ability to achieve its goals depends in large part on the number and type of participants it can amass and maintain” (p. 40). In El Salvador, there was not a women’s movement because the women did not demonstrate any desire to come under an umbrella (movement) that was made up of diverse groups and backgrounds, and by not being able to come under the umbrella of a movement, they could not achieve the inclusion of women’s issues on the peace agreement.
It is true that many of the groups were organized as a response to the war, and many also helped women, but they did not come together under one movement that could represent them and express their needs and demands. According to Ready et al. (2001) women’s groups in El Salvador started to form coalitions, but this did not happen until the mid 1990s after the peace agreement was signed. And it happened mainly because the dissatisfaction that women in general had with their lack of representation in the peace agreement and an increase of women’s participation in politics and elections both at the regional and national levels. The coalitions that the different women’s groups formed were in part a response to the lack of inclusion during the peace negotiations and the peace agreement.

Related to the lack of a women’s movement is also the lack of a frame alignment. There were several groups, not one movement, and for the same reason there were multiple frames from the different women’s groups. Even though there were groups that started to break from FMLN influence, they had limited influence at the time of the negotiations, especially when the focus was to end the conflict—not fighting for women’s rights. Because the groups did not come together in a movement, multiple frames existed, and none of these succeeded in getting their points into the negotiations or the agreement by themselves. It would not be until the peace process was taking place that some of the women’s groups started to change their framing and started to move it towards women’s issues, such gender equality and women’s rights.

Finally, there was the lack of collaboration. The fact that there was not a women’s movement does not mean that there were not voices from different women’s groups. However, they were not loud enough, or the peace negotiation teams just decided not to listen to them. The woman and men that participated on the negotiation team, saw the negotiations only as the process to end the conflict, but not as the process to also include women’s issues. Women’s issues were
not part of the conflict in their perspective, and thus there was no need to listen to any women’s groups that were talking about it or even include them on the peace agreement. The negotiation parties stuck to the agenda that they had agreed on to start the peace negotiations, and that agenda had nothing about women’s issues, so they did not discuss it.

**Alternative Explanation**

As explained in this chapter, El Salvador’s peace agreement did not include women’s issues. For the same reason, coming up with alternative explanations for the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace agreement is difficult, as it is hard to prove a negative. However, I wanted to look at the international actors’ role in this process, as I did in the case of Guatemala, to see if these actors levied any pressure on the negotiation teams for the inclusion of women’s issues.

As indicated in this chapter, many women’s organizations formed during El Salvador’s armed conflict. Many of the groups were organized to help women during the conflict, but they did not come together under one movement. Also, the FMLN had supported the creation of women’s groups as a way to get funding from international organizations that supported women’s organizations. At the same time, there were limited resources from the international countries that were promoting women’s organizations (such as the Nordic countries) to distribute among all the different organizations in El Salvador, and this created competition between these organizations (Kumar, 2001). When it became evident that the FMLN was not interested in supporting women’s equality, but just receiving the financial aid, some of the financial aid stopped.

The United Nations also played an important role in El Salvador’s peace process. The peace talks were possible because the United Nations helped to mediate the peace process. President Cristiani had asked for the help of the United Nations in 1990, asking to help both sides to agree to peace negotiations and to mediate the process, which the UN agreed to do, and the UN assigned
Alvaro de Soto as the lead UN mediator (Montgomery, 1995). De Soto’s role quickly changed and, besides mediating the peace negotiation talks, he started to make proposals and recommendations for the peace agreement. This increased the power of the UN in the process and it allowed the UN to be the one that wrote the majority of the final peace agreement (Montgomery, 1995). The negotiators trusted de Soto as he was Peruvian, knew the region and the language, and helped both parties to realize that the peace agreement was the best solution to end the conflict; they therefore allowed him to include all the proposals and recommendations he suggested (Wilkerson, 2008).

El Salvador’s peace process is the first case where the United Nations organized a group of friends (United States, Cuba, Colombia, Mexico, Spain, and Venezuela) that provided help to the UN with the peace agreement process. The purpose of the group of friends was to “bring leverage over the parties to the conflict to the Secretary-General and his representatives; legitimacy to a privileged involvement in the peace process to the Friends themselves; a measure of equilibrium to the parties; and coordination, resources and informal guarantees to the process as a whole” (Whitfield, 2005, p. 3). However, there is no evidence that countries that were part of the group of friends pressured or even mentioned the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace agreement. For the group of friends, especially Cuba and the United States, the most important thing was to put pressure on the parties to end the conflict (Whitfield, 2010).

Maybe the international actors could have had more influence if they had pushed, for example, for the creation of a women’s movement where they could have provided funding for the movement that benefited all the organizations. Unfortunately, this is all speculation. Ultimately, women’s issues were not included, and proving a negative is extremely difficult. I argue that the outcome probably would have been different if there had been an active women’s movement that
had a specific frame alignment that could have been supported by international actors. For example, they could have reached out to de Soto and made him realize the importance of including women’s issues in the peace agreement. They could have formed a movement where the countries that were supportive of women’s rights would have funneled financial support to increase their advocacy for women’s rights once they saw that there was really a fight for gender equality. What is clear is that there was no united women’s movement with a clear frame in El Salvador and there were no women’s issues added to the peace process agenda and the resulting agreement.

**Conclusion**

In El Salvador’s case women’s issues were not included in the peace agreement. Also, none of the causal mechanisms were present as there was not a women’s movement. For the same reason there was not a frame alignment, and there was no collaboration between the women’s movement and the negotiation teams. To sum up:

**H1:** The cases where there is an active women’s movement are more likely to include women’s issues in the peace agreement.

As illustrated in this case, there was not a women’s movement in El Salvador. Yes, many of the groups were organized as a response to the war, and many also helped women, but they did not come together under one movement that could represent them and express their needs and demands.

**H2:** The cases where the women’s movement used a frame alignment are more likely to include women’s issues in the peace agreement:

Due to the fact that the groups did not come together under a movement, multiple frames existed, and they did not succeed in getting their points into the negotiations or the agreement by
themselves. There were several groups, not one movement. Each women’s group had its own frame. The lack of a women’s movement also means a lack of a common frame alignment.

H3: The cases where there is collaboration between women’s organizations and negotiation teams are more likely to include women’s issues in the peace agreement.

Again, this did not happen in El Salvador either because there was not a women’s movement. Similar to Guatemala, there was a plenipotentiary woman, but there is no evidence that she tried including women’s issues. The women and men that participated on the negotiation team saw the negotiations only as the process to end the conflict, not one to also include women’s issues. This is most likely because there was not a women’s movement that made the others understand how important it was to include women’s issues.
Chapter 8

Colombia

The Conflict

The history of the conflict between the Colombian government and the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia Ejército del Pueblo (FARC-EP) [Armed Revolutionary Forces of Colombia – People’s Army] goes back more than five decades. Some of the violence started at the end of the 1920s and 1930s with the organization of peasant self-defense forces that formed armed groups similar to the Communist Party in Colombia (Guzman Campo et al., 1969). These groups organized in order to claim or take control of farming lands, and they evolved into what would be known as agrarian movements promoted by the Communist Party.

In Colombia, there have been only two political parties since gaining independence from Spain until 1991: the Liberal party and the Conservative party. The two parties had clashed for control of the government, and tensions were approaching a boiling point during the first half of the century. This boiling point was reached on April 9th, 1948, with the assassination of liberal leader and presidential candidate Jorge Eliecer Gaitán. This event led to a civil war known as “La Violencia,” which unleashed a wave of violence across almost all regions of the country. This, in turn which led to the organization of armed self-defense groups into guerrilla warfare groups made up of armed peasants on one side, the government army on the other.

After years of violent conflict, in 1953 the political and economic elite supported a coup d’état led by General Gustavo Rojas Pinilla, who eventually became head of the state. His main responsibilities were to end violence in the country, create development in these regions, and stop the growing guerrilla movement. Rojas Pinilla's government called for a cease-fire and granted amnesty to armed groups that agreed to it, but many of the guerrilla groups did not agree with his
proposal, including the FARC-EP (Pataquiva García, 2009). Within a short time, the FARC-EP demonstrated its capacity for growth and consolidation by extending to other regions. The group became more autonomous and stated its intention to become the ruling power in the country, promising greater social and economic changes, which previously were being promoted by the Liberal party. The FARC-EP expanded to other many different regions in the country and operated using illegal strategies to recruit members and get resources, like drug trafficking, kidnapping, guerrilla raids on the peasant population, and violent attacks on the population at large (Medina Gallego, 2010).

The government of Rojas Pinilla came to an end when Liberals and Conservatives, nervous about the military forces in power, decided to stop the armed conflict and form an alliance to gain back political power. This partnership is known as the Frente Nacional (National Front), in which the two political parties agreed to alternate the presidency every four years, for 16 years, with their respective bureaucratic structures (Medina Gallego, 2010). During this time, it became clear that the FARC-EP was the armed wing of the Communist Party. Its expansion was ideologically based on Marxism-Leninism similar to the Cuban Revolution, and May 27, 1964 was the date they started officially functioning as the FARC-EP (Sanchez, 1984).

Since 1966 the Colombian government has been officially fighting the FARC-EP, but at the same time it has tried to end the conflict through peace negotiations. In 1984 president Belisario Betancourt started a peace process that provided amnesty to illegal armed groups, including the FARC-EP. Some guerrilla groups entered negotiations with the government, reintegrated into civil society, and formed new political parties, like the Patriotic Union (Pataquiva García, 2009). However, the FARC-EP and the government were never able to reach agreement, and the conflict has continued. The FARC-EP originally counted on a base type support from peasants inspired by
communism and guided the armed agrarian struggle with a force made up of approximately 30,000 members. As the decades passed, the group’s ideology changed and the trafficking of drugs seemed to be their new objective. Its violence has been characterized by guerrilla attacks on public and private institutions and civil society, as well as kidnapping as a means of extortion (Pataquiva García, 2009). The conflict has left hundreds of thousands dead, and it is estimated that more than 10 percent of the population (more than six million people) has been displaced (Morales, 2018).

It is important to point out that the FARC-EP was not the only guerrilla group in Colombia. The M-19, the National Liberation Army (ELN), and the Popular Liberation Army (EPL) are some of the other guerrilla groups; the M-19 signed a peace process in late 1989, while the other groups joined the FARC-EP or the ELN (Bouvier, 2016). At the same time that the government was combating the different guerrilla groups, in the 1980s there was an increase of specifically FARC-EP attacks that were answered by the new illegal right-wing paramilitary group United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC), supported mainly by rich landowner families and drug cartels that wanted protection from guerrilla attacks (Morales, 2017).

In 2002, Alvaro Uribe Vélez was elected president of Colombia, and he promised to aggressively fight the guerrillas (“La Historia De,” 2016). During his term, the government developed a Democratic Security strategy program that intended to and succeeded in weakening the structure of the guerrillas using military operations. Other factors contributed to the program’s success, like the death of the FARC-EP founder, Manuel Marulanda Vélez, in 2008 of a heart attack, and the assassination of two of the group’s top commanders, Raul Reyes “Mono Jojoy,” and Alfonso Cano, killed by the Colombian military forces (Pataquiva García, 2009). Uribe also negotiated a peace agreement with the AUC, without the collaboration of any external groups and provided amnesty to most of its members (Sanchez Torres & Diaz, 2005).
In 2010 Colombia elected Juan Manuel Santos as the next president. Santos had served under Uribe as the secretary of defense. He is still the president until August 2018. During Uribe’s administration there were some talks about a possible peace agreement with the FARC-EP, but these were not successful; Santos was aware of that peace attempt, especially because the High Peace Commissioner—Frank Pearl—(Alto Comisionado para la Paz) from Uribe’s administration was still in that position when Santos started his mandate (“Secretos De La,” 2012). Santos’ administration started secret talks with the FARC-EP in February 2012, in the Norwegian capital of Oslo, with the goal of ending armed conflict that has taken thousands of lives for five decades (“La Historia De,” 2016).

Pre-negotiation

As in the cases of Guatemala and El Salvador, I used the stages developed in Social Movement Theory to examine the peace process in Colombia. The emergence stage is the period of time in which part of society feels discontent. But this discontent has not been organized or mobilized. People are just complaining about their situation and do not see these complaints as something that needs to be addressed collectively (Pullum, 2014). Because the Farc-EP conflict lasted almost 50 years, this period of emergence took place during the first 20 years. By the late 1980s, the conflict started to intensify, and women’s organizations started to boom to help women during the conflict. Colombia’s conflict has been one of the longest conflicts in modern history, with the population suffering commensurately. Just as in Guatemala and El Salvador, women had suffered the effects of the conflict by losing family members, being displaced, or sexually abused (Cockburn, 2007). In addition, women’s participation in previous negotiations in Colombia had been almost non-existent, and the women were only in positions of administrative support, not as negotiators or guarantors. Those high-level positions were reserved for men (Bouvier, 2016).
The peace talks in Oslo, Norway, and Havana, Cuba, were not the first talks between the Colombian government and the FARC-EP. There had been multiple attempts at peace negotiations with the FARC-EP for several decades that had failed. To be more exact, there were attempts in each government administration since the 1980s, and all of them failed. The last attempt was during the administration of president Andrés Pastrana, which was chaotic from the beginning, and ended up damaging the reputation of the government, especially after the government had cleared a territory of 43.139 square kilometers (as big as Switzerland) as requested by the FARC, and there was never an attempt to move from just talking to truly negotiate (“El Fracaso De,” 2010).

President Santos decided to conduct secret exploratory conversations to see if there was a possibility of conducting peace negotiations. He sent three government representatives—Frank Pearl, Sergio Jaramillo, and Enrique Santos Calderon—and the FARC-EP sent three representatives—Mauricio Jaramillo, Andres París, and Marcos Calarcá—(“Secretos De La,” 2012). The purpose of these exploratory talks was to “identify if there was willingness from both parties to have a negotiation to end the armed conflict, and if yes, then establishing an agenda of the issues to be negotiated” (Paul, Government team). This secret exploratory phase started in February 2012 and ended in August 2012. On August 26, 2012, president Santos confirmed that official peace negotiations would start with the Farc-EP in October of 2012, first in Norway, and then in Cuba (“Cronología Del Proceso,” 2015). One of the reasons the previous negotiation attempts failed was that there was never a clear agenda before the negotiations started “and this is the strategic difference between the old negotiations attempts, and this one, this time we did not want to talk about God and Humans, but about 6 specific points that we were going to negotiate” (Luke, Government team).
On September 4, 2012, President Santos and the top leader of the FARC-EP, Rodrigo Londono Echeverry (“Timochenko”) publicly confirmed that both parties were going to start peace talks to develop a General Agreement to put an End to the Conflict (Acuerdo General para la Terminación del Conflicto) under very specific conditions: first, the talks would take place outside Colombia, and the government would not give a territory to the FARC-EP; second, the conflict would continue while the parties talked; third, the work at the negotiation table was private and only involved the two parties; fourth, nothing would be agreed on until everything was agreed on (Santos y “Timochenko,” 2012). The agenda agreed upon in the exploratory phase consisted of five specific issues—agrarian reform, political participation, end of the conflict, solutions for the illicit drug problem, and victims and one extra point about implementation and verification—(Jaramillo, 2016) (Appendix H).

Over the nearly 50 years of official armed conflict with the FARC-EP, women started to organize to support each other during the conflict. Again, as in Guatemala and El Salvador, women had been affected in different ways than men. While men were more likely to be killed, kidnaped, or forced to join the guerrilla forces, the women were more likely to suffer sexual violence, forced labor, forced displacement, and loss of family members; the rural areas were more affected than the urban areas, and at some point, it is estimated that in rural regions where the conflict was more intense, one out of ten women became widows, and more than half the women lost an average of two children because of the conflict (Bouvier, 2016).

In Social Movement Theory, the emergence stage is followed by the coalescence stage in which women create new space for political participation where they could act as agents of change and are able to organize, no matter what the age, social status, ethnic group, religious background, their common agenda was moving towards democracy, protecting human’s rights, providing
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justice, economic equality, and peace (Bendelac Gordon, 2015). During the late 1980s and early 1990s, many of the new women’s organizations also started to unite in networks that shared the same goals (Cockurn, 2007). Before starting the analysis of the data, it is important to look at some of the women’s networks and women’s organizations in Colombia. As in Guatemala and El Salvador, women’s organizations are from different sectors of society. Rural, urban, peasant, students, feminist, displaced, refugees, indigenous, Afro-Colombian sectors all have different ideas and agendas but want an end to the conflict. “I believe in the women’s movement there are organizations with different ideological tendencies that are linked with each other” (Greta, Scholar, interview 7/12/2017). Some of the women’s networks are: Ruta Pacífica de Mujeres (Peaceful Way of Women), the Red Nacional de Mujeres (National Women’s Network), Redepaz (Peace Network), the Asociación Nacional de Mujeres Campesinas e Indígenas (National Association of Peasant and Indigenous Women), the Alianza Iniciativa Mujeres por la Paz (Alliance Women’s Peace Initiative).

Ruta Pacífica de Mujeres is a feminist-pacifist network with more than 300 women’s organizations that started in 1995 as a response to the massacres, sexual violence, and forced displacements that women were experiencing because of the conflict. It operates in eight different governmental regions of Colombia — Antioquia, Cauca, Chocó, Cundinamarca, Putumayo, Risaralda, Santander, and Valle del Cauca — where the conflict was more intense, it also opposed the conflict, calling for non-violence and civil resistance (Gallego, 2016). In each of the regions where the Ruta is present, there are between 20 to 30 women’s organizations working that combine indigenous people, peasant women, Afro-Colombian women, students, older women, poor women, displaced women, and so on (Cockburn, 2007).
The Asociación Nacional de Mujeres Campesinas e Indígenas de Colombia (ANMUCIC) was created in 1986, with the goal of improving the life of peasant women and their families, but as the violence increased, they changed their vision to help save lives, and help take care of the displaced people and the orphans from the war; they are currently focusing on human rights, women, and peace (Sisma, 2008). In 2000, the Alianza Iniciativa Mujeres por la Paz (IMP—Alliance Women’s Peace Initiative) a network of more than 22 women’s organizations was created as a response to the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325. This new organization began with the objective of having active participation of women in the peace negotiations process, explaining the effects of the war on women, and becoming activist with a gender perspective in all the regional and national policies that are related to victims and the construction of peace (Duque and Campos, 2015). In 1993, Redepaz was created as a national network of citizen initiatives for peace and against the war, that operates in different regions of the country and has more than 120 organizations as members (Redepaz, 2016). Another network is the Red Nacional de Mujeres (National Network of Women), created in 1991, focusing on gender equality and women’s rights, with more than 63 women’s organizations in more than 14 cities in Colombia. It also focused on the elimination of all types of violence against women and gender discrimination (Red Nacional de Mujeres, 2016).

The formation of these women’s organizations and women’s networks many decades ago has helped them in organizing and working more efficiently with being proactive. Many of these networks have organized local and national marches, which helped them make their cause visible to the rest of the population (Martínez, 2010). For example, the Ruta Pacifica has staged more than 20 marches in Colombia with more than 100,000 women (Gallego, 2016) participating in each of these. Being part of a united network helps the different women’s organizations, as they are joined
by common interests and goals which in turn helps increase individual organization membership numbers as well. This also indicates that women’s networks and organizations in Colombia have practiced advocacy and activism for decades, so they knew what they needed to do by the time the peace negotiations started. Also, the organizations and networks have learned that it was better to unify under one movement than to participate individually, as they actually had done in the past attempts of peace talks (Martínez, 2010). By 2004, the different women’s networks and women’s organizations held a conference in Bogotá, called “International Encounter of Women against the War,” where more than 250 women’s groups met and discussed the conflict, how it affected women, and how they demanded a peaceful solution to end the war (Cockburn, 2016).

The women’s organizations were ready to act as soon as peace talks were announced. They were ready to mobilize and support the end of the conflict, but they also were prepared with a list of demands of women’s issues that they wanted to be included in the peace negotiations and agreement. The day after the peace negotiation talks were announced, different women’s networks in Colombia, such as Ruta Pacífica de Mujeres, IPM, Red Nacional de Mujeres, and Casa de la Mujer (Women’s House), indicated their support of the peace process. For example, on September 4, 2012, the Ruta Pacífica put out a press release in which “The Ruta Pacífica de las Mujeres, which is made up by 300 women’s organizations across the country and organized in nine territories … support and encourage the General Agreement to End the Conflict between the government and the guerrilla of the FARC” (Ruta Pacífica, 2012) (Appendix I). Because of the previous attempts, and seeing how civil society had been excluded from those peace processes, the women’s organizations and networks in Colombia knew that they needed to act as soon as possible to be included in the peace negotiation process.
There were also press releases from different international actors, like nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) such as the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), and international organizations, such as Conciliation Resources and The Global Network of Women Peacebuilders, that supported the peace process, but also demanded the inclusion of women at the table (Appendix J). These different international actors pointed out the role that women’s organizations had in Colombia throughout the decades of armed conflict, and how they can contribute to the peace process because “as women’s organizations they have documented in detail the implications that the armed conflict had in women and men, and the real dimensions of the violence against women” (Conciliation Resources, 2012). Alsema (2012) also indicated, “Many of the women’s organizations in Colombia have worked ceaselessly for the peace in Colombia. These organizations are diverse in origin and make-up and while they do not share a single agenda, they all work for gender equality and the inclusion of women’s issues in public debates.” More important, they also called out the United Nations to put pressure on both the United Nations and the Colombia government to include women at the peace negotiation table and women’s issues on the peace agreement.

When President Santos announced the peace negotiations with the FARC-EP, the United Nation’s UN Women’ head (a division of the United Nations) at the time, former Chilean president Michelle Bachelet, visited Colombia on September 12, 2012. In a speech she praised the country for the advances towards gender equality, but also pointed out how much more work needed to be done: “However, let me add here that these peaceful conditions will not be achieved if the participation of women is overlooked” (Bachelet, 2012) (Appendix K). The day after Bachelet’s speech, President Santos informed her that women will have “a very important space and permanent space” in the peace process, and indicated that there was already a group of women that
had been involved in the exploratory process and were getting ready to have a role in the peace process ("Mujeres Tendrán Rol," 2012) (Appendix L).

**The Negotiations**

The negotiation teams were introduced in Norway on October 19, 2012 and moved to Cuba for the peace talks on November 18, 2012. Each team was made up of a total of 30 members, of which five on each team were plenipotentiaries. There were no plenipotentiary women included on the government side, and on the Farc-EP side, one woman was briefly included, Alexandra Nariño, who was there mostly because spoke English (Bouvier, 2016). A year after the peace talks started, there were some changes, and the presence of women was more evident as I will explain later in this chapter.

The women’s movement knew they needed to be strategic about how to make others understand their goal. I organized all the interview answers using Nvivo nodes (Appendix M). For the frame alignment, the question I asked was, Why is it important or even necessary to include women’s issues in peace negotiations and peace agreements? I organized the answers in two ways where the women’s movement frame alignment exists: the why and the what. The “what” means what can women do for a peace process; I classified this in four categories: reach a peace agreement, democratic equality, sustain peace after the conflict, and rebuild after the conflict. The “why” means why is it important to include women’s issues, and I classified this in five categories: conflict affects women differently, the right for equality, machista language, majority of the victims, and half of the population.
Table 5.

Frame Alignment - What

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame alignment</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Guerrilla</th>
<th>Women's Organizations</th>
<th>International Actors</th>
<th>Scholars</th>
<th>Journalists</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reach a peace agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic equality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain peace after conflict</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuild after conflict</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table indicates the number of times a reason for the frame what can women do for a peace process was mentioned.

As illustrated by the data, the number one reason for including women is that they can sustain peace after the conflict. The women’s movement used this reason as part of their frame: “when you include women, the possibility to sustain peace increases” (Joy, International actor, interview 3/3/2017). One women’s organization in particular said “that women had been in the middle of the war making peace, they have been the ones that have created the environment to sustain peace” (Laura, Women’s group, interview 7/11/2017). This is true about the women’s organizations in Colombia. Besides helping women during the conflict, they have demanded a political solution to end the conflict in a peaceful way (Martínez, 2010).

Relatedly the second reason highlighted is that women usually are the ones that rebuild the communities after the conflict is over, also known as peacebuilding. According to one interview, “women have been the center for reconstruction of a country like ours, a country that has to build up many times” (Ana, Government team, interview 2/6/2017). Most women start this rebuilding process in their own homes, when family members are killed, disappear, or join the conflict, and then they start also helping with the rebuilding of the community. “A woman is a person that can
change her community, that has a very important role to make things better after the war” (Maureen, Journalist, interview 6/8/2017). For the women, hearing that they have an important role in reconstruction gives them a reason to ask to be included during the process where this reconstruction is going to be negotiated, which is the peace talks and peace agreement.

The second question I looked for in the frame alignment was why. Even though the women’s movement has provided in their framing the reasons of what women can do for peace, in my research I found out that the most important part of their framing is the “why,” why is it important to include women’s issues. The following table illustrates the number of times a reason for why women’s issues was given.

Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame Alignment - Why</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Guerrilla</th>
<th>Women's Organizations</th>
<th>International Actors</th>
<th>Scholars</th>
<th>Journalists</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict affects women differently</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right for gender equality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machista language</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority of the victims</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half of the population</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* This table indicates the number of times a reason for the frame why women’s issues should be part of a negotiation process was mentioned.

The number one reason of why it is important to include women’s issues is because women are the majority of the victims, followed by the conflict affects women differently than men, and the right for gender equality. As indicated in the table, there is a vast difference between the
number one reason and the second and third. Colombia’s women, as in the cases of Guatemala and El Salvador, have been the majority of the victims of the armed conflict. The armed conflicts have demonstrated that women are more affected than men:

Women had been an easy target, and the most vulnerable in the conflict. Thousands of widows … victims of sexual violence, and through the history of Colombia’s conflict, especially in the ‘80s and ‘90s, you hear talk about violence, but the women were never a subject in those talk, we forgot about the women (Ana, Government team, interview 2/6/2017).

Recognizing that women are the majority of victims of the conflict is also important because it indicates the collateral damages of war, meaning not only the number of soldiers and guerrillas deaths or injuries, but also the other victims, and the crimes those victims suffered, such as sexual violence and displacement, and this is where women are vastly more affected. While the conflict has not created these crimes, “those crimes had existed in women’s lives throughout human history … but during a war, those crimes are put on a public space, to show what will happen to the enemy” (Sharon, Women’s movement, interview 4/13/2017). For the women’s movement, women’s issues need to be included because “women are the primary victims, not only because they have suffered the most intense consequence through the years of conflict, but also they have suffered the enormous inequality of the conflict, and the discrimination against them” (Mary, Government team, interview 5/8/2017).

According to Ellie (interview, 2/21/2017), a guerrilla member, “of the total number of victims in Colombia, more than 80 percent are women and children.” It is important to include women’s issues—in the peace agreement—because they are part of the population in Colombia. “We are the majority of the victims, but we had survived to so many years of war, death, and pain, and it will not be good that the state also forgets about us after the conflict, as they had forgotten about us during the conflict” (Lucy, Women’s movement, interview 7/19/2017). In fact, it was
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mentioned that women’s issues should be included because women made up more than half of the population of Colombia, and this inclusion has to be meaningful. “The participation of women cannot be just for the photo, but it must be a participation that reflects that we are 51 percent of the population, so having just one woman at the table cannot be representative of that” (Bea, Guerrilla team, interview 6/20/2017).

The fact that women were the most affected by the armed conflict was not new, as well as the fact that the conflict affected women differently, which is the second reason why it is important to include women’s issues. It does not mean that women are not killed, or that men are not displaced or cannot be victims of sexual abuse. What it means is that the women are the majority victims of those crimes. According to Greta, a scholar,

women suffer the conflict in a different way than men, and women’s organizations had been reporting this since a long time ago in Colombia and other parts of the world … and the women are the ones that while not being the number one on deaths, are the ones that are left alone and had to confront the impact of the war (interview 7/12/2017).

If a person looks at a group of survivors, the majority of survivors are women, but that does not mean they have not been victims of the violence. Again, the way the conflict affects women differently does not necessarily mean that the crimes that were committed against women were different than the ones against men. What it means is that “women that were affected by the conflict had different needs, and what we had seen is that those needs are not being fulfilled and are ignored on the peace agreements” (Joy, International actor, interview 3/3/2017).

The third reason why it is important to include women’s issues is the right for gender equality. A peace agreement indicates the changes in structures and institutions that will happen in society after the conflict is over, and
if we do not recognize the differences and the gender inequality that existed in society during the conflict, it will be impossible to transform the new society after the conflict. Women’s issues were not being covered for almost two years after the peace talks started. Many people said that they were not included because they will be addressed later, and the most important part was ending the conflict and not talk about those issues (Joy, International actor, interview 3/3/2017).

Colombian women, as in many other places in the world, had lived in a society where gender inequality existed, but not including women’s issues in the peace agreement was not an option because “it is very difficult to talk about a country’s peace, or about the construction of peace if you do not acknowledge the historical inequality that women had suffered, and if you do not take the positive measures to correct them” (Emma, Government team, interview 3/20/2017).

Having a frame alignment is not a sufficient condition for the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace negotiations and peace agreement in Colombia’s case. An active women’s movement is another necessary condition. I wanted to find out what the role of women’s organizations during the peace process was in Colombia. I looked for the presence or absence of the women’s movement as unification—how the different women’s organizations and networks became a unified movement—and classified this as: activism, mobilizations and advocacy, coalitions and alliances, and Cumbre de Mujeres. I also looked for the presence or absence of the women’s movement as demands—what the women’s movement demanded—and I classified this as: presence at the table, rights, and proposals.

As previously mentioned, the different women’s groups and women’s networks started to work as soon as they realized there was going to be a peace negotiation process. As explained by Sarah, from the women’s movement

we have been working for more than 50 years for a pacific political solution of the armed conflict, and the best way was to be prepared with proposals and mobilizations to achieve the objective of being included. We realized that the negotiations were not going to surprise us with our pants down, we were ready and able to access the table with our proposals (interview 4/3/2017).
One hundred percent of the interviewees indicated that the women’s movement was the one that suggested first to include women’s issues and pushed for that inclusion. How did they do it? I looked at this process by analyzing the active women’s movement in Colombia. The following table indicates characteristics of the women’s movement that helped the movement with the unification process.

Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unification</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Guerrilla</th>
<th>Women’s Organizations</th>
<th>International Actors</th>
<th>Scholars</th>
<th>Journalists</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activism, mobilization &amp; advocacy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalitions &amp; alliances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbre de Mujeres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table indicates the number of times a characteristic of unification of an active women’s movement is mentioned.

As previously mentioned, there are many women’s organizations and women’s networks (made up by such organizations) that have different backgrounds and agendas. Unifying all these different groups is not an easy task, but it was necessary to be able to have a stronger voice. These characteristics are not independent from each other. As previously indicated, Colombia’s women’s organizations and networks had experience in activism, mobilization, and advocacy. According to Paul, a government team member,

what it is interesting, is that the women’s organization have different backgrounds from different sectors of society, under one platform, logically with lots of tension among themselves, but they are able to become a very strong voice during the process, and with lots of activism that allowed them to insert themselves in the government, the FARC, and the international community (interview 2/2/17).

Even though the Cumbre de Mujeres (Women’s Summit) would not take place until a year after the negotiations started, the women’s organizations and networks were working to get the
Cumbre ready, but also making their voices stronger. One of the first acts of the different women’s organizations was pointing out that all the plenipotentiaries that were starting the peace talk were men, and they wanted “to be active, especially through the media, to show that masculine face that the construction of peace was having” (Allyson, Women’s movement, interview 4/21/2017). This is in response to the first photo that was made public of the plenipotentiaries on both sides, all male (Appendix N). The negotiations between Colombia’s government and the FARC-EP only involved them and no other actors were invited to the table. For this reason, the women’s movement knew that they were not going to have a seat at the table, but that there were other ways to have their issues heard “and not only on gender equality issues, but for example organizations that deal with human rights, or women’s rights, started to become more active and received more support from other organizations” (Joy, International actor, interview 3/3/2017).

When the peace talks started the women’s organizations “started to mobilize, to have lobby (with the government), to protest, to show resistance, so little by little the process started to include women and women’s issues, which was a long battle” (Laura, Women’s movement, interview 7/11/2017). Between 2012 and September 2013, different women’s organizations participated at government forums and regional working tables in different parts of Colombia, that had been organized by Colombia’s Congress Peace Commission, and they were able to submit proposals (Jaramillo, 2016). During the first year of the peace process, the government and the FARC-EP reached an agreement on the first two points of the agenda: rural development—agreed on May 26, 2013—and political participation—agreed on November 6, 2013— (“Cronología Del Proceso,” 2015). Neither agreements showed any women’s issues included, and at that time there were still no presence of women at the negotiation table. Emma, from the government’s team, indicated that “I believe they were offended, with all the reason, of not being included, and I believe they were
able to go where they did because the women’s movement was tireless” (interview 3/20/2017). The women’s movement advocated to work for the women who were not having a voice in the peace process, asking for a change in that exclusion, “we were always there, always telling them the importance for women to participate, because as women we wanted to be an active party on this process” (Lucy, Women’s movement, interview 7/19/2017).

Also, the women’s movement used media outlets to talk about women’s issues and to advocate for the inclusion of women and women’s issues. However, the media in general paid little attention to the women’s movement and its efforts in Havana. Actually, it would not be until after the peace agreement was signed that the role of women and the inclusion of women’s issues became a big deal and were covered more by the media, mostly because the opposition to the peace process was saying that the peace agreement was promoting gender ideology. Groups such as Uribe’s party and Christian conservative religious groups indicated that the agreement was destroying the family nucleus in Colombia and encouraging LGBTI rights, and they used this false representation to convince people in Colombia to vote “No” in the referendum. During the peace process between August 2012 to June 2016, less than 20 news articles appeared in the two most important newspapers (El Tiempo and El Espectador) and the most important political magazine (Semana). In four years, just about 20 articles written about women’s role in the peace process (Appendix O).

Continuing with the Social Movement Theory’s life cycle, the third stage, institutionalization, is where the movement gets organized with “hierarchical leadership structure, they hire paid staff, and they also have a considerable degree of access to policymakers” (Pullum, 2014, p. 1382). This stage took place starting with the announcement of the Cumbre de Mujeres. This summit took place in Bogotá, between October 23-25, 2013, organized by nine different
women’s organizations and networks: Casa de la Mujer, Ruta Pacífica, Red Nacional de Mujeres, Mujeres por la Paz, Colectivo de Pensamiento y Acción de Mujeres, Paz y Seguridad, Coalición 1325, Conferencia Nacional de Organizaciones Afrocolombianas, Iniciativa de Mujeres por la Paz, y Asociación Nacional de Mujeres Campesinas, Negras e Indígenas de Colombia, with the technical support from the UN Woman (Muñoz Pallares & Ramírez Cardona, 2013). The Cumbre de Mujeres served as an advocacy and communication tool for women’s organizations that collected the proposals and recommendations developed at 12 working tables during those days and concentrated specifically on point six of the peace negotiation agenda, the implementation and verification (Muñoz Pallares & Ramírez Cardona, 2013).

The Cumbre de Mujeres worked “because the different women’s networks and organizations made strategic alliances at the local, regional, and national levels, and decided what we wanted to say” (Sharon, Women’s movement, interview 4/13/2017). As in Guatemala, the different women’s groups and networks overcome their intersectionality to form one movement. There were three fundamental points that were agreed during the Cumbre: first, the support for the peace process and the demand to the parties of not leaving the table until there was a peace agreement; second, insisting that the process must have the presence and participation of women throughout the process, including the negotiation table; and third, the inclusion of women’s issues and the consequences of the conflict on women’s lives (Sanz Luque, 2013). The Cumbre de Mujeres “was the platform where more coalitions formed, it was a massive organization, and it happened at the best moment, when a plenipotentiary from the government had resigned, and there was pressure from the women’s movement to the government [to] include women at the table” (Deanna, Scholar, interview 4/13/2017).
The Cumbre de Mujeres generated a women’s movement, concentrating specifically on the effects that the conflict in Colombia had on women: “while we know there is structural violence in Colombia’s society, we wanted to focus on the armed conflict and its consequences on women” (Julia, women’s movement, interview 2/22/2017). As previously indicated, Colombia’s women’s organizations have been working for 50 years, especially because women have been the most affected by the conflict, and by the time the Cumbre de Mujeres met, “the women’s organizations had participated in forums, become active and advocated for women’s issues, and they were getting some attention from the government and the guerrillas” (Maureen, Journalist, interview 6/8/2017).

The Cumbre de Mujeres provided the environment to have all the different women’s organizations meeting where they could combine all the years of experience they had working with women’s issues and the conflict in Colombia:

working on advocacy plans, using all the mechanisms and strategies we had learned and known by us due to all the years of working, and to put pressure to change the situation. We were going to go to all the forums that the peace process was creating, we were going to write reports and recommendations, and we were going to go to the media to generate activism (Julia, Women’s movement, interview 2/22/2017).

The Cumbre de Mujeres is where the women’s organizations turned into a women’s movement, where they indicated to the government and the world that there were no women at the table, and that women’s issues had not been included in the negotiations. The Cumbre de Mujeres made the women’s movement have a stronger voice in advocating for the inclusion of women and women’s issues.

The Cumbre de Mujeres “was creating an environment where we were ready to join the peace process, but also participating with an agenda with specific points related to gender issues” (Beth, International actor, interview 6/28/2017). The two biggest results of the women’s movement generated by the Cumbre de Mujeres were the pressure for the inclusion of plenipotentiary women
on the government’s team and the inclusion of women’s issues through the creation of the gender sub-commission in Havana (Appendix P). The inclusion of women’s issues and women at the table was not a random event. It was due to the hard work of the women’s organizations throughout all the years they had been active, but especially the ability of being an organized and active women’s movement that united all the experience these organizations had, the work they had done, the advocacy to pressure the negotiating parties to include women’s issues. Reese, a journalist, indicates “without a doubt, the most important factor for the inclusion was the activism, mobilization and advocacy of the women’s movement” (interview 4/18/2017).

After the Cumbre de Mujeres was over, the women’s organizations that were now part of the women’s movement were going to willingly work together, with advocacy and activism work that can put pressure on the government and the FARC-EP. “We understood that our work was to lobby and advocate for women’s participation, but also for the inclusion of women’s issues, looking for justice, reparations, and no repetition from the war” (Kelly, Women’s movement, interview 3/18/2018). They also made alliances with other groups, for example the victims’ movement, and the LGTBI movement. According to Lucy, a women’s movement leader,

you hear people talking about the women’s movement and the victims’ movement, as if they have done separately work, and while it is true that they are two different movements, the victims’ movement is part of the women’s movement in this process, and the result is the activism these women did, no matter which movement they were from (interview 7/19/2017).

Another important aspect of the women’s movement in Colombia was the demands they were making. The Cumbre de Mujeres indicated very broadly those demands: don’t leave the table until reaching a peace agreement, to include women in the process, and to include women’s issues in the agreement. I analyzed what the different actors thought were the demands that the women’s movement was making. I classified these as: presence at the table, rights, and proposals.
Table 8.

**Women’s Movement - Demands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demands</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Guerrilla</th>
<th>Women’s Organizations</th>
<th>International Actors</th>
<th>Scholars</th>
<th>Journalists</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence at the table</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: This table indicates what the different actors thought were the women’s movement demands.*

As explained through the analysis of how the women’s movement unified, one of the demands they made after the Cumbre de Mujeres was the presence of plenipotentiary women at the table, and as my table indicates, it was the most mentioned demand. A month after the Cumbre de Mujeres met, on November 22, 2013 president Santos announced that he was naming two plenipotentiary women, Nigeria Rentería and María Paulina Riveros ("Dos Mujeres Reforzarárn," 2013). “The FARC never named a plenipotentiary, but we [the women’s movement] were putting pressure and conducting advocacy with the government, because it is our government and have responsibilities to its citizens” (Allyson, Women’s movement, interview 4/21/2017). But the women’s movement didn’t want just any woman at the table but a woman that supported the women’s movement; “while it is important to have women, they should be women that support women’s issues too” (Deanna, Scholar, interview 4/13/2017). The two women the government appointed had experience with the conflict and supported women’s issues. María Paulina is a lawyer with human rights experience that worked with the secretary of the interior; Nigeria Rentereía was the High Advisor for Equality for Women in Colombia ("Dos Mujeres Reforzarárn," 2013).

It is important to note that the women’s movement in Colombia was not a perfect movement. While the Cumbre de Mujeres was successful and kept working throughout the peace
negotiations, there were also problems. As previously mentioned, the organizations that are part
of the movement have different backgrounds, ideologies, and agendas. These different groups
generated tension between the different organizations; “as the women’s movement in Colombia is
very large, [and] dynamic, but for the same reason it is also fragmented in political issues, and that
is going to be a problem during the implementation” (Mark, International actor, interview
7/10/2017). While the women’s movement “has been a unit during the peace negotiations, I believe
the women’s movement is not really unified, there are many different ideological postures around
the agreement, that does not unify them about the implementation process” (Daisy, International
actor, interview 7/7/2017). In fact, shortly after the signature of the peace agreement, the women’s
movement fragmented.

Having a frame alignment and an active women’s movement were necessary but not
sufficient for the inclusion of women’s issues in Colombia’s case. In fact, through my research I
found there are two more causal mechanisms besides those: collaboration between the women’s
movement and the negotiation team, and pressure from international actors. Here I am analyzing
these causal mechanisms.

While having a frame alignment and an active women’s movement were necessary for the
inclusion of women’s issues in the peace agreement in Colombia, there was also the collaboration
between the women’s movement and the negotiation teams, in Colombia’s case most specifically
the women that worked in the second-tier negotiations in both teams. I also looked for the presence
or absence of collaboration in two ways: first, training mechanisms, classified as: education,
forums, websites and surveys, and courses and training services. Second, direct mechanisms,
classified as: collaboration and cooperation, second-tier negotiators, experts, proposals and
recommendations, and the gender sub-commission.
Table 9. 

*Collaboration - Training*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training mechanisms</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Guerrilla</th>
<th>Women's Organizations</th>
<th>International Actors</th>
<th>Scholars</th>
<th>Journalists</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forums</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites and Surveys Courses and training services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* This table indicates the number of times a training mechanism was mentioned by the different interviewees that could help with collaboration between the women’s movement and the second-tier negotiation team.

The training mechanisms refer to the different mechanisms that help increase and cement the collaboration between the women’s movement and the second-tier negotiation team. As indicated in the table, Forums and Education are most mentioned by the respondents. The civil society national forums were set up by the government with the help of the National University’s Center for Reflection and Monitoring the Peace Talks and facilitated by the United Nations (Bouvier, 2016). They were not exclusively for women, they were for all the groups of civil society, and had as an objective to draft policy papers that would add support to the peace talks, while monitoring the peace process, and including the different sectors of the civil society. However, women’s organizations always went to these forums, and they always brought an agenda with them, always had something to add, especially to increase the visibility of a gender perspective in these points that being negotiated, and both negotiation teams were getting all this information (Greta, Scholar, interview 7/12/2017).

Beside these national forums there were also regional forums:

Colombia’s congress organized other regional forums through the peace commission that produce information that was taken to Havana. The government and the FARC received all this massive information and processed and analyzed all the proposals and recommendations that civil society was giving us about different
subjects, and in there we noticed the huge amount of women participation and suggestions (Paul, Government official, interview 2/2017).

While the negotiation table and talks were very private and closed, the forums were an opportunity to include civil society and get their proposals and recommendations to the table.

The education mechanism refers mostly to how the negotiation teams started to study the proposals made by the women’s organizations, but also to educate themselves on gender issues. This education process generated change in the views both parties had about women’s issues. For example, one of the government officials observed that “the women of the FARC started to study gender relationships, and they realized through the study of gender and feminism that for them it was a new subject. They have been part of a very patriarchal organization, and they started to open their views” (Paul, Government team, interview 2/2/2017). This education process had to be for both women and men on the teams, not just the FARC-EP. “At some point the delegations on both side were made up by 50-50, but that does not mean that the women on the delegations supported women’s issues, and they saw it as a less relevant or inferior point in the negotiations, it was important to educate the people who were not in support and become sensitive to the issues” (Ashley, Government team, interview 3/4/2017).

The sensitivity issue was brought up many times as part of the education that both negotiation teams needed:

it is important to be sensitive to women’s issues, not just see women as victims, but in order to create a public policy, a change, and an implementation plan, it is very important to learn and understand the different impact the conflict has on people. For the same reason there should be an education process of the negotiation teams so they can develop awareness about women’s issues and know what they need to do to include women’s issues throughout the process (Patty, Government team, interview 5/14/2017).

The negotiation teams had to develop this sensitivity, and almost two years after the process started, it was announced that the gender sub-commission was being installed. This was a
continuing education process through the entire negotiation that did not stop with the creation of the sub-commission.

The direct mechanisms refer to the direct collaboration that existed between the women’s movement and the second-tier negotiation team, which started with the creation of the gender sub-commission in September 2014. While in Guatemala’s case there was no evidence of a direct collaboration, and while it was possible there was an indirect collaboration, there was little evidence to say that it existed. In Colombia there was direct collaboration through different mechanisms indicated in the following table.

Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration – Direct Mechanisms</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Guerrilla</th>
<th>Women’s Organizations</th>
<th>International Actors</th>
<th>Scholars</th>
<th>Journalists</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration and cooperation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second tier negotiators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenipotentiary women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals and recommendations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender sub-commission</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table indicates the areas where collaboration occurred between the women’s movement and the second-tier negotiations teams.

While the women’s movement generated several proposals, they did not have a direct mechanism for how to make these proposals reach the negotiation table and have them included in the agreement. This changed almost two years after the negotiations started when the gender sub-commission was installed on September 7, 2014. It was only when the women’s movement coalesced around the main point—that women’s issues should be added—that they were
successful. The activism of the women’s movement was relentless in putting pressure and pushing for the inclusion women’s issues:

the addition of women’s issues on the peace process is the product of the women’s movement mobilization. It was not that the FARC and the government thought since the beginning that it was important to have a gender perspective in the peace process. That was a later response to the movement and to the women inside the negotiations teams that knew it was important and necessary to pay attention and bring it to the table (Paul, Government team, interview 2/2/2017).

The gender sub-commission was led by two women: María Paulina Riveros, who joined as a government plenipotentiary in November 2013, and Victoria Sandino, a commander in the FARC-EP, who had joined the FARC-EP’s negotiation team in April, and the majority of the team members were women, with only one male on each team (Bouvier, 2016). This sub-commission “came as an answer to the huge pressure that we [the women’s movement] put to the negotiation teams, to have the representation of at least one woman from the government and one woman from the FARC” (Julia, Women’s movement, interview 2/22/2017). The gender sub-commission “worked to include all the issues that are specific to women, not only as victims, but as political and socioeconomic actors, and this generates that the reconstruction of peace is also for women, and empowers them to recognize specific measures for them, so they can enforce their right of equality” (Paul, Government team, interview 2/2/2017).

When the women’s movement saw that the government and the FARC-EP had already negotiated two points they took action:

we decided to analyze the two points that had been agreed already, pointed out that they did not include any women’s issues, and wrote our suggestions and recommendations to include a gender perspective on those, and the ones in the future. We sent all this information to the guerrilla team and the government team, and that is when they realized that this was important. We were able to convince them to open a gender sub-commission, where women from both parties were in charge of making sure the agreement had a gender focus. We started to have a closer relationship with the women in those teams, especially the government side as they were able to travel, we will meet with them periodically, and we gave them
documents that they will share once they got back to Cuba (Allyson, Women’s movement, interview 4/21/2017).

Most of the collaboration happened in the gender sub-commission. The people who worked in the sub-commission also worked in other areas of the process, so the gender sub-commission had to work almost on the side of what had already been negotiated and what still had to be negotiated. The collaboration was not only between the women’s movement and the second-tier negotiation teams, but also between the women on both negotiation teams. I tried to find out which party was the first to suggest the inclusion of women’s issues, and while both the government and the FARC-EP agreed that the women’s movement was the one that pushed for it, both teams take credit for being the ones that mentioned first. However, as one of the government officials said, “what is important is that both parties realized the importance of the women, and women’s issues, and agreed to fight for their inclusion” (Emma, Government team, interview 3/20/2017).

There was support for women’s issues on the negotiation teams and they were able to talk to each other about the importance of including women’s issues and knew that if they came together it would be easier to have the plenipotentiaries on board too:

Tanja [FARC] was explaining to me that, before the gender sub-commission was put in place, women’s issues were being discussed a lot between both parties especially the women on each team; for example, she had several informal talks with Juanita Millan [government] about gender issues where they will agree about some things, and how they brought it up to the negotiations team was that Tanja will go to her superiors and say “the government is thinking about doing this about gender, and we should be as active” and Juanita will do the same; so the alliances and collaboration was done not only with the women’s movement, but also between the women in each team, not so open, but it definitely happened (Angel, Scholar, interview 6/6/2017).

Once the proposals reached to the gender sub-commission they started to work on those: “the participation was very active and required a lot of sacrifice by the team negotiators, as many of the meetings related to the sub-commission took place after normal working hours. The gender
sub-commission did a great job in getting together all the proposals made by the women’s movement, talked about them, and included them in the agreement” (Bea, Guerrilla team, interview 6/20/2017). But this was not an easy process. As previously mentioned, the gender sub-commission started to function only two years after the peace talks started, and two points had already been agreed.

The plenipotentiaries in both parts did not want to reopen both points, as they considered too risky. I think we were successful because we had a very clear set of rules, where we were going to be able to incorporate women’s issues in the points that had already been agreed, without having to reopen the points, but adding specific measures that were related to women, presenting those additions to the negotiation table, and they approved them (Paul, Government team, interview 2/2/2017).

Another important area for the collaboration was the inclusion of experts on the issues that were being negotiated. As previously indicated, being a woman does not necessarily mean one supports or understands women’s issues. The government’s negotiation team had selected women like Elena Ambrossi that had experience working for the government, and on the guerrilla side Victoria Sandino, one of the leaders of the FARC-EP, became a very important figure for the inclusion of women’s issues. For them it was important to bring experts from civil society that could guide, provide information, and assist the gender sub-commission.

We started to have meetings with different experts. For example, we held three meetings with women’s organizations and LGBTI organizations experts in the area of gender issues. We also had a meeting with ten experts in the subject of victims, who were experts in sexual violence; also, we had a meeting where we brought women excombatants from El Salvador, Guatemala, South Africa, Ireland, that told us about their experiences, especially in the point of end of the conflict and implementation (Ellie, Guerrilla team, interview 2/21/2017).

The collaboration between the women’s movement and the gender sub-commission was important in the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace agreement
The gender sub-commission was able to develop and listening to our proposals and our demands in a very efficient way, and we achieved an impact on the negotiation table, where the decisions were taking place. I think without the gender sub-commission it would have been very hard to achieve the things that we achieved (Julia, Women’s movement, interview 2/22/2017).

But the achievements of the gender sub-commission are related to all the collaboration that existed outside the sub-commission too: “the women’s movement played an impeccable role, not only insisting to the government for the sub-commission, but also supporting all the efforts of the creation and the functions and work of it” (Emma, Government team, interview 3/20/2017). The gender sub-commission looked at “women’s issues not only in the context of the armed conflict, but also in the construction of peace, what would be the necessary actions and programs to develop, to guarantee that in cases where women had been unequal and suffered injustice, the agreement guarantees the inclusion of women’s rights” (Sharon, Women’s movement, interview 4/13/2017).

There were different areas and sources of collaboration in Colombia’s peace process. However, the work of the gender sub-commission would not matter if it did not have the support of the plenipotentiaries, since in the end those were the people making the decisions. The important thing is that, slowly but steadily, “the plenipotentiaries started to be convinced about the need of the gender sub-commission, and I have to admit, I never saw any opposition from them or from any member of the FARC” (Emma, Government team, interview 3/20/2017). While there was still a very patriarchal structure and the majority of the plenipotentiaries were men, the majority of the support teams were women:

the men, like Sergio Jaramillo and Humberto De La Calle, were never negative towards women’s issues, but they have very little technical knowledge to have an agenda with a gender perspective; however, the women that work on the delegations were there every day, going to meetings, and were very positive about including women’s issues, for example, Elena Ambrossi was very positive and important in this process (Joy, International actor, interview 3/3/2017).
On the FARC-EP side there was support too, especially due to the work performed by Victoria Sandino:

Victoria Sandino said that the women had to get up at 4 a.m. to work on all the women’s issues, to be able to be ready at 8 a.m. with concrete points prepared and meet with the negotiation table. Each delegation had its own internal debates, but without a doubt the work of Victoria Sandino in the FARC, and Elena Ambrossi in the government, helped to make women’s voices stronger (Daisy, International actor, interview 7/7/2017).

By the time the sub-commission started to produce recommendations, “both delegations agreed that it was necessary to have a central group of people from both delegations that took the responsibility to work on the points we had already agreed on and bring support to the ones we still need to negotiate” (Luke, Government team, interview 9/28/2016). Once the proposals or recommendations were agreed on the gender sub-commission, the second-tier negotiation teams presented them to the top-tier negotiator, and they cooperated to add women’s issues to the peace agreement. Even though that was not a difficult process, it was not easy either.

The men in the top-tier negotiation did not oppose or were hostile to the inclusion of women’s issues, they were curious about the subject, asked a lot of questions, especially because they had little technical knowledge about it. Serio [Jaramillo] and Humberto De La Calle were not negative about it, but lack of knowledge about what it means to work with a gender agenda. However, the women in the junior teams [second-tier] knew about the subject and worked hard to incorporate it (Joy, International actor, interview 3/3/2017).

The partnership between the men and women is evident throughout the agreement. Colombia’s peace process included women’s issues in all aspects discussed in the process. The work and leadership of women like Elena Ambrossi on the government’s team and Victoria Sandino on the FARC-EP team help to gain support from the men on the top-tier negotiation team. “On the government team, there was never an opposition, but we knew it was going to be difficult to re-open the points that had already been agreed, but the fact
that both teams agreed to re-open them indicates the willingness to included women’s issues” (Emma, Government team, interview 3/20/2017).

The top-tier negotiators also became empathic to the women’s request, and understood that women’s issues needed to be included, as Luke from the government’s team explains:

we realized that in Colombia gender discrimination exists, not just because of the conflict, but also because of Colombia’s social structure, so we decided to include women’s issues and gender issues in general. It was not just talking about women, but establishing the necessary mechanisms, so the women that had been the most affected by the conflict, would be able to receive the benefits from the implementation programs (interview 9/28/2016).

The collaboration between the women’s movement and the second-tier negotiators was necessary for the inclusion of women’s issues. However, similar to the movement’s frame alignment, to have an active women’s movement is not sufficient. Through my research about Colombia, I found out there was another causal mechanism: pressure from international actors.

**Alternative Explanation**

In Colombia, the negotiation processes in this study were also influenced by international actors, more specifically the United Nations and two countries, Sweden and Norway. However, what is important to indicate is that it was not an initiative by the international actors to push for the inclusion of women’s issues, but that the Colombian women’s groups initiated the international pressure, by calling out the United Nations to put pressure on both the United Nations and the Colombia government to include women at the peace negotiation table and women’s issues in the peace agreement: “the fight from the women’s movement to include women’s issues was helped a lot from the external pressure done by the United Nations and other countries from the international system” (Bea, Guerrilla team, interview 6/20/2017). The main roles of these international actors were to motivate the parties to sit down and open a dialogue, provide new ideas
and solutions, speed up the process by using deadlines, and offer different techniques to achieve an agreement (Spector 2010). As the World Bank and the Carter Center reports (1997) explain, the international community can take the role of mediating the process but can also provide financial incentives for the parties to participate in the process without increasing or contributing to the conflict: “if you have the support of international actors, they can echo the message from the women’s organizations, and indicate how important it is to have the inclusion of women’s issues” (Deanna, Scholar, interview 4/13/2017). In the table below, I analyzed where the international support for Colombia’s peace process came from. I classified the international actors as countries and the United Nations. These two classifications referred to what the interviewees saw as the areas where the international support came from.

Table 11.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Actors - Support</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Guerrilla</th>
<th>Women's Organizations</th>
<th>International Actors</th>
<th>Scholars</th>
<th>Journalists</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: This table indicates what the interviewees saw as where the support came from international actors in Colombia’s peace process.*

The United Nations had a role when it produced resolutions, such as the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 (UNSCR 1325) (Appendix Q), which helped the women’s movement argument for the inclusion of top-tier women negotiators and women’s issues on the agenda and in the agreement. The resolution “urges all actors to increase the participation of women and incorporate gender perspectives in all United Nations peace and security efforts … also calls to take special measures to protect women and girls from gender-biased violence” (OSAGI, 2000).
One of the mechanisms that was created to help women get a place at the negotiation table and/or have their issues included on the agenda was the UNSCR 1325 (2000), which was going to be used in Colombia’s case specifically, as it did not exist during Guatemala’s or El Salvador’s peace agreements. The Beijing Platform for Action was the preamble for the creation of the UNSCR 1325. Shepperd (2008) indicates that the nongovernmental organization Working Group on Women, Peace and Security and the United Nations claim authority for the document, but the reality is that both organizations contributed to the creation of it. On October 31, 2000, the UNSCR 1325 on Women, Peace and Security was signed unanimously by all member states, making it a legally binding document. The UNSCR 1325 emphasizes the roles of women in armed conflict and peace processes (Gumru et al., 2009) and stresses the importance of equal participation by men and women in peacemaking (Bell et al., 2010).

The resolution encourages states to include women at the peacemaking negotiation table but also to include “a gender perspective in any planning or implementation of peace operations and peace negotiations” (Nakaya, 2003). While all signatories are responsible for upholding their obligations under Resolution 1325, the existing patriarchal structures make implementation problematic, such as the perception that armed conflict is men’s business, and for the same reason only men can negotiate the peace as previously indicated. According to Allyson, a women’s movement leader,

when we see the installation of the negotiation table in Norway, we realize, because we have a very clear picture of it, that the table is very masculine, there are 10 men from the FARC and 10 men from the government, so we started sending letters to the government, that under the frame of the Resolution 1325, which makes the government accountable, they must follow with what it says, and they are not doing it, as at this moment there are not women participation at the table (interview 4/21/2017).
The women’s movement could not demand the enforcement of Resolution 1325 to the FARC-EP but they could to the government.

In Colombia, the women’s movement used UNSCR 1325 as a tool to pressure the negotiation teams, specifically making the government team accountable, since Colombia had signed this resolution, and the resolution calls for the inclusion of plenipotentiary women in peace negotiations:

we have been working since 2000 using the framework of Resolution 1325, so we have very clear understanding of the needs and the importance of having women participating in the negotiation, and the inclusion of women’s issues, so we used the resolution as an advocacy and activism tool since we found out about the peace negotiations (Allyson, Women’s movement, interview 4/21/2017).

In addition, I argue here that the United Nations had the opportunity to show the world that the UNSCR1325 was a very applicable tool to help women during and after an armed conflict indeed.

Also, there was direct involvement of the UN through its division UN Women, which helped the women’s movement. As previously indicated, UN Women provided the technical and logistical support for the Cumbre de Mujeres, but also supported the women’s movement during the peace process and reminded them about Resolution 1325 and all the other resolutions that followed, such as 1889, 1820, 1888, and 1960, to increase the role of women in peace. The international community, especially Norway and Sweden, were asking to follow Resolution 1325. Colombia’s women’s movement used Resolution 1325 as a key factor in their activism and advocacy for the inclusion of women and women’s issues in the peace process. The resolution helped women to educate themselves to increase women’s participation in any conflict-related process, but also to bring attention to their cause at the local, national, and international levels, with the help of the UN. “The role of the United Nations, and UN Women, was to provide all the information about international regulations, about 1325 and all the other resolutions, and pointing
out that women needed to be included, and generating pressure for this inclusion” (Daisy, International actor, interview 7/7/2017).

An example of the support from the UN Women during the process is the press release when President Santos announced the inclusion of two plenipotentiary women (Appendix R). During the peace negotiations, once the women plenipotentiaries joined the government team and the gender sub-commission was put in place, UN Women “was present, helping with the development of reports, and organizing both teams in the sub-commission” (Emma, Government team, interview 3/20/2017). In 2015, UN Women in Colombia had published several articles about the role of women in Colombia’s peace process.

Besides the United Nations, there was also the support of individual countries. First, it was what is called the guarantors’ countries: Cuba, Norway, Sweden, and Venezuela. These countries had the role of supporting the peace process in different areas. For example, Cuba was the country where the negotiation talks were taking place; Norway is a country that has a tradition of conflict resolution and diplomacy, and had knowledge about Colombia’s conflict as many NGOs from Norway operate in Colombia; Venezuela was selected by the FARC-EP as its government had pushed the guerrillas to sit down and negotiate; last, Chile, selected by the government as it had experience with political transition in Latin America (“El Rol Que,” 2016).

There were two countries that were supporting Colombia’s women’s movement and the peace process, Norway and Sweden, and their role was very important. The international community, where development organizations were also pushing for more gender-inclusive programs tied to funding and resources (Montecinos, 2001), and funding resources for development and reconstruction programs are influenced especially by countries where gender equality had been a priority, such as Sweden and Norway:
I think for us it was very important to work with women’s organizations directly in the country, to know directly from them what are their needs, and also help them redact the proposals, to make them relevant, and that they can be achieved. You do not want to show up to the negotiation table with 1000 proposals, but we just help them to systematize, articulate them, and help them get the space where they can share their common goals and ideas, as there are different perspectives within the women’s movement (Mark, International actor, interview 7/10/2017).

Similar to Norway, Sweden has knowledge about Colombia’s armed conflict, and many Swedish NGOs work in Colombia. “Even though Sweden was not officially part of the peace process, it had been supporting civil society in Colombia for more than 30 years. Sweden had a very strong relationship with Colombia’s civil society, supporting human right organizations and women’s organizations” (Joy, International actor, interview 3/3/2017). This relationship was evident as Colombia’s government was requesting help from Sweden’s government throughout the process: “Sweden “gave us enormous help, the government brought help from experts, such as Chris Coulter, and she did training services, especially with the gender sub-commission in the areas of methodology and conceptualization, and also in the production of policies” (Paul, Government team, interview 2/2/2017). But the services that these two countries provided were not exclusive with the government: “Norway and Sweden provided a lot of financial assistance, and they were the ones that paid for all the training of the FARC” (Angel, Scholar, interview 6/6/2017).

Both Sweden and Norway were pointing out the lack of women’s presence in the negotiations. “In the beginning of the process, Norway was worried that there were no women at the table, and women’s issues were not being included, and this was an issue on both delegations” (Mark, International actor, interview 7/10/2017). Increasing women’s presence and including women’s issues on the negotiation was very important for these countries, and they provided support not only to the negotiating table, but also to the women’s movement. “The government of
Sweden supported women’s organizations, while Norway was putting pressure at the table for the inclusion of women” (Ashley, Government team, interview 3/4/2017). Putting pressure on the delegations helped with the women’s movement demands. “We had the support of the international community, especially during the forums they gave financial and technical support, but also to make it relevant on an international level and helped us [the women] to make substantial changes in the agreements and included a gender focus” (Ellie, Guerrilla team, interview 2/21/2017).

While it is fundamental to mention that the international actors (UN, Norway, and Sweden) helped to get women’s issues included because they supported their cause, they also provided the resources for the women’s movement and the negotiations teams because the women’s movement asked them for help first. The international actors’ influence was not enough by itself to include women’s issues, and even though they had a very important role they would not have succeed if the other causal mechanisms had not been present.

Conclusion

In Colombia’s case, I conducted process tracing just as I did in Guatemala’s and El Salvador’s cases. I indicated the causal mechanisms that worked (or did not work) in this case. I followed the sequence of events to find how women’s issues made it to the peace agreement, looking at the actors that participated, and who pushed for the inclusion, when they pushed for that inclusion, and what the response was to the demand of including women’s issues. Colombia’s peace agreement included over 120 provisions on women’s issues (Appendix S). The causal mechanisms that I analyzed were the active women’s movement, the frame alignment used by the women’s movement, and the collaboration between the women’s movement and the negotiation teams. To sum up:
H1: The cases where there is an active women’s movement are more likely to include women’s issues in the peace agreement.

In Colombia, the women’s movement originated with the Cumbre de Mujeres. However, all the women’s groups and networks that were part of the women’s movement had been working for decades, and they were ready to go once the peace negotiations were announced. They knew that coming together under one movement was key for their fight for the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace agreement. Having an active women’s movement that was prepared with a list of demands was necessary in Colombia’s case. The Cumbre de Mujeres got all the different women’s groups together with one common voice and agenda.

H2: The cases where the women’s movement used a frame alignment are more likely to include women’s issues in the peace agreement.

This was also a necessary condition in Colombia’s case. The women’s movement in Colombia framed their cause as: women were half of the population in the country and for the same reason their issues should be included in the peace agreement, especially because women were also the majority of the victims. The women’s movement knew that by pointing out these two main reasons, they could convey to the parties at the negotiation table, but also the rest of the population, why they were fighting for the inclusion of women’s issues.

H3: The cases where there is collaboration between women’s organizations and negotiation teams are more likely to include women’s issues in the peace agreement.

In Colombia’s case, the collaboration between the women’s movement and the negotiation teams, more specifically the second-tier negotiation teams, was necessary for the inclusion of women’s issues. As in to Guatemala’s case, there were women on the negotiation teams that felt
empathic to the women’s movement. The difference was that they had an extensive collaboration with the women’s movement, working together for the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace agreement.
Chapter 9

Conclusions

Armed conflict has been part of human history as far back as we know it, and sadly it does not seem it will stop any time soon. However, it has been declining overall, but what has been changing though, is that modern conflict affects more women than men, not in fatalities, but in cases of forced displacement, sexual abuse, and loss of family members. Yet despite women being the most victimized, their issues have not been often addressed in peace negotiations or peace agreements. Out of 35 comprehensive peace agreements in the world, only eight included women’s issues.

My project was developed to determine whether the partnership between the women and men on the negotiation teams was the main factor that influenced the inclusion or absence of women’s issues in the agreement. My primary methodology was process tracing because this method enabled me to identified what I believe are the causal mechanisms connecting the independent variable and the dependent variable using case studies. The causal mechanisms were: an active women’s movement; the women’s movement frame alignment; the collaboration between the women’s movement and the second-tier negotiation teams. In the case of Colombia, there was a fourth causal mechanism, the pressure from international actors. I selected the cases of Guatemala, El Salvador, and Colombia, which are similar in regional location, language, and history, but vary in the main dependent variable: whether or not women’s issues are in the peace negotiation agreements.

In this chapter I review the main findings of my research, discuss their implications, provide recommendations for future peace negotiation process, and lastly, I suggest some opportunities for future research.
Findings

There were several findings in my research. The use of process tracing helped me to identify the causal mechanisms that I hypothesized as connecting the independent and dependent variables. Some of the causal mechanisms were present in Guatemala’s case; in El Salvador’s case they were not present; and in Colombia they were all present, but also there was one more causal mechanism. Also, the causal mechanisms were all necessary, but none of them were individually sufficient to have women’s issues included. I describe briefly the findings in each case. Also, the application of Social Movement Theory helped me to document the process of how women’s organizations may grow into a women’s movement, and how they developed a frame alignment that helps the movement in pursuing its goals. I describe below the most important findings in this study.

I had argued that the inclusion of women’s issues could take place during pre-negotiation and negotiation phases. In Guatemala’s and Colombia’s cases this inclusion actually happened during the negotiation phase, and there was no evidence that women’s issues were discussed during the pre-negotiation phase in either case. In all three cases, the women’s groups started to emerge during the pre-negotiation phase, while the conflict was still taking place, mostly as a response to the conflict and the effects that it had on women.

In my main hypothesis, the independent variable is the partnership between the women and men on the negotiation teams, while the dependent variable is the addition of women’s issues to the agreement. The three causal mechanisms that I believe connected my independent variable with my dependent variable are: a women’s movement frame alignment, an active women’s movement, and the collaboration between the women’s movement and the negotiation teams.
Table 12.

*Causal Mechanisms in each case*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Women's Movement</th>
<th>Frame Alignment</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* This table indicates whether the causal mechanisms were present or not in each of the cases in this study.

**A Key Variable: Presence of an Active Women’s Movement**

As illustrated in the cases, there were some women’s groups before the conflict started. However, during a conflict new groups could emerge as a consequence of the conflict, for example, the Salvadoran Women’s Association (AMES) in El Salvador; Ruta Pacífica in Colombia; and CONAVIGUA in Guatemala. The number of women’s organizations increased with armed conflict, and in Guatemala and Colombia the consolidation of a women’s movement started to happen as the conflict intensified.

I had argued that during conflict more women’s groups are generated, and this could contribute to the creation of a women’s movement. This was true in Colombia and Guatemala, but it did not happen in El Salvador. The women’s movement was created in spaces where the women’s groups came together to acknowledge, address, and resolve gender and women’s issues. In Guatemala, the number of women’s organizations expanded during the conflict, and they unified during the peace talks when the women’s organizations realized they were being excluded from the peace process and created the Women’s Sector within the ASC. In Colombia, the women’s movement consolidated after the peace process started with the organization of the Cumbre de Mujeres, a summit that unified more than 450 women’s organizations and networks. In El
Salvador, the women’s movement was never created, as the different organizations never came together with one voice with a common agenda.

In the cases of Colombia and Guatemala, the respective women’s movements were prepared with a list of demands and recommendations and were ready to fight for the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace agreements; in both cases the women’s movement was formed by different types of groups that did not share the same vision or goals. What they did have in common is that they wanted an end to the conflict and they had been supporting women that had been affected by the conflict. In Guatemala and Colombia, all the different women’s groups that were part of the women’s movement had different ways of operating, different ideas on how to achieve their goals, and different ideologies. However, they came together under a women’s movement and agreed on a unified purpose. I found evidence of different women’s groups that did not agree with other organizations but became part of the movement and decided to work together in order to fight for the inclusion of women’s issues in peace agreements. Under the women’s movement, these organizations, networks, and platforms worked together even while continuing to work independently.

In Guatemala and Colombia, I found also collaboration between other civil society groups and the women’s movement. For example, in Guatemala, there was collaboration between the Women’s Sector, and other civil society members of the ASC, such as indigenous or union groups. In Colombia, the Cumbre de Mujeres collaborated also with LGBTI groups, victims’ groups, and displaced groups. They worked together to pressure for the inclusion of women’s issues in peace negotiations and agreements.

In both cases, the women’s movements were able to present a unified agenda that pressured for the inclusion of women’s issues, resulting from to the type of political action, advocacy, and
activism that they agreed to do. I found that they were able to come together because they understood that it was a movement made up of different groups, and these groups were able to prevent a division between them that could stop them from achieving the movement’s goal. A unified women’s movement was key because it brought together all the women’s groups and represented their main demands under one voice and not hundreds of voices. All the groups that are part of the movement agreed on their demands, needs, and goals, and it got the attention from the negotiation teams. For the same reason it is important to see how they were able to become unified and what type of frame alignment they used.

**A Key Variable: Frame Alignment**

In all three cases I expected to find that a specific frame alignment unified women’s movements and justified their demands for their inclusion in the peace negotiations and agreements. However, because El Salvador did not have a women’s movement, I only found the frame alignment in Guatemala and Colombia’s cases. This frame was very similar in both cases: the women’s movement framed their cause by indicating that they were the majority of the victims of the conflict and that the conflict had affected them differently than men. In Colombia the women’s movement added to their frame that women were also half of the population, as a result their issues needed to be included in order to be able to sustain peace. The different groups and organizations that existed in each case started to look to other groups that shared their same goals, vision, or mission and organize under networks or platforms to make their cause more visible.

As indicated in this study, in Social Movement Theory, the framing perspective attempts to explain why and how social movement ideas are understood by the populations involved, how people construct their reality, and how they interpret their problems and grievances. In Guatemala and Colombia, the women came together and formed groups such as those for indigenous women,
middle class educated women, rural women, urban women, victims, and combatants. However, within these different groups, they understood that the shared unifying element was how the conflict had affected them differently than men, that the women were the majority of victims, and that it was up to them to make this clear to the rest of the population. This frame alignment was important because it helped women from different groups to come together in one movement and express their needs and demands during the peace process.

According to Snow et al. (1986) this frame alignment involves four aspects: First, linkage brings together people who share similar views or grievances but who lack an organizational base (p. 467). In Guatemala, El Salvador, and Colombia, there were women in different sectors of society who were being affected by armed conflict, but they were not organized at that point. Second is amplification, where the women started to organize in different groups in which they expressed the grievances caused by conflict. This happened in the three cases too, the different women’s groups indicated that the violence of the conflict was changing their lives, for example, they were forced to join the labor force and provide for the family; they often became victims of sexual violence, were displaced (more than men), and had their families destroyed by the deaths of the men or children in their lives.

Third is extension where different groups involved promoted each other even if their main goals were not the same. In all three cases, there were many women’s groups with different agendas. But it was only in Guatemala and Colombia that I found that the women’s movement became stronger and developed a frame alignment that showed they were the largest population affected by conflict and for this same reason it was necessary that their issues were included in the peace agreements.
Even though frame alignments start to develop when different groups share the grievances of the conflict, it is not going to be strong until there is a women’s movement in place. Many women’s groups can have the same frame alignment, as they did in El Salvador, but if they do not come together under a single movement, that frame will not be strong enough to pressure the negotiation teams. However, if they could use this frame to incorporate more participants that share the same understanding, they can come together under a movement where they agree they have one thing in common: women are half of the population and they are the majority of victims of the armed conflict. This framing indicates women’s issues must be included in peace agreements, as happened in Guatemala and Colombia.

A Key Variable: Collaboration

This was a very interesting finding. I expected to find collaboration in Guatemala and Colombia since the other two causal mechanisms were present. However, I only found the collaboration in Colombia. In Guatemala, I expected to find that the collaboration between the negotiation teams and the women’s movement was necessary to get these issues to the table. I was confident that I was going to find evidence of collaboration between the women’s movement and the negotiation teams, but that collaboration was not very obvious. While it is true that Luz Méndez, the plenipotentiary from the URNG, was the person who helped introduce the Women’s Sector proposals, there was not enough evidence to indicate that there was collaboration between her and the women’s movement. While it is true that all the women’s issues that the Women’s Sector submitted were included, there is no evidence of direct collaboration.

In Colombia’s case, I found collaboration between the negotiation teams and the women’s movement was necessary to get these issues to the table. They worked together, and the second-tier of negotiators listened to the demands and recommendations from the women’s movement and
then brought the proposals to the top-tier negotiators. Also, as in Guatemala, there were plenipotentiary women. However, the collaboration was directly done with the second-tier negotiators, but it helped having women in the top-tier that worked constantly with second-tier negotiators. This working proximity facilitated the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace agreement.

As illustrated in all three cases, I predicted that in cases where women’s issues were successfully included in peace agreements, it was the result of an active women’s movement (not just women’s groups), that used a specific frame to advocate for the inclusion of women’s issues on these agreements, and that there were women on the negotiation teams (supported by the women’s movement) who started to collaborate with men at the negotiation table. However, after analyzing all three cases, the prediction is true about an active women’s movement that used a specific frame alignment. The collaboration only happened in Colombia’s case, and since I do not have compelling evidence for all cases, more research and testing has to be done in other cases, to see if the different types of conditions, in this case the collaboration, will hold up.

**Alternative Explanation**

I also analyzed an alternative explanation in each case, the pressure from international actors. While I believe this pressure has increased over time, the international actors could not have included women’s issues by themselves. It had been almost 16 years since Guatemala’s peace agreement was signed and the beginning of Colombia’s process. During this period of time, many things happened worldwide that helped women’s movements, such as the Fourth World Women’s Conference in Beijing in 1995 and the development of United Nations resolutions, starting with the UNSCR 1325.
Also, since 2000 there had been three comprehensive peace agreements that included women’s issues: Liberia in 2003, Sudan in 2005, and Nepal in 2006. However, during the same period of time there were also seven other comprehensive peace processes that did not include women: Papua New Guinea in 2001, Djibouti in 2001, Macedonia in 2001, Angola in 2002, Senegal in 2004, Indonesia in 2005, and Cote d’Ivoire in 2007. The lack of inclusion probably helped the women’s movement in Colombia, by looking at the difference in the ones that included women’s issues and the ones that did not, during the time that the Resolution 1325 was put in place, a resolution that had been signed by every single United Nations member.

Additionally, during the time between Guatemala’s and Colombia’s peace agreement, women’s organizations had the opportunity to prepare and educate themselves and the public more. They also developed new techniques of advocacy and activism, and there was a boom of international organizations that focused on gender issues. But all these international advances in women’s rights were not enough if the women’s movement had not called out for help from the UN and countries like Norway and Sweden. While it may be true that international actors influenced the inclusion of women’s issues in Colombia’s peace process, there is no substantial evidence of that.

Limitations

In Guatemala and El Salvador, the conflicts had been over decades ago, so many of the people that I might have wanted to interview may not remember exactly how the negotiation process took place, and for the same reason it was better for my research to use secondary sources for these cases. However, there are limitations associated with secondary sources, such as the authors could have missed information about the process. The way I addressed these limitations was that I used the sources that have been accredited and published; the authors and scholars are
experts in their fields and have studied and published on the conflicts to a great extent. I used the information to reconstruct the process of how women’s and men’s partnership influenced the inclusion (or exclusion) of women’s issues on the peace agreement, and none of these sources had specifically done that work. I was able to conduct one key interview with Raquel Zelaya, the woman plenipotentiary from the government’s side, and she clarified some questions I had about the collaboration in Guatemala.

In Colombia, the armed conflict had just ended, and feelings of mistrust in general still exits. I received verbal agreement from all the people that I interviewed to used their names if I wanted. However, due to the fact that the conflict had just ended, and that there is still mistrust, I did not use their real names or exact job positions. I addressed this limitation by guaranteeing the participants that no identifiable information was going to be provided. I preferred to keep their identities confidential.

Also, in Colombia, one more limitation was the gender bias that can happen with the selection of subjects. In order to prevent this situation, I tried to have an equal number of men and women. As I was conducting the interviews, it was evident that most of the subjects were going to be women. During my research period, I was not able to get any guerrilla men to participate, as most of the men who were involved in the peace process were very busy or too highly positioned for me to be able to reach them. However, I was able to interview government officials, and two important guerrilla women, as well as other men that were involved with the peace process.

Another limitation was the lack of access to some of the people I wanted to interview, in particular the members of the government and guerrilla teams that did the agenda setting before the negotiations started. Until April of 2018, I was still trying to reach these people. For the government, the High Commissioner for Peace (Sergio Jaramillo) was too busy with an active
peace negotiation with a different guerrilla group, plus the implementation of the agreement, and the other person, Frank Pearl, was running for president of Colombia and never answered my requests. With the guerrillas, in both the agenda setting and the interviews, it was extremely difficult to find a contact or to get an answer. Despite these limitations, in the end I had 30 quality interviews with people who were directly involved in the peace process.

Finally, there was the use of intersectionality. I wanted to use intersectionality as a concept to document women’s experiences during conflict, the effects of conflict, what happens to them after a conflict, and how different women’s groups have different experiences of the conflict because of their different backgrounds—such as rural vs. urban, or government vs. guerrilla. In this study, I wanted to include the experiences of women (indigenous, non-indigenous, rural, urban, guerrilla, government,) before, during, and after a conflict, and how they were able (or unable) to come together and add women’s issues to agendas and peace agreements. In all of the cases within this study, gender intersected with socioeconomic class and with other categories such as education, indigenous/non-indigenous, rural/urban, and so on.

Where possible, I tried to apply the concept of intersectionality, which means that I considered the different characteristics (such as ethnicity, age, class status) in addition to gender. However, in Guatemala and El Salvador, the use of secondary sources made it difficult to apply the concept of intersectionality. I tried to apply it by highlighting the voices from indigenous people, the negotiators that sat at the table, and using sources that included research from different perspectives, such the indigenous, middle-class and guerrilla forces. In Colombia, I tried to apply it with the different interviews I conducted, by including the perspectives from different groups, such as rural vs. urban women, upper-class vs. middle-class, government vs. guerrilla members,
indigenous vs. nonindigenous, which provided an analysis of their experience before, during, and after a conflict different from the men’s experiences and the other women too.

Throughout this study, I found that including an in-depth intersectionality approach was difficult to achieve. There was evidence of intersectionality in the different women’s groups that came together in one women’s movement. Becoming a movement is overcoming intersectionality and its many categories (rural, urban, poor, rich, indigenous, educated, uneducated, and so on). The one commonality between all these groups is being women, and as such unequal in terms of rights and in terms of victimization. However, I realized that I could apply it on future research, for example, in analyzing the different women’s groups that are part of a women’s movement. In the cases of Guatemala, El Salvador, and Colombia, intersectionality is useful to understand why different women’s groups formed, their purpose and agendas, and why they unified in a movement during the peace negotiations.

In terms of validity and reliability, these two issues have been discussed for qualitative studies. According to Golafshani (2003) reliability refers to the precision of the instrument that is being used, and due to the nature of qualitative studies, reliability is a concept that usually is not taken into consideration. In many cases, in order to increase the reliability and validity in qualitative methods, triangulation (using different instruments) helps improve these concepts in the study. I used triangulation by checking primary sources, the people on both negotiation teams, against secondary sources produce by the journalists, scholars, international actors, and women’s organizations. I wanted to ensure that I spoke with a diverse range of participants from across sectors. In addition, I checked the information by examining newspaper and magazine articles and any type of communication that any of these diverse groups produced.
Recommendations

As previously indicated, the women’s movements in Guatemala and Colombia fractured after the peace agreement. One of the recommendations that I suggest is that while they are united during the peace talks they also work towards the future which would greatly impact implementation of these issues that they worked so hard to place on the agreement agendas. This means they need to decide what to do after the peace agreement is signed. Part of the fragmentation in Colombia’s case is because they could not agree on the implementation of the agreement. Even though there are different groups with different agendas, the women’s movement can achieve more for all the women’s group, than the groups can for themselves. The conflict of interest and their priorities are always there, but as was seen in Colombia, the fracturing of the movement makes the organizations seem weak and conflicted, and perpetuates the stereotype of women being difficult and problematic. This gives an advantage to the opposition groups. If the leaders of the women’s movement also work towards the future, it could be better for their goals.

For the same reason, it must be clear who are the leaders of the women’s movement. If this is agreed before the implementation stage, then it is easier for the movement to appoint the women in all the institutions and implementations programs. At this moment in Colombia, the opposition has taken advantage of the lack of unification among the women’s groups, and the government has filled positions mostly with men because the women cannot agree on who to represent them. For the same reason, the women’s groups should have a list of candidates ready and agreed on the women they want to present to fill those positions. Those discussions cannot happen during the implementation. They must happen before, for example with training and planning meetings.

Another recommendation is to increase the attention of the media. The women’s movement could use the media more effectively to make the government accountable for the agreements they
had signed on women’s rights, both at the national and international level. It could also increase the attention of international actors that want to help, but at the national level, it can inform the people with the right information and get the support they need, making it clear why it is important to have women’s issues included.

**Future research**

Originally, when I started this project I wanted to do a mixed methods study, where the quantitative part was going to analyze what the impact of including women’s issues on a peace agreement was on women’s status post-conflict, especially in the areas of political representation and education, because education is really at the heart of advancing opportunities for women and their families, and political representation is ultimately a direct measure of their influence on policymaking. Any changes, reforms, and/or promotions in these two areas are usually very visible and could influence changes in other areas. Also, the process of changing, developing, and implementing programs that improve the status of women post-conflict starts at the peace negotiations.

However, I was not able to continue with this part of the project, as only Guatemala (at that time) had included women’s issues, El Salvador had not, and Colombia was still going through peace negotiations, but more importantly Guatemala’s peace process failed to be implemented, as the people of Guatemala voted against any changes on women’s issues that the agreement suggested. By 2006, only 69 percent of the accord has been implemented, and of that none of the women’s issues had been implemented (Peace Accords Matrix, 2017). On the other hand, in El Salvador, where women’s issues were not included, by 2002, 96 percent of the peace agreement had been implemented (Peace Accords Matrix, 2017), but because women’s issues were not
included, we have no way to compare if the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace agreement had an impact and improve in women’s status post-conflict.

In Colombia’s case, the implementation process started a year ago, and it has been going very slowly. I believe this is going to be a good research area, especially because I asked all the people that I interviewed about what the future holds for Colombia. They all agreed that the implementation stage is more difficult than the peace negotiations, as new opposition forces can be stronger. Also, the women’s movements in Guatemala and Colombia fragmented after the peace negotiations, mainly because each group that was part of it saw the implementation as the opportunity to push for their own agenda.

Also, another future research opportunity is what happens with the women’s organizations or movement in cases (the majority) where women’s issues are not included, after a peace agreement is signed. For example, in El Salvador, the women’s movement organized after the peace agreement was already signed, when the different women groups came together to fight for women’s equality, mainly in political participation, after they realized there were no women’s issues included on the peace agreement.

Lastly, another area for future research is to explore the groups that opposed these peace agreements, the techniques they used, and if they were successful or not. For example, the conservative right in Colombia opposed the peace agreement by using the definition of “family unit” and “gender ideology” as a tactic to get people to vote against the agreement during the referendum. Through the use of religion, patriarchal ideologies, and fake media, they convinced more than 50 percent of the voters to vote “no,” arguing that by including women issues and LGBTI’s issues in the peace agreement, the family unit of Colombia’s society was going to be destroyed. This is a rich area for future research.
References

*Development in Practice, 14*(3), 342-353.


Grandin, G. (1997). To end with all these evils: Ethnic transformation and community mobilization. *Latin American Perspectives, 24*(2), 7-34


Kampwirth (Eds.), *Radical women in Latin America: Left and right* (pp. 133-164). University Park: Pennsylvania State University.


Sanz Luque, B. (2013). *Cumbre nacional de mujeres y paz - Sitematización.* *Cumbre nacional de mujeres y paz* (pp. 9-10). Bogotá: UN Women.


Sector de Mujeres (1997). *Análisis de los acuerdos de paz: ideas principales de cada acuerdo y los compromisos específicos hacia las mujeres*. Ciudad de Guatemala: Sector de Mujeres ASC.


Touraine, A. (2000). *Podemos vivir juntos?* Ciudad de Mexico: FCE.


## Appendix A

### Comprehensive Peace Agreements with Women’s Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence start date</td>
<td>5-Oct-68</td>
<td>1-May-97</td>
<td>1-Jan-00</td>
<td>16-May-83</td>
<td>13-Nov-60</td>
<td>13-Feb-96</td>
<td>28-Jun-98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main cease fire agreement</td>
<td>10-Apr-98</td>
<td>18-May-99</td>
<td>17-Jun-03</td>
<td>31-Dec-04</td>
<td>4-Dec-96</td>
<td>26-May-06</td>
<td>16-Nov-03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main accord date</td>
<td>10-Apr-98</td>
<td>7-Jul-99</td>
<td>18-Aug-03</td>
<td>9-Jan-05</td>
<td>29-Dec-96</td>
<td>21-Nov-06</td>
<td>28-Aug-00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months of violence</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of deaths</td>
<td>3526</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4,058</td>
<td>1.2 million</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>13,347</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average deaths per year</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>1,521</td>
<td>55,400</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>40,909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population prior to conflict</td>
<td>1,502,000</td>
<td>4,009,756</td>
<td>2,439,389</td>
<td>21,460,587</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>22,170,625</td>
<td>Roughly 6,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of deaths of population</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of refugees</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>490,061</td>
<td>33,977</td>
<td>693,632</td>
<td>500,000 to 1.5 million</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of IDPs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td>5,355,000</td>
<td>50,356</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of conflict</td>
<td>Intrastate-Territory</td>
<td>Intrastate-Government</td>
<td>Intrastate-Government</td>
<td>Intrastate-Territory</td>
<td>Intrastate-Government</td>
<td>Intrastate-Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women issues mentioned</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Note:* It does not include Colombia’s peace agreement.
Appendix B

Interview Questions

The purpose of the study is to find out how the addition of women’s issues to the peace negotiation agreement influences women’s status post-conflict. This research takes place in two different stages: The first stage examines why women’s issues are, or are not, included on the peace negotiations’ agreement. The second stage looks at how the addition of women’s issues to peace negotiation agreements influences women’s status post-conflict, particularly in the areas of representation and education.

Questions for Colombia (Stage 1)

1. Could you describe how the peace negotiation agenda was set?

2. Do you believe it is important or even necessary to include women’s issues in peace negotiations and agreements? Could you please elaborate your answer?

3. Do you think it was the government, the guerrilla, civil society, or international organizations that pushed for the inclusion of women’s issues on the agenda?

4. Do you remember who first suggested adding women’s issues to the agenda?

5. How would you compare women’s and men’s involvement in including women’s issues in the peace negotiation process?

6. What types of mechanisms/spaces/opportunities were created by men to facilitate the participation of women in the process?

7. What is the most important factor that allowed the inclusion of the women’s issues in the peace negotiation agenda? Could you elaborate how this factor helped bring women’s issues to the agenda?

8. What suggestions/advice would you give people involved in other peace processes for them to be able to have a gender inclusive process?

9. What impact do you think the inclusion will have on women’s lives? Could you please give me some examples?
Questions for Guatemala (Stage 2)

1. What measures were put in place to guarantee the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace negotiation agendas and agreements?

2. Did including women’s issues in the agenda have a positive or negative impact on women’s status since the agreement was signed? Could you give me an example of the same?

3. How did the inclusion of women’s issues influence women’s status, specifically in the areas of political representation and education?

4. Have more women been elected to office as a result of the inclusion of women’s issues in the agreement?

5. Do more women have access to educational opportunities as a result of the inclusion of women’s issues in the agreement? Could you please elaborate your answer?

6. Do you think these changes in education and political representation are seen more at the regional or national level, why? What does this signify for you?

7. Which area has been impacted more? Could you explain to me how the provisions in the agreement had this impact?

Additional questions and questions for specific groups

1. What role did the government play in the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace negotiation process and agreement? (Government)

2. What role did the guerrilla play in the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace negotiation process and agreement? (Guerrilla)

3. What role did your organization play in the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace negotiation process and agreement? (International Organizations)

4. Why do you think it is important that international organizations were involved in the agenda and/or the peace negotiations? Please explain your answer. (International Organizations)

5. What role did civil society play in the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace negotiation process and agreement? (Civil Society)
6. Why do you think it is important that Nongovernmental organizations were involved in the agenda and/or the peace negotiations? Please explain your answer.

7. In your opinion, what was the response from the public about including women’s issues in the peace negotiations? (Journalists and Scholars)

8. Could you describe to me some of the challenges in setting the agenda? (All groups)

9. What was the response from the other parties to the idea of including women’s issues on the agenda? Could you describe their reactions? (All groups)

10. Which groups, in your view, were either ambivalent or opposed to the inclusion? (All groups)

11. Did men’s involvement or the lack of it impact the addition of women’s issues? (All groups)

12. What measures should be put into place to guarantee the inclusion of women’s issues in the peace negotiation agendas and agreements? (All groups)

13. What would you have done differently in this process? Why? (All groups)
Preguntas para la Entrevista

El propósito de esta investigación es averiguar cómo es el proceso de la incorporación de asuntos de la mujer en la agenda y el acuerdo de las negociaciones de paz, y cómo esta inclusión influyen el estatus de las mujeres después del conflicto. Esta investigación se lleva a cabo en dos etapas. La primera examina ¿Por qué se incluyen o excluyen los asuntos de las mujeres en los acuerdos de paz? La segunda etapa de investigación busca analizar el efecto tiene el haber incluido los asuntos de las mujeres en los acuerdos de paz, en el estatus de las mujeres después del conflicto, particularmente en las áreas de representación política y de educación.

Preguntas para Colombia (Etapa 1)

1. Según recuerda, ¿puede describir el proceso de cómo se estableció la agenda de las negociaciones de paz?

2. ¿Por qué cree que es importante, o incluso necesario incluir los asuntos de las mujeres en las negociaciones y en los acuerdos de paz? ¿Podría por favor elaborar su respuesta?

3. En su opinión, ¿quién cree que fue, el gobierno, las sociedades civiles, o las organizaciones internacionales, las que impulsaron por la inclusión de los asuntos de las mujeres en la agenda?

4. ¿Quién sugirió primero agregar los asuntos de las mujeres en la agenda?

5. ¿Cómo describiría usted la participación entre los hombres y mujeres que discutieron la inclusión de asuntos de las mujeres en el proceso y acuerdo de negociación de paz?

6. Según recuerda, ¿qué medidas se pusieron o pueden ser puestas en marcha para garantizar la inclusión de los temas de las mujeres en las agendas de negociación de paz?

7. ¿Cuál cree que es el factor más importante que permite la inserción de los asuntos de las mujeres en la agenda de negociación de paz y por qué? ¿Podría elaborar cómo ese factor ayudó a que se añadieran los temas de las mujeres en la agenda.

8. ¿Qué sugerencias / consejos le daría a otras personas involucradas en futuros procesos de paz para que sean capaces de tener un proceso de inclusión de género?

9. En su opinión, ¿Cuál es el efecto que va a tener en el estatus de las mujeres, el haber incluido los asuntos de las mujeres en las negociaciones y el acuerdo de paz? ¿Me podría dar un (unos) ejemplo?

Preguntas para Guatemala (Etapa 2)

1. Según recuerda, ¿qué medidas se pusieron o pueden ser puestas en marcha para garantizar la inclusión de los temas de las mujeres en las agendas de negociación de la paz?
2. ¿Cree que incluir los temas de las mujeres en la agenda ha tenido un impacto positivo o negativo en el estatus de la mujer después del acuerdo? ¿Me podría dar un ejemplo?

3. ¿Cómo cree que la inclusión de los temas de la mujer ha influido en el estatus de la mujer, específicamente en las áreas de la representación política y la educación?

4. ¿Cree que más mujeres han sido elegidas para un cargo político como consecuencia de la inclusión de los temas de la mujer en el acuerdo de paz?

5. ¿Cree que hay más oportunidades de educación y acceso a estas, para las mujeres como resultado de la inclusión de los temas de la mujer en el acuerdo? ¿Podría por favor elaborar su respuesta?

6. ¿Cree que cualquier cambio en la educación y la representación política de las mujeres se ven más a nivel regional o nacional, ¿Qué significa esto para usted?

7. ¿Qué área que ha sido impactada más? ¿Podría explicarme cómo lo dispuesto en el acuerdo generó o influenció este impacto?

Preguntas adicionales y para grupos específicos

1. ¿Qué papel desempeñó el gobierno para poder incluir los temas de las mujeres en el proceso de negociación de paz y el acuerdo? (Gobierno)

2. ¿Qué papel desempeñó la guerrilla para poder incluir los temas de las mujeres en el proceso de negociación de paz y el acuerdo? (Guerrilla)

3. ¿Qué papel desempeñó su organización en poder incluir los temas de las mujeres en el proceso de negociación de paz y el acuerdo? (Organizaciones Internacionales)

4. ¿Por qué cree que es importante que las organizaciones internacionales participen en establecer la agenda y en las negociaciones de paz? Por favor, explique su respuesta. (Organizaciones internacionales)

5. ¿Qué papel desempeñaron las organizaciones no gubernamentales en la inclusión de los temas de las mujeres en el proceso de negociación de la paz y en el acuerdo? (Organizaciones no gubernamentales)

6. ¿Por qué cree que es importante que las organizaciones no gubernamentales participaran en establecer la agenda y las negociaciones de paz? Por favor, explique su respuesta.

7. En su opinión, ¿Cómo respondió la población acerca de incluir los temas de las mujeres en las negociaciones de paz?
8. Según recuerda, ¿Observó algún retos en la creación de la agenda de negociación?

9. ¿Cuál fue la respuesta de los demás grupos involucrados en el proceso, con la idea de incluir temas de las mujeres en la agenda? Podría describir sus reacciones? (todos los grupos)

10. En su opinión ¿cuáles grupos eran ambivalentes o se opusieron a la inclusión de los temas de las mujeres? (todos los grupos)

11. ¿Usted piensa que la participación de los hombres, o la falta de ella, impactaron la inclusión de los temas de las mujeres? (todos los grupos)

12. ¿Qué medidas se podrían poner en marcha para garantizar la inclusión de los temas de las mujeres en las agendas y acuerdos de paz? (todos los grupos)

13. ¿Qué hubiera hecho de otra manera en este proceso? ¿Por qué? (todos los grupos)
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The results of this participation will be confidential and will not be released in any individually identifiable form without the prior consent of the participant unless required by law. Any written data will be stored in a locked file cabinet away from public access, while being processed into an electronic version. The data will be stored electronically and only the researcher (Natalia Meneses) will have access to it. Once the study is concluded, all the data collected will be thoroughly and completely destroyed. In order to ensure anonymity the researcher will remove all identifying details, and your real name will be replaced with a changed name.
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Título del proyecto que se está investigando: Los asuntos de mujeres en las negociaciones de paz y su efecto en el estatus de las mujeres después del conflicto.
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Usted ha sido invitado a participar en un proyecto de investigación conducido por Natalia Meneses, estudiante en Kennesaw State University. Antes de que usted decida participar en este proyecto, usted debe leer este acuerdo y preguntar si no entiende algo. Los siguientes puntos han sido explicados:

Propósito del proyecto
El propósito de esta investigación es averiguar cómo es el proceso de la incorporación de asuntos de la mujer en la agenda y el acuerdo de las negociaciones de paz, y cómo esta inclusión influyen el estatus de las mujeres después del conflicto, y cuál es el grado de esa influencia? Esta investigación se lleva a cabo en dos etapas. La primera es ¿Por qué se incluyen o excluyen los asuntos de las mujeres en los acuerdos de paz? La segunda etapa de investigación busca analizar ¿qué efecto tiene el haber incluido los asuntos de las mujeres en los acuerdos de paz, en su estatus después de que se pasa el conflicto?
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Los procedimientos son los siguientes: Se espera que la entrevista tenga una duración aproximada de entre 30 y 40 minutos; se llevará a cabo en persona, teléfono, o por Skype, y será grabada. Durante la entrevista se le preguntarán varias preguntas demográficas (edad, sexo, nivel de educación, etc.), así como las preguntas de opinión personal con respecto a sus puntos de vista y experiencias sobre la inclusión de temas de la mujer en los procesos de paz. Las preguntas deben ser fáciles de responder y no requieren conocimientos o preparación especial. La mayoría de las preguntas involucran opiniones o sentimientos acerca de su experiencia en el proceso. Usted puede participar en este estudio sólo si usted es un adulto (18 + años de edad o más), y que observó/participó en el proceso de negociación de paz.

Tiempo Requerido
Se espera que la entrevista tenga un tiempo de duración aproximadamente de 30 y 40 minutos.

Riesgos o Molestias
La participación en este estudio no tiene ningún riesgo conocido. Sin embargo, si usted se siente en algún momento incómodo cuando este hablando de temas relacionados con asuntos de la mujer durante los conflictos, o en general, sepas, por favor, que es libre de saltarse una pregunta en cualquier momento, o puede concluir su participación en el estudio.

Beneficios
Aunque no habrá ningún tipo de beneficio directo para usted por participar en este estudio, la investigación si se beneficiará al obtener más información sobre el proceso que se llevó a cabo.
para incluir los asuntos de las mujeres en las negociaciones y acuerdos de paz, así como la influencia o efecto que éstos tienen en el estatus de las mujeres después del conflicto.

**Compensación**
No hay compensación de ningún tipo por participar en este proyecto.

**Confidencial**
Los resultados de esta participación serán confidenciales y no serán revelados en ninguna manera en que sea posible identificar cualquier información personal sin el consentimiento previo del participante a menos que sea requerido por la ley. Los datos escritos se guardan en un archivador bajo llave, fuera del alcance del público, mientras que se están procesando electrónicamente. Los datos serán almacenados electrónicamente y sólo el investigador (Natalia Meneses) tendrá acceso a la información. Con el fin de asegurar el anonimato de las personas que colaboraron en el estudio, el investigador eliminará todos los datos de identificación, y su verdadero nombre sería reemplazado con un nombre diferente.

**Criterio para participar**
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**Firma del acuerdo**

Estoy de acuerdo y doy mi consentimiento para participar en este proyecto de investigación.

Entiendo que la participación es voluntaria y que puedo retirar mi consentimiento en cualquier momento sin penalización

__________________________
Firma del Participante o Representante Legal, Fecha

__________________________
Firma del Investigador o Representante Legal, Fecha

Por favor firme ambas copias, deje una para usted y devuelva la otra para el investigador
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Guatemala’s Peace Agreement – Women’s issues

The below information describes the specific points from Guatemala’s peace process, where women’s issues were included. They are included on the agreements on Human Rights, agreement for the Resettlement of Population Displaced by the Armed Confrontation, agreement on the Identity and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, agreement on the Strengthening of Civil Power and the Rule of the military in a Democratic Society, and agreement on Socioeconomics Issues and the Agrarian Reform.

COMPROMISOS RELATIVOS A LOS DERECHOS DE LAS MUJERES EN LOS ACUERDOS DE PAZ

ACUERDO PARA EL REASENTAMIENTO DE LAS POBLACIONES DESARRAIGADAS POR EL ENFRENTAMIENTO ARMADO
II. Garantías para el reasentamiento de la población desarraigada
2. Hacer particular énfasis en la protección de las familias encabezadas por las mujeres así como de las viudas y de los huérfanos, que han sido los más afectados.
III. Integración productiva
8. El gobierno se compromete a eliminar cualquier forma de discriminación de hecho o legal contra la mujer en cuanto a facilitar el acceso a la tierra, vivienda, créditos y participar en los proyectos de desarrollo. El enfoque de género se incorporará a las políticas, programas y actividades de estrategia global de desarrollo.

ACUERDO SOBRE IDENTIDAD Y DERECHOS DE LOS PUEBLOS INDÍGENAS
II. Lucha contra la discriminación
B. Derechos de la mujer indígena
1. Se reconoce la particular vulnerabilidad e indefensión de la mujer indígena frente a la doble discriminación como mujer y como indígena, con el agravante de una situación social de particular pobreza y explotación. El Gobierno se compromete a tomar las siguientes medidas:
   i) Promover una legislación que tipifique el acoso sexual como delito y considere como agravante en la definición de la sanción de los delitos sexuaules el que haya sido cometido contra la mujer indígena.
   ii) Crear una Defensoría de la Mujer Indígena con su participación, que incluya servicios de asesoría y servicio social.
   iii) Promover la divulgación y fiel cumplimiento de la Convención sobre la eliminación de todas las formas de discriminación contra la mujer.
2. Se insta a los medios de comunicación y organizaciones de promoción de los derechos humanos a cooperar en el logro de los objetivos del presente literal.
III. Derechos culturales
E. Uso del traje
1. Debe ser respetado y garantizado el derecho constitucional al uso del traje indígena en todos los ámbitos de la vida nacional. El Gobierno tomará las medidas previstas en el capítulo II, literal A, del presente acuerdo para luchar contra toda discriminación de hecho en el uso del traje indígena.

G. Reforma educativa

4. Para facilitar el acceso a los indígenas a la educación formal y no formal, se fortalecerá el sistema de becas y bolsas de estudio. Así mismo se corregirá cualquier material didáctico que exprese estereotipos culturales y de género.

IV. Derechos civiles, políticos, sociales y económicos

F. Derechos relativos a la tierra de los pueblos indígenas

9.vii) Eliminar cualquier forma de discriminación de hecho o legal contra la mujer en cuanto a facilitar acceso a la tierra, vivienda, crédito y a participar en los proyectos de desarrollo.

ACUERDO SOBRE ASPECTOS SOCIOECONÓMICOS Y SITUACIÓN AGRARIA

I. Democratización y desarrollo participativo

B. Participación de la mujer en el desarrollo económico-social

11. La participación activa de las mujeres es imprescindible para el desarrollo económico y social de Guatemala y es obligación del Estado promover la eliminación de toda forma de discriminación contra ellas.

12. Reconociendo la contribución, insuficientemente valorada, de las mujeres en todas las esferas de la actividad económica y social, particularmente su trabajo a favor del mejoramiento de la comunidad, las partes coinciden en la necesidad de fortalecer la participación de las mujeres en el desarrollo económico y social, sobre bases de igualdad.

ACUERDO SOBRE ASPECTOS SOCIOECONÓMICOS Y SITUACIÓN AGRARIA

I. Democratización y desarrollo participativo

B. Participación de la mujer en el desarrollo económico-social

13. La participación activa de las mujeres es imprescindible para el desarrollo económico y social de Guatemala y es obligación del Estado promover la eliminación de toda forma de discriminación contra ellas.

14. Reconociendo la contribución, insuficientemente valorada, de las mujeres en todas las esferas de la actividad económica y social, particularmente su trabajo a favor del mejoramiento de la comunidad, las partes coinciden en la necesidad de fortalecer la participación de las mujeres en el desarrollo económico y social, sobre bases de igualdad.

15. Con este fin, el Gobierno se compromete a tomar en cuenta la situación económica y social específica de las mujeres en las estrategias, planes y programas de desarrollo, y a formar el personal del servicio civil en el análisis y la planificación basados en este enfoque. Esto incluye:

(a) Reconocer la igualdad de derechos de la mujer y del hombre en el hogar, trabajo, en la producción y en la vida social y política, y asegurarle las mismas posibilidades que al hombre, la tierra y otros recursos productivos y tecnológicos.

Educación y capacitación
(b) Garantizar que la mujer tenga igualdad de oportunidades y condiciones de estudio y capacitación y que la educación contribuya a desterrar cualquier forma de discriminación en contra suya en los contenidos educativos.

Vivienda
Garantizar a las mujeres el acceso, en igualdad de condiciones a vivienda propia, eliminando las trabas e impedimento que afectan a las mujeres con relación al alquiler, crédito y construcción.

Salud
(d) Implementar programas nacionales de salud integral para la mujer, lo cual implica el acceso a servicios apropiados de información, prevención y atención médica.

Trabajo
Garantizar el derecho de las mujeres al trabajo, lo que requiere: (i) impulsar por los diferentes medios la capacitación laboral de las mujeres; (ii) revisar la legislación laboral, garantizando la igualdad de derechos y de oportunidades para hombres y mujeres; (iii) en el área rural, reconocer a las mujeres como trabajadores agrícolas para efectos de valoración y de remuneración de su trabajo; (iv) legislar para la defensa de los derechos de la mujer trabajadora de casa particular, especialmente en relación con salarios justos, horarios de trabajo, prestaciones sociales y respeto a su dignidad.

Organización y participación
(f) Garantizar el derecho de organización de las mujeres y su participación en igualdad de condiciones con el hombre, en los niveles de decisión y poder de las instancias locales, regional y nacional.

(g) Promover la participación de las mujeres en la gestión gubernamental, especialmente en la formulación, ejecución y control de los planes gubernamentales.

Legislación
(h) Revisar la legislación nacional y sus reglamentaciones a fin de eliminar toda forma de discriminación contra la mujer en la participación económica, social, cultural, y política y dar efectividad a los compromisos gubernamentales derivados de la ratificación de la Convención sobre la Eliminación de todas las formas de Discriminación contra la Mujer.

II. Desarrollo social
178. Educación y capacitación
21(b) Evitar la perpetuación de la pobreza y de las discriminaciones sociales, étnicas, hacia la mujer y geográficas en particular las debidas a la brecha campo-ciudad.

B. Salud
23(d) Dar prioridad a la lucha contra la desnutrición, al saneamiento ambiental, la salud preventiva, las soluciones de atención primaria, especialmente la materno-infantil. El Gobierno se compromete a presupuestar por lo menos 50% del gasto público en salud a la atención preventiva, y se compromete a reducir la mortalidad infantil y materna, antes del año 2000, a un 50% del índice observado en 1995.

23(g) Fomentar la participación activa de las municipalidades, las comunidades y las organizaciones sociales (incluyendo mujeres, indígenas, sindicales, cívicas, humanitarias) en la planificación, ejecución y fiscalización de los servicios y programas de salud, a través de los sistemas locales de salud y los consejos de desarrollo urbano y local.
ACUERDO SOBRE EL FORTALECIMIENTO
DEL PODER CIVIL Y FUNCIÓN DEL EJÉRCITO
EN UNA SOCIEDAD DEMOCRÁTICA

VI. Participación de la mujer en el fortalecimiento del poder civil

59. Para fortalecer las oportunidades de participación de las mujeres en ejercicio del poder civil, el Gobierno se compromete a:

a) Impulsar campañas de difusión y programas educativos a nivel nacional encaminados a concientizar a la población sobre el derecho de las mujeres a participar activa y decididamente en el proceso de fortalecimiento del poder civil, sin ninguna discriminación y con plena igualdad, tanto de las mujeres del campo como de las mujeres de las ciudades;

b) Tomar las medidas correspondientes a fin de propiciar que las organizaciones de carácter político y social adopten políticas específicas tendientes a alentar y favorecer la participación de la mujer como parte del proceso de fortalecimiento del poder civil;

b) Tomar las medidas correspondientes a fin de propiciar que las organizaciones de carácter político y social adopten políticas específicas tendientes a alentar y favorecer la participación de la mujer como parte del proceso de fortalecimiento del poder civil;

c) Respetar, impulsar, apoyar e institucionalizar las organizaciones de las mujeres del campo y de la ciudad;

d) Determinar que en todas las formas de ejercicio del poder, se establezcan y garanticen oportunidades de participación a las mujeres organizadas o no.

60. Las partes valoran el trabajo que realizan en el ámbito nacional las diversas organizaciones de mujeres y las exhortan a unificar esfuerzos para dar su aporte en el proceso de implementación de los Acuerdos de Paz particularmente en aquellos compromisos más directamente relacionados con las mujeres.

ACUERDO SOBRE CRONOGRAMA

II. Cronograma de los 90 días a partir del 15 de enero de 1996
Foro de la Mujer

29. Propiciar la convocatoria de un foro de la mujer sobre los compromisos relativos a los derechos y participación de la mujer, plasmados en los Acuerdos de Paz.

III. Cronograma del 15 de abril al 31 de diciembre de 1997
Participación de la mujer en el desarrollo económico y social

88. Teniendo en cuenta los resultados del Foro previsto en el párrafo 29 del presente Acuerdo, dar seguimiento a los compromisos relativos a la mujer contenidos en los Acuerdos de Paz.

IV. Cronograma 1998, 1999 y 2000
Participación de la mujer

178. Realizar una evaluación de los avances en la participación de la mujer, y sobre esta base, elaborar el plan de acción correspondiente.

Appendix H

Colombia’s Peace Negotiation Agenda

This document is the peace agenda agreed between Colombia’s government and the FARC-EP. The delegates of the Government of the Republic of Colombia (National Government) and the delegates of Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia-Ejército del Pueblo (FARC-EP) agreed to sit down for peace talks. The exploratory meetings took place in Havana, Cuba, between February 23 and August 26, 2012. The meetings included the participation of Government of the Republic of Cuba and the Government of Norway as guarantors, and with the support of the Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela as logistics facilitator and companion. It was a mutual decision of the parties to negotiate the end of the conflict, as it was an essential condition for building stable and lasting peace.

Appendix I

Press Releases Ruta Pacífica and IPM

Ruta Pacífica

https://www.rutapacific.org.co/sala-de-prensa/comunicados/2012/106-las-mujeres-ruta-respaldamos-proceso-de-negociacion-si-a-la-paz

IPM

http://www.humanas.org.co/archivos/impcomunicado.pdf
Appendix J

International Organizations’ Press Releases

Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom

http://www.peacewomen.org/e-news/article/peace-talks-colombia-sideline-women

https://colombiareports.com/participation-of-women-essential-for-colombias-peace-talks/

Conciliation Resources


The Global Network of Women Peacebuilders

Appendix K

Remarks by Michelle Bachelet

Appendix L

Remarks by President Santos

El Tiempo

http://www.eltiempo.com/archivo/documento/CMS-12217408
### Appendix M

**Nvivo**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Collaboration &amp; cooperation; second-tier negotiators; experts; plenipotentiary women; proposals &amp; recommendations; gender sub-commission.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Education; forums; websites &amp; surveys; courses &amp; training services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame Alignment</td>
<td>What</td>
<td>Reach a peace agreement; democratic equality; sustain peace after conflict; rebuild after a conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why</td>
<td>Conflict affects women differently; right for gender equality; machista language; majority of the victims; half of the population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Movement</td>
<td>Demands</td>
<td>Presence at the table; rights; proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unification</td>
<td>Activism, mobilizations &amp; advocacy; coalition &amp; alliances; Cumbre de Mujeres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Actors</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix N

The Plenipotentiary men – Peace Negotiations, Oslo

Source: A.P.
Appendix O

News

El Tiempo
http://www.eltiempo.com/archivo/documento/CMS-13139875
http://www.eltiempo.com/archivo/documento/CMS-13143578
http://www.eltiempo.com/archivo/documento/CMS-14974475

Semana

https://www.semana.com/nacion/articulo/proceso-farc-mujeres-propuestas-de-paz-conversaciones/362252-3
https://www.semana.com/nacion/articulo/comision-de-la-verdad-mujeres-ruta-pacifica-de-las-mujeres/366098-3
https://www.semana.com/opinion/articulo/mujeres-en-la-mesa-de-negociacion-proceso-de-paz-opinion-carlos-velandia/366335-3
https://www.semana.com/nacion/articulo/delegacion-de-genero-llego-la-habana/412304-3
https://www.semana.com/educacion/articulo/primer-aniversario-de-la-subcomision-de-genero-de-la-habana/442452-3
https://www.semana.com/nacion/articulo/dialogos-las-mujeres-de-las-farc-en-la-habana/464031
https://www.semana.com/nacion/articulo/monica-cifuentes-y--elena-ambrosi-mujeres-que-han-moldeado-el-proceso-de-paz/464478
https://www.semana.com/opinion/articulo/inclusion-de-las-mujeres-en-el-proceso-de-paz/482559
https://www.semana.com/nacion/articulo/proceso-de-paz-criticas-por-ausencia-de-mujeres-en-negociaciones-del-plebiscito/499082
El Espectador

https://www.elespectador.com/noticias/paz/una-mujer-sera-negociadora-plenipotenciaria-mesa-de-hab-articulo-458743

https://www.elespectador.com/noticias/paz/se-instala-subcomision-de-genero-los-dialogos-de-paz-articulo-515215


https://www.elespectador.com/opinion/opinion/la-paz-con-las-mujeres-columna-645684

https://colombia2020.elespectador.com/politica/los-logros-de-la-subcomision-de-genero-en-tres-acuerdos-de-la-habana

Appendix P

Cumbre De Mujeres – Letter to President Santos and “Timochenko”

https://www.rutapacifica.org.co/proyectos/cumbre-de-mujeres/166-pronunciamiento-de-las-mujeres-participantes-de-la-cumbre-nacional-de-mujeres-y-paz-celebrada-en-la-ciudad-de-bogota-entre-el-23-y-25-de-octubre-de-2013
Appendix Q

United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325

http://www.un-documents.net/sr1325.htm
Appendix R

Women United Nations – Press Releases

http://colombia.unwomen.org/es/noticias-y-eventos/articulos/2015/08/organizaciones-mujeres-la-habana

http://lac.unwomen.org/es/noticias-y-eventos/articulos/2015/09/dialogos-de-paz


Appendix S

Colombia’s Peace Process – Women