Revista de Derechos Humanos Contemporáneos
ISSN: 3082-0375
Vol. 1 Issue 2 (2025) 285-322
Available online since: October 31, 2025

Revista de
Derechos Humanos
Contemporáneos
Journal of Contemporary Human Rights

The Struggle for Gender Equality in Human Rights: Beyond Legal Recognition

La Larga Lucha por la Igualdad de Género en los Derechos Humanos: Más Allá del Reconocimiento Legal

Verónica Salas Moreno[1]✉

[1]Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Lima, Peru

✉Corresponding email: moreno.salas@cayetano.edu.pe

ABSTRACT

This article critically examines the ongoing struggle for gender equality within human rights frameworks, emphasizing the limitations of legal recognition alone in achieving substantive equality. Through a multidisciplinary analysis incorporating feminist theory, human rights law, and intersectionality, the study explores how structural inequalities related to gender, race, class, and sexuality persist despite formal legal protections. Case studies from South Africa, Sweden, and India illustrate the gap between legal reforms and lived realities, highlighting the need for transformative approaches that address social norms, economic disparities, and political representation. The novelty of this research lies in its advocacy for integrating socio-cultural change and grassroots activism into gender equality strategies, moving beyond juridical recognition towards genuine empowerment. This

article contributes to expanding the human rights discourse by bridging legal frameworks with intersectional feminist praxis.

Keywords *Gender equality*, *Human rights*, *Intersectionality*, *Feminist theory*, *Legal reforms*

RESUMEN
Este artículo examina críticamente la lucha continua por la igualdad de género dentro de los marcos de derechos humanos, enfatizando las limitaciones del reconocimiento legal para alcanzar una igualdad sustantiva. A través de un análisis multidisciplinario que incorpora teoría feminista, derecho de los derechos humanos e interseccionalidad, el estudio explora cómo las desigualdades estructurales relacionadas con género, raza, clase y sexualidad persisten a pesar de las protecciones legales formales. Estudios de caso en Sudáfrica, Suecia e India ilustran la brecha entre las reformas legales y las realidades vividas, destacando la necesidad de enfoques transformadores que aborden normas sociales, disparidades económicas y representación política. La novedad de esta investigación radica en su defensa de integrar el cambio sociocultural y el activismo de base en las estrategias de igualdad de género, avanzando más allá del reconocimiento jurídico hacia el empoderamiento genuino. Este artículo contribuye a ampliar el discurso de derechos humanos al articular marcos legales con la praxis feminista interseccional.

Palabras clave *Igualdad de género*, *Derechos humanos*, *Interseccionalidad*, *Teoría feminista*, *Reformas legales*

A. Introduction

The pursuit of gender equality has long been established as a cornerstone of the modern international human rights project, transitioning from a peripheral concern to a central normative mandate. Since the mid-20th century, the global community has witnessed a significant shift toward the formal legal recognition of women's rights, most notably anchored by the 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). Often described as the "international bill of rights for women," CEDAW has provided a robust legal architecture that compels states to dismantle discriminatory laws and promote equal opportunities (Hathaway, 2021). This era of "legal liberalism" has successfully integrated gender equality into national constitutions and statutory

frameworks across diverse jurisdictions, creating a *de jure* standard of protection that was previously non-existent in the Westphalian system.

However, a profound "compliance gap" persists between the ratification of international treaties and the substantive reality of women's lives. The research problem identified in this study centers on the inherent limitations of formal legal recognition in dismantling deeply entrenched patriarchal structures. Despite the proliferation of "gender-neutral" laws, structural inequalities—often rooted in the historical and systemic marginalization of women—continue to thrive. Legal frameworks frequently operate under the assumption that the removal of formal barriers is sufficient to achieve equality, yet this approach fails to account for the "sticky" nature of institutionalized sexism (Sassen, 2014). Consequently, even in nations with advanced legal protections, women continue to experience systemic disparities in wages, political representation, and personal safety, suggesting that the law alone is an insufficient tool for social transformation (Chetail, 2019).

The complexity of this struggle is further exacerbated by the failure of traditional legal models to address the intersectionality of gender with other axes of identity. As argued by Crenshaw (1989), women do not experience discrimination in a vacuum; rather, their lived realities are shaped by the overlapping forces of race, class, sexuality, and disability. A legal system that focuses solely on "gender" as a monolithic category often inadvertently centers the experiences of privileged women while invisibilizing the unique struggles of those at the margins (Yamin, 2016). This research highlights how structural inequalities are reproduced through these intersections, ensuring that legal recognition does not translate into equal outcomes for migrant women, women of color, or the economically disenfranchised, who remain trapped in the "blind spots" of international human rights law.

Furthermore, the persistence of socio-cultural norms and "informal institutions" often negates the progress made in the formal legal sphere. In many regional contexts, traditional patriarchies maintain a powerful hold over private life, effectively insulating the domestic sphere from human rights oversight. This creates a "dual legal reality" where women may possess constitutional rights to autonomy but are socially coerced into surrendering them. Dauvergne (2008) suggests that legal recognition frequently stops at the "threshold of the home," failing to address the private-sector and domestic power dynamics that are the primary sites of gender-based subordination. This limitation is particularly evident in the "private/public" divide that continues to shield certain forms of systemic violence from state intervention (Costello, 2016).

Economic structures also present a formidable barrier to substantive equality, as neoliberal globalized markets often rely on the undervalued and unpaid labor of women. The dichotomy between the "productive" public sphere and the "reproductive" private sphere remains a structural feature of the global economy that legal frameworks have yet to reconcile. Even where equal pay legislation exists, the "gendered division of labor" and the lack of social infrastructure for care work ensure that women's economic participation remains precarious (Betts & Collier, 2017). This research argues that without a fundamental restructuring of economic rights, legal equality remains a "hollow hope" for the millions of women performing essential, yet uncompensated, labor.

The objective of this paper is to interrogate this disconnect by advocating for a transition from formal equality to substantive equality. This requires a holistic and multi-dimensional approach that transcends "black-letter law" to address the socio-cultural, economic, and political factors that underpin gender discrimination (Goodwin-Gill & McAdam, 2021). By synthesizing legal theory with sociological insights, this study aims to bridge the gap between theory and practice, proposing that human rights must be re-envisioned as tools for structural redistribution rather than mere tools for procedural recognition. The paper seeks to provide a roadmap for "transformative justice," where equality is measured by the tangible redistribution of power and resources in the lived experience of all women (Aleinikoff & Zamore, 2019).

This study contributes to the evolving discourse on human rights by highlighting how the "sovereignty-protection paradox" often leaves the most vulnerable women without recourse. By moving beyond legal recognition, the study sets an agenda for further research into the "socio-legal efficacy" of human rights in the 21st century (Milanovic, 2011). It invites scholars and policymakers to look beneath the surface of treaty ratifications to the structural realities of the workplace and the home. The struggle for gender equality is thus framed as a struggle to redefine the human rights subject as a complex, intersectional being whose dignity cannot be realized through legal decrees alone, but through the radical dismantling of the systems that profit from their exclusion.

B. Legal Recognition of Gender Equality: Achievements and Limitations

The evolution of gender equality from a grassroots social movement into a foundational principle of international law represents one of the most significant normative shifts in modern legal history.

This section evaluates the international and national architectures that codify these rights while analyzing the systemic friction that prevents legal text from manifesting as social reality.

1. *International Legal Frameworks and the Primacy of CEDAW*

The cornerstone of gender-based legal recognition is the 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). Often described as the "international bill of rights for women," CEDAW transcends traditional "negative" rights—which merely prohibit state interference—by imposing "positive" obligations on states to actively eliminate discrimination in both the public and private spheres (Hathaway, 2021). Unlike previous instruments, CEDAW explicitly targets the social and cultural patterns of conduct that perpetuate gender hierarchies, moving the legal needle from mere non-discrimination to the active pursuit of parity.

Furthermore, the 1995 Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action served to operationalize these treaty obligations by introducing the concept of "gender mainstreaming." This strategy requires that the implications for both women and men of any planned action, including legislation and policies, be assessed at every level of government. This normative development marked a shift toward a more holistic understanding of gender, recognizing that the "woman question" is inextricably linked to the broader structures of governance, development, and peace (Goodwin-Gill & McAdam, 2021).

The international architecture is further bolstered by regional instruments that provide more localized enforcement mechanisms. For instance, the Istanbul Convention (2011) in Europe and the Maputo Protocol (2003) in Africa have introduced specific mandates regarding violence against women and reproductive health. These regional frameworks often act as "normative catalysts," pushing states to adopt standards that exceed the minimum requirements of global treaties. By creating regional courts and monitoring bodies, these instruments provide a secondary layer of accountability for women whose rights are neglected by national systems (Costello, 2016).

Globally, these international instruments have heavily influenced the drafting of modern national constitutions. Many post-conflict or post-authoritarian states have utilized the "CEDAW standard" to include explicit equality clauses and gender-sensitive interpretations of the right to dignity within their supreme laws. This constitutionalization of gender equality is a critical step in providing a high-level legal shield against discriminatory legislation. It allows for the judicial review of laws that, while seemingly neutral, may have a

disparate impact on women's biological or social realities (Chetail, 2019).

Despite these robust frameworks, the international regime faces significant challenges regarding state reservations. Many nations have ratified CEDAW while maintaining extensive reservations—particularly concerning Article 16, which governs marriage and family life. These reservations often cite religious or cultural sovereignty, effectively hollowing out the convention's core protections in the domestic sphere. From an analytical perspective, this suggests that while the international community has reached a consensus on public-sphere equality, the private-sphere remains a contested battleground for state sovereignty (Dauvergne, 2008).

The achievement of international legal frameworks lies in their ability to provide a universal vocabulary for rights-claims. Even in jurisdictions where enforcement is weak, the existence of a ratified treaty provides civil society with a powerful tool for advocacy and "reputational shaming." However, the reliance on periodic state reporting and voluntary compliance means that the international regime remains more of a normative lighthouse than an enforcement engine. The transition from formal treaty recognition to lived reality still depends heavily on the political will of the individual nation-state.

2. *National Legal Reforms: Codifying Substantive Rights*

Domestic legal landscapes have undergone radical transformations to align with international standards, particularly through the codification of rights in the criminal and civil codes. Key reforms often focus on three critical pillars: Gender-Based Violence (GBV), Reproductive Rights, and Workplace Equality. Many jurisdictions have moved beyond simple assault laws to recognize domestic violence as a specific human rights violation. This shift acknowledges that violence in the home is not a "private matter" but a systemic barrier to the exercise of citizenship and bodily autonomy (Costello, 2016).

In the economic sphere, workplace equality reforms have moved toward addressing the "motherhood penalty." Modern legislation in many states now includes mandatory pay-gap reporting, protected maternity and paternity leave, and prohibitions against discrimination based on pregnancy. These reforms formally recognize that gender equality in the public market is impossible without addressing the unequal distribution of "reproductive labor" in the private home (Betts & Collier, 2017). By mandating that employers accommodate the biological realities of childbirth and the social realities of caretaking, states are attempting to restructure the economy around the human rights subject rather than the ideal "unencumbered" male worker.

Legal reforms have also expanded into the realm of political representation through the use of gender quotas. Many countries have enacted legislative requirements for a minimum percentage of female candidates in elections or female representatives in corporate boards. While controversial, these "temporary special measures" are justified under CEDAW as a means to accelerate de facto equality. Analytically, quotas represent a transition from "equality of opportunity" to "equality of results," acknowledging that historical exclusion cannot be undone through neutral competition alone (Aleinikoff & Zamore, 2019).

Reproductive rights have seen a wave of liberalization across various continents, with many states decriminalizing abortion and expanding access to contraception as a matter of constitutional right. These reforms are increasingly framed through the lens of "health justice" and "biological autonomy." Legal recognition of these rights is crucial because, as Yamin (2016) argues, control over one's reproductive life is a prerequisite for the enjoyment of all other civil and political rights. Without the legal ability to decide if and when to have children, women remain structurally disadvantaged in education, employment, and political life.

The criminal justice system has also seen the introduction of specialized "gender-sensitive" protocols. This includes the training of police forces to handle sexual assault cases with trauma-informed care and the establishment of specialized courts to expedite GBV cases. Such procedural reforms aim to address the "second victimization" that women often face when navigating the traditional legal system. By making the process of seeking justice less hostile, these reforms attempt to increase the reporting rates of gender-specific crimes, thereby closing the "impunity gap" that historically protected perpetrators of violence (Goodwin-Gill & McAdam, 2021).

However, the proliferation of these laws does not always correlate with a reduction in inequality. In some cases, states engage in "rights-washing," where they pass progressive laws to gain international favor while failing to provide the budget or political support necessary for their implementation. For example, a law protecting against workplace harassment is ineffective if there is no labor inspectorate to enforce it. Thus, the achievement of national legal reform must be measured not just by the text of the statute, but by the administrative resources and judicial independence allocated to its survival (Sassen, 2014).

3. *The Implementation Gap and Normative Resistance*

Despite these formal achievements, legal recognition frequently fails to translate into substantive change, creating a "de jure vs. de facto"

dichotomy. This "implementation gap" is often a result of chronic underfunding and a lack of administrative capacity. As Sassen (2014) identifies, this is a form of "administrative exclusion," where the law exists on paper but is rendered inaccessible by the prohibitive costs of litigation, the lack of legal aid, or the sheer geographic distance to the nearest court. In this sense, the law remains a "luxury good" available only to those with the social and economic capital to navigate the state's bureaucracy.

Furthermore, the judiciary itself often acts as a site of normative resistance. Even when progressive laws are passed, they must be interpreted by judges who may harbor deeply ingrained gender biases. If the "reasonable person" standard in law continues to be interpreted through a traditionally male lens, women's experiences—such as the complexities of "coercive control" in domestic abuse—are often marginalized or dismissed. Hathaway (2021) notes that without a gender-sensitive judiciary, the most revolutionary statutes can be "hollowed out" by conservative interpretations that prioritize family unity or traditional values over individual rights.

Entrenched cultural and societal norms also act as a powerful "shadow law" that reinforces gender hierarchies. In many societies, the formal legal system exists alongside informal customary or religious systems that may be explicitly discriminatory. Even when the formal law takes precedence, women may be socially or culturally coerced into surrendering their legal rights to property, inheritance, or bodily autonomy. This "social sanctioning" ensures that the formal legal victory remains a "dead letter" for women who cannot afford the social cost of challenging patriarchal tradition (Dauvergne, 2008).

Intersectionality further complicates the implementation of gender equality laws. A legal system that assumes a "universal woman" often fails to protect those whose identities are marginalized by race, class, or sexuality. For example, a migrant woman facing domestic violence may be deterred from using protective laws because she fears that contact with the police will lead to her deportation. As Crenshaw (1989) argues, the law's inability to see "intersecting" vulnerabilities means that legal recognition often serves the most privileged women while leaving the most marginalized in a state of double-jeopardy.

Economic neoliberalism also places limits on the efficacy of legal recognition. When states prioritize austerity and the privatization of social services, the "social safety net" that facilitates women's equality—such as childcare, healthcare, and eldercare—is often the first to be cut. In such environments, the formal "right to work" is undermined by the practical impossibility of balancing labor with uncompensated care work. Betts and Collier (2017) observe that legal rights are fragile when

they are not supported by the economic infrastructure that allows individuals to exercise them.

There is the issue of "backlash politics." In many parts of the world, the success of gender equality reforms has triggered a conservative reaction that seeks to roll back hard-won rights. This is often framed as a defense of "traditional family values" or "national culture" against perceived "Western ideological colonization." This political resistance ensures that gender equality is never a "settled" legal reality but a constant site of negotiation and struggle. To bridge the implementation gap, the international community must move beyond the "recognition of rights" and focus on the "redistribution of power" within the lived experience of the person (Milanovic, 2011).

4. *Case Studies: Examining the Disconnect in Practice*

To illustrate the varying degrees of success and failure in legal implementation, this study examines three distinct national contexts: South Africa, Sweden, and India. These cases demonstrate that while the "legal roadmap" may look similar across borders, the destination is determined by local structural factors. In South Africa, the 1996 Constitution is arguably one of the most progressive in the world, explicitly protecting against discrimination based on gender and sexual orientation. However, the country suffers from some of the highest rates of femicide globally. This disconnect highlights the limits of constitutionalism when it is forced to operate in a landscape of extreme poverty, systemic trauma, and a historically under-resourced police force (Yamin, 2016).

Sweden represents the "gold standard" of state-feminism and workplace equality. Through decades of "gender-neutral" social engineering, Sweden has achieved high rates of female labor participation and political representation. Yet, even here, researchers point to the "gender-equality paradox": despite equalized social policies, the Swedish labor market remains highly segregated by gender, and the "glass ceiling" in the private sector remains remarkably resilient. This suggests that even under optimal legal and economic conditions, deeply ingrained social stereotypes about "men's work" and "women's work" continue to shape outcomes (Milanovic, 2011).

In India, the legal recognition of women's rights has been marked by landmark legislation, such as the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace Act (2013) and significant amendments to the Hindu Succession Act. However, the intersection of caste, religion, and patriarchal tradition creates a formidable barrier to the legal agency of marginalized women. For a Dalit woman in rural India, the formal law in New Delhi often feels light-years away from the "informal" laws

governed by village councils (Khap Panchayats). This case demonstrates that legal reform can inadvertently widen the gap between urban, middle-class women and their rural, marginalized counterparts (Crenshaw, 1989).

Across all three cases, the role of civil society emerges as the decisive factor. In South Africa, activist groups have been instrumental in using the constitution to litigate for access to healthcare; in India, the "Me Too" movement utilized social media to bypass a stagnant judiciary. These "bottom-up" pressures are what transform the law from a static text into a dynamic social force. However, as Chetail (2019) notes, when the state perceives this activism as a threat to its sovereignty or stability, it often reacts by restricting the very legal "space" required for these movements to operate.

The comparative analysis also reveals a "global-local" friction. International benchmarks provided by CEDAW are often viewed by local traditionalists as foreign impositions, allowing political leaders to dismiss gender equality as "Western elitism." This cultural defense is frequently used in India and South Africa to justify the non-enforcement of laws regarding inheritance or domestic violence. Bridging this gap requires a "vernacularization" of human rights, where global norms are translated into local idioms that resonate with the specific social and historical experiences of the community (Chetail, 2014).

In addition, the case studies of South Africa, Sweden, and India collectively demonstrate that legal reform is only the beginning of the struggle. For legal recognition to move "beyond the paper," it must be accompanied by a massive redistribution of social and economic resources. Without this, the law serves merely as a "mirror of the state's aspirations" rather than a "tool for the subject's liberation." The future of gender equality in human rights law lies in its ability to address these structural underpinnings, moving from a model of "formal recognition" to one of "transformative justice" (Aleinikoff & Zamore, 2019).

C. Feminist Theory and Intersectionality: A Framework for Understanding Structural Inequalities

The endeavor to move beyond formal legal recognition necessitates a robust analytical framework capable of deconstructing the invisible architectures of power. Feminist theory, particularly when sharpened by the lens of intersectionality, provides the requisite tools to move from a "symptomatic" view of gender inequality to a "structural" one. This section explores the theoretical foundations that allow legal scholars to identify the root causes of systemic exclusion and the persistence of the "compliance gap."

1. *Feminist Theory: Deconstructing Patriarchy and Power*

At the core of feminist legal theory is the critique of patriarchy—not merely as a collection of prejudiced individuals, but as a systemic social structure that prioritizes the male perspective and interests as the universal standard. Feminist scholars argue that the law is often "gendered" in its very foundations, operating under an assumed "neutral" subject that is, in reality, modeled on the unencumbered male experience (Chetail, 2019). This bias manifests in legal doctrines that fail to account for the specificities of female biology or the socio-economic consequences of the domestic sphere, often treating women's concerns as "exceptions" to the rule.

Gender norms and power dynamics further refine this inequality by naturalizing certain roles and behaviors as biological imperatives rather than social constructs. Theoretical analysis reveals that the "private/public" divide—where the state historically refused to intervene in domestic matters—is a primary mechanism for maintaining patriarchal control. By labeling domestic violence or unpaid care work as "private," the legal system effectively insulated these sites of power from human rights oversight, thereby legitimizing the subordination of women within the family unit (Costello, 2016).

Furthermore, feminist theory interrogates the concept of "formal neutrality," arguing that treating everyone the same in a context of deep historical inequality only serves to entrench the status quo. Scholars like Hathaway (2021) emphasize that "sameness of treatment" is not "equality of result" if the starting line for women is set back by centuries of legal and economic disenfranchisement. This leads to the demand for "substantive equality," which requires the law to recognize and rectify the structural advantages historically granted to men.

The "male gaze" of the law also extends to the definition of "work" and "value." In the capitalist-patriarchal nexus, value is predominantly assigned to labor performed in the public market, while the reproductive labor performed at home is rendered invisible and economically worthless. Feminist theory argues that this structural "invisibilization" is what keeps women in a state of economic dependence, regardless of how many formal "non-discrimination" laws are passed (Betts & Collier, 2017).

Power dynamics are also maintained through the control of language and the framing of rights. Traditional human rights discourse has often prioritized civil and political rights (the "first generation") over socio-economic rights (the "second generation"). Feminist theorists point out that this hierarchy is inherently gendered, as the rights most critical to women's daily survival—such as health, housing, and social

security—are often marginalized as "policy goals" rather than enforceable rights (Yamin, 2016).

The critique of patriarchy also involves an analysis of "coercive control" beyond physical violence. Power is exercised through the restriction of movement, the denial of financial resources, and the psychological policing of gender roles. A legal system that only recognizes "brute force" as a violation of rights fails to capture the subtle, pervasive ways in which patriarchal power limits women's agency and autonomy on a daily basis (Sassen, 2014).

Deconstructing these norms is essential for a legal framework that seeks to achieve genuine liberation. Feminist theory moves the focus from "fixing women" to "fixing the system." It demands that the legal architecture itself be re-engineered to reflect a diverse range of human experiences, ensuring that the "universal" human rights subject is truly inclusive of all genders and social realities.

2. *Intersectionality: The Multi-Dimensionality of Oppression*

The concept of intersectionality, as pioneered by Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989), revolutionized the understanding of gender inequality by arguing that discrimination does not occur along a single, isolated axis. Instead, it is the result of overlapping social identities—such as race, class, sexuality, and disability—that converge to create unique experiences of marginalization. For an individual who is both a woman and a member of a racialized minority, the experience of discrimination is not simply "gender plus race"; it is a distinct, synthesized form of oppression.

Intersectionality exposes the "essentialist" fallacy of traditional human rights law, which often presumes a "universal woman" whose needs and experiences are identical to those of the most privileged members of the group. Without an intersectional approach, legal reforms often disproportionately benefit white, middle-class women while leaving the most vulnerable at the periphery. By acknowledging these "intersections," legal analysis can begin to identify the "blind spots" where rights are nominally present but practically inaccessible due to the weight of multiple burdens (Crenshaw, 1989).

From a legal standpoint, intersectionality challenges the "categorical" approach to anti-discrimination law. Most legal systems require a plaintiff to choose a single ground for their claim—either gender or race—which forces them to fragment their identity to fit into a legal box. This "single-axis" framework effectively erases the specific harm suffered by women of color, whose experience of sexism is inextricably linked to their experience of racism. Hathaway (2021) notes

that this legal fragmentation prevents the law from addressing the totality of the person's lived reality.

Intersectionality also highlights the "intra-group" differences that are often ignored in broad policy-making. For example, a "women's empowerment" initiative that focuses on corporate leadership will have little to no relevance for an undocumented migrant woman working in the informal economy. By ignoring the axes of class and legal status, such initiatives reinforce existing hierarchies within the category of "women," furthering the marginalization of those already at the bottom of the social ladder (Sassen, 2014).

The framework is also vital for understanding the specific vulnerabilities of LGBTQ+ women. For trans women or lesbians, gender inequality is compounded by heteronormativity and transphobia. A legal system that relies on a narrow, "biological" definition of womanhood excludes these individuals from essential protection services, such as domestic violence shelters or specialized healthcare. Intersectionality provides the tools to broaden these definitions, ensuring that the "protection umbrella" of human rights is truly universal (Costello, 2016).

Furthermore, intersectionality reveals how systems of oppression can be "mutually reinforcing." For instance, the lack of affordable childcare (a gender issue) is exacerbated by the lack of living wages (a class issue) and the discriminatory policing of low-income neighborhoods (a race issue). Addressing one without the others is akin to treating a symptom while ignoring the systemic infection. An intersectional legal analysis demands a "multi-pronged" approach to reform that addresses these overlapping structures simultaneously.

Integrating intersectionality into human rights praxis requires a fundamental shift in how we measure "progress." Success can no longer be defined by the aggregate advancement of "women" as a whole. Instead, we must look at the margins—to the experiences of the most disenfranchised—to determine if the legal system is truly functioning. As Yamin (2016) argues, intersectionality turns the legal gaze toward the "interstices" of power, where the most profound and invisible rights violations occur.

3. *Structural Inequalities: Analyzing Systemic Oppression*

Gender inequality cannot be understood in isolation; it must be analyzed within the context of intersecting social structures that create systemic oppression. For marginalized groups—including women of color, working-class women, and LGBTQ+ individuals—inequality is reinforced by a "matrix of domination" where economic deprivation, racial profiling, and heteronormativity work in tandem. Sassen (2014)

notes that these structural forces often result in "expulsions," where certain groups are systematically pushed out of the social contract and the legal protections it supposedly affords.

In the context of the global economy, the "working-class" woman often faces a triple burden of labor: low-wage formal employment, unpaid domestic work, and the "emotional labor" of community survival. A legal framework that ignores class as a structural barrier to gender equality will fail to address why women in the Global South remain trapped in precarious labor despite formal "equal pay" laws. Betts and Collier (2017) observe that economic neoliberalism has effectively "outsourced" the cost of social reproduction to women, making their poverty a functional requirement of the current global market.

Structural inequality also manifests in the "geography of rights." Women in rural areas or conflict zones face a vastly different structural reality than those in urban centers. The lack of infrastructure, the presence of non-state armed groups, and the collapse of the rule of law create a vacuum where formal legal recognition has no purchase. In these contexts, gender inequality is not just a social norm but a survival mechanism enforced through brute force and the absence of state protection (Goodwin-Gill & McAdam, 2021).

Furthermore, the "criminalization of survival" is a structural barrier that disproportionately affects marginalized women. For those living in poverty, survival strategies—such as informal street vending or sex work—are often met with policing rather than support. This creates a "revolving door" between poverty and the carceral state, where the legal system acts as an instrument of punishment rather than a source of protection. A structural analysis reveals that the law often targets the symptoms of inequality rather than the causes, effectively punishing women for their own marginalization (Dauvergne, 2008).

The education system also serves as a site where structural inequality is reproduced. While many states have achieved "gender parity" in primary school enrollment, the curriculum and the "hidden classroom" often continue to reinforce traditional gender roles. Moreover, for girls in poverty or from marginalized ethnic groups, the "right to education" is often curtailed by the need to contribute to family labor or the lack of safe transportation. This structural exclusion from high-level education ensures that the "pipelines" to political and economic power remain dominated by men (Chetail, 2019).

Systemic oppression is also maintained through the "politics of knowledge." The data used to drive policy is often "gender-blind" or ignores the specificities of marginalized groups. When we do not collect data on the specific health needs of disabled women or the economic

contributions of migrant women, we render their struggles invisible to the state. Yamin (2016) argues that this "epistemic exclusion" is a primary structural barrier to reform, as the state cannot address what it chooses not to see.

The persistence of structural inequality demands a move toward "redistributive justice." This involves not just changing the law, but changing the material conditions of women's lives. It requires a commitment to universal basic services—such as healthcare, housing, and childcare—that alleviate the "structural weight" of patriarchal oppression. Without a commitment to material change, legal recognition remains a "hollow crown," offering the prestige of rights without the power to exercise them (Aleinikoff & Zamore, 2019).

4. *Integration of Feminist Praxis and Human Rights*

The integration of feminist praxis and intersectionality into human rights frameworks offers a pathway toward a more comprehensive and "transformative" justice. This involves shifting the burden of change from the individual to the state and the underlying social structures. Rather than simply asking "is there a law against this?", a feminist human rights approach asks "how does the structure of this law prevent certain women from accessing it?" (Hathaway, 2021). This move from procedural to substantive analysis allows for the development of "positive duties" that require states to proactively dismantle the barriers to equality.

This integration also necessitates a "subject-centered" approach to international law, where the lived experiences of marginalized women inform the development of legal norms. Aleinikoff and Zamore (2019) argue that by incorporating these "bottom-up" perspectives, the international community can move toward a "rights-based" model that is sensitive to local contexts while adhering to universal principles. This ensures that human rights are not seen as "foreign impositions" but as tools for local liberation that reflect the actual needs of the community.

Feminist praxis also demands a "re-tooling" of human rights monitoring. Traditional monitoring focuses on state reports and legislative changes. A feminist approach would include "shadow reporting" from grassroots organizations and the use of qualitative data that captures the nuances of women's lived realities. This provides a more accurate picture of the "legal environment" and identifies the "micro-violations" that state reports often gloss over (Costello, 2016).

The integration also involves "de-colonizing" human rights. For too long, the gender equality agenda has been driven by the Global North, often ignoring the specific historical and colonial legacies that shape inequality in the Global South. A de-colonial feminist praxis

acknowledges that the "liberation of women" cannot be separated from the struggle against global economic inequality and systemic racism. This leads to a more robust, "anti-imperialist" human rights framework that seeks to empower women within their own cultural and economic contexts (Chetail, 2014).

Furthermore, feminist praxis emphasizes the importance of "collective rights." Traditional human rights are focused on the individual. However, for many women, empowerment is found through collective action—unions, cooperatives, and community organizations. Legal frameworks must recognize and protect these collective spaces as essential for the realization of gender equality. By protecting the right to organize and the right to collective bargaining, the law can support the "counter-powers" that are necessary to challenge patriarchal institutions (Goodwin-Gill & McAdam, 2021).

The role of the "legal advocate" also changes under this framework. Advocates are no longer just "experts" interpreting a code; they become "translators" who bridge the gap between the formal legal system and the lived reality of the client. This involves a commitment to "legal literacy" programs that empower women to understand and use the law for themselves. As Dauvergne (2008) suggests, the most effective way to integrate feminist praxis into the law is to ensure that the people most affected by the law have the power to shape it.

The integration of these frameworks serves to "politicize" human rights. It acknowledges that gender equality is not a technical problem that can be solved through administrative "tweaking." It is a political struggle over the distribution of power, resources, and dignity. By using intersectionality as a diagnostic tool, human rights practitioners can design interventions that are specifically tailored to the unique needs of those at the "intersections" of multiple systems of oppression, ensuring that the promise of gender equality is finally realized for all (Yamin, 2016).

D. Case Studies: Gender Equality in Practice

The gap between legal recognition and lived reality is most visible when comparing states that have adopted progressive frameworks but continue to struggle with systemic disparities. This section provides a comparative analysis of South Africa, Sweden, and India to illustrate the persistent friction between constitutional mandates and structural socio-economic barriers.

1. South Africa: The Paradox of Constitutionalism and Femicide

In the post-apartheid era, South Africa emerged with what is widely considered one of the most progressive legal frameworks for gender equality in the world. The 1996 Constitution was designed to be "transformative," explicitly prohibiting discrimination based on gender and sexual orientation. Significant legal reforms followed, such as the Prevention of Family Violence Act and the Domestic Violence Act (1998), which aimed to bring the private sphere under the protection of the rule of law. These reforms were intended to rectify the dual marginalization experienced by women under the intersection of racial and patriarchal oppression (Yamin, 2016).

However, the substantive reality for South African women remains characterized by a "culture of violence." The country consistently records some of the highest rates of femicide and sexual assault globally, indicating that constitutional protections have failed to penetrate the social fabric. This failure is exacerbated by extreme economic inequality; black women, in particular, remain at the bottom of the economic hierarchy, facing high unemployment and limited access to land. Sassen (2014) notes that in contexts of extreme structural poverty, legal rights become "latent," as the lack of resources prevents the marginalized from activating the state's protection mechanisms.

Furthermore, while South Africa has made strides in women's political representation within the parliament, this "descriptive representation" has not always translated into "substantive representation." Political leadership often remains tethered to patriarchal party structures that prioritize institutional stability over radical gender reform. The persistence of traditional authorities and customary laws—which often conflict with constitutional equality—further complicates the legal landscape, leaving rural women in a jurisdictional "no-man's-land" where their rights are frequently bartered for political consensus (Dauvergne, 2008).

2. Sweden: The Limits of the "Gender Equality Gold Standard"

Sweden is frequently cited as the global leader in gender equality, having institutionalized "state-feminism" through comprehensive social engineering. Policies such as dual parental leave—which includes "daddy months" to encourage shared caregiving—and the integration of gender budgeting across all levels of government have successfully equalized labor market participation rates. Sweden's success is built on the premise that gender equality is not just a human right but an

economic necessity, leading to high levels of female representation in both the public sector and political offices (Milanovic, 2011).

Despite these achievements, Sweden faces the "gender-equality paradox." While social policies are neutral, the labor market remains highly segregated, with women disproportionately represented in lower-paid public sector roles like nursing and teaching, while men dominate the private technical sectors. This suggests that even when the state removes all formal barriers, deeply ingrained gender roles in caregiving and career choice persist. For women in lower socio-economic brackets, particularly migrant women, the struggle for equality is compounded by "integration hurdles" that the universalist Swedish model often fails to address (Costello, 2016).

The Swedish case also reveals that "economic disparities" can be masked by high aggregate equality scores. The "glass ceiling" in the private sector remains remarkably resilient, and women still perform the majority of unpaid domestic labor. This highlights the limits of a model that focuses on "market participation" without fundamentally challenging the patriarchal valuation of care work. As Betts and Collier (2017) argue, unless the "reproductive economy" is given equal weight to the "productive economy," women will continue to bear a "double burden" that limits their substantive freedom.

3. *India: Intersectional Barriers and the Rural-Urban Divide*

India offers a complex landscape where ancient patriarchal traditions intersect with a modern, democratic legal framework. The Indian Constitution provides a robust foundation for equality, and landmark laws like the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act (2005) and the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace Act (2013) signal a formal commitment to women's safety. Furthermore, the 73rd and 74th Amendments, which mandated 33% reservation for women in local self-government (Panchayats), have brought over a million women into the political sphere (Chetail, 2019).

However, these legal victories are often stymied by the "matrix of domination" involving caste, class, and religion. For a Dalit or Adivasi woman, the experience of gender inequality is inseparable from her caste-based exclusion, which often renders the police and judiciary hostile or indifferent to her claims. The Crenshaw (1989) model of intersectionality is vital here: a law that protects an urban, upper-class woman from harassment may be entirely inaccessible to a rural woman whose movement is restricted by community elders and whose economic survival depends on precarious agricultural labor.

The rural-urban divide in India creates a "rights-asymmetry." In urban centers, women are increasingly entering the workforce and challenging social norms; in contrast, rural areas often see the persistence of "honor-based" violence and discriminatory inheritance practices. This indicates that the "reach" of the state is uneven, and the "informal legal systems" of village councils often carry more weight than the Supreme Court in the daily lives of millions. Genuine empowerment in the Indian context remains hindered by the lack of "legal literacy" and the structural absence of basic resources like safe transport and clean sanitation (Yamin, 2016).

4. *Common Themes: Moving Toward Transformative Justice*

Across South Africa, Sweden, and India, several common themes emerge that clarify the nature of contemporary protection failures. The most prominent is the limitation of legal reform in isolation; without a concomitant change in the distribution of economic and social power, laws remain "dead letters." In all three cases, the state has been more successful at passing legislation than at enforcing it, particularly when enforcement requires challenging the interests of powerful patriarchal or corporate actors (Hathaway, 2021).

The persistence of cultural and social norms acts as a "normative anchor," pulling back the progress made by legal instruments. Whether it is the "culture of violence" in South Africa, the "caregiving roles" in Sweden, or "caste-patriarchy" in India, these informal institutions prove more resilient than the formal law. This suggests that gender equality cannot be "legislated into existence" but must be won through a "transformative approach" that addresses the structural underpinnings of society—moving from a focus on individual rights to a focus on systemic redistribution (Aleinikoff & Zamore, 2019).

Finally, these case studies emphasize that the "struggle for gender equality" is not a linear journey toward progress but a constant site of negotiation. The "compliance gap" is not a technical error to be fixed with better administration; it is a political choice made by states that prioritize sovereignty and traditional order over the radical equality demanded by international human rights law. Addressing these gaps requires a re-envisioning of the human rights project as one that is "intersectional by design," ensuring that the law serves the most marginalized subjects rather than just the most visible ones (Chetail, 2014).

E. Beyond Legal Recognition: Addressing Social Norms and Economic Disparities

The persistence of gender inequality in the face of progressive legislation suggests that the law is often a "shallow" instrument when confronted with the "deep" structures of social and economic life. To achieve substantive equality, the human rights project must pivot from the mere drafting of statutes to the active deconstruction of the informal institutions that govern daily existence. This section analyzes the extra-legal barriers that prevent the realization of gender parity across global contexts.

1. *Social Norms and the Persistence of Gender Roles*

Even in societies that have reached a high degree of formal legal parity, social and cultural norms continue to act as a powerful "shadow law," dictating the boundaries of women's agency. These norms are often so deeply ingrained that they operate at a pre-conscious level, shaping individual desires, career aspirations, and family dynamics long before a legal dispute ever arises (Chetail, 2014). Patriarchal attitudes regarding emotionality and leadership capability create a psychological glass ceiling that laws cannot easily shatter, as the "internalized" expectations of gender performance often lead to self-censorship and limited participation in public life (Yamin, 2016).

The role of the "private sphere" remains the primary site where social norms override legal rights. In many cultures, the "good woman" is defined by her domesticity and self-sacrifice, a stereotype that is reinforced through family pressure and religious teachings (Goodwin-Gill & McAdam, 2021). When these norms are violated, the consequence is often not a legal penalty, but a social one—ostracization or familial alienation—which can be far more deterrent than the threat of a fine is for a perpetrator of discrimination. Arendt (1951) famously noted that the loss of social standing can be equivalent to a loss of the "right to have rights."

Furthermore, the "internalization" of gender roles means that women themselves may align their ambitions with societal expectations to avoid conflict. This is particularly evident in "choice-based" discrimination, where women "choose" lower-paid careers to accommodate family needs. While the law views this as a free choice, a feminist analysis reveals it as a "constrained choice" made within a social architecture that provides no other viable path for domestic survival (Chetail, 2019). Nussbaum (2000) argues that such "adaptive preferences" are a direct result of living under long-term structural inequality.

Patriarchal norms also dictate the "acceptability" of certain rights, particularly concerning property and inheritance. For instance, while a woman may have the legal right to inherit land, social norms in many regions of the Global South dictate that property should remain with male heirs to preserve lineage. A woman who attempts to exercise her legal right may find herself cast out of her community support network. In such cases, the "social cost" of the right outweighs its legal benefit, rendering the law a "dead letter" (Dauvergne, 2008).

The media and popular culture play a critical role in the perpetual recycling of these stereotypes. Even in progressive societies, digital content often reproduces the "male gaze," portraying women in subordinate or hyper-sexualized roles. This constant barrage of imagery reinforces the notion that women's primary value is aesthetic or reproductive, rather than intellectual or political. Sassen (2014) identifies this as a form of "cultural capture" that makes it difficult for legal reforms regarding workplace equality to take firm root in the public imagination.

Language itself remains a repository of gendered power, often excluding women from the "universal" subject of law. The use of masculine pronouns as defaults serves to remind women of their secondary status in the linguistic and legal order (MacKinnon, 1989). Legal recognition of equality is frequently undermined by a linguistic environment that continues to categorize "doctor" or "leader" as male, while "nurse" or "assistant" is feminized. Transforming these norms requires a linguistic shift that law alone cannot mandate but which is essential for the normalization of female authority.

Institutional culture also resists legal reform through "micro-aggressions" and informal gatekeeping. In male-dominated professions, women often face a "chilly climate" where they are excluded from informal networking and mentorship. These practices are rarely illegal under standard labor laws, yet they are highly effective at preventing women from reaching the upper echelons of power (Moreno-Lax, 2017). Addressing this requires a move toward "cultural audits" within organizations to identify and dismantle these invisible barriers.

The resilience of social norms is often tied to "identity politics," where gender equality is framed as a threat to traditional or national values. Political leaders frequently use the "defense of the family" as a populist tool to roll back women's rights, particularly in the realm of reproductive health (Milanovic, 2011). This suggests that the struggle for gender equality is not just a legal battle but a cultural war over the meaning of "tradition." For human rights to succeed, they must be "vernacularized"—translated into local cultural idioms that resonate with the lived values of the community.

2. *Economic Disparities: The Material Limits of Rights*

Economic inequality serves as the most significant structural barrier to the realization of legal rights. The gender pay gap, which persists in every country regardless of development status, ensures that women remain in a state of relative economic precariousness. This financial gap is not merely a matter of "equal pay for equal work" but reflects the systemic "devaluation" of professions dominated by women (Betts & Collier, 2017). When caregiving and education are paid less than finance and technology, the market itself functions as a patriarchal institution that subsidizes growth through female under-compensation.

The "motherhood penalty" represents a profound economic disparity that legal frameworks have yet to fully reconcile. In the current neoliberal market, the "ideal worker" is someone who has no domestic responsibilities. Because women still perform the vast majority of unpaid care work, they are penalized for their perceived "unreliability" (Hathaway, 2021). This leads to a lifetime of lower earnings, reduced social security benefits, and a higher risk of poverty in old age, creating a "feminization of poverty" that rights-based approaches often ignore (Aleinikoff & Zamore, 2019).

Access to credit and capital remains a gendered hurdle, particularly for women in the Global South and working-class women in the North. Financial institutions often require collateral—such as land or property—that women are less likely to own due to historical inheritance laws. Without access to capital, women are unable to start businesses or achieve the economic independence necessary to exit abusive domestic situations (Zetter, 2007). In this sense, "property rights" for men often act as a barrier to "human rights" for women.

The global undervaluation of unpaid care work—estimated to be worth trillions of dollars—is the "hidden engine" of the global economy. By relying on women to provide free childcare, eldercare, and domestic labor, states are able to reduce public spending on social infrastructure (Costello, 2016). This "care crisis" is a structural form of exploitation that formal legal recognition of equality fails to address. Achieving substantive equality requires a "redistributive" model where care is recognized as a social responsibility rather than a private female burden (Agamben, 1998).

Education disparities, while narrowing at the primary level, remain significant at the higher technical and vocational levels. In many regions, the "hidden curriculum" steers girls away from STEM fields (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math), which are the primary drivers of high-wage employment. This educational segregation ensures that women remain trapped in the "pink-collar" service sector,

where wages are lower and labor protections are often weaker (Edwards, 2011). This stratification is a direct consequence of a global economy that prioritizes "flexibility" over equity.

Economic dependence is the primary "leash" that prevents women from exercising their legal rights. A woman who is financially dependent on her husband is far less likely to report domestic violence or seek a divorce, even if the law provides for it. The fear of homelessness and destitution is a more powerful deterrent than any "protection order" a court can issue (Yamin, 2016). Therefore, the "right to a living wage" and "universal basic services" are fundamental prerequisites for the "right to bodily autonomy."

The "austerity trap" also has a disproportionate impact on women. When governments cut funding for public transport, healthcare, and social housing, women bear the brunt of the "time-poverty" created by having to fill these gaps through their own labor (Sassen, 2014). Austerity is, in effect, a gendered economic policy that transfers the costs of the state onto the backs of women. This structural violence undermines the progress made in gender equality legislation, as women are forced back into the domestic sphere to survive.

Economic disparities ensure that the "rule of law" is experienced differently depending on one's class. For a wealthy woman, the legal system may provide a path to equality; for a working-class woman, the law is often an obstacle or a source of punishment (Dauvergne, 2008). To move beyond legal recognition, the international community must commit to a "humanity-based" economic model that prioritizes social reproduction over capital accumulation, ensuring that every woman has the material resources to be truly free.

3. *Political Representation and the Illusion of Power*

The barriers to political participation often shift from "exclusionary" to "containment" strategies once legal quotas are introduced. While gender quotas may increase the number of women in legislative bodies, they do not automatically grant women actual political power. In many contexts, women are relegated to "soft" committees like culture or social affairs, while "hard" portfolios such as finance and defense remain male-dominated (Moreno-Lax, 2017). This "thematic segregation" ensures that the core levers of state power remain unchanged by the presence of women.

Patriarchal party structures often serve as the "informal gatekeepers" of political life. Even when quotas exist, parties may select female candidates who are "proxies" for male relatives or who are unlikely to challenge the patriarchal status quo (Chetail, 2019). This "descriptive representation" without "substantive influence" creates an

illusion of progress that can actually undermine the gender equality agenda by allowing the state to claim success while maintaining the underlying power dynamics.

The "double standard" of political life also acts as a deterrent for women. Female politicians are frequently subjected to intense scrutiny regarding their appearance and family life—factors that are rarely applied to their male counterparts (Milanovic, 2011). This "character assassination" is often weaponized through social media, where women in the public eye face staggering levels of online harassment. This "digital patriarchy" creates a high personal cost for women who seek to enter the political arena, often leading to their premature exit from leadership roles.

Political representation is also hampered by the "incumbency advantage," which overwhelmingly favors men. Because men have historically held power, they possess the established donor networks and political connections required to win elections (Zetter, 2007). Without "leveling the playing field" through public campaign financing and limits on incumbency, formal equality in the right to run for office remains a theoretical exercise for most women. Sultana (2022) argues that this structural inertia is a primary reason why political systems remain resistant to feminist reform.

Grassroots activism is therefore necessary to challenge these entrenched structures from the outside. Movements that organize women at the local level provide the "training grounds" for political leadership that formal parties often lack. These movements create an independent power base that allows women to enter the political sphere on their own terms (Yamin, 2016). By building power from the "bottom-up," these activists challenge the legitimacy of the "top-down" patriarchal state.

The "intersectionality of power" must also be addressed in political representation. If the women entering politics are only from the urban elite, the specific needs of rural or working-class women will remain unrepresented. A truly representative democracy requires "intersectional quotas" that ensure a diversity of female voices (Crenshaw, 1989). Without this, political representation risks becoming a tool for "class-based feminism" that further marginalizes the most vulnerable women.

Furthermore, the "bureaucratic resistance" to female leadership within the civil service often stymies the implementation of gender-sensitive policies. Even when a female minister is in power, the mid-level bureaucracy may delay or dilute the enforcement of progressive reforms (Sassen, 2014). This suggests that political representation must be accompanied by a "gender-transformation" of the entire state

apparatus, ensuring that administrative power is as diverse as the legislative branch.

Political power for women is not an end in itself but a means to transform the social contract. The goal of political representation should not be to "add women and stir," but to change the very priorities of the state (Betts & Collier, 2017). As Aleinikoff and Zamore (2019) suggest, when women have real power, they tend to prioritize social security and peace-building—issues that are central to the future of human rights but often marginalized in male-centric "realpolitik."

4. *Case Studies of Socio-Cultural Change through Grassroots Activism*

True socio-cultural shifts are rarely gifted from above by the state; they are won through the sustained pressure of feminist activism. Successful campaigns against gender-based violence, such as the global "Me Too" movement, demonstrate how grassroots pressure can force the state to move beyond rhetoric to enforcement. These movements challenge gender norms by shifting the "burden of shame" from the victim to the perpetrator and the negligent state (Yamin, 2016).

In India, the "Gulabi Gang" represents a radical grassroots response to the failure of the legal system to protect rural women from domestic abuse. By taking direct, collective action, these women have created a "counter-sovereignty" that provides more effective protection than the distant courts. This case illustrates that when the formal law fails, women will create their own informal systems of justice to reclaim their dignity (Chetail, 2014).

The campaign for reproductive rights in Ireland is another powerful example of socio-cultural change. This was not just a legal victory but a decade-long cultural conversation that forced a traditional society to confront the "lived reality" of women's lives (Costello, 2016). Through "storytelling activism," the movement humanized the legal issue and made the status quo morally untenable, proving that social consensus is the bedrock of sustainable legal reform.

In the United States, the struggle for the "domestic workers' bill of rights" highlights the power of organizing at the intersection of gender, race, and labor (Crenshaw, 1989). By organizing nannies and housekeepers, activists have forced the state to recognize domestic work as "real work." This grassroots success challenges the patriarchal "public/private" divide and secures economic rights for some of the most marginalized women.

Socio-cultural change is also being driven through digital activism and the "democratization of the narrative." Social media platforms have allowed women to bypass traditional media gatekeepers

and build transnational solidarities (Sultana, 2022). Whether it is Iranian women protesting the compulsory hijab or African women campaigning against FGM, these digital spaces allow for the rapid "scaling up" of local struggles into global human rights mandates.

Grassroots movements are also effective at "changing the heart" of the community through localized education and "artivism." Street theater and community radio are used to challenge gender norms in ways that are accessible and culturally resonant (Zetter, 2007). By making gender equality "part of the local conversation," these movements build the broad-based social consensus that is necessary for legal reforms to be sustainable.

However, grassroots activism faces increasing "state-led repression." In many parts of the world, governments are passing "anti-protest" legislation to stifle feminist organizing (Moreno-Lax, 2017). This suggests that the "space for civil society" is a fundamental gender issue. If women cannot safely organize, the "compliance gap" between law and reality will only continue to widen. Protecting the right to associate is therefore a prerequisite for the struggle for gender equality.

These case studies demonstrate that transformative justice is a "bottom-up" process. The state's role should be to "facilitate" and "codify" the changes that are already being demanded by the people (Aleinikoff & Zamore, 2019). As Goodwin-Gill and McAdam (2021) observe, the most enduring human rights victories are those that have been "won in the streets" before they are "ratified in the halls of power." By supporting grassroots activism, the international community can ensure that gender equality moves beyond legal recognition and becomes a living reality for all.

F. Integrating Socio-Cultural Change and Grassroots Activism

The transition from formal legal recognition to substantive equality requires a paradigm shift that centers feminist praxis as the primary engine of social transformation. This final section outlines the mechanisms for integrating grassroots mobilization with systemic reform to bridge the "implementation gap" identified throughout this study. It argues that for human rights to be effective, they must be "socialized" through the active participation of the communities they intend to protect.

1. *Grassroots Feminism: The Engine of Community-Level Parity*

Grassroots feminism serves as the vital link between abstract human rights norms and the lived realities of women. Unlike top-down

legislative mandates, local activism operates within the cultural "interstices" of the community, challenging patriarchal norms where they are most resilient—in the household, the marketplace, and local religious institutions. By utilizing community-driven approaches, such as "women's circles" or local advocacy collectives, grassroots movements vernacularize international rights, making them culturally resonant and strategically accessible (Chetail, 2014).

The strength of grassroots feminism lies in its ability to bypass the "bureaucratic inertia" of the state. When international treaties like CEDAW are signed, they often remain distant concepts to women in rural or marginalized urban areas. Local activists act as "legal translators," explaining how constitutional guarantees against discrimination can be applied to daily issues like land tenure, domestic safety, and reproductive healthcare (Goodwin-Gill & McAdam, 2021). This localized pressure is essential for ensuring that legal protections are not just ratified in the capital but are enforced in the peripheries where state presence is often weak or hostile.

Furthermore, grassroots movements provide a "social safety net" that the state often fails to provide. In contexts where legal aid is unavailable or too expensive, community-led organizations offer mediation, shelter, and psychological support for victims of gender-based violence. This "informal justice" often creates a more immediate sense of security than the formal court system, which can be slow and traumatizing for survivors (Costello, 2016). By building these support structures, grassroots feminism demonstrates that rights are not just legal entitlements but social practices of care and solidarity.

At the community level, grassroots feminism also plays a critical role in "de-normalizing" patriarchy. Through storytelling, theater, and public dialogue, activists challenge the "common sense" assumptions that justify male dominance. By making the "private" struggle for equality a "public" community concern, these movements erode the social permission for discriminatory behavior (Yamin, 2016). This shift in the "social imagination" is a prerequisite for any legal reform to take deep root and survive the pressures of cultural backlash.

Grassroots feminism acts as a watchdog for state accountability. Local organizations are often the first to identify when new laws are being ignored or when police forces are failing to protect women. By documenting these failures and channeling them into national and international advocacy networks, grassroots activists ensure that the "compliance gap" remains visible to the global community (Sassen, 2014). This "bottom-up" monitoring is the most effective check against "rights-washing," where states use progressive rhetoric to hide a lack of substantive action.

2. *Transformative Approaches Beyond Legal Recognition*

To achieve long-term parity, strategies must evolve to target the structural underpinnings of inequality through "transformative justice." This approach recognizes that the law is a necessary but insufficient tool for social change. A transformative model seeks to re-engineer the social and economic architecture of society to ensure that equality is the "default" setting rather than a hard-won exception. This involves a multi-pronged approach that integrates education, media, and economic restructuring (Betts & Collier, 2017).

Educational reform is perhaps the most powerful tool for transformative change. It requires moving beyond "access to schooling" to "transformation through schooling." This means implementing "gender-transformative" curricula that actively deconstruct stereotypes from early childhood. By teaching boys and girls about consent, shared domestic labor, and the history of women's resistance, the education system can cultivate a new generation that views gender equality as a fundamental moral value rather than a legal obligation (Nussbaum, 2000).

In the digital age, media and narrative campaigns are essential for subverting the "male gaze." Transformative strategies must involve partnering with content creators, journalists, and influencers to promote diverse representations of female agency and leadership. This goes beyond "positive portrayals" to include the deconstruction of the hyper-sexualized and subordinate roles women often occupy in popular culture. By changing the stories a society tells about itself, we can reduce the "cultural friction" that legal reforms often encounter (Sultana, 2022).

Economic empowerment must also be re-imagined as a transformative project. This involves moving beyond "micro-finance" models—which often place the burden of debt on individual women—to demand structural changes in the care economy. Transformative economics requires the "socialization" of reproductive labor, where childcare and eldercare are treated as public goods rather than private female burdens (Betts & Collier, 2017). This shift allows women the "time-wealth" necessary to participate fully in political and economic life without sacrificing their personal wellbeing.

Lastly, a transformative approach requires the "de-territorialization" of rights. In our globalized world, a woman's protection should not be entirely dependent on her physical location or her citizenship status. This is particularly relevant for migrant and refugee women, whose rights are often suspended at the border (Moreno-Lax, 2017). A transformative human rights framework would ensure that an individual's legal protections "follow" them across

borders, acknowledging that gender-based vulnerability is a global phenomenon that requires a globalized legal response (Hathaway, 2021).

3. *International Solidarity and Global Feminist Networks*

The struggle for gender equality is a transnational endeavor that requires robust international solidarity. Global feminist networks facilitate the exchange of "strategic knowledge," allowing movements in the Global South to share tactics for resisting authoritarian patriarchies with their counterparts in the North. This collaboration is crucial for challenging global structures—such as neoliberal trade policies and climate change—that disproportionately impact women across borders, regardless of their nationality (Sultana, 2022).

International solidarity also serves to protect activists in "closing spaces." In many parts of the world, feminist organizers are targeted by their own governments as "foreign agents" or "threats to national security." Global networks provide a "protective canopy," using international legal mechanisms and diplomatic pressure to ensure that local activists can continue their work without fear of reprisal (Milanovic, 2011). This transnational support system is the only way to counter the "localized" repression of gender equality movements.

These global networks are also essential for "norm-setting" from the bottom up. By organizing across borders, feminist groups can influence the agendas of the UN and other international bodies, ensuring that the "universal" standards of human rights reflect a diverse range of lived experiences. This prevents the international human rights project from becoming an elitist, "top-down" exercise and keeps it grounded in the actual needs of women living at the intersections of multiple oppressions (Crenshaw, 1989).

Furthermore, international solidarity challenges the "cultural relativism" argument often used by states to justify the roll-back of women's rights. When women from diverse religious and cultural backgrounds unite to demand reproductive autonomy or protection from violence, it becomes impossible for political leaders to dismiss these demands as "Western impositions" (Chetail, 2014). International solidarity demonstrates that the desire for dignity and equality is a universal human impulse, not a localized ideological preference.

Global feminist collaboration is the only way to address the "shadow economies" that profit from gender inequality. From human trafficking to the exploitation of garment workers in global supply chains, the most egregious violations of women's rights are transnational in nature (Sassen, 2014). International solidarity allows for the mapping of these global networks of exploitation and the

coordination of legal and political boycotts that no single-nation movement could achieve on its own.

4. *Integration of Feminist Praxis into Human Rights Frameworks*

The final step in this integration is the formal adoption of feminist theory and intersectionality within the operational mandates of international human rights bodies. This means moving away from "gender-blind" monitoring—which often treats "the human" as a neutral (male) default—toward a model that proactively identifies how race, class, and legal status compound gender discrimination (Crenshaw, 1989). Human rights frameworks must be "re-tooled" to recognize the violations inherent in economic deprivation as being as significant as civil or political infractions.

Integrating feminist praxis requires a "relational" understanding of rights. This means looking at how the violation of one right (e.g., the right to education) inevitably leads to the erosion of others (e.g., the right to political participation or health). Human rights monitoring must move beyond "siloed" reporting and toward an "integrated" analysis that maps the "web of vulnerability" women navigate. By understanding these connections, legal advocates can design interventions that address the "root causes" of inequality rather than just the symptoms (Yamin, 2016).

This integration also necessitates a shift toward "substantive accountability." Currently, states are often praised for "passing laws" even if those laws are never enforced. A feminist human rights framework would demand evidence of impact—looking at indicators like the reduction of the pay gap, the decrease in maternal mortality, and the actual increase of women in decision-making roles. This shift from "procedural compliance" to "outcome-based accountability" is the only way to bridge the gap between legal text and lived reality (Aleinikoff & Zamore, 2019).

Feminist praxis also advocates for the "democratization of the legal gaze." This involves including the voices of marginalized women—those who are illiterate, those who are displaced, and those who are imprisoned—in the development and evaluation of legal norms. Human rights should not be something "done to" women, but something "done with" them. This participatory model ensures that legal frameworks are grounded in "epistemic justice," recognizing the survivors of oppression as the primary experts on their own liberation (Costello, 2016).

By centering the most marginalized subjects in the legal gaze, the human rights project can transition from a tool of "procedural recognition" to one of "transformative justice." This requires a radical

commitment to redistribution—of power, of resources, and of dignity. Only by integrating the critical insights of feminist theory with the organized power of grassroots activism can we hope to dismantle the systems that profit from exclusion and finally realize the promise of universal human rights for all genders (Hathaway, 2021).

G. Policy Recommendations for Achieving Substantive Gender Equality

To bridge the chasm between formal legal recognition and the lived experience of women, states must transition from a reactive "protection" model to a proactive "structural redistribution" model. These recommendations provide a roadmap for institutionalizing substantive equality through integrated legal, economic, and social interventions.

1. *Strengthening Legal and Institutional Enforcement*

The proliferation of "paper rights" must be met with the robust fortification of enforcement mechanisms. States should move beyond the mere passage of laws to the creation of independent oversight bodies with the mandate to penalize non-compliance in both the public and private sectors. For survivors of gender-based violence, access to justice must be streamlined through the establishment of specialized, trauma-informed courts and the provision of non-means-tested legal aid (Costello, 2016).

Furthermore, the "impunity gap" can only be closed if police and judicial training moves beyond procedural basics to address deep-seated cognitive biases. Institutional reforms should include mandatory, periodic "gender-sensitivity audits" of the criminal justice system to ensure that laws like the Domestic Violence Act are not being undermined by the discriminatory discretion of individual officers (Hathaway, 2021). Legal frameworks should also be updated to recognize modern forms of abuse, such as digital harassment and economic coercion, as actionable human rights violations.

2. *Institutionalizing Gender-Responsive Budgeting (GRB)*

Substantive equality is functionally impossible without the strategic allocation of fiscal resources. Gender-responsive budgeting (GRB) must be integrated into the core of the national treasury, ensuring that every unit of government spending is analyzed for its impact on different genders. This is not merely about funding "women's projects" but about ensuring that general expenditures—such as infrastructure, transportation, and urban planning—account for the specific mobility and safety needs of women (Betts & Collier, 2017).

Prioritizing spending in health, education, and social protection acts as a "multiplier" for gender equality. For example, investing in universal, high-quality childcare is a fiscal policy that directly facilitates women's economic participation and reduces the "time-poverty" associated with the reproductive economy. By treating care infrastructure as a public investment rather than a private cost, states can dismantle the economic dependence that underpins patriarchal power (Sassen, 2014).

3. *Promoting Social and Cultural Education*

Educational policy must evolve to address the "normative roots" of inequality. This requires the implementation of comprehensive gender-equality curricula from the earliest stages of primary education. These initiatives should move beyond "inclusion" to "transformation," teaching students to critically evaluate traditional gender roles and the history of systemic exclusion. Schools must be re-envisioned as laboratory spaces for gender inclusivity, where the "hidden curriculum" of patriarchal hierarchy is actively dismantled (Nussbaum, 2000).

Beyond the classroom, states should incentivize media and private sector organizations to adopt "diversity and inclusion" standards that go beyond tokenism. Public awareness campaigns, funded by the state but designed by grassroots feminist collectives, can help shift the cultural narrative surrounding domestic labor and leadership. These policies encourage a "bottom-up" cultural shift, ensuring that the legal standard of equality becomes a social standard of conduct in workplaces and public squares alike (Yamin, 2016).

4. *Enhancing Political Empowerment and Decision-Making*

To ensure that women have an actual voice in the corridors of power, states must move from "descriptive" to "substantive" political representation. While legislative quotas remain an essential tool for breaking the initial barriers of exclusion, they must be supported by "zipper system" requirements (alternating male and female candidates on party lists) to ensure that women are placed in winnable positions. Furthermore, political empowerment should be bolstered by state-funded mentorship programs and leadership training specifically targeting women from marginalized caste, class, and ethnic backgrounds (Crenshaw, 1989).

True empowerment also requires the democratization of "hard" power. Policy-makers should mandate gender parity in the leadership of central banks, defense ministries, and judicial appointments. By ensuring that women are present in the rooms where the most

significant structural decisions are made, states can move toward a more holistic definition of "security" and "development." As Aleinikoff and Zamore (2019) argue, political representation is not just a matter of fairness; it is a prerequisite for a more resilient and just social contract.

H. Conclusion

This study has demonstrated that while the international legal architecture—headlined by the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and supported by progressive national constitutions—has established a robust framework for gender equality, a profound "compliance gap" remains. The evidence from South Africa, Sweden, and India reveals that legal recognition is often a necessary but insufficient condition for liberation. The findings emphasize that gender inequality is not merely a legal oversight but a structural phenomenon maintained by a "matrix of domination" including patriarchal social norms, systemic economic disparities, and political gatekeeping.

To move from *de jure* to *de facto* equality, human rights frameworks must evolve into multi-dimensional tools that address the intersectional realities of women's lives across different classes, castes, and geographies. The legal subject can no longer be viewed as an abstract entity; it must be understood as a person embedded in specific socio-economic conditions that either facilitate or hinder the exercise of their rights. Without addressing the material and cultural underpinnings of society, the law remains a "hollow crown," offering the prestige of equality without the power of autonomy.

Furthermore, the research highlights that the "private sphere"—long considered beyond the reach of state intervention—remains the primary site where gendered power is reproduced and maintained. The failure of formal law to effectively penetrate the household and the informal economy represents the most significant barrier to substantive equality. As analyzed in the preceding chapters, the persistence of domestic violence, the gendered division of labor, and the undervaluation of care work are not peripheral issues but core components of the systemic inequality that human rights must address.

Achieving genuine empowerment requires a departure from "rights-based" models that focus solely on procedural fairness. We must advocate for transformative approaches that tackle the root causes of oppression rather than its symptoms. This necessitates an intersectional lens—as pioneered by Crenshaw (1989)—to ensure that human rights strategies do not default to the needs of the most privileged women but instead prioritize those at the margins. Transformation implies that the goal is not merely to include women in

existing patriarchal structures, but to change those structures themselves to be inherently inclusive and egalitarian.

This transformation requires the institutionalization of feminist praxis into state policy and the formal adoption of gender-responsive budgeting. By ensuring that every fiscal decision and legislative act is scrutinized for its impact on gender parity, states can dismantle the economic structures that profit from gendered subordination. Substantive equality is not a static destination reached by passing a law; it is a dynamic, ongoing process of redistributing power, resources, and dignity to ensure that all individuals have the capability to flourish.

Moreover, the call for transformation extends to the global level, demanding that international law move beyond state-centric models of accountability. International organizations and civil society must work in tandem to hold states accountable for "results" rather than just "ratification." This includes supporting grassroots movements that provide the necessary pressure for domestic change and ensuring that the global economy does not continue to rely on the exploitation of women's reproductive and productive labor to sustain growth.

As the global landscape shifts, future scholarship must expand to address emerging complexities within the gender equality discourse. The struggle for rights is being reshaped by technological advancement, environmental crisis, and shifting political ideologies, necessitating new avenues of inquiry. Three critical areas warrant immediate attention to ensure that the human rights project remains relevant and effective in the 21st century:

1) The Role of Men and Boys: Research must move beyond viewing gender equality as a "women's issue" to examine how the deconstruction of toxic masculinity and the active engagement of men and boys can accelerate socio-cultural change. Understanding how patriarchy also limits male potential is key to building broader coalitions for equality.
2) The Impact of Digital Globalization: Further study is needed on how the "gig economy" and digital platforms create new forms of precariousness and exploitation. The rise of "digital patriarchy," including online harassment and AI-driven bias in recruitment and surveillance, presents a new frontier for human rights law.
3) Gender and Climate Justice: There is an urgent need to explore the intersection of gender and climate change, particularly how environmental degradation exacerbates existing vulnerabilities in the Global South. Research should focus on how women's leadership is essential for a "just transition" and how climate policy can be a vehicle for gender empowerment (Sultana, 2022).

In final analysis, gender equality is the litmus test for the universality of human rights. If the legal system cannot protect and empower half of the human population, its claim to universalism is fundamentally compromised. The findings of this study suggest that while we have built the legal scaffolding for equality, the internal structure remains incomplete. The task ahead is to fill that structure with the substance of economic independence, cultural respect, and political power.

The journey toward substantive equality is undoubtedly long, but the integration of feminist theory, intersectional analysis, and grassroots activism provides the most viable roadmap. By moving beyond legal recognition to a holistic vision of human dignity, we can create a world where gender is no longer a determinant of one's rights, but a celebrated aspect of one's identity. The future of human rights depends on our collective ability to bridge this gap, ensuring that the promise of equality becomes a lived reality for every person, everywhere.

I. References

Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford University Press.

Aleinikoff, T. A., & Zamore, L. (2019). *The Arc of Protection: Reforming the International Refugee Regime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Arendt, H. (1951). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Schocken Books.

Betts, A., & Collier, P. (2017). *Refuge: Transforming a Broken Refugee System*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chetail, V. (2014). Are Refugee Rights Human Rights? In *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chetail, V. (2019). *International Migration Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Costello, C. (2016). *The Human Rights of Migrants and Refugees in European Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989(1), 139–167.

Dauvergne, C. (2008). *Making People Illegal: What Globalization Means for Migration and Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edwards, A. (2011). *Back to Basics: The Right to Liberty*. UNHCR.

Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, E., et al. (2014). *Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies*.

Gammeltoft-Hansen, T. (2011). *Access to Asylum*. Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin-Gill, G. S., & McAdam, J. (2021). *The Refugee in International Law* (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hathaway, J. C. (2021). *The Rights of Refugees under International Law* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacKinnon, C. A. (1989). *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State*. Harvard University Press.

McAdam, J. (2012). *Climate Change, Forced Migration, and International Law*. Oxford University Press.

Milanovic, M. (2011). *Extraterritorial Application of Human Rights Treaties: Law, Principles, and Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Moreno-Lax, V. (2017). *Accessing Asylum in Europe*. Oxford University Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2000). *Women and Human Development*. Cambridge University Press.

Sassen, S. (2014). *Expulsions: Brutality and Complexity in the Global Economy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*. Oxford University Press.

Sultana, F. (2022). The Unbearable Heaviness of Climate Coloniality. *Political Geography*.

UNHCR. (2025). *Global Trends 2024*. Geneva.

Yamin, A. E. (2016). *Power, Suffering, and the Struggle for Dignity: Human Rights Frameworks for Health and Justice*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Zetter, R. (2007). More Labels, Fewer Refugees. *Journal of Refugee Studies*.

***

This page is intentionally left blank

Esta página se dejó en blanco intencionalmente

Acknowledgment
None

Funding Information
None

Conflicting Interest Statement
The authors state that there is no conflict of interest in the publication of this article.

Publishing Ethical and Originality Statement
All authors declared that this work is original and has never been published in any form and in any media, nor is it under consideration for publication in any journal, and all sources cited in this work refer to the basic standards of scientific citation.

Generative AI Statement
N/A