

5

FEMICIDE AND INTERSECTIONALITY¹

Lorena Sosa

Introduction

During the last 30 years, feminist scholars and activists have introduced the theoretical concepts of femicide and feminicide to pin down the systematic killing of women because of their gender. The resolve to name the systematic gender-related killings of women as femicide derives from the need to make women's realities visible and relates to a socio-political process of recognition of the human rights of women and their right to a life free from violence (Carmona López et al., 2010). Defined as the misogynistic killing of women by men (Radford and Russell, 1992), the concept of femicide was revised in the early 2000s to highlight the structural and political nature of the murders, their connection with gender, and the inaction of the state (Lagarde, 2006). Other scholars have emphasised that, while femicide foregrounds the killing of women, it also calls attention to the progression of violent acts that end in death, such as emotional and psychological abuse, beatings, insults, torture, rape, prostitution, sexual harassment, child abuse, domestic violence, and institutional violence (Monárrez Fragoso, 2002).

Different authors have nevertheless questioned the capacity of the theoretical notion of femicide and its judicial and legal adoption to recognise women's diversity and the various structures of gender inequality that exist in different geopolitical arrangements (Bueno-Hansen, 2010; Cullen et al., 2021; Romero Figueroa, 2019; Sosa, 2017a). Incorporating *intersectionality* can help to fulfil such conceptual gaps since it seeks to reveal "the interaction between gender, race, and other social categories of distinction in individual lives, social practices, institutional arrangements, and cultural ideologies and the outcomes of these interactions in terms of power" (K. Davis, 2008: 68). By capturing the diversity of women, how power relations are constructed and sustained, and the impact of geopolitics on gender-based violence, intersectionality can strengthen the structural and systemic dimension that the theoretical concept of femicide attempts to bring to the fore. Multiple disciplines, including human rights law, increasingly recommend adopting an intersectional approach to address discrimination and violence against women (Sosa, 2017b).

That said, the translation of the conceptualisations of femicide into legal terms, particularly concerning criminal law, reveals symbolic (whose systemic experience of violence is recognised and captured) and material tensions (how to identify and document those cases). Moreover, by highlighting women's diversity and the structural causes of the violence, these tensions are sometimes intensified by the intersectional approach, revealing new challenges and the need to "expand" the concept and introduce these considerations.

This chapter will first explore the theoretical commonalities and points of departure between the concept of femicide and intersectionality, followed by an overview of how femicide has been adopted in law, case law, and policies at the international, inter-American, and European levels. Finally, the chapter concludes with a brief reflection on the shortcomings and limitations that emerged from the analysis and possible strategies to incorporate an intersectional perspective in the analysis, criminalisation, and prevention of femicide.

Conceptualizing femicide in law

There is no universally agreed-upon definition of femicide (Dawson and Carrigan, 2020; Weil et al., 2018). However, in general terms, femicide refers to the gender-related killings of women that remain in impunity due to the omission or negligence of state authorities to prevent and eradicate these crimes. As mentioned in the introduction, the theoretical concept of femicide attempts to make the systematic murder of women visible, highlighting the structural and systemic character of these deaths (Bandelli, 2017; Olivera, 2006; Radford and Russell, 1992), which result from the power imbalances and discriminations women suffer and the inaction or insufficient response of the state to prevent it (Lagarde, 2005, 2006; Lagarde and Roberts, 2018).

The concept, thus, is dynamic, shaped by the interaction of other theoretical concepts key to feminist thought, such as patriarchy, gender, woman, inequality, and violence, which are in constant revision and transformation. Although these concepts have been often deployed (and developed) in history, sociology, literature, philosophy, anthropology, feminist studies, ethnic studies, and queer studies, they have also been discussed in legal studies and even incorporated into laws.

However, incorporating those concepts into the legal structures often leads to inaccuracies and tensions with established legal principles. Regarding femicide, these relate to the principle of legality or legal certainty in criminal law. Difficulties are also observed in the way states have legislated on femicide and how courts interpret such legislation. However, incorporating femicide in law, particularly criminal law, can convey a strong message to society that such violence is unacceptable, counteracting impunity and gender biases that see violence as something natural and belonging to the private sphere.

Looking at femicide from a criminal perspective, the “Latin American Model Protocol for the Investigation of Gender-Related Killings of Women” (the Protocol) (Bernal Sarmiento et al., 2014), developed by UN Women and UNODC, has provided a helpful overview of the main characteristics of the crime, guiding its domestic implementation and contributing to its definition. Similarly to the 2012 report of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women (UN SRVAW) on femicide, the Protocol recognises two *categories* of femicide: an *active* or *direct* forms of femicide, which include intentional killing, armed-conflict-related killings, female infanticide, and killings based on the sexual orientation and gender identity of women, and *passive* or *indirect* forms of femicide, which include maternal mortality and other forms of deaths resulting from neglect disproportionately affecting women or as the result of harmful practices (Bernal Sarmiento et al., 2014: 14). In addition, the Protocol recognises different *types* of femicide: femicide where the perpetrator had a relationship or intimate connection with the victim (intimate femicide), femicide in which the perpetrator had no relationship with the victims, femicide committed because of the association/connection with the woman, and femicide derived from trafficking, smuggling, prostitution, or other stigmatised occupations (Bernal Sarmiento et al., 2014: 15–16). While these different types of femicide may overlap, they recognise the different contexts and domains in which they are perpetrated, suggesting different configurations of power imbalances and inequalities.

The Protocol also recognises the existence of racist, lesbophobic, and transphobic femicide, acknowledging the relevance of categories, such as race, sexual orientation, and gender identity in the subordination and oppression of women, besides gender. It even explicitly points out “the intersectionality of discrimination” and the benefits of an “intersectional analysis” of the violence

and victims and witness statements and testimonies (Bernal Sarmiento et al., 2014: 16, 43). This attention to intersectionality has allowed the Protocol to point out specific groups of women² whose characteristics can influence the context and circumstances of the crime.

The Protocol, however, fails to unleash the potential of intersectionality to understand and tackle femicides. This chapter argues that a conception of intersectionality that encourages an interdisciplinary examination of the interaction of gender and other social categories of distinction and highlights the individual, social, and institutional dimensions of inequality provides a more comprehensive understanding of femicides. The following section clarifies the main theoretical notions underlying intersectionality and highlights the main implications for analysing femicides.

Intersectionality Propositions and Their Potential for Cases of Femicide

The term “intersectionality” was coined by Kimberlee Crenshaw to address the intersecting inequality affecting African American women due to the convergence of race and gender (Crenshaw, 1989, 1991). It draws from Black, Chicana, and lesbian feminist critiques of the idea that women share common, inherent attributes and experiences regardless of differences based on race, class, or sexual orientation (Anthias and Yuval-Davis, 1983; Anzaldúa and Moraga, 1981; Combahee River Collective, 1983; A. Davis, 1981; Dill, 1983; Hill Collins, 1990; hooks, 1989, 2014; Kanuha, 1994; Lorde, 1984). Intersectionality explores how categories used to distinguish and differentiate between individuals and groups, such as gender, race, or class, are created and used, how they interact with each other, and how they interconnect to different systems of oppression.

Intersectionality advances an overarching notion arguing that individuals (and groups) are affected by *multiple systems of oppression based on various grounds of distinction* rather than by discrimination based on one ground at a time. This notion reveals how multiple intersecting categories of difference, such as gender, race, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability, and other social categories, shape inequalities women face and the complexity of the violence they suffer (Crenshaw, 1993). Therefore, gender-based violence, including femicide, cannot be investigated and analysed based on only one category of difference – gender – while precluding others because social categories intersect and interlock in multiple systems of oppression that collectively affect an individual’s life (Sokoloff, 2008). The murder of transgender women helps illustrate this since they require exploring how gender identity and expression in combination with gender shapes their experiences, determines their social positioning, and often results in violence. Conceptualisations of femicide that exclusively focus on gender result too limited to address such complexity, leading the trans movement to propose alternative conceptualisations such as “transfemicide” or “travesticide” (Radi and Sardá, 2016; Sosa, 2020).

Two of the propositions of intersectionality challenge and simultaneously complement the underlying notions of the theoretical concept of femicide. Firstly, intersectionality highlights that we find *diversity and contrasting characteristics within each category of difference*. This internal diversity makes it impossible to refer to any category of difference, such as gender, or groups of individuals, such as women, as homogeneous. Moreover, portraying a group or category as homogenous tends to exclusively relate to the dominant elements of such group. The famous criticism that “all women are white and all Blacks are men” perfectly illustrates this by highlighting how the characteristics, needs, and desires of white, middle-class, heterosexual women have often been taken as representative of all women, while characteristics, needs, and desires of Black men have been often taken as representative of all African Americans (Hull et al., 1982). This proposition of intersectionality, thus, challenges established notions in law, such as listing vulnerable groups, which usually include migrant women, minority women, older women, or groups of women who face specific types of violence, since doing so pre-empts the examination of their subordinate position in the intersections of systems of power. Instead, intersectionality inquires how these groups are affected by the intersection of race, nationality, gender, age, class, and other categories.

Intersectionality goes beyond the analysis of “intersecting identities” or women’s “qualitatively different experience” (Crenshaw, 1991). It highlights the *socio-structural nature of inequalities* by pointing out that social categories of distinction are shaped by social and cultural norms; the dynamics within each social, economic, and political system; and institutional arrangements. At the same time, these social, economic, cultural, and institutional structures interlock, creating a complex system that sustains (and perpetuates) inequality (Dempsey, 2007). Thus, “structural intersectionality” examines the dynamics and processes that create categories of difference leading to subordination (Crenshaw, 1991). Women, or any group, are “made vulnerable” by the structures and systems of power.

The same dynamics are at play in contexts of violence. While recognising the specific barriers that some women may face due to their intersectional positioning, *structural intersectionality* highlights how these categories are created and interlock to prevent them from accessing justice, support services, or protection orders. This structural view is entirely in line with conceptualisations that argue that femicides are not incidental and sporadic cases but rather represent a structural situation and a social and cultural phenomenon deeply rooted in customs and mindsets (CEDAW, 2005, para. 159), based on a culture of violence and discrimination (*González et al. [“Cotton Field”] vs Mexico*, 2009, para. 133).

Nevertheless, the principle of intersectionality, suggesting that *the hierarchy between categories of difference cannot be determined a priori* (Hancock, 2007: 67), challenges conceptualisations of femicide. While recognising that gender, race, and class intersect, one cannot assume that gender is per se predominant over race, class, or other categories, and vice versa. This idea questions the assumption of gender as the primary source of discrimination affecting *all* women and the definitions of femicide, such as “the systematic murder of women because of being women.” Instead, it calls for a comprehensive examination of the multiple systems of oppression and inequalities involved in a case and how these are at play in a specific context.

For instance, how did globalisation, the emergence of the maquila industry, drugs, sex and human trafficking and smuggling “shape” gender, age, origin, ethnicity, and socio-economic class in Ciudad Juárez? How did these interactions impact women? Which women faced excessive exposure to violence? Intersectionality, thus, moves the analysis beyond patriarchy and incorporates other systems of oppression, such as racism, heteronormativity, cisnormativity, and class inequality. By introducing different dimensions of analysis, intersectionality addresses the layered nature of oppression and the complexity of inequality. It sheds light on the intricacy of femicide and leaves traditional one-dimensional understandings behind.

In sum, intersectionality suggests that certain groups of women at the intersection of two or more social categories of difference are *made* more vulnerable to (specific types of) violence and/or face specific difficulties. However, it demands an examination of the structural elements that place them in such a position and the recognition that some women may have different standings, experiences, or needs within the same group. Intersectionality also contributes to understanding femicide as the result of multiple forms of oppression, or in legal terms, multiple discriminations or inequalities. It confirms the connection of femicide with structural (institutional and social) inequalities, which can take place in multiple policy domains (family, workplace, educational institutions, and other realms). Furthermore, by acknowledging the interconnection of systems of oppression operating through multiple categories of distinction, intersectionality shifts the focus exclusively from the outcomes (discrimination, violence, or death) promoted by traditional legal approaches. Instead, it introduces a structural analysis of inequality that calls for long-lasting transformative changes in the dominant social and institutional arrangements, providing “a template for intervention” that “traverses the fields of thinking and acting” (Crenshaw, 2011: 232). Applied to femicide, intersectionality demands attention to prevention and protection from violence in addition to the investigation and punishment of the crimes.

Approaches to Femicide in International Law, Case Law, and Policies

Gradually, gender-based violence against women has entered the realm of international human rights law, both at the international and regional levels (Edwards, 2013; Sosa, 2017b). In the last decades, the notion of femicide has entered international human rights systems and domestic legislation. These developments suggest an institutional awareness of the violence, yet how have femicides been conceptualised, and what implications have these conceptualisations brought into practice? To what extent has intersectionality, being formally and institutionally recognised (Kantola and Nousiainen, 2009; Koldinská, 2009; Sosa, 2017b; Verloo, 2006), informed the interpretation of femicides and the initiatives to tackle them? This section will provide an overview of the different international and regional experiences with the formal recognition of femicide considering the intersectional approach discussed in the previous section.

In 2013 and 2015, the United Nations General Assembly adopted two resolutions expressing concern about the gender-related killing of women and girls and drawing attention to “the alarming proportions reached by this phenomenon in all its different manifestations” (Taking Action against Gender-Related Killing of Women and Girls, 2013; Taking Action against Gender-Related Killing of Women and Girls, 2015). They also recognised the efforts made by states to address gender-related killings, including passing national legislation incorporating the concept of femicide or feminicide. The resolutions resonate with the theoretical conceptualisations of femicide, formally recognising the gender-based nature of the killings and highlighting the need to eliminate impunity. They also recommend “adopting an integrated, multidisciplinary and gender-sensitive approach to the prevention, investigation, prosecution and punishment of gender-related killing of women and girls” (Taking Action against Gender-Related Killing of Women and Girls, 2015, para. 41. ff), and more specifically, they call for the implementation of the Protocol. They highlight the importance “to identify groups at high risk” (Taking Action against Gender-Related Killing of Women and Girls, 2015: 8) and mention practices of disaggregated data collection (Taking Action against Gender-Related Killing of Women and Girls, 2015: 9). The resolutions point to “aboriginal females in Canada” or specific crimes, such as honour-related and dowry-related killings and organised crime. However, the resolutions do not adopt a fully intersectional approach since there is no recognition of what categories intersect to make women vulnerable to violence and how these result in such vulnerability.

Femicide has also become one of the thematic priorities of the UN SRVAW. Mandate holder Rashida Manjoo (2009–2015) focused on the conceptualisation of femicide, its prevalence, and the global trends and initiatives. She underlined the same conceptual elements discussed in the introduction: the systemic nature of the violence, the state’s role either in perpetrating or condoning the violence, the existence of impunity, and the fact that death is the culmination of a continuum of violence against women. She recognised direct and indirect femicide, and similar to the Protocol proposed an ecological model to understand the discriminatory nature of femicides that entails multiple intersecting and concentric circles (structural, institutional, interpersonal, and individual) (United Nations Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women Its Causes and Consequences, 2012, para. 17). She proposed adopting an intersectional approach to the gender-related killing of women, highlighting how important it is to “disaggregate data by factors such as race, ethnicity, education, sexual orientation and economic status, among others, to establish systemic patterns that exacerbate existing vulnerabilities” (United Nations Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women Its Causes and Consequences, 2012, para. 18). “The blindness to structural inequalities and the complex intersecting relations of power in the public and private sphere,” she argued, are main gaps in states’ preventive programmes (United Nations Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women Its Causes and Consequences, 2012, para. 103).

Manjoo's successor, Dubravka Šimonović (2015–2021), also expressed concern about the increased prevalence of gender-related killings of women. Mindful that to prevent gender-based violence against women, the documentation of violence becomes crucial, she issued a report on femicide emphasising data collection and the establishment of crime observatories (United Nations Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women Its Causes and Consequences, 2016). She has then called annually on states, public institutions, and civil society to submit information on legislative models or operational guides to investigate gender-related killings of women, good practices in data collection, and landmark jurisprudence.³

The 2016 report of the special rapporteur builds from the International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes (ICCS), in which femicide falls under the classification of intentional homicide – namely, unlawful death inflicted upon a person with the intent to cause death or severe injury – indirectly reducing the focus to *direct femicides*. The ICCS classifies the killings concerning the situational context (which would still distinguish between intimate and non-intimate femicide), the relationship between victim and perpetrator, and the killing mechanism (*modus operandi*). The report notes other relevant aspects of victims to track, such as whether she was a human rights defender, homeless, indigenous or her sexual orientation (United Nations Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women Its Causes and Consequences, 2016, para. 59). The intersectional approach, however, is not fully transposed to the data collection process, since Šimonović calls for the disaggregated collection of victims' data only by their age and ethnicity (in addition to gender) and the gender of the perpetrators (United Nations Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women Its Causes and Consequences, 2016, para. 29). However, collecting data on victims and perpetrators disaggregated by categories, such as nationality and residence status, sexual orientation and gender identity, occupation, place of residence, and other elements indicating their social positioning, could significantly contribute towards an intersectional view and response to femicide.

In the Americas, the notion of femicide has been instrumental in bringing attention to the extreme levels of violence affecting women (García-Del Moral, 2016; Gonzalez and Deus, 2019; Pinos and Ávila, 2012; Toledo Vásquez, 2019). As a result, the Organization of American States (OAS) elaborated a normative and policy framework on femicide, mainly through the Committee of Experts monitoring the implementation of the Belém do Pará Convention (MESECVI), the Inter-American Commission of Human Rights (IACHR), and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACtHR). The Declaration on Femicide (Follow-up Mechanism to the Belém do Pará Convention (MESECVI), 2008), the Model Law on Femicides (Follow-up Mechanism to the Belém do Pará Convention (MESECVI), 2018), and the Latin American Protocol conform to the conceptualisation of femicide described in the introduction.

Moreover, the IACtHR found violations to the Inter-American Convention on the Prevention, Punishment, and Eradication of Violence Against Women (Belém do Pará Convention) in four landmark cases addressing femicide: *González et al. ["Cotton Field"] vs Mexico*, 2009; *Veliz Franco et al. vs Guatemala*, 2014; *Velasquez Paiz et al. vs Guatemala*, 2015; *Vicky Hernández v. Honduras*, 2021. The *Cotton Field* case introduced the notion of *femicide* to address the systematic murder of women in Ciudad Juárez, who were young, underprivileged, working-class women – often employed in the maquila – students or migrants (*González et al. ["Cotton Field"] vs Mexico*, 2009, para. 116). In *Veliz Franco* and *Velasques Paiz*, the Guatemalan context indicated a combination of gender and class inequalities, made evident by the contrasting social background of the victims. In *Vicky Hernandez*, concerning the murder of a trans woman sex worker living with HIV and human rights defender, the court considered that she was in “a particularly vulnerable situation where numerous factors of discrimination converged intersectionally” (*Vicky Hernández v. Honduras*, 2021, para. 135).

The court held that these cases revealed an ineffective institutional response to VAW, which confirmed the gender stereotyping attitudes of the authorities, encouraged impunity, and facilitated the repetition of acts of violence (*González et al. [“Cotton Field”] vs Mexico*, 2009, para. 401–402; *Veliz Franco et al. vs Guatemala*, 2014, para. 45–50; *Velasquez Paiz et al. vs Guatemala*, 2015, para. 180). The court’s anti-stereotyping approach, however, focused on *gender* stereotyping alone, without considering assumptions based on the victims’ class, age, or origin, failing to incorporate an intersectional approach (Sosa, 2017a). Moreover, despite the indications of the greater danger for specific groups of women, the court focused on the disproportionality of women victims without looking at the over-representation of *some* women. This is a limitation in the court’s reasoning since although it recommends that states improve data collection by disaggregating data based on gender, it has not included other categories that may reveal other patterns of discrimination and inequality, despite recognising their relevance. That said, the IACtHR examined the social context of the violence in these cases to discover the existing patterns of inequalities and discrimination and the extent to which the characteristics of the victims fell under those patterns. This attention to context offers great potential for a more comprehensive and intersectional understanding of femicides.

Femicide is also getting more attention in Europe. Although the Council of Europe (CoE) Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence Against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention) has not explicitly referred to femicide, and GREVIO, the body monitoring the implementation of the Istanbul Convention, is still to provide a conceptual elaboration of femicide, several states have included information on the measures adopted to tackle femicide in their reporting procedure. GREVIO commends member states’ efforts to provide information on the issue (Group of Experts on Action against Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (GREVIO), 2019b, p. 30) and invites them to comply with the recommendations of the UN SRVAW (Group of Experts on Action against Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (GREVIO), 2019a, para. 236, 2020, para. 195).

Similarly, the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) encourages and supports the member states in collecting data regarding femicide (European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE), 2017b, 2017a). EIGE recognises the connection of the killings with gender inequality and the role of the state in perpetrating or tolerating the violence while concerning itself with intimate and non-intimate forms of femicide (European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE), 2017a, p. 17). However, it proposes a working definition for data collection that reduces femicide to intimate femicide because it appears “most feasible in terms of measurability” (European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE), 2017a, p. 28). No references are made to the disaggregation of data based on other social categories of distinction besides sex, thus not contributing to an intersectional examination of femicides.

Despite these developments at the institutional level, judicial recognition of femicides is still pending in Europe. While the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) recognised the intentional killing of women as a form of gender discrimination in *Opuz v. Turkey* (*Opuz v. Turkey*, 2009), it has not incorporated the terminology of femicide. In fact, the recognition of violence against women as a form of gender discrimination largely depends on the availability of reports providing a *prima facie* indication that such violence affects mainly women and that the general attitudes of the local authorities create a climate conducive to it (*Opuz v. Turkey*, 2009; *Valiulienė v. Lithuania*, 2013; *Talpis v. Italy*, 2017; *Volodina v. Russia*, 2019; *Kurt v. Austria*, 2021; *Tkheldidze v. Georgia*, 2021). Moreover, the ECtHR hardly uses the term “structural discrimination” or refers to intersectionality, disregarding the impact that intersecting categories can have in cases of violence (*Kurt v. Austria*, 2021, dissenting opinion Judge Elósegui, para. 8).

Conclusions

This chapter identified three main elements characterising the definitions of femicide proposed by feminist movements and scholars. The first one is the systematic nature of the killings of women in a social and institutional context of gender inequality. Secondly, femicide definitions highlight the

responsibility of the state in perpetrating, tolerating, or fostering impunity of these killings. The understanding of femicide as the culmination of a continuum of violence is the final distinctive element. The chapter argues that adopting an intersectional approach to femicide can strengthen these constitutive elements of the concept of femicide by highlighting structural inequalities and the power dynamics at play in the different settings where femicides occur. It also broadens the scope to other inequalities affecting women based on other social categories of distinction, such as race, class, sexual orientation, gender identity, nationality, or disability.

All legal frameworks discussed have acknowledged the systemic nature of the killings and states' responsibility. However, a short review of international and regional initiatives reveals a contrast between the understandings and approaches to femicide in these systems, certainly from an intersectional perspective. On the one hand, European initiatives fail to reflect an intersectional approach by focusing exclusively on gender and reducing working definitions to intimate femicide. On the other hand, the inter-American system has formally encouraged an intersectional approach to femicides but shows shortcomings in practice. Lastly, the United Nations' interest in femicide is led by the UN SRVAW, with a strong emphasis on data collection.

There are several technical and theoretical shortcomings in these normative and policy frameworks. While recognising the importance of prevention, these frameworks emphasise criminalisation and data collection. This forcefully shifts the focus towards individual criminal responsibility and away from the responsibility of the state. Only *transformative* measures, including prevention, can tackle the systemic nature of the killings. In doing so, an intersectional approach can help highlight social, institutional, and structural arrangements (stereotypes and inequalities) that lead to violence and examine how racism, ageism, ableism, homophobia, transphobia, and xenophobia connect and contribute to it. Case law suggests that attention to context can promote such transformative intersectional understanding of violence. In addition, collecting data with an intersectional perspective by including multiple categories of difference in addition to gender would better capture the diversity of victims. This would not only show the relevance of intersecting categories on victims' (lack of) access to justice, services, or protection but also indicate how they interact to make women vulnerable.

By comparing the legal and policy practice at different levels, the chapter shows that attempts to connect the conceptualisations of femicide and intersectionality call for conversations across regional systems. Hopefully, this edited volume will contribute to creating theoretical and methodological approximations.

Notes

- 1 The research for this publication was financed by the Dutch Research Council (NWO) as part of the project Proud and Safe (project number 016.VENI.197.218/6838).
- 2 The protocol identifies girls, older women, women with disabilities, Indigenous women, trans women, and migrant women.
- 3 Only 25 states responded to the 2020 call (Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Cyprus, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden), as well as 14 public entities and eight civil society organisations.

Bibliography

- Anthias, F., & Yuval-Davis, N. (1983). Contextualising feminism: Gender, Ethnic and Class Divisions. *Feminist Review*, 15, 62–75. <https://doi.org/10.3109/17477160902953066>
- Anzaldúa, G. E., & Moraga, C. L. (Eds.). (1981). *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*. Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.
- Bandelli, D. (2017). *Femicide, Gender and Violence*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-47785-5>

- Bernal Sarmiento, C., Lorente Acosta, M., Roth, F., & Zambrano, M. (2014). *Latin American Model Protocol for the Investigation of Gender-related Killings of Women (Femicide/Feminicide)*. UN Women (ONU Mujeres); ISBN 978-9962-5559-0-2.
- Bueno-Hansen, P. (2010). Femicidio. In R.-L. Fregoso & C. Bejarano (Eds.), *Terrorizing Women: Femicide in the Americas* (pp. 290–311). Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822392644-019>
- Carmona López, A., Gómez Caballero, A., & Castro Rodríguez, L. (2010). Femicide in Latin America in the Movement for Women's Human Rights. In R.-L. Fregoso & C. Bejarano (Eds.), *Terrorizing Women: Femicide in the Americas* (Issue February, pp. 157–176). Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822392644-010>
- CEDAW. (2005). *Report on Mexico Produced by the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women Under Article 8 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention, and Reply from the Government of Mexico*.
- Combahee River Collective. (1983). The Combahee River Collective statement. *Home Girls: A Black Feminist Anthology*, 272–282. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203357071>
- Crenshaw, K. W. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Policies. *The University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1, 139–167. <https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2007.54.1.23>
- Crenshaw, K. W. (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review*, 1, 1241–1299.
- Crenshaw, K. W. (1993). Beyond Racism and Misogyny. *Words that Wound: Critical Race Theory, Assaultive Speech, and the First Amendment*.
- Crenshaw, K. W. (2011). Postscript. In H. Lutz, M. T. Vivar, & L. Supik (Eds.), *Framing Intersectionality*. Routledge.
- Cullen, P., Dawson, M., Price, J., & Rowlands, J. (2021). Intersectionality and invisible victims: Reflections on data challenges and vicarious trauma in femicide, Family and intimate partner homicide research. *Journal of Family Violence*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-020-00243-4>
- Davis, A. (1981). Rape, Racism and the capitalist setting. *Black Scholar*, 12(6), 39–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00064246.1978.11414005>
- Davis, K. (2008). Intersectionality as buzzword: A sociology of science perspective on what makes a feminist theory successful. *Feminist Theory*, 9(1), 67–85. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700108086364>
- Dawson, M., & Carrigan, M. (2020). Identifying femicide locally and globally: Understanding the utility and accessibility of sex/gender-related motives and indicators. *Current Sociology*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392120946359>
- Dempsey, M. M. (2007). Toward a feminist state: What does 'effective' prosecution of domestic violence mean? *The Modern Law Review*, 70(6), 908–935. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4543184>
- Dill, B. T. (1983). Race, Class and gender. *Feminist Studies*, 9(1), 131–150.
- Edwards, A. (2013). *Violence Against Women Under International Human Rights Law*. Cambridge University Press.
- Opuz v. Turkey, (2009).
- Valiulienė v. Lithuania, (2013).
- Talpis v. Italy, (2017).
- Volodina v. Russia, (2019).
- Kurt v Austria, (2021).
- Tkheldidze v. Georgia, (2021).
- European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE). (2017a). *Glossary of definitions of rape, femicide and intimate partner violence*. <https://doi.org/10.2839/58061>
- European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE). (2017b). *Terminology and indicators for data collection: Rape, femicide and intimate partner violence*. <https://doi.org/10.2839/980842>
- Follow-up Mechanism to the Belém do Pará Convention (MESECVI). (2008). *Declaration on Femicide*.
- Follow-up Mechanism to the Belém do Pará Convention (MESECVI). (2018). *Inter-American Model Law on the Prevention, Punishment and Eradication of the Gender-Related Killing of Women and Girls (Femicide/ Feminicide)*.
- García-Del Moral, P. (2016). Symposium on theorizing twail activism: Femicidio: TWAIL in action. *American Journal of International Law Unbound*, 110(10), 31–36.
- Gonzalez, D., & Deus, A. (2019). *Análisis de legislación sobre femicidio/ feminicidio en américa latina y el caribe e insu- mos para una ley modelo*. UN Women (ONU Mujeres) and MESECVI.
- Group of Experts on Action against Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (GREVIO). (2019a). *Baseline Evaluation Report France*.
- Group of Experts on Action against Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (GREVIO). (2019b). *Baseline Evaluation Report Italy*.
- Group of Experts on Action against Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (GREVIO). (2020). *Baseline Evaluation Report Belgium*.

- Hancock, A.-M. (2007). When multiplication doesn't equal quick addition: Examining intersectionality as a research paradigm. *Perspectives on Politics*, 5(1), 63–79. <https://doi.org/10.1017/Si537592707070065>
- Hill Collins, P. (1990). Knowledge, Consciousness, and the politics of empowerment. *Black Feminist Thought*, 132. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2074808>
- hooks, bell. (1989). Choosing the margin as a space of radical openness. *Yearnings: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics*, 203–209.
- hooks, bell. (2014). *Ain't I a woman: Black Women and feminism*. (2nd edition, Issue 1). Routledge. <https://doi.org/https://doi-org.proxy.library.uu.nl/10.4324/9781315743264>
- Hull, G. T., Scott, P. B., & Smith, B. (1982). *All the Women Are White, and All the Blacks Are Men, but Some of Us Are Brave: Black Women's Studies*. Feminist Press.
- Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACrHR). (2009). *González et al. ("Cotton Field") vs. Mexico*.
- Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACrHR). (2014). *Véliz Franco et al. vs. Guatemala*.
- Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACrHR). (2015). *Velasquez Paiz et al. vs. Guatemala*.
- Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACrHR). (2021). *Vicky Hernández et al. v. Honduras*.
- Kantola, J., & Nousiainen, K. (2009). Institutionalising Intersectionality in Europe. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 11(4), 459–477. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616740903237426>
- Kanuha, V. (1994). Women of color in battering relationships. In *Women of color: Integrating ethnic and gender identities in psychotherapy* (pp. 428–454).
- Koldinská, K. (2009). Institutionalising intersectionality. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 11(4), 547–563. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616740903237509>
- Lagarde, M. (2005). El feminicidio, delito contra la humanidad. In *CEjRM. Feminicidio, justicia y derecho* (pp. 151–164). Cámara de Diputados del H. Congreso de la Unión – LiX Legislatura México.
- Lagarde, M. (2006). Del femicidio al feminicidio. *Desde El Jardín de Freud*, 6, 216–225.
- Lagarde, M., & Roberts, C. (2018). Preface: Feminist keys for understanding femicide. In R.-L. Fregoso & C. Bejarano (Eds.), *Terrorizing Women: Femicide in the Americas* (Issue February). Duke University Press.
- Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. In *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Crossing Press. https://doi.org/10.1300/J155v11n03_01
- Monárez Frago, J. (2002). Femicidio sexual serial en ciudad Juárez 1993–2001. *Debate Feminista*, 25, 279–305. <https://doi.org/10.22201/cieg.2594066xe.2002.25.642>
- Olivera, M. (2006). Violencia femicida: Violence against women and Mexico's structural crisis. *Latin American Perspectives*, 33, 104.
- Pinos, G., & Ávila, J. (2012). El femicidio: La manifestación mortal de la violencia contra la mujer. *Maskana*, 3(2), 19–30. <https://doi.org/10.18537/mskn.03.02.02>
- Radford, J., & Russell, D. (1992). *Femicide: The Politics of Woman Killing*. London: Twayne Publishers.
- Radi, B., & Sardá, A. (2016). Travesticidio/transfemicidio. *Boletín Del Observatorio de Género En La Justicia*, 9, 28–37.
- Romero Figueroa, D. (2019). Políticas de femicidio en México: Perspectivas interseccionales de mujeres indígenas para reconsiderar su definición teórica-legal y las metodologías de recolección de datos. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 20(8).
- Sokoloff, N. J. (2008). Expanding the intersectional paradigm to better understand domestic violence in immigrant communities. *Critical Criminology*, 16(4), 229–255. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10612-008-9059-3>
- Sosa, L. (2017a). Inter-American case law on femicide: Obscuring intersections? *Netherlands Quarterly of Human Rights*, 35(2), 85–103. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0924051917708382>
- Sosa, L. (2017b). *Intersectionality in the Human Rights Legal Framework on Violence against Women: At the Centre or the Margins?* Cambridge University Press.
- Sosa, L. (2020). Now you see me? The visibility of trans and travesti experiences in criminal procedures. *Politics and Governance*, 8(3), 266–277. <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v8i3.2804>
- Toledo Vásquez, P. (2019). Criminalising femicide in Latin American countries – legal power working for women? In *Contesting Femicide* (pp. 39–51). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351068048-4>
- Taking action against gender-related killing of women and girls, Pub. L. No. Resolution 68/191 (2013).
- Taking action against gender-related killing of women and girls, Pub. L. No. Resolution 70/176 (2015).
- United Nations Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women Its Causes and Consequences. (2012). *Gender-related Killings of Women* (Issue A/HRC/20/16).
- United Nations Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women Its Causes and Consequences. (2016). *Modalities for the Establishment of Femicides/Gender-related Killings Watch* (Issue A/71/398).
- Verloo, M. (2006). Multiple inequalities, intersectionality and the European Union. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13(3), 211–228. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506806065753>
- Weil, S., Corradi, C., & Naudi, M. (2018). *Femicide across Europe: Theory, research and prevention*. In *Femicide across Europe: Theory, Research and Prevention*.