

1. Introduction: Gendering the Masculine Field of Mining for Sustainable Community Livelihoods

Kuntala Lahiri-Dutt

This volume presents a selection of papers that were presented at an international workshop on 'Mining, Gender and Sustainable Livelihoods', organised to disseminate the results of an 'action research' project.¹ The project endeavoured to integrate a gender outlook in one major mining company's community development initiatives, and strengthen interdisciplinary approaches in examining the interface between gender, mining and sustainable livelihoods (EC 2007). Held in late 2008 in the Resource Management in Asia-Pacific Program (RMAP) of The Australian National University (ANU) in Canberra, the workshop was, for a number of reasons, an important international event in the field of social and community issues surrounding the extractive industries. It represented a confluence of several streams of thought and disciplinary approaches to gender and mining. The significance of this confluence lies in its holistic approach, through a conflation of community and gender interests, to the broad field of mining—without separating large and formal mining from informal, artisanal and small-scale mining (ASM) practices. Academics and other researchers, activists, civil society organisations and policy-makers who participated in the workshop joined hands to address the increasingly important question of how to engender the field of mining. Above all, the workshop brought together, on the same platform, the collective wisdom of many of the key people actively working on mining and gender in a wide variety of contexts, with different lenses and from different perspectives. The chapters in this volume² highlight the key issues and implications of integrating gender to foster sustainable livelihoods in both large-scale and informal, artisanal and small-scale mining in different parts of the world.

1 The 'Mining, Gender and Sustainable Livelihoods' workshop was the outcome of an action research project funded in 2006 by the Australian Research Council. This Linkage Project was a collaboration between The Australian National University (ANU) and PT Kaltim Prima Coal (KPC). Project outputs included in-company gender surveys, gender needs assessments, gender impact assessments, social impact studies and gender training materials. As a Chief Investigator for the project, I would like to acknowledge the industry leadership that KPC provided in recognising and responding to gender concerns and opportunities in their organisation and community activities. In addition to the Australian Research Council, we received funding from the World Bank and AusAID to support the travel of international participants; I thank both these agencies for this assistance.

2 This volume represents only a selection of papers that were presented in the workshop. The manuscript has gone through the usual peer review process, and I thank the reviewers for their constructive suggestions and comments.

A significant body of scholarly and practitioner research has now emerged on this niche area of interest, namely gender and the extractive industries. Examples and case studies from all around the world have drawn attention to the need to make visible the roles of women in large-scale mining operations, and to encourage government and industry to adopt inclusive community development processes to ensure that mining-led development can benefit women and men equally. Another expanding body of research and action has drawn attention to the contribution and roles of both women and men in informal mining, more commonly known as ASM—a diverse range of mining practices that sustains the livelihoods of millions of people in the mineral-rich tracts of poorer countries around the world. This evidence has far-reaching implications for future research, activism and industry practice with regard to sustainability and policy-making by national and international bodies, development agencies and mining companies. It is of great importance that the researchers are able to communicate their research and experience, think critically and reflect on the initiatives that have been undertaken in different contexts by different actors, and ask whether the ideas developed in one corporate, political or cultural context can or should be applied to others.

One of the questions addressed by the chapters in this volume is what scholarly and practitioner research—using historical, feminist or contemporary participatory approaches—can contribute to the growing body of knowledge on sustaining community livelihoods in areas of mining and other extractive practices. This remains a highly contested terrain, and the papers in this volume expand the vista of contemporary theorisations situated upon it. They add depth to international-level policies and practices in the industry that have begun to initiate some corrective measures in this regard. The papers in this volume contribute to exploding the myth of the gender-equitable and homogeneous ‘community’ that other natural resource sectors discarded decades ago, but that has persisted in the extractive industries. The volume considers effective ways to integrate gender into these industries’ development project to contribute to meeting Millennium Development Goal 3, to promote gender equity and to empower women, in areas of mining work. What is the relationship between gender equity and sustainable development, and is it universal in nature? A critical issue, raised by Macintyre in this volume, is what our approach should be in challenging the gender-blind, male-centred conceptualisations of development, promulgated by the extractive industries. In responding to the marginalisation of women in these industries’ community practices, should one adopt a ‘feminising development’ approach? Indeed, in our joint work published earlier, we took up such a women-centred approach while suggesting a ‘human rights of women’ case (see Lahiri-Dutt and Macintyre 2006). However,

experience has shown us that such an approach, best expressed in the genre of 'Women in Development' (WID) philosophy, has the potential of diluting the feminist agenda through its uncritical stance on development.

The adoption of WID by addressing so-called 'women's issues' (think, for example, about community health projects stressing contraception and fertility) allows the mining and other extractive industries to utilise instrumentalist justifications for 'incorporating' women, and leads to a shift away from equity to efficiency approaches in development projects. As we now know, such 'add women and stir' projects primarily address women's practical, rather than strategic, gender needs and interests through women-only projects and organisations. Since the 1980s, a growing consensus among feminists has highlighted the need to shift the focus from 'women' to 'gender'. McIlwaine and Datta (2003: 370–1) feel that a gender and development (GAD) discourse offers a more radical agenda that can address the bases of inequalities between women and men, and redistribute the power inherent in gender relations. Indeed, in integrating gender concerns in the extractive industries, the adoption of a GAD offers significant advances on 'women only' approaches on two fronts. First, it is robust enough to critique the development process itself by highlighting how capitalist mining and industrial development adversely affect both the productive and reproductive lives of women. Gender is also conceptualised as a dynamic social construct, reflected in a greater appreciation of diversity in GAD, and can lead to shifts towards empowerment and participatory processes. Above all, as the 'natural home' for questions of race, GAD creates a space for understanding and accommodating 'difference' within its community of practitioners, allowing the creation of new and different identities for women from less developed countries. These women no longer need be uniformly victimised, poor and uneducated—the opposite of modern, liberated and educated 'Western' women.³ In GAD, the appreciation of diversity among women, especially around race and ethnicity, has a transformative politics at its heart that is also materially engaged. This engagement is one way to reduce the gaps between research and activism. The action research project that led to these deliberations at the workshop provides an example of integrating gender in community development projects. The project itself represented a politically engaged and socially relevant form of research; a kind of research that not only used the participants to seek data but also involved and sensitised them, and in the process, created new gender identities.

3 White (2006: 58) comments sharply on this stark difference in visibility of race in contemporary gender studies, described by Moore as 'The whiteness of faces and Britishness of passports' in development agencies such as Department for International Development (DFID): 'while gender is marked in bright colours, race is at best a shadowy presence in development discourse.'

If, indeed, there is a case for gender mainstreaming in the extractive industries, then one may ask: what is to be mainstreamed and where? As Macintyre points out gender is often nowhere, when it is believed to be everywhere; that is, gender is mainstreamed in name but gender equality is not specifically institutionalised by embedding gender-sensitive practices and norms in policy structures, processes, and environments. The diverse nature and complexity of issues raise serious questions for the extractive industries. Are the cases for gender mainstreaming different for large and small-scale mining or are there significant overlaps? Can the adoption of a broader sustainable livelihoods approach, by incorporating gender-equitable, socially-just, pro-community, and equity-oriented development for host communities, be useful for the mining industry? What roles might the different actors—governments, international policy bodies, and the industry—play in helping to mainstream gender in the mining sector? What changes in policy or practice can be expected to arise from the growing interest in gender equity and mainstreaming? To continue with the momentum, what lessons have been learned, what further steps need to be taken, and by whom? To begin answering these questions, one must first take a brief look at what has been done so far by international policy-making bodies.

The year 2005 was a notable one in regard to how international policy bodies think about these complex and contested issues around mining. The International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM), the global body for the extractive industries, published a Community Development Toolkit (CDT) for mining companies to use in their outreach work. For those working on the complex interface between mining and gender from a development perspective, the CDT was disappointing because of its complete neglect of gender analysis. Clearly, ‘the community’ envisioned in the document was an imaginary, homogeneous entity, in which the gender of the actors did not make any difference. One cannot be sure if this was indeed a deliberate omission or just an oversight. Either way, this manner of thinking reflects the assumptions of many in the industry that the interests of some people within a community can be conflated with the interests of all. Such omissions from important international bodies have the potential to reinforce the masculinism that the large-scale mining industry has been notorious for. More importantly, the CDT appears to be based on, and to perpetuate, the naïve assumption that if the benefits of mining extend to men they will automatically trickle down to women. Feminists discarded this assumption with contempt long ago, and have produced a rich body of evidence to contradict it. Unless the extractive industries build policies on and in dialogue with contemporary feminists, the path to sustainability will remain elusive.

Researchers are aware that the notional ‘community’, when used as a reductionist collective noun, hides many critical differences and divisions within it and is

hence misleading (see Gujit and Shah 1999 for example). As Robert Chambers (2008) has pointed out, there are biases within every community that need to be recognised and offset, and attitudes and behaviours which are dominating and discriminatory are more common among the powerful. Most often, the more powerful individuals within a community are men. Maguire (1996: 29–30) observed that a gender-blind approach is common even in more participatory approaches to ‘community’ development: ‘Gender was hidden in seemingly inclusive terms: “the people”, “the oppressed”, “the campesinos”, or simply “the community”. It was only when comparing ... projects that it became clear that “the community” was all too often the male community.’ By ignoring these realities, the CDT turned itself into a blunt tool, without cutting edge impact.

A significant amount of scholarly work had been published on gender, development and mining prior to the publication of the CDT. While there has been research to make visible women’s past and present roles and contributions to mining—within both the industry and mining communities—there has also been a steady stream of policy-related work that has highlighted why and how development interventions work better when the benefits reach both women and men. In recent years, human rights organisations and activists have consistently argued for a rights-based approach to development and have demanded that women be included as equal partners in participatory approaches to resource management. The research project that gave rise to the ‘Mining, Gender and Sustainable Livelihoods’ workshop has also contributed to this growing body of knowledge and examples of practice.

The ground covered in this volume is complex and some of the terms used remain highly contested. First, while the book does not directly deal with the largely unresolved and hostile relationship between mining and development, it does favour a move towards the concept of ‘sustainable livelihoods’⁴ and away from the ‘sustainable development’ framework more commonly adopted by the mining industry. The latter framework, while useful in raising awareness of, and developing concrete steps to, care for the environment, has neglected crucial areas of concern to the extractive industries. These include unequal power relations and access to income within the community, assets that are valued

4 In this book, we invoke the best-known definition of sustainability or sustainable development put forth by the World Commission on Environment and Development, defining sustainability as ‘forms of progress that meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs’. The connotation of the term, ‘livelihood’ is more people-centred, smaller in scale, broader as a concept and reaches beyond the economic wellbeing to the overall process of securing a survival as both food and cash by the individuals or families. Valdivia and Gilles (2001: 7) see livelihood strategies as a portfolio of activities and the social relations by which families secure or improve their wellbeing or cope with crises. To Blaikie et al. (1994: 9), the word means the command an individual, family or other social group has over an income or bundles of resources that can be used or exchanged to satisfy its needs. This may involve information, cultural knowledge, social networks, legal rights as well as tools, land or other physical resources. This definition clearly indicates that livelihood is much more than just the financial resource.

by the community, activities that sustain the community and the community's entitlements, which are linked to legal and customary rights. The volume aims not only to gender-sensitise the mining sector, but to broaden the definition of sustainability that is currently in use by extractive industries as well as development agencies engaged with mining communities or operating in mineral resource-dependent countries and regions. A broad definition of sustainability would not ignore but include, within the broad definition of 'extractive industries', ASM practices. ASM forms an important source of livelihoods in many mineral-rich tracts in developing countries, in which women continue to participate in large numbers in contrast to large-scale mining operations where they still largely remain less visible.

Second, the implication or functional meaning of the term 'gender mainstreaming' has been and remains widely debated. Gender mainstreaming can be understood as the institutionalisation of gender equality that is achieved by 'embedding gender-sensitive practices and norms in the structures, processes and environment of public policy' (Daly 2005: 435). Gender mainstreaming can also be seen as an end, rather than a means for achieving gender equality (Eveline and Bacchi 2005). For the mining sector, the definition of gender mainstreaming that most readily applies is that of an organisational strategy to be applied internally and externally as a means of bringing a gender perspective to all aspects of an organisation's policies and activities, thus building gender capacity and accountability (Reeves and Baden 2000; Walby 2005). Such an approach to gender mainstreaming would involve bringing a gender perspective and integration of gender analysis into all stages of the design, implementation and evaluation of all projects, policies and programs (UNDP 2007). Thus, we can see gender mainstreaming applying both within the industry and in the community development work of the industry, in making both women and men visible in their roles and contributions, in giving voice to women as well as men, in ensuring women's participation in community consultations and in extending the benefits of mining to them.

The range of definitions of gender mainstreaming raises the question of how such a contested concept can be crystallised within a corporate body. Moving gender from the margin of vision to the centre is a major challenge and leads to strong resistance from within organisations. On the one hand, many corporate bodies have mandates that do not match the ideology of gender equity and have bureaucratic procedures that border on inflexibility; on the other hand, gender advocates must rely on bureaucrats who are either indifferent or hostile to perceived political interference across professional boundaries into their personal lives (Razavi 1997: 1111). The international political economy of gender mainstreaming is also complex. It sounds like nearly an impossible task to bring about gender equity within corporate bodies so ensconced within the

neo-liberal market-led growth paradigm. No matter what the various industry brochures and toolkits propound, philosophically the industry is inherently opposed to all kinds of interventionism because of its faith in markets as self-optimising mechanisms. Framing gender equity within mainstream neo-liberal policies gave rise to the ‘gender efficiency’ discourse—demonstrating positive spin-offs in terms of financial effectiveness—which has been widely critiqued (see Razavi 2009). More lately, gender mainstreaming advocates have focused on transforming the mainstream through ingenious ways, often building alliances with men.

To put my view simply, principles of gender equality can be applied vertically and horizontally across the spectrum of business activities within a mining organisation. The vertical approach would involve the creation of a separate unit or department to deal with gender equity issues, while the horizontal approach would require the application of a ‘gender lens’ to every aspect of an organisation’s work. This should not be restricted purely to community relations departments. Developing a gender policy, addressing gender issues in the workplace and providing gender training as part of staff inductions by specialised personnel are key aspects of the vertical approach. Examining how each and every policy or project (for example, an expansion of the project’s area of operation or setting up a new water filtration plant) affects women and men differently, and ensuring that women do not bear the majority of negative impacts, would be the second approach. Making available gender disaggregated data at every step would be an effective measure of gender mainstreaming in the extractive industries. Daly (2005: 437) prescribes that ‘a mix of equality approaches’—equal opportunities, positive action and mainstreaming—can and should evolve simultaneously’.

This chapter is the first of 12 chapters written by key scholars and professionals in the field. The second chapter, ‘Modernity, Gender and Mining: Experiences from Papua New Guinea’ is by anthropologist, Martha Macintyre. Macintyre explores the complicated overlap between the capitalist modernity that is symbolised by the large mining industry and the traditional gender ideologies that are embedded within culture, reflecting on her long engagement with mining projects in Papua New Guinea (PNG). She points out that mining projects—being essentially commercial enterprises meant to raise profits for shareholders—are by nature unlike aid projects, and hence the institutional, economic and social changes unleashed by them are not managed effectively. Macintyre raises the issue in terms of the concept of ‘gender mainstreaming’, and the ambivalences that are embedded in it. She points to the contradictory stance of large multinational mining projects operating in areas inhabited by indigenous communities characterised by complex gender and social relations. In such circumstances, the companies’ notions of corporate social responsibility

carry with them the principle of non-intervention in the social and cultural lives of local communities. However, while it is accepted that the mine, in providing employment and developing infrastructure and services, will improve people's quality of life, it remains implicit that cultural practices would neither be impinged upon, nor would the values that sustain customary sociality be eroded. Consequently, the specific disadvantages that women suffer from arise from structural inequities that exclude and disenfranchise women even before a mining project is embarked upon. Indirectly, the chapter highlights the importance of exploring gender-specific disadvantages such as unequal access to and control over resources by women as compared to men. As some of the other chapters also highlight, unequal power relations between men and women are reinforced and accentuated by the large mining projects which establish a 'new social order' in the areas of their operation. Consequently, gender relations in the host communities change in such ways as to further marginalise women from decision-making power.

The third chapter, 'Bordering on Equality: Women Miners in North America' by Laurie Mercier shows how women historically resisted the masculinism of the mining industry and found their way into the male-dominated occupation. Mercier shows how gender ideologies take root and spread across time, space and cultures. The examples from North America of the reactions of male employers and co-workers as women challenged the barriers to mining work are applicable to many other contexts of large and corporatised mining projects. Mercier also discusses how women resisted and persisted in their efforts to break down rigid ideas of gender codes and gained more comfortable lives for their families. Above all, she explores how gender relations change as male miners voice greater support for affirmative action quotas. She also splits open the imagined unitary category of 'women', by showing how much of the resistance to women's employment came from male miners' wives, who were hostile to the idea of employing women in mines. Again, race makes itself visible in her analysis as she notes that many women and men from the black communities supported the hiring of women. Although thanks to the efforts of early feminists women are no longer completely 'hidden' from the history of mining (Burke 2006), Mercier's chapter brings home the importance of understanding history and social context in developing a fuller appreciation of gender in mining.

The fourth chapter, 'Sex Work and Livelihoods: Beyond the "Negative Impacts on Women" in Indonesian Mining' by Petra Mahy explores how one of the main planks of conventional 'victimology' around gender and mining can be rethought. Sex work in mining towns has been a vexed issue where varying perspectives reveal one's moral and/or feminist viewpoint. Women sex workers in the 'negative impacts of mining' literature are portrayed either as victims or heroines, reflecting a futile debate around forced work versus voluntary work.

One of the ways to resolve the debate, she suggests, is to apply some of the more recent theoretical approaches to sex work around large-scale mining operations. This would encourage a rethinking of the roles of women sex workers not generally as victims but as part of the growing and diverse populations around mining towns, as part of the large service industry and as active economic agents. She gives an example from her fieldwork in East Kalimantan in Indonesia, where the operations of a large modern coal mine (KPC) have completely changed the social and cultural fabric in recent years.

The fifth chapter, 'Experiences of Indigenous Women in the Australian Mining Industry' by Joni Parmenter describes the experience of hiring aboriginal women in a large-scale mining project, called Century Mine, located in northern Australia. For many of the women who live in remote communities, this was their first experience in mainstream employment, but it was also an environment heavily dominated by non-indigenous and mostly male workers. The chapter also helps to establish the complexities of gender that lie beyond just sex, and highlights the complex and critical issue of race in gender and mining. Indigenous women and women of colour have argued that 'western' feminists have been a part of the systemic oppression that has disempowered them. Within the dominant 'western' society in Australia, Aboriginal women suffer from a dual oppression from patriarchy and colonialism, and are a double minority. Such women are both indigenous and female, and when hired to work in a very unfamiliar environment such as those in large mechanised mines, they are experience both sexism and racism. Thus it may not be theoretically robust to talk of 'women' as a homogenous and unitary category. A gender perspective would also highlight that Aboriginal women only receive poorly-paid employment in the industry with little scope for career improvement, that is, for their instrumental value as labouring bodies. Parmenter highlights that while the employment of Aboriginal women in the Australian mining industry has contributed to economic gains and empowerment, the challenges faced by indigenous women have been seriously compounded due to additional familial and cultural responsibilities. Employment alone, therefore, is not the panacea towards women's empowerment and gender equality.

A series of subsequent chapters follows, giving examples of what is being done and with what results towards gender equality. The sixth chapter by anthropologist Ciaran O'Faircheallaigh, entitled 'Indigenous Women and Mining Agreement Negotiations in Australia and Canada', exemplifies how indigenous women can be integrated in community consultations from an early stage. Negotiated mining agreements are increasingly becoming more important in Australia and Canada and the benefits such negotiations bring are far from even or gender equitable. These negotiations assume that 'the indigenous community' or 'the indigenous group' is the primary unit of analysis and hence women

are marginalised from the very inception of a mine project. With a number of examples, O’Faircheallaigh shows that agreements work better when indigenous women play an active role in the negotiations. He expands the definition of the term ‘negotiation’ to include activities carried out between the company and the community, and shows that indigenous women play a more complex and substantial role than previously assumed by the literature. Moreover, the specific role played by indigenous women depends on the specific structures used to prepare for, oversee and undertake the negotiation of agreements, and to conduct ongoing processes. Not only has O’Faircheallaigh opened up a new path of research for feminist scholars, his chapter has significant implications for policy makers. For example, while it was the law that created an enabling environment for indigenous groups to negotiate, the participation of women in the cases studied by him were made possible by more gender-specific and conducive cultural factors. It may be possible to enhance these factors so that indigenous women are able to take part in negotiations to ensure that their needs and interests are represented and met by the large mining companies.

This chapter is followed by my own case study of how gender can be integrated within community development projects. Entitled ‘Gender-Based Evaluation of Development Projects: The LAST Method’, the seventh chapter is based on my experience on a research project (with KPC) in Kalimantan, Indonesia. It shows how the monitoring and evaluation of development projects initiated by mining company ‘community development’ departments can be performed on a participatory basis. It also shows that such ‘asset-based’ community evaluations reveal how men and women of different economic groupings are affected differently. While some men more enterprising have tended to benefitted more, with a clearer gender focus, these projects can also be used as key vehicles to empower women. Such gender focus would involve, among other things, listening to the interests of women and supporting and strengthening women’s networks and activities.

Following this point, Ana Maria Esteves discusses another area of positive intervention so far neglected in community development projects supported by mining companies. Her perspective has emerged from her experience of working in Ghana, and is presented in the eighth chapter entitled ‘Women-Owned SMEs in Supply Chains of the Corporate Resources Sector’. She shows that the integration of local small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in the supply chains of large mining companies can build the capacity of women entrepreneurs and also enhance developmental benefits to local communities. Citing the Ahafo linkages program as an example, Esteves reinforces how support to women entrepreneurs in obtaining procurement and supplies locally can benefit women. Again, this case has implications for community development work by mining companies. Within the resources sector, the measurement of linkages has remained a

prominent gap. In their calculations, economists assess the purchase of goods and services in terms of their economic contributions to regions as a whole. However, these activities provide opportunities to plough back money into the hands of women who might spend it more wisely than men. Above all, support to women-owned SMEs in mine-affected regions can also be a starting point to go deeper into the community to address inequalities in power-sharing within the households. Intra-household (mal)distribution of power and resources has been the key area of feminist research on gender and development, and scholars have maintained that women's empowerment would begin in the home. Thus, Esteves' chapter provides for an area of further research.

In the ninth chapter, 'On the Radar? Gendered Considerations in Australia-Based Mining Companies' Sustainability Reporting, 2004–2007' Sara Bice reveals that Australia-based mining companies are devoting more attention and funds to reporting sustainable development. But then Bice raises the question: how do they report gender issues—under the auspices of 'sustainable development' or 'corporate social responsibility' programs? To examine this problematic, Bice uses discourse analysis of the contents of sustainability reports. She argues that the paucity of gender indicators within commonly used voluntary reporting initiatives (such as the Global Reporting Initiative or GRI) contributes to a cycle wherein gender does not make it on to the sustainability program agenda. She notes that it is vital that awareness of gender issues be stretched beyond employment concerns to incorporate gender impacts, which draws attention to the need for further refinement of popular reporting frameworks, such as the GRI.

The next two chapters deal with the other end of the mining and extractive industries spectrum, covering informal, artisanal and small-scale mining. Compared with formal mining, ASM is not only a repository of poor people, it also represents the area where women's labour in mining is concentrated. Women are employed in very large numbers in ASM for a number of reasons that vary from context to context. In general, women are in informal mining because they may be excluded from the better-paid jobs in large-scale mining. Deepening rural poverty, the need to secure cash incomes, male outmigration from rural areas and the realities of women's critical roles in ensuring household food security are factors as important as tradition or generational continuity (Lahiri-Dutt 2008). Trend reports from the mineral-rich tracts of almost all poorer countries reveal that the numbers of women in ASM are increasing. ASM itself is poorly understood and encompasses a diverse range of mining practices. Feminist research and critiques of mining so far have neglected these mining practices, which comprise a critical element in the livelihood baskets of poor families trying to ensure survival under difficult conditions (see Lahiri-Dutt forthcoming).

Some conventional feminist approaches, such as purely class-based analyses, would be difficult to apply in explaining gender roles and relations in ASM communities. While work is underway to introduce means to accommodate ASM under new mining laws by national governments undergoing economic and mining sector reforms, a lot more work is being undertaken by civil society organisations in some places. International non-government organisations (NGOs), as well as major donors, are working in collaboration with large mining companies which are being sensitised to ASM's importance as a means for survival for the local poor. Pact is one such international NGO operating in areas ridden by ethnic conflict. The tenth chapter 'Towards Post-Conflict Transition: Security of Artisanal Mining Women in the Democratic Republic of Congo' results from Rachel Perks' long-term involvement with Pact in the conflict-torn areas of the country. The chapter shows how critical it is to rebuild and value the roles of women in bringing about a peaceful future and economic revitalisation for the Congo (DRC), where informal mining provides a livelihood for a large number of people. Her chapter shows that investment in women artisanal and informal miners is more likely to increase broader social capital due to their role as sole income providers in many communities, and their relationship with a more traditional and stable rural life. Thus, she concludes, gender issues should be at the forefront of social development initiatives in order to enhance social stability, and development objectives and work—whether in public-private partnerships, NGO programs or UN projects, or concession-mining—must be aligned to a commonly agreed framework to increase their potential for impact.

In Mongolia, the transition from a socialist state to a market-based economy that relies heavily on revenues from resource extraction has fuelled informal mining. Diminishing employment and livelihood opportunities in rural areas, as well as a series of severe winters that resulted in rising commodity prices saw an enormous increase in people involved in ASM within a few years. It was clear that poor people were resorting to ASM as a means of survival. In the eleventh chapter, entitled 'Artisanal and Small-scale Mining, Gender and Sustainable Livelihoods in Mongolia', Bolorma Purevjav outlines the gender issues in ASM in Mongolia and outlines how the Mongolian government, in collaboration with an international donor agency, intervened in ASM communities to improve their livelihoods. Mongolia is an interesting case because the country experienced a phenomenal growth in ASM as the new state embraced liberal principles of economic development. As a large number of nomadic herders began digging up the grasslands, women shouldered a large part of the work required in the ASM processes as well as chores at home. Purevjav builds a case for developmental interventions to improve rural women's livelihoods rather than delegitimising them. Such interventions need to be multifaceted in their approach, addressing social, environmental, legal and economic issues, and she cites ongoing work to reinforce her point.

The twelfth and final chapter, which I co-authored with Gill Burke, entitled ‘Gender Mainstreaming in Mining in Asian Countries: Strengthening a Development Perspective’, builds and strengthens a development case for gender in mining as against the business case. The argument we have made is that while there has been mineral boom in Asian countries—with generally low scores against the Gender Development Index—this boom may lead to negative impacts on women. The expansion of mining also provides an opportunity to pursue a more gender-sensitive and socially-just development in these countries. Asia has a long history of mining and Asian women have a long history of participating in productive labour, although many new foreign-based mining companies embark with their notions of traditionally submissive, home-based ‘Asian women’ who have never been involved in ‘non-traditional’ areas of work. An understanding of the history of women’s productive labour and contributions to mining is essential and such knowledge would be helpful for developing gender mainstreaming policies in mining initiatives in Asia.

To conclude, I would point out that there are *five* (often overlapping) major areas of concern in trying to engender the field. To embed gender-sensitive practices and increase levels of gender equity in the mining sector as a whole, the first area of concern is *policy evaporation*. One reason for less attention being paid to gender issues in the mining sector is the assumption that engendered participatory processes will automatically feed into industry policy. While there have been some efforts to ensure community participation and engagement, these processes have yet to become gender inclusive or sensitive to key gender issues. So far, there has not been any clear-cut prioritisation of gender issues on the sustainable development agenda of mining companies. This neglect leads to mining company programs being either gender-blind or gender-insensitive, marginalisation of gender issues in sustainability programs and little or no reporting on gender actions. In various reporting initiatives, gender is not even considered an indicator that is closely related to sustainability. If at all it receives a mention, gender is generally treated as a ‘soft issue’. And while the incorporation of ‘women’ in the GRI’s descriptions of community engagement indicators is welcome, it is still not theoretically robust or broad enough to include within its gamut relations between women and men which are dependent on sex, class, race, ethnicity and age. The dilution of a gender focus—due to the lack of clear cut gender indicators—can be described as ‘policy evaporation’. Such an evaporation of policy can also occur due to the fear of a backlash; for example, when community relations staff retreat from focusing on gender issues over concerns that all community development work will be reduced to a gender strategy. Evaporation can also be due to the reluctance of mining companies to interfere with ‘local culture’—as if a culture is a static and unchangeable object, and as if the company’s very presence has not already triggered sufficient

cultural change to affect gender roles within the community. To prevent policy evaporation, the international mining community must mainstream gender as a critical aspect of the reporting process.

The second area of concern is the *conceptual confusion* that arises when the outdated WID approach continues to be used, instead of the theoretically more sound GAD approach. WID perspectives are still entrenched in even the most well-intentioned publications in the extractive industries and mining sector. For example, a look at community development projects and strategies would reveal how they continue to target a few 'female' problems in isolation, such as girls' education, women's reproductive health problems or domestic violence.⁵ A GAD approach would involve the analysis of inequalities between men and women and then proposing measures that can address those inequalities. Such projects would also involve men so that they too help, support and advocate gender equality. Feminist researchers on mining need to find allies within governments and the industry who can champion gender issues. There is no doubt that women are marginalised from decision-making processes within the mining industry. Further, although it is important to increase women's numbers, simply adding women to planning and decision-making bodies would not address gender issues. As the chapter by O'Faircheallaigh has shown, within mine-impacted communities, women can be involved in crucial areas of participatory negotiations and consultations for better results. In the course of our project experience in Indonesia, we observed that more money remained within the family and was spent on the creation of assets when women were part of consultations involving compensation for land.

The third area of concern is the *mining culture* that includes the attitudes and beliefs of the main actors in the industry. The prevailing 'macho' mining culture hampers the use of a 'gender lens' in areas such as staffing patterns and procurement, as well as community development work. An essential ingredient for effective gender mainstreaming requires staff with the knowledge, skills and commitment to address gender issues in their workplace. So far, the mining industry has seriously lacked strength in these areas. In many companies, no specific gender and equity policies exist yet; the staff induction process does not involve training in gender and equity issues and staff are not systematically exposed to the importance of gender issues. Gender, in general, is subsumed within the broad gamut of 'social' issues. Usually, the work of community relations departments involves a broad range of tasks that may include external relations

5 Diane Elson (1991: 1) noted how the WID approach facilitates the view that 'women' as a general category can be added to an existing approach to analysis and policy and that this will be sufficient to change development outcomes so as to improve women's position. It facilitates the view that 'women's issues' can be tackled in isolation from women's relations with men. It may even give rise to the feeling that the problem is women themselves, rather than disadvantages faced by them; and that women unreasonably ask for special treatment rather than the redressal of injustices and the removal of distortions which limit their capacities.

and publicity, in addition to community development. These departments are often ‘ghettoised’ within the organisational hierarchy and are poorly staffed with relatively low budgets. Even if community development professionals in the industry are committed to gender equity, policy commitments generally fail to be implemented and thus have limited, if any, impact.

The fourth area of concern is the role played by *national laws*. Besides industry culture, laws relating to work and employment in individual countries can play a dual role in hindering gender equity. In countries like the USA and Canada, Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and anti-discrimination legislation can create the illusion that gender equity exists in all spheres of life simply because of the existence of such laws, as well as women’s advocacy groups and associations. In other (particularly less-developed) countries, laws relating to women’s economic citizenship remain discriminatory. For example, the officially recognised ‘Head of Household’ in some countries such as Indonesia must be a man—the father, brother or husband of a woman—who controls economic decisions, such as those relating to cash compensation for land during mining negotiations. In instances where mining jobs could be offered as compensation for loss of land, discriminatory laws may sometimes exclude women from taking advantage of the economic opportunities created by new mining projects. Described broadly as ‘protective’ legislation and initiated largely by the International Labour Organisation (ILO) in response to extremely poor working conditions in the early twentieth century, they prevent women from engaging in particular types of hard labour—at night, or in underground mining. In the Indian context, for example, I have shown that the very laws that restrict women’s workforce participation also disadvantage them in the job market instead of protecting them, and push women into more marginal and less secure forms of work in informal mining and quarrying (Lahiri-Dutt 2006). Access to all kinds of safe and decent work is the right of both women and men; there is no reason why women in particular would require a special letter of permission from their fathers or husbands allowing them to work in mines (as is the case in Indonesia). Further, the existence of laws tends to give the impression that there are adequate measures for achieving gender equality, potentially resulting in other actors feeling relieved of their obligations and responsibilities to actually uphold women’s rights. For example, many countries have constitutions that appear as ‘woman-friendly’ documents, but in reality, women’s rights (such as equal inheritance and land ownership) are not realised in daily life. Once the extractive industries mainstream gender within the sustainable development framework, it will be easier for them to lobby national governments on women’s right to mining work.

Finally, as women enter employment in mining, we need a better understanding of the *mining organisation as a workplace*. This includes not only offices but also 'field jobs' in operation areas such as the pits. Workplace issues need to be seriously addressed by the mining industry, which needs to develop a culture of gender equity. While there has been a mushrooming of 'toolkits' and guidelines in recent years, no gender-audit, gender-budgeting, gender-based occupational health and safety rules, or measures to stop sexual harassment and bullying by men, have been proposed. The number and position of women within the organisational structure relative to men are still lower, and the gender wage gap and other such indicators of inequality provide stark evidence of women still concentrated in lower paid jobs within the industry. Again, in dealing with such workplaces, instead of a 'women-only approach', a gender lens would be far more useful. To give just one example, efforts by mining companies to increase the level of employment of indigenous women need to be coupled with measures to ensure these women are given the opportunity to develop their career prospects and rise within the organisation to positions of power and influence. The industry also needs to seriously consider the principles behind diversity; the reasons why it must create an enabling and empowering workplace for women are not clear yet. Some arguments that are widely offered apparently in favour of women's employment can actually be based on biological essentialism and, hence, retrograde. They can lead to further stereotyping of men and women and erosion of gender equity. A classic example of gender stereotyping in mining which ultimately constrains women's career prospects is the use of arguments such as, 'women are safer (in their operational behaviour)', 'women take fewer risks (in driving the trucks)', 'women care for machines (like their children)' or 'women are more docile workers (and do not form unions)'. A critical reflection on such statements would be enough to show that they threaten to mobilise gender for all the wrong reasons in mining—that women should only be hired because they are more compliant or cost the company less. These unverified statements can easily lead us into the trap of biological essentialism that views all women as mothers and carers, and reinforces predetermined notions about who they are and what they should be like.

In mining, feminist research and praxis clearly still has many important hurdles to jump, and there is no doubt that new challenges arising with every positive step. However, none of these challenges is insurmountable. A critical mass of knowledge and expertise now exists, and what is more, this body is growing with contributions from all disciplines and experts from wide-ranging practices, as evident from the contributions in this volume.

I encourage the reader to see this volume as a continuation of consistent efforts by a number of actors to draw attention to the issues surrounding gender and mining. It follows civil society initiatives such as the 'Tunnel Vision' conference

organised by Oxfam Community Aid Abroad in 2002, and various international gatherings of the International Women and Mining Network. In 2004, I organised the 'Pit Women and Others' international workshop at the ANU to discuss women miners in developing countries, and jointly edited a book with Martha Macintyre (2006). The World Bank had also successively sponsored 'Women in Mining' conferences in Papua New Guinea in 2003 and 2005. I am delighted to be able to present some of the outcomes of the 'Mining, Gender and Sustainable Livelihoods' workshop to a wider international audience through this publication. While the papers presented here reflect the great diversity of mining practices across Asia and the Pacific region, the contributors share a common purpose—to critically reflect on the lasting gender inequalities within the mining industry in its many areas of operation, and to explore ways in which changes could be initiated. It is not just another volume; it is an outcome of a long process of struggle by a number of agents.

It is a privilege that we can discuss ways and means to positively affect the lives of women and men in mining regions. We can share ideas that can create conditions for women to be empowered, and for men to support such empowerment so that together they can achieve gender equality. Recognising this privilege helps us avoid the traps of tokenism; we all bear a responsibility to ensure, challenge, advocate and insist that all development strategies are gender sensitive. In order to achieve gender equity we cannot give up until it happens. Our privilege also comes with a sense of engagement with and duty to promote and respect the rights of men and, in particular, women, enshrined in international conventions and agreements that have been endorsed by the world and that are generally guaranteed in the constitutions of countries around the world.

References

- Blaikie, P., T. Cannon, I. Davis, and B. Wisner, 1994. *At Risk; Natural Hazards, People's Vulnerability and Disasters*. London: Routledge.
- Burke, G., 2006. 'Women Miners: Here and There, Then and Now.' In K. Lahiri-Dutt and M. Macintyre (eds), op. cit.
- Chambers, R., 2008. *Revolutions in Development Inquiry*. London: Earthscan.
- Daly, M., 2005. *Gender Mainstreaming in Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- EC (Empowering Communities), 2007. 'Creating Empowered Communities: Gender and Sustainable Livelihoods in a Coal Mining Region in Indonesia'. Viewed 28 July 2010 at <http://empoweringcommunities.anu.edu.au/index.php>
- Elson, D., (ed.), 1991. *Male Bias in the Development Process*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- Eveline, J. and C. Bacchi, 2005. 'What are we Mainstreaming when we Mainstream Gender?' *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 7(4): 496–512.
- Gujit, I. and M.K. Shah, 1999. *The Myth of Community: Gender Issues in Participatory Development*. London: Intermediate Technology Publication.
- Lahiri-Dutt, K., 2006. 'Introduction: Where Life is in the Pits (and Elsewhere) and Gendered.' In K. Lahiri-Dutt and M. Macintyre (eds), op. cit.
- , 2008. 'Digging to Survive: Women's Livelihoods in South Asia's Small Mines and Quarries.' *South Asian Survey* 15(2): 217–44.
- , forthcoming. 'Digging Women: Towards a New Agenda for Feminist Critiques of Mining.' *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography*.
- Lahiri-Dutt, K. and M. Macintyre (eds), 2006. *Women Miners in Developing Countries: Pit Women and Others*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Maguire, P., 1996. 'Proposing a More Feminist Participatory Research: Knowing and Being Embraced Openly.' In K. de Koning and M. Martin (eds), *Participatory Research in Health: Issues and Experiences*. London: Zed Books.
- McIlwaine, C. and K. Datta, 2003. 'From Feminising to Engendering Development.' *Gender, Place and Culture* 10(4): 369–82.
- Razavi, S., 1997. 'Fitting Gender into Development Institutions.' *World Development* 25(7): 1111–25.
- , (ed.), 2009. *The Gendered Impacts of Liberalisation: Towards 'Embedded Liberalism'?* New York: Routledge.
- Reeves, H. and S. Baden, 2000. *Gender and Development: Concepts and Definitions*. Brighton: BRIDGE Institute of Development Studies.
- UNDP (United Nations Development Programme), 2007. *Gender Mainstreaming in Practice: A Toolkit*. New York: United Nations (3rd edition).
- Valdivia, C. and J. Gilles, 2001. 'Gender and Resource Management: Households and Groups, Strategies and Transitions.' *Agriculture and Human Values* 18(1): 5–9.

Walby, S., 2005. 'Introduction: Comparative Gender Mainstreaming in a Global Era.' *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 7(4): 453–70.

White, S., 2006. 'The Gender Lens: A Racial Binder?' *Progress in Development Studies*, 6(1): 55–67.