

## THERE'S NO MAINSTREAM WITHOUT FEMINISM

Nina Reiners\*

Being feminist is more mainstream than radical;<sup>1</sup> this is true for most parts of world politics. Yet, Angela Merkel, Germany's first female Chancellor and widely celebrated as an icon for all women on their path to power, was asked at the Women20 Summit in Berlin in 2017, around a decade after she came into office, whether she considers herself a feminist. The then-Chancellor, a scientist with a doctorate in physical chemistry, responded: "I am not afraid of it [the label]. If you think that I am one—please, vote on it. But I don't want to adorn myself with these feathers. . . . I don't want to embellish myself with a title I don't have." Merkel's reasoning for her bizarre<sup>2</sup> response was that she felt others like Simone de Beauvoir have done more to deserve this label. My point, drawing on this example for the symposium and Mark Pollack's much-needed insightful and self-reflective contribution is the following: feminism should not be seen as a label, something to "adorn" or "embellish" one's research. It is more than that: it is a normative belief in the importance of gender equality and a continuous practice to work against power imbalances.

As such, feminism can and should indeed easily be part of all mainstream scholarship in International Relations (IR) and International Law (IL)—but without placing it next to "other" schools of thought. We should see feminism as mainstream through much more than just including gender as a variable. Mark mentions the role of curricula and the discussion on where to bring in feminism, but this would suggest that it is again its own "label." Another way, one I advocate for, is to think about feminism in mainstream IR and IL across all theories. This starts with recognizing gender equality through citations and approaching references as signalling power. We can also practice being a feminist IR or IL mainstream scholar by highlighting female scholars when assigning readings, making sure the reference lists represent no biases and that authors who have been making the arguments under the label of "radical" or "critical" feminism are cited when the mainstream

---

\* Professor, Norwegian Centre for Human Rights, University of Oslo.

1. This might be typical for my own bubble, but the number of men who identify as such openly has increased significantly. Yet, needless to say, there is a difference between men proudly adding the label to their social media bios (#feminist) and the way being a feminist plays out in practice.

2. Katie O'Malley, *Angela Merkel Responds to The Question 'Are You A Feminist?' In The Most Bizarre Way*, ELLE (April 27, 2017), <https://www.elle.com/uk/life-and-culture/culture/news/a35440/angela-merkel-question-feminist>.

scholarship reaches the same conclusion, usually years later.

Mark's chapter is a great stock-taking and, at the same time, stimulating exercise for an interdisciplinary scholar like me. There is hardly any disagreement with his observations, just more curiosity to discuss how to explain the different developments in IR and IL, the question is whether "the mainstream" is the same for every scholar in every country and generation, and how these observations extend to race, class, and intersectional issues. I want to stimulate our discussion by approaching feminism as mainstream based on three observations from my own, but also current scholarship in IR and IL. First, I want to question the kind of gender equality mainstream IR and IL are embracing (or not). Is "the mainstream" offering a seat at the table, but decides who is invited? In this regard, I think it is important to turn towards scholarship on representation and look beyond the numbers to encourage more research on substantive representation in IR and IL.

Second, I want to highlight the importance of intersectional analyses for IR and IL in this regard. Much of the scholarship in IR has advanced our knowledge substantively in the recent years to the extent that we know which women are more likely to get a seat at the table and make use of it. Drawing on a recent collaboration with Sara Kahn-Nisser, I illustrate how a positivist research design on women and their participation in international expert bodies updates our priors and at the same time shows that it is not "enough" to simply add more women to achieve gendered outcomes.

Third, I want to come back to feminism as a label that many scholars, like politicians such as Angela Merkel, do not want to use. Why? One reason is the consequences that women—both as scholars and as politicians—face when embracing this label. I will discuss some examples before concluding my comment with some suggestions to move forward practicing feminism as mainstream scholarship.

#### **TAKE A SEAT – DESCRIPTIVE AND SUBSTANTIVE REPRESENTATION FOR WOMEN IN IR AND IL**

Much of the discussion on feminism in IR and IL mainstream builds on the liberal-feminist assumption that it simply needs "more" women to make the disciplines more sensitive towards women and gender issues, and thus more equal. This assumption is limited to the view that it needs a certain corporeality of women to include women's interest in decision-making or scholarly findings, which is best captured by the image of women getting a "seat at the table"<sup>3</sup>. As critical feminists have argued,

---

3. Georgina Waylen, *A Seat at the Table—Is it Enough? Gender, Multiparty Negotiations, and Institutional Designs in South Africa and Northern Ireland*, 10 POL. & GENDER, no. 4, 2014, at 495; Kara Ellerby, *A Seat at the table is not enough: understanding women's substantive representation in peace processes*, 4 PEACEBUILDING, no. 2, 2016, at 136.

this image must include the acknowledgement that the table has been built without them, that this seat usually requires an invitation, and that often having a seat means nothing if that position is powerless, compared to other positions at the table.<sup>4</sup> For both IR and IL mainstream, it is safe to say that the table has been built by men and, as Mark's reference to Keohane's infamous article reminds us, it is also a table where men decide on who is invited and allowed to speak (aka the good girl).<sup>5</sup> For any discipline serious about gender equality, there needs to be new "table rules" to have it become a reality. In other words, we need to move forward from just adding more women to committees, boards, and faculty. We also need to understand which barriers still exist, how we make all voices heard and count, and how this can lead to the desired outcomes.

Let me take an example from feminist institutionalist scholarship to theorize how IR and IL mainstream—understood as institutions—can achieve this change of the rules. Theoretically, gendered change in international policymaking is mainly explained from two theoretical viewpoints. The first is rooted in liberal feminism and assumes that more women represented in institutions will lead to better gender policies. Feminist institutionalists on the other hand drawn attention to the specific dynamics of inclusion and exclusion within institutions that shape gender outcomes. While largely overlooked among liberal feminists, feminist institutionalist scholars have focused on agency to explain how institutions can produce or resist positive gendered change by adding critical actors to their institutionalist framework.<sup>6</sup> Under the rather broad term of feminist IR, theorists have early on highlighted the crucial role of studying international institutions through a gender lens.<sup>7</sup> Many studies have focused on women's representation in the staff of international bureaucracies,<sup>8</sup> among state delegates and diplomats<sup>9</sup> and

---

4. Bina D'Costa, *Where Exactly Am I Sitting at that Table? Race, Prejudice, and Perpetual (In) security in Global Politics*, 9 *Critical Studies on Security*, no. 1, 2021, at 12–16.

5. For the sake of my own argument, I cite Cynthia Weber here; Cynthia *Weber, Good girls, little girls, and bad girls: Male paranoia in Robert Keohane's critique of feminist International Relations*, 23 *MILLENIUM*, no. 2, 1994, at 337.

6. Jennifer Thomson, *Resisting gendered change: Feminist institutionalism and critical actors*, 39 *INT'L POL. SCI. REV.*, no. 2, 2018, at 178.

7. SANDRA WHITWORTH, *FEMINISM AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS* (Springer ed., 1994).

8. Heather MacRae, *Double-speak: the European Union and gender parity*, 35 *W. EUR. POL.* 301 (2012); Kristen Haack et al, *The United Nations at Seventy-Five: Where Are the Women in The United Nations Now?* 34 *ETHICS & INT'L AFF.*, no. 3, 2020, at 361.

9. HELEN MCCARTHY, *WOMEN OF THE WORLD: THE RISE OF THE FEMALE DIPLOMAT* (Bloomsbury ed. 2014); HELEN MCCARTHY & JAMES SOUTHERN, *Women, Gender, And Diplomacy A Historical Survey*, in *GENDER AND DIPLOMACY* (Jennifer A. Cassidy ed., 2017); Karin Aggestam & Ann-Towns, *The Gender Turn in Diplomacy: A New Research Agenda*, 21 *INT'L FEMINIST J. POL.*, no. 1, 2020 at 9; Catriona Standfield, *Gendering the practice turn in diplomacy*, *EUR. J. INT'L RELS.* 140 (2020).

also as leaders.<sup>10</sup> Overall, these studies conclude that women's participation in international organizations enhances the effectiveness and legitimacy of the institutions, and the outcomes produced in their decision-making. However, this claim has been deconstructed by critical feminist scholars<sup>11</sup>, and feminist IR has highlighted that descriptive representation does not always lead to substantive representation, specifically in regard to women, peace, and security.<sup>12</sup> Including designated gender experts in international institutions' decision-making as a potential solution often results "in entrenching neoliberal agendas detrimental to feminist goals."<sup>13</sup>

For positive gendered change in international lawmaking, meaning both increasing women's representation in international legal institutions and the enactment of gender-friendly norms, feminist scholars point to its power-relations maintaining and often discriminating structure as a tough barrier.<sup>14</sup> Even the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) was criticized for leaving out crucial discrimination experiences of women,<sup>15</sup> despite being influential for legal developments across all levels.<sup>16</sup> Recent scholarship has turned from analysing the representation of gender in formal treaties to asking whether women on the bench can change law's discriminating features.<sup>17</sup> While fighting structural inequalities in international law should not solely be the responsibility of women on judicial bodies,<sup>18</sup>

---

10. Constanza Barraza Vargas, *Women in Command: The Impact of Female Leadership on International Organisations*, 33 GLOBAL SOC'Y 541 (2019); Ingvild Bode, *Women or Leaders? Practices of Narrating the United Nations as a Gendered Institution*, 22 INT'L STUDIES REV. 347 (2020).

11. Ann-Kathrin Rothermel, *Gender in the United Nations' Agenda on Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism*, 22 INT'L FEMINIST J. POL. 720 (2020).

12. Carol Cohn et al., *Women, Peace and Security: Resolution 1325*, INT'L FEMINIST J. POL. 130, 130–140 (2004); Laura J. Shepherd, *Sex Security and Superhero(in)es: From 1325 to 1820 and Beyond*, 13 INT'L FEMINIST J. POL. 504 (2011); Jennifer Thomson, *The Women, Peace, and Security Agenda and Feminist Institutionalism: A Research Agenda*, 21 INT'L STUDS. REV. 598 (2019).

13. Rahel Kunz & Elisabeth Prügl, *Introduction: Gender experts and gender expertise*, 2 EUR. J. POL. & GENDER 3 (2019).

14. Hilary Charlesworth et al., *Feminist Approaches to International Law*, 85 AM. J. INT'L L. 613 (1991); Vasuki Nesiah, *Decolonial CIL: TWAIL, Feminism, and an Insurgent Jurisprudence*, 112 AM. J. INT'L L. 313 (2018).

15. SUSANNE ZWINGEL, *TRANSLATING INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S RIGHTS NORMS: THE CEDAW CONVENTION IN CONTEXT* (Plaggrave MacMillan ed., 2016).

16. WOMEN'S HUMAN RIGHTS: CEDAW IN INTERNATIONAL, REGIONAL AND NATIONAL LAW (Anne Hellum & Henriette Sinding Aasen eds., 2013).

17. Christina L. Boyd et al., *Untangling the Causal Effects of Sex on Judging*, 54 AM. J. POL. SCI. 389 (2010); Fionnuala N. Aoláin, *More Women–But Which Women? A Reply to Stéphanie Hennette Vauchez*, 26 EUR. J. INT'L L. 229 (2015); LOUISE CHAPPELL, *THE POLITICS OF GENDER JUSTICE AT THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT* (Oxford University Press ed. 2015); Erik Voeten, *Gender and Judging: Evidence from the European Court of Human Rights*, 28 J. EUR. PUB. POL.'Y 1453 (2021).

18. Nienke Grossman, *Achieving Sex-Representative International Court Benches*, 110 AM.

there is wide recognition of women's abilities to act on change once elected or appointed to such positions. Feminist legal research on the impact of gender mainstreaming in the work of the treaty bodies, for example, found that these institutions "are becoming more sensitive to the reality of women's lives."<sup>19</sup> The increase of descriptive representation of women, however, does not necessarily guarantee active participation in substantive change processes,<sup>20</sup> nor is it required.

### ALL WOMEN? INTERSECTIONAL RESEARCH AND THE MAINSTREAM

As Mark points out in his article, the mainstream in IR got a head start before IL on feminism because the discipline started earlier to include analyses of the representation of women into their scholarship on international policymaking. Yet, scholarship on international lawmaking, often by IR scholars, has picked up and in that way tried to go beyond the analysis of descriptive representation, turning towards the mechanisms that make women engage in international politics and law and their effect on outcomes. I want to make a point here also on the choice of data and methods: in my view, IR and IL have much to gain from more sociological approaches. I want to flag biographical methods as key to detecting intersectionality and how these dynamics influence power balances in the discipline's scholarship. The participation of women in international institutions—ranging from physical representation to providing substantial expertise—has been widely studied in international relations, as Mark's contribution highlights.<sup>21</sup> Most scholars argue that women's participation increases the legitimacy of institutions and impacts decision-making, contributing to change for women and girls around the globe.<sup>22</sup> Articulating gender-specific needs is key to having these needs recognized.<sup>23</sup> As such, equal gender

---

J. INT'L L. 82 (2016); Neus Torbisco-Casals, *Why Fighting Structural Inequalities Requires Institutionalizing Difference: A Response to Nienke Grossman*, 110 AM. J. INT'L L. 92 (2016); Andreas Føllesdal, *How Many Women Judges Are Enough on International Courts*, 52 J. SOC. PHIL. 436 (2021).

19. Rachael Johnstone, *Feminist Influences on The United Nations Human Rights Treaty Bodies*, 28 HUM. RTS. Q., no. 1, 2006, at 148.

20. Catherine O'Rourke, *Walk[ing] the Halls of Power-Understanding Women's Participation in International Peace and Security*, 15 MELBOURNE J. INT'L L. 128 (2014).

21. J. Ann Tickner & Jaqui True, *A Century of International Relations Feminism: From World War I Women's Peace Pragmatism to the Women, Peace and Security Agenda*, 62 INT'L STUD. Q., no. 2, 2018, at 221.

22. GEORGINA WAYLEN, *ENGENDERING TRANSITIONS: WOMEN'S MOBILIZATION, INSTITUTIONS AND GENDER OUTCOMES* (Oxford University Press, ed., 2007); Georgina Holmes et al., *Feminist Experiences of 'Studying Up': Encounters with International Institutions*, 47 MILLENIUM 210 (2007); Maria Noel Leoni et al., *Symposium on Gender Representation: Making the Case for Gender Balance at UN Human Rights Institutions*, OPINIOJURIS (April 10, 2021), <http://opiniojuris.org/2021/10/06/symposium-on-gender-representation-making-the-case-for-gender-balance-at-un-human-rights-institutions>.

23. Denisa Kostovicova& Tom Paskhalis, *Gender, Justice and Deliberation: Why*

representation is crucial in those international institutions established to monitor the non-discriminating enjoyment of human rights.

In a recently published article,<sup>24</sup> Sara Kahn-Nisser and I am interested in why we see so much variation in the actual participation of independent experts in the UN human rights treaty bodies. We observe that some members take the floor to ask questions to state parties more often than others, some are more critical towards governments in their line of questioning during consultations, and some do not visibly participate at all during public meetings. Women<sup>25</sup> have been traditionally underrepresented on these bodies. We find that gender is highly significant for participation, and female members are more active than male members. This is an interesting finding considering that female members are a minority in the human rights treaty body system overall. In the past, the election of human rights experts has shown an imbalance of gender. Women are still underrepresented members on the human rights treaty bodies.<sup>26</sup> Following feminist critiques of international law and human rights, the human rights treaty body system had little to offer for women for most of its time existing.<sup>27</sup> One can even argue that the genesis of most UN treaties and general principles of public international law reflects a bias against women and led to an understanding of human rights as men's rights,<sup>28</sup> yet examples for change led by feminist advocates on expert bodies exist. The recognition of domestic violence as torture in two treaty bodies, for example, was explained by feminist advocates "consciously strategizing to change the law, collaborating amongst themselves, and leveraging institutional opportunities."<sup>29</sup> Women's

---

24. Nina Reiners & Sarah Kahn-Nisser, *A Voice or an Echo?: Women in the UN Human Rights Expert Bodies*, 30 GLOB. GOVERNANCE, no. 3, 2024, at 383 (2024).

25. While our paper includes only two genders (women/men), we acknowledge that more genders exist. Our data is based on the CVs provided by the experts themselves, as submitted for their nomination. To date, none of these experts identified as non-binary and we thus decided to not include a third category into our gender measure. Accordingly, we also did not assign genders (e.g., based on names) to individuals but relied on the experts' self-identification.

26. ANNA-KARIN HOLMUND, GENDER PARITY IN THE UNITED NATIONS TREATY BODIES: A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW (2017), <http://www.gqualcampaign.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Gender-parity-in-the-United-Nations-Treaty-Bodies-final-for-publication1.pdf>; IVONA TRUSCAN, DIVERSITY IN MEMBERSHIP OF THE U.N. HUMAN RIGHTS TREATY BODIES (Geneva Academy ed., 2018), <https://www.geneva-academy.ch/joomlatools-files/docman-files/Diversity%20in%20Treaty%20Bodies%20Membership.pdf>.

27. Rachael Johnstone, *Feminist Influences on the United Nations Human Rights Treaty Bodies*, 28 HUM. RTS. Q., no. 1, 2006, at 148.

28. Hilary Charlesworth, *Not Waving but Drowning: Gender Mainstreaming and Human Rights in the United Nations*, 18 HARVARD HUM. RTS. J. 1 (2005).

29. Natalie R. Davidson, *Everyday Lawmaking in International Human Rights Law: Insights from the Inclusion of Domestic Violence in the Prohibition of Torture*, 47 L. & SOC. INQUIRY, no. 1, 2022, at 205.

presence, understood as their descriptive representation, in international institutions provides “communicative advantages”<sup>30</sup> in decision-making, but having a seat at the table means nothing if that position is powerless compared to other positions at the table.<sup>31</sup> Considering wider research on women and their participation in such male-dominated institutions, we assumed that women are less active participants on human rights treaty bodies than men.

Yet, the analysis of the data did not confirm our hypothesis. In fact, there was robust and statistically significant evidence indicating that women were more active than men in the treaty bodies. A possible explanation for this unexpected finding relates to the specific characteristics of the human rights-oriented expert bodies. It is possible that this environment is more progressive and more attentive to the need to give equal voice to minorities, including women. Another possible explanation is that some of the women’s activity stemmed from an unequal division of labour between women and men wherein women take on the review of more treaty provisions than men, resulting in their more active participation. Based on interaction models, our analysis suggests that females were more active than males only if they held the sense of status and capital of belonging to geo-cultural or a professional dominant group. While this suggests that the inclusion of western, legally trained females gives women more voice, it also underlines the importance of diversifying the regional and professional membership of the treaty bodies to allow experts from all backgrounds to contribute to the international effort to promote human rights.

### WHY ISN’T EVERYONE CALLING THEMSELVES A FEMINIST? CONSEQUENCES FOR CAREERS

My third point on Mark’s summary of the IR and IL mainstream’s engagement with feminism concerns the varying consequences for colleagues identifying as feminist or claiming this label. Coming back to my introductory example, why would Angela Merkel not answer the questions whether she’s a feminist with “yes” at that time (but at the end of her tenure she did)? There are several explanations for her behaviour, all would easily be transferred to scholars in IR and IL mainstream: first, there is the individualistic-liberal opposition to feminism, often exposing a generational conflict. She made a career in both male-dominated sciences and politics without any claims to equal opportunities, so why should others have it easier? Early career scholars in both IR and IL can all tell stories of when senior female colleagues acted as gatekeepers

---

30. Jane Mansbridge, *Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Continent Yes*, 61 J. POL., no. 3, 1999, at 628.

31. Bina D’Costa, *Where exactly am I sitting at that table? Race, Prejudice, and Perpetual (In)security in Global Politics*, 9 CRITICAL STUD. SEC., no. 1, 2021, at 12.

instead of showing solidarity. Another reason for not identifying as feminist can also be Merkel's socialization in the German Democratic Republic, where it was normal that women worked, and childcare was organized and provided by public institutions. However, this socialization into gender equality<sup>32</sup> was never reflected in her policies when she had the chance. Similarly, being socialized in academic institutions with a high percentage of women among the faculty does not automatically lead to feminist research and teaching.

My main point though to explain the uneasiness with the feminist "label" is the fear of negative consequences. In Merkel's case, these could come from within the party – the conservative Christian-democratic party – or fear of voters at the next election. Voting out of mandate holders with feminist agendas is even happening in international institutions set up to defend women rights and values of equality and non-discrimination. For example, the adoption of General Comment No. 3 by the Committee overseeing the Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), which presented a progressive clarification of the rights of women and girls with disabilities. This clarification, running seventeen pages and sixty-five paragraphs, became necessary because although the treaty speaks of multiple types of discrimination, it did not distinguish dynamics related to intersectionality.<sup>33</sup> The working group for this treaty interpretation was formed by all six women on the committee at that time, but as a reaction to the draft, five of them were not re-elected after the adoption of the General Comment. This left only one woman of the 18 experts on human rights, after states only elected male candidates to the committee.

In that regard, being a feminist scholar has real consequences: at worst, it can cost jobs, publications, and entrance to professional networks. There is also a fear among female scholars that as soon as they publish on gender inequality in IR and IL, feminism is the "label" they will keep in their discipline.

#### PRACTICING FEMINISM AS IR AND IL MAINSTREAM

To sum up, the at first glance ambivalent relationship between feminism and IR and IL mainstream has made some progress, but we should start seeing the mainstream as feminism and feminism as mainstream. I agree that all critical theory loses momentum when embraced by the mainstream – after all, what is there to criticize? In that regard, it is not "just critiquing" (p. 2) the mainstream: there will and

---

32. On gender inequality in the GDR, see Annemette Sørensen & Heike Trappe, *The Persistence of Gender Inequality in Earnings in the German Democratic Republic*, 398 AM. SOCIOLOGICAL REV. 398 (1995).

33. Ena Chadha & Roxanne Mykitiuk, *Article 6—Women with Disabilities*, in THE UN CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES COMMENTARY 171–197 (I. Bantekas et al. eds., 2018).

should always be critical feminist, racist, colonial, queer and radical approaches to IR and IL highlighting the persistent power imbalances of the disciplines. It is also, in my view, not the role of critical theorists to “reshape the mainstream”. Everyone in IR and IL still doing research without reflection on which world view their findings may support and which voices are left out has a responsibility to reflect – and thereby reshape the mainstream. Or in Mark’s words: the problem here occurs when “*mainstream theorists or policymakers do engage with feminists and feminist concerns, they often do so superficially, adopting the language of feminism and gender without fundamentally reassessing or challenging the reality of gender inequality or their own complicity in its reproduction.*”

Just like Angela Merkel embraced the “label” later in her career, mainstream IR and IL have various opportunities to include feminist—and intersectional—practices in their scholarship and move beyond superficial treatment of a “label.” Mainstreaming feminism starts by acknowledging that important contributions to the -isms have been made by women. Female authors should be cited and given proper recognition for their work. Preferably, equality is represented in the reference list. Some journals have started to demand a quota for citing women, which is to applaud and the better way than the common practice of citing women only when referencing feminist or critical scholarship. Peer reviewers can do their part by recommending female scholars or making omissions and potential biases known in their feedback.

In my view, we as disciplines made significant progress from seeing only positivist scholarship as the mainstream in IR (or doctrinal scholarship in IL). I read Mark’s rich summary of the history of feminism’s engagement with the mainstream<sup>34</sup> (and vice versa) with great interest, but also with the impression that we have moved on and embrace more pluralism in IR and IL. However, when self-reflecting on my socialization into becoming an IR scholar, I acknowledge the profound impact of the women I had as supervisors and mentors.<sup>35</sup> Now working in Norway, I also appreciate the distinct Nordic context<sup>36</sup> for doing IR and IL. In that sense, we need to come back to the question who defines what is mainstream—and does the answer vary across regions and generations?

---

34. And feminist research in IR also applies positivist research designs!

35. Who, upon reflection for this article, also do not claim the label “feminist.”

36. Lene Hansen, *An Introduction to Gender and International Relations in a Nordic Context*, 36 COOPERATION & CONFLICT, no. 2, 2001 at 147; Cecilia Bailliet, *A Nordic Approach to Promoting Women’s Rights Within International Law: Internal v. External Perspectives*, 85 NORDIC J. INT’LL., no. 4, 2016, at 368; Ann Towns & Birgitte Niklasson, *Gender, International Status, and Ambassador Appointments*, 13 FOREIGN POL. ANALYSIS, no. 3, 2017, at 521; Anne Hellum, *Not so exceptional after all?*, in GENDER EQUALITY AND NATIONAL BRANDING IN THE NORDIC REGION 173–190 (Routledge ed., 2021).