WOMEN, WAR & PEACE

Elizabeth Ferris
Life & Peace Institute

Life & Peace Institute

The Life & Peace Institute (LPI) is an international and ecumenical institute for peace research and action. Founded in 1985 by the Swedish Ecumenical Council, LPI aims to further the causes of justice, peace and reconciliation through a combination of research, publications and projects for conflict transformation.

LPI activities currently focus on three broad themes:

- Religion, conflict and peace
- Human rights and economic justice
- Nonviolent conflict transformation

CONTENTS

Foreword

At one level, not much has changed since this piece was written ten years ago. Women largely remain on the margins of peace negotiations, and politics is still seen as primarily the business of men. There are still very few women in positions of power and those that are, such as Condolezza Rice in the United States, are far from challenging the system. Moreover, in the past two years, we have seen how the language of liberation of women has been used to justify or endorse war, as was the case with the war in Afghanistan. We have also seen photographs of women soldiers abusing prisoners in Iraq.

On another level, however, there is growing awareness of the contributions that women can make in peace processes, and there are cases where women's groups have fought for a place at the peace negotiations table - as in Burundi, Sierra Leone, and Angola - even though such examples have not yet become the norm.

On still another level, since this piece was written ten years ago, there has been growing awareness that women are disproportionately victims of conflict. UN agencies, nongovernmental organizations and churches have all developed programmes to address the needs of women refugees and other women who suffer the effects of civil conflict. A substantial amount of work has been done in the area of sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV). A decade ago, it was mainly women's groups that raised the issue of SGBV; today it has become almost mainstream.

But while raising awareness of women's needs is important, the fact remains that the response of national organizations and the international community is woefully inadequate. Frankly, I do not know whether sexual violence against women in wars has increased in the past decade or whether we are just becoming more aware of it. But in either case, it is clear that this is a major part of war with horrible long-term consequences for women and for their societies. No one who visits Darfur in Sudan or the Democratic Republic of Congo, for example, can be untouched by the devastation experienced by women victims of war. In spite of the growing awareness about SGBV and about women as victims of conflict, the programmes developed by the UN, NGOs and churches are far from sufficient to address the growing needs.

In early 2002, a study in three West African countries, commissioned by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and Save the Children-UK, found that peacekeeping forces and humanitarian agencies had engaged in sexual abuse of refugee and displaced women and children. The study found that this was not the result of the isolated actions by a few individuals,

but rather was widespread. News coverage of the study led to an outpouring of new codes of conduct and new standards to prevent such behavior. But as long as there are desperate women and as long as humanitarian workers and peacekeepers are regarded as people with power, this abuse will continue.

Given the growing awareness of the effects of war on women and given the failure of men to bring about lasting peace in many of today's conflicts, I ask myself why it is that women have not become more active in the burning issues of war and peace. It may be that women are forced to devote ever more energies to simply surviving in an increasingly difficult economic and political situation. Or it may be that women's efforts to promote peace are being carried out on the grassroots level where they are not as visible as high-level peace negotiations.

The UN has reported, for example, on the important role of women in Rwanda - as 49 percent of the Parliament - in leading their society away from the ashes of genocide. In Nepal, women who were victims of violence are seeking representation in peace talks between the government and Maoist rebels. Women's Peace Caravans travel into the most dangerous parts of Colombia to protest against the civil war and negotiate with armed bands. The Ecumenical Women's Solidarity Fund in the Former Yugoslavia has supported hundreds of women's groups to work on reconciliation at the local level. The Mano River Women's Peace Network brought women from Liberia, Guinea and Sierra Leone together to try to bring about peace in Liberia. So powerful was their collective voice that they were later invited to be one of the signatories to the peace agreement. Such efforts are important signs of the contributions that women can make to their communities.

Another positive development is the strength, which women draw from sharing their stories and working together. The report of the *Consultation on Peace with Justice: Women Speak Out!* * captures both the pain and the potential of women working together to address the violence in their communities. "As we laughed and cried together, we shared numerous stories that spoke of bravery, resolve, determination, wisdom, and deep insight into the true meaning of life in community. Our vision of peace and justice was imbued with continuing resistance to the power of violent patriarchal institutions in eroding our sense of humanity. Our accounts enumerated the several ways in which we are involved in making the visions a reality in our public and private lives. We sought and shared ways in which peace and a full life in communities could be realized for all members of the community; it meant

* This consultation was jointly organized by the World Council of Churches, the Lutheran World Federation, World Alliance of Reformed Churches and the Conference of European Churches and took place in Geneva. Switzerland, 16-21 March 2002 with the participation of 50 women from all regions and various faith traditions.

creating models of inclusive community living. We recognised the necessity of simultaneously challenging patriarchal structures of power and exercising our own individual and collective power at home and in our societies. To that end, we acknowledged the need for immediate cessation of violence in all its forms, a sustained commitment to peace in our homes and nations, and restoration of the dignity, respect, and humanity for women all over the world."

I hope that in 2014 I'll be able to report that some of the long-standing conflicts that have destroyed lives and devastated communities have been brought to an end. I hope that in the coming decade women are able to mobilize themselves to become active forces for change and for peace. Most of all, I hope that the terrible violence against women on the battlefields and in the home is diminished. But if this is to occur, the hard work of organizing women must begin now.

August 2004

Elizabeth Ferris

World Council of Churches

WOMEN, WAR & PEACE

Elizabeth Ferris

1. Introduction

> This much we have learned from our living: life begets life. Life for women, life for the earth, the very survival of the planet is found only outside the patriarchy; beyond their sad and shallow definitions; beyond their dead and static knowing; beyond their amnesia; beyond their impatience; beyond their wars - wars which unmask the fear, insecurity, and powerlessness that form the very base of patriarchal rule.

> To end the state of war, to halt the momentum toward death, passion for life must flourish. Women are the bearers of life-loving energy. Ours is the task of deepening that passion for life and separating from all that threatens life, all that diminishes life; becoming who we are as women; telling/living the truth of our lives; shifting the weight of the world. [Note 1]

This quotation summarizes much of current feminist thinking about women, war, and peace. Women affirm life in a male-dominated society, seek peace in a militaristic world, and challenge the very basis of knowing and thinking about society and the world. Women's passion for life not only provides a natural basis for their role as peacemakers in a violent world, but also reaches out to encompass the whole of the planet.

Women's orientations toward the rest of the world are grounded in their experiences - "telling and the living the truths of our lives." The power of women to transform society, to "shift the weight of the world" is central to this vision.

Since the beginning of recorded history - and undoubtedly before -women have been resisting war and injustice. Many of their stories are

unknown; rarely are they taught in school. However, women's perspectives on war and peace, violence and struggle, are beginning to be recognized as offering unique contributions to the great debates on the nature of society and the international system.

This essay synthesizes some of the perspectives (and some of the controversies) related to issues of women, war, and peace. These are more complex than usually depicted - for example, between wars and domestic violence, movements for peace and those for justice, nationalism and women's rights. Not all women are nurturing, peace-loving, and antiwar. Not all men are militaristic warmongers.

Moreover, women are not a monolithic bloc. They are divided by race, class, culture, and life experiences. They differ in their analyses of the system and their visions for the future. Some argue for more women in positions of political power; others advocate grassroots activism. Some focus on increasing women's participation in the system, others on rejecting or transforming it.

This essay is part of a research project, "Women and Nonviolence," organized by the Life & Peace Institute (Uppsala), the World Council of Churches (Geneva), and the Lutheran World Federation (Geneva). The project intends to build on work already done, not duplicate previous studies, projects, or meetings. Besides offering background material for a project meeting in November 1993 in Manila, this essay also identifies questions for further analysis and reflection in connection with eight issues:

1. Women as peacemakers.

2. Women on the sidelines of international politics.

3. Women's experiences with violence.

4. Women and peace.

5. Maternal thinking.

6. Women organizing for peace.

7. Women and nonviolence.

8. Women's rights and social transformation.

This essay does not pretend to be a comprehensive or even a representative survey of the vast literature on these issues; indeed, exceptions could be noted

for almost every sentence. But it is meant to provoke discussion and perhaps lead to the discovery of still other connections. One goal of the project as a whole is to increase awareness of the contributions women are making to the struggle for peace and justice in many parts of the world. It also affirms the importance of analysis and seeks connections among different facets of women's engagement with nonviolence.

2. Women as Peacemakers

There is, perhaps, no *woman,* whether she have borne children, or be merely a potential child-bearer, who could look down on a battlefield covered with the slain, but the thought would rise in her, "So many mothers' sons! So many bodies brought into the world to lie there! So many months of weariness and pain while bones and muscles were shaped within;... so many baby mouths drawing life at woman's breasts. All this, that men might lie with glazed eyeballs and swollen bodies, and fixed, blue, unclosed mouths, and great limbs tossed. This, that an acre of ground might be manured with human flesh! (Olive Schreiner, South Africa, 1911)[Note 2]

In all societies, women give birth and nurse babies. In most societies, women are the primary caregivers, responsible for children and the family. Women's role in nurturing, building relationships, and maintaining the family is central to their identity. These concerns with relationships and people often mean that women play the role of peacemakers within their families and communities.

Carol Gilligan has shown that women perceive the world differently than men, seeing it as a web of relationships by which individuals can be identified.[Note 3] Women's concerns with relationships are the basis of their nurturing role, passion for affirming life, and opposition to war. She finds that men tend to have an "ethic of justice" premised on equality (everyone should be treated the same). Women, on the other hand, are more likely to have an "ethic of care" premised on nonviolence (no one should be hurt).

In most societies, such values are transmitted to boys and girls from an early age. Girls are raised to be more docile, obedient, nice. In many places, they are raised to believe that their role is to serve men, to sacrifice their own needs for the good of men, and for the well-being of the family. Their gods are male gods, and often gods who glorify war and domination.

It was not always thus. Women's myths and rituals, often dating back thousands of years, affirm the power of women to give life, and hint at societies in which women and their values are central. Traditionally, women are seen as closer to the life-giving earth, associated with fertility and cycles. Mythic images of women as nature, as sexuality and fertility, are deeply imbedded in our cultural psyches.

This concern with the earth, this reverence for life, shows itself in many forms - from ancient goddess symbols of fertility to women's fascination with the modern "deep ecology" movement, which links environmental and spiritual concerns. Women's holistic visions of the world integrate concern for the environment, for creation, with reverence for life - all life - in community.

In contrast, wars are started by men operating in male systems. Hilkka Pietila says:

> The idea of killing another human being is extremely alien to women. Aggressors have always been men. There is not one case where women have set out to conquer. While women are occasionally violent, women have never institutionalized violence.[Note 4]

The relationship between militarism and patriarchy has been extensively studied by feminist researchers. As Betty Reardon summarizes:

> Authoritarian patriarchy, which seems to have emerged with the major elements of "civilization" - human settlements, organized agriculture, the state, and male domination - invented and maintains war to hold in place the social order it spawned.[Note 5]

Modern survey data, at least in Western countries, show a consistent pattern of women providing less support to militaristic policies, wars (in general and in particular), and capital punishment. The surveys show patterns of women's preferences for environmental protection, social policies of education and health, and peace initiatives.

Researchers in psychology, history, religion, political science, sociology, anthropology, and literature have written extensively about women's inherent life-affirming qualities, their peace-loving nature. These ideas have become so commonplace that they have become almost a given in most feminist literature, political strategizing ("What do we do about the women's vote?"), and the mindsets of both women and men in many countries.

The research results are fairly clear. Women are more likely than men -for a variety of reasons - to advocate peace and oppose wars. This assumption has formed one major basis of the women's peace movement, and provided the motivation for thousands of women's groups working to change the societies in which they live. It has led to major political movements, alternative forms of social organization, and to women often taking the "moral high ground" both in debates over political issues and in interpersonal relations.

But there are disturbing questions which must be raised. If women are so loving, peaceful, and nurturing, why do so many of their sons become violent? Women are often the transmitters of culture within the family -and some of the values they transmit are precisely values which lead to war and its glorification.

Think of the mighty war machines of this century - Nazi Germany, imperial Japan, the Cold War superpowers - or of the Falklands/ Malvinas and Iran-Iraq wars. In all these cases, mothers sacrificed their sons, often willingly, for the war effort. As Jean Bethke Elshtain argues, "behind every fighting man is a woman." Women have always been a necessary part of the war machine in mobilizing the population in support of war and in providing the bodies to do the fighting.[Note 6]

Women's resistance to the war machine has varied over time and place; as will be discussed, there has been a vital women's peace movement for generations. But even though women tend to support wars less than men

do, they still tend to support them in large numbers. Most wars have been fought with the acquiescence and support of women.

Nationalism is undoubtedly one of the major reasons for war. Wars have been fought between nation-states in pursuit of national security and national glory, to affirm ethnic and national values. Struggles for self-determination, indigenous rights, and ethnic autonomy have many life-affirming, community-enhancing features. But they often imply a denigration of the other, a hatred of other ethnic groups that leads to war, violence, and sometimes unspeakable atrocities.

Women's roles in building and creating nationalism have not been systematically studied, but can be assumed to be central. The US mother who teaches her children that their country is number one, the Croat mother who depicts Serbs as the enemy, the Palestinian mother who nurtures the desire for the homeland along with a hatred of Israelis, the Armenian mother who keeps alive the aspirations and memories of her people - all are fostering nationalism, with all of its positive and potentially militaristic implications. Like men, women are products of the society in which they are raised; it is not surprising that they share many of the same values.

Although women tend to be more "peace loving" than men, there have always been violent women. Joan of Arc was glorified for her military prowess; Rani Lakshimi Bai of Jhansi, a warrior in the great Maratha tradition, led her troops against the British in India; French women were incredibly violent toward Nazi collaborators after World War II; in some Native American traditions, women were responsible for the torture and mutilation of prisoners; women's battalions have fought in ex-Yugoslavia; women have played important roles in armed struggles for national liberation.

Women's desires for revenge, punishment, and blood are strong - and don't fit the myth of women as peace-loving, nurturing mothers. According to Elshtain, in comparison with male violence, female violence tends to be formless, unstructured, and anarchic.[Note 7] But the potential for violence is still there, albeit perhaps in a different form, within women as within men.

In exploring connections between patriarchy and women's oppression, some writers have considered the way in which women have collaborated in this pattern:

> Militarism is primarily a male phenomenon and the ultimate power of patriarchy is the organized, legitimized violence of the nation-state. For millennia, part of women's role has been to decry male aggression. We often see ourselves as posing a better way - a more loving, nurturing way of life than the masculine mode poses.

> Sometimes love and hatred seem polarized along sex lines.... We have generally portrayed ourselves as the victims of male domination, down playing the areas in which we ourselves hold power. We have thoroughly described and documented that half of the age-old saga of domination and oppression in which we are the victims.

> We have not yet fully recognized the effects of maternal power over children as a root cause of resentment, fear, and hatred of females. Rarely do we admit that males have sometimes been our victims, as we have been theirs.[Note 8]

In the dichotomy frequently assumed between peace-loving women and war-mongering men, men are often seen as victims. In fact, much of the feminist movement has affirmed that men - trapped by tradition into playing certain roles, unable to express feelings, shackled into a macho role - suffer as much as women from the patriarchal system.

In looking at militarism, the victimization of men becomes even clearer. It is usually men who are sent off to war to do the fighting and dying (although today - and this is a change - wars are as likely to kill civilians, most of whom are women and children, as soldiers.) The fact that men are more likely to do the fighting is usually ascribed to their greater physical strength and to cultural beliefs of warfare as appropriate male behavior.

The movement for women's rights is also affecting traditional understandings of women as inherently more peaceful than men. For example, women's rights advocates in some industrialized countries argue that women have a right to fight in the armed forces, to assume more active

roles in combat. Some even assert that by having more women in the military, the military itself can be changed and humanized.

But the weight of the evidence goes in the opposite direction. When women participate in the military, they, not the military, are changed.[Note 9]

In other contexts, women mobilize to support nationalist struggles as a way not only of affirming their culture but also as a way of increasing their relative power in society. But "throughout the world, men have seen in the state and in the ideologies legitimating it - of which nationalism is the most potent - a means of enforcing their control over women." Nationalism is far from being gender-neutral as it seeks to mobilize women for a particular purpose.[Note 10]

If women's nurturing, peace-loving, life-affirming role is to be strengthened, if it is to have the power to transform the world, then we need to look more deeply into that role - and at the sometimes disturbing and contradictory forces within it:

> As long as we ascribe to our oppressor what we can't control, we also remain helpless to change it. It is far more frightening to look into ourselves to see how we have collaborated in allowing the death culture to take over, than to place the blame entirely outside ourselves.

> Yet, ultimately, it is perhaps also our only hope, for if there are forces within women, as well as within men, leading to violence and violation of our human potential, we as women can play a very big part in turning the course of events, by trying to probe and understand and act on what we are beginning to find out.[Note 11]

In this section, we have explored some of the literature around the question of whether women are inherently more peace loving than men. The conclusion seems to be yes/but. While women seem to be more predisposed to

peace, they also play a role in maintaining the war system and in transmitting cultural values which make wars more likely, and sometimes they can be quite violent themselves. (The relationship of women's maternal roles to their predisposition toward peace is further explored in section 5.) As Elise Boulding says:

> I don't think women are naturally more peaceful than men. They have to learn to be peaceful, just like men do, but women are in situations where they develop their peaceable capabilities, such as child rearing. You have a chance to learn things when you work with children. Men who are removed from that process of human growth don't get the same chance to cultivate that peaceable nature. It's not inherent.[Note 12]

3. Women on the Sidelines of International Politics

3.1. Section introduction

While the question of whether women are "inherently" more peaceful than men is interesting, the fact remains that at least 99 percent of the world's wars have been initiated and fought by men. Though women can be very violent, and often support violence through their social roles, the war system (that is, the institutionalization of violence) is primarily a male construction.

This section looks at three specific issues related to the institutionalization of violence and the exclusion of women from that system - the extent to which women (1) participate in international politics, (2) benefit from international political decisions, and (3) have their perspectives included in international political thought. (The short answer to all three questions is, hardly at all.)

3.2. International politics as a "man's game"

International politics is traditionally viewed as relations between nation-states. Whether trade agreements, diplomacy, or war, these are overwhelmingly carried out by men. With very few exceptions, men are the government leaders, diplomats, and high-ranking international civil servants.

Reasons for women's exclusion from politics generally have been well-documented; though such reasons vary from society to society, they include religious and cultural beliefs, political structures that make it difficult for women to participate, and economic obstacles. Perhaps most of all, women are excluded from politics at the domestic level because, to varying degrees, men exercise the power and set the rules for political engagement.

In some cultures, however, women choose not to become involved in politics because they do not see it as important to their lives:

> Women in Thailand have been taught by their mothers and grandmothers not to leave important things in life - earning money and providing food - to men. This special sense of responsibility is drummed into the ears of young girls. Considering "what is important in life" differently from men, Thai women in general leave the affairs of community and national politics to men - because traditionally they have thought that politics is not a matter of life or death. Therefore, it can be left to men to talk and make speeches in parliament and in government offices - while women are busy making money.[Note 13]

Even in those societies where women play important political roles, the portfolios of national defense, the military, and foreign relations are usually assigned to men. After four years studying decision making around nuclear issues, the Oxford Research Group found that of the approximately 800 key decision-making positions in the five nuclear states, five were then occupied by women.[Note 14]

Female politicians and civil servants are usually relegated to "soft" policy areas like education, culture, environment, and socalled women's issues. Moreover, for many women seeking leadership roles in the political system "doing the job as well as a man" means accepting masculine standards, and thus reinforcing dominant masculine values.[Note 15]

The few models of strong women leaders (Margaret Thatcher or Golda Meir, for example) provide little challenge to the "system" in which male values dominate and in which men make most of the decisions. In fact, political systems as currently set up ensure that women who make it to the top espouse the values of the system - often more so than their male counterparts.

Thus, even though women have formed the backbone of the peace movement in Western countries and have been in the fore of disarmament efforts, actual negotiations are carried on by men. In negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union during the 1980s, women were rarely present; in the one or two cases where a woman was involved, it was at a junior level.

This exclusion is explained in different ways. For example, Donald Regan, US President Ronald Reagan's chief of staff, said women were not at the 1986 US-Soviet summit because:

> They're not going to understand missile throw-weights or what's happening in Afghanistan, or what's happening in human rights. Some women will, but [not] most women.... Believe me, your [female] readers, for the most part ... would rather read the human interest stuff of what happened.[Note 16]

More than in any other areas, foreign and military policy are male domains. Similarly, as we shall see, the study of international politics, foreign policy, arms control, and war and peace are dominated by patriarchal thinking. Women are perceived as not interested in and not sufficiently informed to participate in the debates on defense and foreign policies, which are seen as issues for experts (therefore, better left to men) rather than issues requiring or benefitting from popular input.[Note 17]

Of course, this reliance on experts also disempowers the vast majority of the world's men. But, since there are men who can participate in this system, the exclusion of women is striking.

One of the ways popular participation in general and women's participation in particular is discouraged is through the use of language. The jargon of military establishments and disarmament negotiations is technical and obtuse, and uses images and allusions to activities that in most societies are mostly the preserve of men. Such jargon sanitizes and obscures intended results of arms and foreign policies.

Consider, for example, the dubbing of a US missile as "the peacekeeper" by US President Ronald Reagan. In the Gulf war, this process was carried to new heights (or depths) with the emphasis on "collateral damage," "smart bombs," and "damage limitation."

The jargon frequently has a sexual component, as antiwar activist Helen Caldicott often illustrates in her discussions of phallic worship and missile envy. Carol Cohn recounts her incredulity at the extent to which sexual imagery was used when she studied at a major university's defense studies center:

> A professor's explanation of why the MX missile is to be placed in the silos of the newest Minuteman missiles, instead of replacing the older, less accurate missiles, was "because they're in the nicest hole. You're not going to take the nicest missile you have and put it in a crummy hole."

> Other lectures were filled with discussions of vertical erector launchers, thrust-to-weight ratios, soft lay downs, deep penetration, and the comparative advantages of protracted versus spasm attacks - or what one military adviser to the National Security Council has called "releasing 70 to 80 percent of our megatonnage in one orgasmic whump.[Note 18]

She goes on to describe the influence of language and the extensive use of "defense" jargon on her efforts to understand that value system and maintain her own. She says it did not take long to learn the language of nuclear war and its specialized information. But whenever she tried to communicate with colleagues in nonjargon, she found they didn't listen, and considered her soft headed:

> I adopted the vocabulary, speaking of "escalation dominance," "pre-emptive strikes," and, one of my favorites, "subholocaust engagements." This opened my way into long, elaborate discussions that taught me a lot about technostrategic reasoning and how to manipulate it.

> But the better I became at this discourse, the more difficult it became to express my own ideas and values. While the language included things I had never been able to speak about before, it radically excluded others.

> To pick a bald example: the word "peace" is not a part of this discourse. As close as one can come is "strategic stability," a term that refers to a balance of numbers and types of weapons systems - not the political, social, economic and psychological conditions that "peace" implies.

> Moreover, to speak the word is to immediately brand oneself as a soft-headed activist instead of a professional to be taken seriously. If I was unable to speak my concerns in this language, more disturbing still was that I also began to find it harder even to keep them in my own head.[Note 19]

After her experiences at the center, she drew some conclusions about the importance of the words arms specialists use to describe what they are working with - words which make it possible for them to continue working in the area of mass destruction and which also create their own reality:

> While I believe that the language is not the whole problem, it is a significant component and clue. What it reveals is a whole series of culturally grounded and culturally acceptable mechanisms that make it possible to work in institutions that foster the proliferation of nuclear weapons, to plan mass incinerations of millions of human beings for a living.

> Language that is abstract, sanitized, full of euphemisms; language that is sexy and fun to use; paradigms whose referent is weapons; imagery that domesticates and deflates the forces of mass

destruction; imagery that reverses sentient and nonsentient matter, that conflates birth and death, destruction and creation - all of these are part of what makes it possible to be radically removed from the reality of what one is talking about, and from the realities one is creating through the discourse.[Note 20]

Words which are intended to exclude are used not only by defense establishment intellectuals in powerful countries. Sexual language is used to mobilize male soldiers, foster their camaraderie, and inspire them to assert their masculinity. Thus, US and allied pilots in the Gulf War were shown pornographic films as part of their preraid preparations. A US army jingle used by soldiers in training runs, "This is my rifle [pats rifle], this is my gun [pats crotch]. One is for shooting, the other for fun."

In this case, language is used to convey the reality of war in which rape and other violence against women is committed by soldiers, particularly, but not exclusively, by those on the winning side. The hundreds of thousands of rape victims in Bangladesh as a result of the war in 1970-71, in China as a result of the Japanese invasion of the 1930s, or in Cyprus during the Turkish invasion of 1974 were not "side effects" of war, but part of a deliberate policy to demoralize and humiliate the enemy.

The widespread and sometimes systematic rape of women in the conflicts of the 1990s in the former Yugoslavia is only a recent manifestation of this long-standing phenomenon. What is unusual, however, is the widespread media attention to such sexual violence, and the emergence of a movement to include rape as a war crime under international law. As Susan Brownmiller argues, rape and war go hand in hand.[Note 21]

It is hard to find cases where women's voices have been heard in the political debates on the international level or in the decisions to go to war. As we have seen, it may be that women provide implicit support for government war-making abilities, and that their silence is, in fact and in interpretation, acquiescence in such decisions. But actual decisions to go to war, conduct it in a certain way, and stop fighting are made by men.

Women are largely absent from the decision-making processes of international politics. To a lesser extent, they are largely excluded from the processes of national policy making. But, it may be argued, even if they

are excluded from the process (as are most of the world's people, men and women, and (disproportionately) people living in the South), perhaps it is because they are not so affected by the international system. But:

> International relations is concerned with affecting policy, clarifying the major struggles of the world, understanding international conflict, and assisting decision makers in national governments and in international institutions. Women belong on this agenda.[Note 22]

3.3. Effects of women's exclusion on women

Clearly, war affects women. But there are other decisions taken at the international level which shape women's lives, and the trend is toward these international decisions having a greater impact on women's lives. While it has long been assumed that international aid programs benefit both men and women, recent research shows that women are in fact excluded or bypassed in many supposedly gender-neutral development programs. For example, even in countries where women perform most of the agricultural labor, agricultural assistance often focuses on men.

In response to such research findings, and to growing frustration among women relief and development workers, some programs have been developed which focus on women as beneficiaries. Yet, a decade later, these programs still reach only a small percentage of women.

For example, in the late 1980s, among UN agencies, 3.5 percent of programs (representing 0.2 percent of budget allocations) were deemed to benefit women. Less than 1 percent of the projects of the Food and Agriculture Organization contain strategies to reach women. Bilateral initiatives fare little better. At its high point, the Women in Development (WiD) program of USAID provided 4 percent of its funds to women. In the private sector as well, the results are disturbing. At the Ford Foundation, a women's bureaucratic insurgency achieved an increase to 3.5 percent of its international funding for women's programs.[Note 23]

In comparison with other areas of international concern, WiD programs have achieved considerable legitimacy. Over the past decade, they have been included in most of the industrialized countries' aid machineries, and

considerable emphasis has been placed on the role of grassroots women's groups in mobilizing forces for development.

But the record of actual achievement (particularly in comparison with official rhetoric) is less encouraging. Results within SIDA (Swedish International Development Agency), which has one of the most far-reaching programs, have not met expectations. While WiD has become accepted within the bureaucracy, it is still seen as peripheral, and is inadequately resourced.[Note 24] A study tracing WiD thinking at the World Bank concludes:

> As one bank staff member put it, women are not ignored on purpose. However, they are not purposefully included either. WiD is being treated as a residual issue that may or may not be addressed depending on interest, rather than as a matter of bank policy.[Note 25]

Kathleen Newland traces the growth of the WiD movement from the 1970s and notes the many contradictions which emerged in it. For example, she examines divisions which result when Western women plunge into analyses of the oppression of Third World women by applying Western feminist values with little respect for Third World cultures.

Women from then-Marxist-ruled countries were relatively passive in the debate, pointing to their own successes and identifying Third World women's oppression with capitalism. Third World women reacted with anger at the patronizing tone of the debate, and the denigration of their culture while seeing that Western women were not questioning basic assumptions (such as the intrinsic value in development using Western models.)

But, Newland reports, in spite of conflicts, the movement was growing, dynamic, and alive. However, she reports, the designation by the UN General Assembly of 1975 as International Women's Year, followed by the International Women's Decade, coopted this dynamic, albeit conflicted, movement. The debate shifted away from basic questions of sexism, power, and values to statements at intergovernmental meetings and technical discussions.

The literature on development and North/South relations contains many other examples of ways in which women are systematically discriminated against in the international policy arena. Women are not only excluded from decision making in areas of war and peace, but are also poorly represented in the international policy-making apparatus, even in those "soft" areas where women have been given responsibilities in some countries.

To cite just one more example, structures of international debt oppress and kill women and children in many countries throughout the world. Decisions made on a structural adjustment program in a given country are often matters of life and death, not just technical decisions made on the basis of economic criteria. To the extent women do not participate in those decisions, and to the extent women's voices are not heard, those policies will continue to oppress them.

3.4. Conceptualizing international politics

The very way in which we think about international relations is bounded by male conceptions of power, sovereignty, and interstate relations:

> International relations theory, has, overwhelmingly, been constructed by men working with mental models of human activity and society seen through a male eye and apprehended through a male sensibility.... As long as the discipline excludes all that flows from women's experiences of the world from its field of vision, it will continue working with a vision of the world that is more partial and distorted than is otherwise possible.[Note 26]

While many are comfortable with the idea that women are a social group which should be studied, and are even comfortable with the idea of looking at female participation in international politics, there is greater reluctance to consider feminist challenges to the field of international relations. For example, international politics is generally understood as relations between sovereign nation-states. But some feminists are now beginning to question this, and to suggest that some subjects traditionally considered as belonging to the "private" (as opposed to the "public") sphere (such as family issues) are, in fact, greatly affected by international policy decisions.

Similarly, actors in international politics are generally assumed to be diplomats or other representatives of nation-states. But that assumption is being questioned by feminist scholars such as Cynthia Enloe who look at a transnational network of actors affecting international policies. She includes women active in many roles - for example, prostitutes near foreign military bases, wives of missionaries (who frequently imposed certain cultural values on the people with whom they came into contact), and Northern consumers (who shape international commodity transactions which, in turn, affect women's lives in many countries).[Note 27]

The way in which power is conceptualized is fundamental to our understanding of the way the international system works. Traditionally, power is seen in a male perspective as "power over" or "being able to make someone do what you want him or her to do." Moreover, it is a zero-sum game; when one country increases its power, another's power is inevitably reduced.

But, as Robert Keohane notes, if power is conceptualized as "the ability to act in concert," a different perspective emerges. No longer is it a zero-sum game; the power of all actors can be enhanced at the same time, to the extent they are able to work together.[Note 28]

Feminist analyses seek to move beyond "emphasizing the victimization of women by the patriarchal state" by considering related questions, such as the extent to which the interstate system depends on gendered roles or women's underrewarded labor.[Note 29] In other words, women not only suffer from the current system; it is based on their systematic exploitation.

Still others look at the extent to which the capitalist system incorporates male values, ignoring women's perspectives. Before the industrial revolution, women's labor was valued for its contribution to the family and community well-being. With industrialization and its changed patterns of employment and consumption, women's economic contributions were systematically devalued. Work which could not be readily assigned a monetary value, such as child care, decreased in value; non-productive factory work, such as arms making, was given a value. Moreover, as Ali

Mazrui has noted, capitalism, on the whole, became "more masculine" as it became more internationalized and mechanized.[Note 30]

Even though rejecting some important components of mainstream approaches to international relations (such as the inevitability of war), even peace researchers generally accept much of it (such as the dominance of the nation-state model), and tend to see women's issues as marginal - or even as a distraction from the main goals of disarmament and the abolition of war:

> The interplay between limited feminist analysis of the war system and the exclusion of even that limited analysis from most research and policy discussions perpetuates the same masculine exclusion of the feminine from peace research and world order studies as it has from the traditional social sciences and virtually all institutions of authority and legitimacy.[Note 31]

In recent years, there have been efforts within the peace-research community to consider feminist contributions; the International Peace Research Association has formed a working group on women and peace to stimulate debate on women's perspectives. However, Birgit Brock-Utne predicts that in the future there will be two groups of feminist peace researchers: feminist scholars (mostly women) going into peace research, and peace researchers (mostly men) looking at feminism. She predicts the men will get more attention/visibility because of their higher status within patriarchy (apparent even among peace researchers!), because feminist perspectives are threatening to even enlightened peace researchers, and because women are less likely to assert themselves.[Note 32]

3.5. Section summary

We have looked in this section at the lack of women's participation in the current international system. We have seen that women are negatively affected by decisions made on the international level, and we have seen that

the traditional ways of thinking about international politics are based on patriarchal values and provide legitimacy to the present exclusion of women from both participating in and benefiting from international politics. Now we look more closely at the effects of such exclusion on women and violence.

4. Women and Violence

4.1. Wars

There seems to be a trend toward more women participating in the armed forces. Women have played leadership roles in revolutionary situations in Nicaragua, El Salvador, Angola, Namibia, Eritrea and a host of other struggles. In nonrevolutionary situations, women's military participation has been largely limited to industrialized countries.

One result of the Gulf war has been a narrowing of the gap between US men's and women's military duties. While women were excluded from "combat positions," they were allowed to launch missiles. As wars of intervention become more technological (from the intervenor's side), it is likely women will play more active military roles. The fact that 20,000 US women were sent to the Gulf also changed the perception of the role of women in combat - as well as patterns of child care in the United States (where grandmothers assumed most of the childcare role while mothers were off fighting).

It also changed patterns of combat within Israel; the Gulf war was the first of Israel's wars where its Jewish males didn't fight, but sat with their women and children in sealed rooms. In Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, the war and the presence of foreign troops, including women, led women in those countries to question their own social roles as well.[Note 33]

But, in spite of some trends in the Gulf war, women still generally participate as victims in most wars and other forms of communal violence. As we have seen, rape and sexual intimidation is a common feature of warfare in all societies. Most wars are still fought largely by men, but, increasingly, civilians are the victims. Thus in World War I, about 5 percent of casualties were civilians. In World War II, that figure increased to

50-75 percent. Civilian casualties in more recent wars are over 90 percent. This means that women are now about as likely as men to be war casualties.

Of the world's refugee population of 17 million, over half are children under 16; among adults, women make up a majority. Although systematic data are lacking, it appears that men are more likely to stay behind to fight and/or to be killed. However, for refugee women, escape from the immediate fighting often does not mean escape from violence. Women suffer attacks during their flight, at borders, and in refugee camps.

Unfortunately, rape, intimidation, and harassment are not uncommon in most of the world's refugee populations. The breakdown of social norms and mores against violence as a result of uprooting may create a climate of violence within refugee camps. A survey by nongovernmental organizations showed that the biggest threat to women refugees living in camps came from domestic and community violence.[Note 34]

While the war that displaces women from their homes is usually considered to be a matter of international politics, the violence they experience in refugee camps is traditionally considered marginal to international affairs. And yet, that violence is affected by international policy decisions - such as budgeting and programming policies of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees.

On a broader scale, refugee issues are generally considered marginal to the great debates on war and peace; refugees are seen as the tragic, but inevitable, consequences of conflict. Some authors go so far as to describe refugees as a "necessary condition" for social change.[Note 35]

In situations short of war, where human rights violations are widespread and repressive governments reign, women are also victims. They may be imprisoned, tortured, and killed for their own political activities, or as a way to intimidate male relatives or colleagues. (Thus, a woman might be abducted as a way of pressuring her husband or father or brother or son to turn himself in.)

Sometimes, women suffer human rights abuses because they reject social mores and customs about their proper role. Thus, some women from

Iran fled their country because of reprisals for refusing to wear a veil or to abandon certain professional occupations.

Women suffer greatly in these situations from violence against family members and communities. As we shall see in subsequent sections, this 5 has been one of the main motivating forces for women's organizations. While both mothers and fathers grieve over an imprisoned child or a disap- i peared spouse, in cultures where women derive their identity from their role within the family, such a loss may be deeper than for the man. That is, when a mother loses a child, she loses not just a loved one, but also part of her identity, part of her reason for being.

Women suffer as well from the effects of militarized economies. When governments choose to devote scarce resources to arms and wars, women suffer disproportionately. For example, when a government shifts money from education to military spending, women more than men lose jobs in education. And men more than women gain jobs in the military sector. The relationship between military spending and debt is also well documented; as we have seen, women and children suffer disproportionately from the economic and social consequences of large foreign debt.

Wars have other consequences for women. For instance, there is considerable evidence that men returning from war are more likely to be violent toward their wives. One counsellor working with US veterans of the Vietnam war reports about a third of those seeking counselling from his center were involved in violence against women. Of veterans married before going to Vietnam, almost 40 percent were divorced within six months of returning home. Half the veterans treated at the center suffered persistent problems of emotional adjustment. He goes on to report that, nationally, unconfirmed reports estimate that more Vietnam veterans have died by suicide since the war than died in Vietnam (58,000).[Note 36] In sum:

Militarism and violence against women are inextricably linked. Military spending not only creates an economic injustice for women, it supports the ethic of violence against women.[Note 37]

4.2. Violence beyond wars

> If a person is murdered because of his or her politics, the world justifiably responds with outrage. But if a person is beaten or allowed to die because she is female, the world dismisses it as "cultural tradition."[Note 38]

In traditional conceptions of international politics, wars between or within countries are considered matters of international politics, while violence against women in family or community situations is considered private. Women are rejecting that distinction, with far-reaching consequences.

Violence against women occurs in many settings. In fighting between armies and within the family, violence against women is widespread and related to patriarchal structures. In some cultures, beating wives and children is an accepted tradition. In other cultures, violence against women and children is becoming more prevalent as a result of a breakdown of social mores, increasing urbanization, frustrations resulting from unemployment, and alcoholism and other forms of drug addiction.

It is perhaps the case in most cultures that violence against women is not openly discussed or acknowledged. Rather it is kept under cover by a tradition that a man's home is his castle and that what he does at home is only of concern to him and his family - not to the community.

In Papua New Guinea, a law reform committee reported that 67 percent of rural women and 56 percent of urban women had been victims of wife abuse. But when the PNG parliament debated some years ago whether wife beating should be outlawed, most parliamentarians were violently opposed, on grounds the government should not interfere in family life. William Wi argued that wife beating "is an accepted custom.... We are wasting our time debating the issue."[Note 39]

In the United States, Susan B. Anthony is said to have met far more resistance among Quakers for sheltering a woman being battered by her husband than for housing escaped slaves.[Note 40]

When cases of family violence come before the courts, almost universally, the social impulse is to preserve the family at all costs, even if this compromises a woman's safety. As a male High Court judge in Uganda said: "It is better for one person to suffer rather than risk a complete breakdown of family life."[Note 41]

Statistics on violence against women are alarming and almost universal. In Peru, 70 percent of all crimes reported to the police are of women being beaten by their partners. A study in the largest slum of Bangkok found that 50 percent of married women are beaten regularly. In Austria in 1985, 54 percent of all murders were committed in the family, with women and children constituting 90 percent of the victims. Dowry deaths in India and Bangladesh number in the thousands. (Women's advocates in those countries are quick to point out that bride burning is but the most visible and sensational symbol of a continuum of violence.) One in four US women can expect to be the victim of domestic violence during her lifetime. [Note 42]

Explanations abound for the reasons for the persistence of violence against women within the family. But as Sanna Naidoo says, "Some people say that unemployment, alcohol, dagga [marijuana] and over-crowded housing causes men to beat women. Things like shebeen [local bars] and poverty do make things worse. But they are not the root cause of the problem. Men get away with beating their wives and girlfriends because they believe that it is men's right to own and control women."[Note 43]

5. Women and Peace

5.1. Emergence of the Western women's peace movement

To focus on rage alone will exhaust our strength, forge our energy into a tool of the patriarchy's death lure, force us to concede allegiance to the path of violence and destruction.

On the other hand, compassion without rage renders us impotent, seduces us into watered-down humanism, stifles our good energy.

Without rage, we settle for slow change, feel thankful for tidbits of autonomy tossed our way, ask for something mediocre like "equality." It is with our rage we defy the male supremacies, find the courage to risk resistance.

And it is with our intimate connection to the life force which pulses through our veins that we insist there is another way to be. By combining our rage with compassion, we live the revolution every day.[Note 44]

Since the beginnings of recorded history, women have been working for peace - and picking up the pieces from the wars started by men:

The basic energies common to all human beings have been redirected so that men seek power and women protect men from the consequence of power seeking. ... At the close of every war, destroyed communities have been rebuilt, and much of the physical labor of rebuilding has been women's work.

Another activity traditionally expected of women is conflict resolution, since it is troublesome to go to war all the time. The old practice of marrying the daughters of one village to the sons of the next was a war-avoidance strategy.[Note 45]

One characteristic of the contemporary women's peace movement is that it tends to see connections - between domestic violence and war, economic oppression and militarism, women's rights and environmental concerns. We turn now to a brief review of its history.

The modern Western women's peace movement is usually dated from the middle of the 19th century. At that time, several social movements emerged - against slavery; for women's rights, labor unions, temperance, nonviolence. The Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society (founded in 1833) was the first active political organization for women in the United States.

The movement for women's suffrage, which grew throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries, often linked a concern for peace with a commitment to women's rights. Indeed, reading some of the early suffragette literature is a sobering experience; many expected wars to end once women had the vote.[Note 46]

In the years before World War I, women in Europe and North America organized to try to prevent it. In July 1914, the International Women Suffrage Alliance presented a petition for peace to the UK foreign ministry, from 12 million women in 26 countries.

Once war broke out, the suffrage movement divided. Some supported the war efforts of their government; others continued to work for peace. An international group of women decided to organize the International Congress of Women, in the Hague in April 1915. Presided over by Jane Addams, it brought together over a thousand women, and agreed to send envoys to European and the US governments in a plea to stop the war.

The congress didn't stop the war, but it did create a basis for the women's peace movement. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom was born out of the Hague conference. The Women's Peace Crusade, formed in 1917-18, brought in grassroots movements. These women's peace groups faced tremendous resistance in their own societies as they sought to mobilize antiwar sentiment.

In 1923, three women - Jesse Wallace Hughan, Tracy Mygatt, and Frances Witherspoon - founded the War Resisters League. Jeanette Rankin was the only member of Congress to vote against US participation in both world wars, and was a steadfast worker for peace.

Women's groups mobilized against World War II, and women's peace movements sprang up in its aftermath to combat the Cold War mentality. In the United States, such groups were harassed and intimidated during the McCarthy era. Women's Strike for Peace was formed in 1961 to protest the arms race.

Scandinavian Women for Peace brought half a million signatures (and German women 100,000 more) to the UN secretary-general at the world conference of the International Women's Decade, in Copenhagen in 1980.

At Greenham Common and the Pentagon, women's actions for peace mobilized thousands of women to protest policies making nuclear war more likely.

In thousands of other communities, women have not only opposed war, but have also organized to resist the invasion of their countries. Vietnamese women have played a vital role in the struggles of their country for centuries, beginning with the national uprising in 39, led by the two sisters Trung, against the aggression of the feudal An dynasty from the north.

Me Katilili, a 70-year-old woman in Kenya, organized her people against the British in the Giriama uprising of 1911-1914. Campaigning from settlement to settlement, she incited the people with fiery speeches and built solidarity among the Giriama, who pledged to refuse to pay taxes and do forced labor, and to keep colonial settlers from their lands. When the resistance fighters set several government offices on fire, the British arrested Me Katilili and sent her to prison.

5.2. Women's initiatives for peace and justice

After generations of silence, the stories of women's struggles for social change and peace, of courage in confronting the forces of death are beginning to be told - women in Northern Ireland protesting the violence there, Palestinian and Israeli women trying to overcome barriers of distrust and enmity, the mothers of the Plaza de Mayo in Argentina, Japanese women protesting racism and nuclearism, South African women whose long history of nonviolent resistance has been central to that country's struggle, Nigerian women taking over the marketplace, and many, many more. Two recent books by Pam McAllister *(You Can't Kill the Spirit* and *This River of Courage)* are collections of such stories:

> Storytelling makes the world stronger because the stories reveal the complexity of our truth. In telling our stories we resist diminishing our truths into vague or generalized abstractions; we maintain the urgency and intensity of the concrete.... [In the telling of stories of resistance and action,] the courage that has come before is not lost but flows like a river, cutting through history's bleakest terrains and

most barren deserts, its waters feeding us still, sustaining life through our valleys of despair.[Note 47]

Each story is unique, situated in a particular context of time and place. But certain themes run through them all, as three contemporary examples show.

In Sri Lanka, a bloody civil war has led to thousands of deaths throughout the country. Part of the violence has been the disappearance of at least 25,000, and perhaps as many as 60,000, Sinhalese boys and men who were abducted from their homes, most probably as a result of JVP (People's Liberation Front) terror. In some cases, their bodies have been recovered. In most cases, their disappearance remains officially unacknowledged.

In 1990, Richard de Zoysa was abducted and murdered. His was not a typical case because he was of high caste and spoke English fluently, and his mother was a respected medical doctor in the country's capital. But, like mothers in other parts of the world, when she sought information, the death threats began: "You are about to set out on a venture seemingly to avenge your son's death. If you do so, you too become a traitor. Mourn the death of your son - as a mother you must do so. Any other steps will result in your death at the most unexpected time. Only silence will protect you."

But his mother, Manorani Saravanamuttu, did not keep silent. From her anger and her pain, the Mothers Front emerged, a mass movement of 25,000 mothers of Sri Lanka's "disappeared." Despite police threats and government allegations of subversion, the mothers have held rallies and presented their demands to the government.[Note 48] Like the Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo and the Mothers of the Disappeared in El Salvador, these Sri Lankan women organized and risked their lives because of their children.

In Serbia, women have been manipulated into supporting the war in the former Yugoslavia. "I call upon all Serbian women to give birth to one more son in order to carry out their national debt," said one politician. Another, Rada Trajkovic of the Association of Kosovo Serbs, was even

more explicit: "For each soldier fallen in the war against Slovenia [June 1991] Serbian women must give birth to 100 more sons."

Men are urged to fight for the cause and not to listen to women urging peace. Said one parliamentarian: "We in Montenegro believe that a man who is fighting at the front and allows himself to be hauled back home by a woman should commit suicide at once."

But small groups of women began to organize. A committee of women was formed in Montenegro in October 1991 to protest the war and the killing. In July 1991, a parliamentary session in Belgrade was interrupted by several hundred parents, mostly conscripts' mothers. Said the women:

> This was the first civil society initiative against the war in the federal capital and the first to protest against the abuse of women's reproductive work by the state, nation, army and party. Men are the controllers of the war and of our sons. We do not give them permission to push our sons forward to kill one another.

At the beginning of the war, women from different ethnic groups and backgrounds throughout ex-Yugoslavia began to establish contacts with one another and to engage in joint and simultaneous protests, such as the weekly demonstrations by the "women in black." But, as the war intensified, antiwar activities became more difficult.[Note 49]

The women-in-black demonstrations in Serbia have been the target of abuse, insults, and threats. Animosity hardened as the casualties - and atrocities - grew. Communication and other links among women's groups on various sides of the conflict became more difficult to sustain. While a few struggled to continue contacts, others seemed to be waiting for an end to the war.

Karen Ridd of Peace Brigades International worked in El Salvador with COMADRES (the Committee of Mothers of the Disappeared of El Salvador). She recalls that in 1989, in the middle of the night, a bomb blasted open the front of the building where the COMADRES office was. Soldiers gathered outside, preparing to enter and raid the office. In the tension of the moment, women began to make coffee:

The foreigners inside the building were aghast. It is 3.30 in the morning, a bomb has just gone off, the soldiers are about to drag everyone away - and the mothers are making coffee. Have they lost their minds?

When the coffee is ready, the women pour it into cups and take it, steaming, out to the soldiers in the street. They are young, the soldiers in El Salvador. Some of them are scarcely 16 years old. It is the middle of the night. They are tired, cold, and miserable. Probably they are a little nervous too. They take the coffee, not hesitating, and drink it.

In that moment, something changes. For, having drunk the coffee someone has offered you, having shared that symbolic meal, having partaken of someone's hospitality, it becomes impossible to turn around and raid their office, dragging them away.

The soldiers finished their coffee, handed back the mugs, and slipped quietly away. The women began to reconstruct their wall.[Note 50]

The following month, soldiers raided the offices and arrested nine COMADRES activists. Amnesty International reports that some of those arrested later said they were blindfolded, handcuffed, and beaten in deten-tion.[Note 51]

In all three stories, women act as mothers - agonizing over their child-ren's disappearances, angry because continuing violence destroys their families. Maternal thinking is a powerful motivation for action, but, as the next section shows, not the only force behind women's actions for peace and justice.

6. Maternal Thinking

The extent to which women's political activism and commitment to peace results from their experiences as mothers has been explored by both activists

and academics. One of the most influential authors in this field is Sara Ruddick. She looks at relationships between maternal thinking and peace politics, beginning with implications of caring for children as a regular and substantial part of one's working life.[Note 52]

She argues that to be a mother is to take "upon oneself the responsibility of child care, making its work a regular and substantial part of one's working life." Although most mothers have been and are women, some men can identify with maternal work. And, she argues, mothering is essentially different from fathering as "fatherhood is more a role determined by cultural demands than a kind of work determined by children's needs."[Note 53]

Ruddick finds that mothers acquire a fundamental attitude toward the vulnerable, a protectiveness she calls "holding." That means:

> to minimize risk and to reconcile differences rather than to sharply accentuate them. Holding is a way of seeing with an eye toward maintaining the minimum harmony, material resources and skills necessary for sustaining a child in safety.[Note 54]

Maternal thinking is reinforced by women's work in the "caring labor" of "sheltering, nursing, feeding, kin work, teaching the very young, tending the frail elderly."[Note 55] Maternal roles in resolving conflicts within their families, reconciling differences, and naming threats to their children creates a certain predisposition toward working for peace and using nonviolence.

But, being a mother isn't enough to lead to peace; like men, women are often caught up in the pressures of conflict and the excitement of war. The relationship between maternal roles and peace is more complicated:

> A pure maternal peacefulness does not exist; what does exist is far more complicated: a deep unease with military endeavors not easily disentangled from patriotic and maternal impulses to applaud, connect, and heal; a history of caring labor interwoven with the romance of violence and the parochial self-righteousness on which militarism depends.[Note 56]

This unease with militarism coupled with women's history of caring intervention not only creates a predisposition to resist violence, but also a justification for action. Maternal protectiveness is continually expanding its domain of action. A mother's concern to keep her home safe expands to working for a safe community or to opposing governments which threaten that security.

Motherhood is a powerful motivation for political action in all parts of the world. The mothers of the Plaza de Mayo in Argentina acted as mothers - not as political activists - when they began to protest the lack of information about their disappeared children:

> No mother is asked what her ideology is or what she does; neither do we ask what her children were doing. We do not defend ideologies; we defend life.... Our great concern is not to be manipulated by any political party.... Neither the government's threats nor their rifles are a match for the faith of a mother.[Note 57]

In repressive situations, when women act because they are mothers, authoritarian governments often don't know how to react. For example, during the military dictatorship in Uruguay, women's groups could act even when more political mixed groups were forbidden. The women were acting because of their family roles:

> There was nothing feminist in their formulation; motherhood and housewifery propelled them to act.... The military ideology, with its paternalistic overtones, could not find fault with what Uruguayan women were doing because women were doing what they were supposed to do according to the military definition of gender roles: they were acting as mothers, wives, and housewives.[Note 58]

Similarly, Palestinian women's involvement in the struggle for self-determination is shaped by their role within the family. Palestinian women's groups

don't use Western arguments that women should not be regarded *only* as wives and mothers, but rather that they should be respected *because* they are wives and mothers responsible for the upbringing of Palestinian children.[Note 59]

When women act as mothers, even without political consciousness, they play a role in transforming society. Referring to the mothers of the Plaza de Mayo, Maria del Carmen Feijoó argues:

> In practice, the madres became another movement of women who, without trying to change patriarchal ideology or abandon their femininity, produced a transformation of the traditional feminine conscience and its political role. As a result, a practical redefinition of the content of the private and public realms has emerged.[Note 60]

Maternal thinking and roles don't lead to defiant action only against oppressive governments, for "when women mobilize as mothers on behalf of their families, they become a potent political force, but one as adaptable to repressive as to liberating causes."[Note 61] Repressive governments from Hitler's Germany to Pinochet's Chile have mobilized women to support their regimes by appeals to defense of the family.

Some feminists are critical of a peace movement built on women's identity as mothers. Women play many roles in society; justifications based on biology reinforce patriarchy. They also suggest that linking maternal values to peacemaking absolves men of their equal responsibility to value and protect life.[Note 62]

Of course, women are motivated to work for peace and justice for many reasons. Sometimes they are moved to action because governmental policies threaten their place in the family and society. As early as 1913, Indian women in South Africa organized when the government said only

Christian marriages were legal. In Iran, women's groups organized for the right not to wear a veil; in some cases their protests led to their deaths.

Sometimes, women see their actions as motivated by forces larger than their own self-interest. As Maggie Lowry explained her presence at Greenham Common:

> I am not here just because I don't want my children to grow up threatened with a nuclear holocaust, nor for the opportunity of sheltering from the flagrant sexism I used to confront in the streets of a busy city. I am here because my heart weeps over the great folly of men planning for war throughout the ages.[Note 63]

7. Women Organizing for Peace and Change

One problem in analyzing women's political actions is that the term "political" has been largely defined by men. Women's activities in community or church groups, for example, are often labeled "volunteer," "charitable," or "social," even though they have a political impact. As Bookman and Morgen conclude:

> Until we broaden our definition of politics to include the everyday struggle to survive and to change power relations in our society ... women's political action will remain obscured.[Note 64]

As we have seen, women organize for social change for different reasons. Guida West and Rhoda Lois Blumberg suggest four types of issues around which women organize:

> 1. economic survival (food, jobs, welfare).

> 2. nationalist or racial/ethnic (both right- and left-wing issues).

> 3. humanistic/nurturing (peace, environment, education, mental health care, etc.; most closely related to "maternal thinking," where women have historically justified political involvement as an extension of their nurturing work at home).

> 4. women's rights.[Note 65]

Though these are presented as separate categories, in fact they overlap and vary considerably. And, many women involved in one type of social movement come to see connections, and become involved in others.

Sometimes, women organize in women's groups because they feel there is no place for them within existing action groups. There are many stories of women working within progressive social movements and struggles for national liberation who left because of sexism. As one Israeli woman activist says:

> Peace Now leadership is definitely chauvinist.... They are getting better, but they have no awareness that women have something to say and want to be addressed equally. Yes, there are women there, but did you see any of them on television? Did you know about them?[Note 66]

There are also cases where women's peace initiatives are disdained by men's groups - until they become successful, at which time the men-dominated groups try to coopt them.[Note 67]

For their study of women in social protest movements, West and Blumberg compared women's involvement in gender-integrated and genderseparated movements and found what they call "the iron law of patriarchy." In groups of women and men working together on issues, even progressive issues, the result is male domination.[Note 68]

In other cases, changes in the social context appear to encourage women's participation in protest activities. For example, in Brazil,

socio-economic changes under the military dictatorship led to a dramatic expansion of women in higher education while an increasingly active Roman Catholicism led women militants to work in poor areas. The return of women exiles to South America following the transition from military rule was another force encouraging women to take a more activist role.[Note 69]

The story (pp. 29-30) of the Salvadoran women also indicates that women's groups sometimes engage in different kinds of activities than mixed groups. While generalizations are impossible, there are some suggestions of ways in which women's work for peace differs from others. Brock-Utne identifies three characteristics of women's work for peace:

1. It is connected to the concern for human life, especially for children, but also for themselves and other women.

2. It uses a varied set of nonviolent techniques, acts, and strategies.

3. It is transpolitical, often transnational, and aimed at reaching other women in the opposite camp.

The rich variety of nonviolent techniques used by women has been amply demonstrated in the books edited by McAllister (footnotes 1 and 47), as well as by individual stories women have told throughout the ages. Ruddick notes that skills required by mothers in daily life reflect four ideals of nonviolent peacemaking: renunciation, resistance, reconciliation, and peacekeeping.[Note 70]

And yet, much of women's peace work remains invisible. Except for occasional coverage of large demonstrations, the activities of women's peace groups are usually unreported by the mass media. When they are reported, they are often trivialized.

The process of recovering women's experiences of resistance and nonviolent action is just beginning. There is much we don't know about how women organize for peace and justice. Research on the internal structures of women's groups is scanty, though there is some evidence women's groups tend to be less hierarchical and more concerned with networking than with developing a "territorial" sense of a power base.

In general, it appears that women's groups are less concerned than other groups with structures, formal membership, constitutions, and formal

leadership. The friendship and solidarity which women experience in these groups may be as important as the political causes they espouse. Participation in communal kitchens and volunteer feeding programmes was a necessary economic survival strategy for Peruvian women, but studies show women *stay* in these groups because of the solidarity and friendship they feel with other women in the group.[Note 71] They tend to organize around a specific cause or grievance, from disappeared children to disappearing forests.

Often, in the course of their work on the particular issue, they come to see the larger connections and move into new, often more political areas of work. Women at Greenham Common report that the link between small affinity groups and the international movement was a source of strength and creativity. The small affinity groups encouraged direct actions which no central organizational structure could have imagined or planned. Instead of being an isolated enclave, "the affinity group is linked to others in an international network, which shares some if not all the small group's goals."[Note 72]

The de-emphasis on formal structures also creates problems for some groups. Women's groups may avoid conflict and may have ambiguous feelings about leadership, oscillating between being anti-leadership and responding to charismatic leaders.[Note 73] As Mallica Vajrathon notes:

> It is not easy for us [Thai women] to get organized and take action as a group - because we are influenced by Buddhism, which taught each of us to be self-reliant and to look after herself as an individual. The other difficulty we face is that... most Thai women prefer negotiations to manipulate the weakness of male opposition to our advantage, rather than to engage in confrontation with the male establishment and structure, whose sexist attitudes will take a long time to change.[Note 74]

These characteristics apply not only to Thai women, but to women in many cultures who prefer to avoid confrontation and conflict. In a study of the Working Women's Forum in Madras (India), a researcher reports that in initial interviews:

> A word was ringing in my ears. It was not a word I expected, like "power," "empowerment," "leadership," or "good or bad leaders." It was *"dhairiyam,"* i.e., courageous, brave, or, bold....

> Truly, grassroots leadership is about boldness: the boldness to face one's life and one's community, to bring to consciousness inner contradictions and conflicting values, to challenge the fear of injustice and oppression, to overcome cowardice in oneself and others, and to walk away from stale and stifling traditions. It is about the courage to change and to be, that is, to step out of a well-trod rut to start on a new and unknown path.[Note 75]

This boldness is apparent when one listens to the stories of women activists working in war-torn countries. It requires courage to confront police or a dictatorial government, but often women's actions for peace and justice exhibit boldness and creativity that almost mocks the forces of oppression.

One thinks of the mothers of the Plaza de Mayo who not only gathered in the city's main square to protest their children's disappearances, but who also used symbols and photographs to move beyond protest to confront the powers of the government. One thinks also of the Green Belt movement in Kenya where the simple act of planting trees has acquired a political momentum of boldness.

In other situations, where the degree of personal risk is less, women have shown great creativity in confronting the war machine. For example, at Greenham Common and the Women's Pentagon Action, women

activists have used their creativity to dramatize the threat posed by expanding nuclear arsenals.

Perhaps the greatest contribution to justice and peace of organized groups of women is the emphasis on networks which emerge out of sharing stories and seeing common bonds. Concepts of national security and national defense seem to have a different meaning for women. Examples abound of cases where women have reached out to women on the other side in an effort to find common bonds.

International solidarity has been expressed in a variety of ways among women's groups struggling in different ways on different issues. Sometimes these international connections can provide protection to women endangered because of their activities.

The fact that women organize around different issues sometimes leads to tension, particularly between Northern and Southern women who have different priorities. While Western white women have been at the forefront of efforts to dismantle the nuclear arms race, others have engaged in different struggles:

> From the point of view of women of color, who are the majority of the majority of the world's people, and who are also the poorest, the threat of nuclear war and nuclear power is inseparable from day-to-day military-industrial repression: "sex," "race," and "class" issues are "peace" issues.[Note 76]

Today, women's struggles encompass the full range of peace, justice, and environmental issues. Women are protesting racism and nuclear dumping, wife abuse and policies of the International Monetary Fund, military spending and sexual harassment. In many cases, women organize around a specific issue, such as providing food to a shantytown, but in doing so they often come to see the connections and move beyond the group's original purpose.

At the same time, it is important to recognize that women often organize - or are organized - in support of the status quo. For instance, though some women's groups in Chile organized for democracy and life during the Pinochet dictatorship there, not all espoused progressive political agendas. Ximena Bunster recounts the network of pro-Pincohet women's organizations created to support the military dictatorship. An estimated 2

million women were involved in them in the 1973-1983 period. This mobilized political support from women was crucial to Pincohet's remaining in power.[Note 77]

We also don't know much about what happens to women's groups in the long run. There is some evidence that those which emerge to meet a specific situation simply fade away once that situation changes. In Argentina, for example, women mobilized in opposition to the dictatorship and for human rights. They were effective advocates of change. But, once the transition to democracy occurred, women became less visible, leading one Argentinean to write:

> The Argentine experience may confirm the generalization that women mobilize to meet the demands of a crisis, but this mobilization is fragile, and women often return home when the crisis is past.[Note 78]

Moreover, the skills that are effective in mobilizing women to protest and denounce are not as effective in working within traditional political structures. Political know-how and negotiating tactics are essential.

A similar dynamic has been apparent in other countries undergoing transition. In Uruguay, for example, women's groups were active during the military dictatorship but were organizationally limited in scope and lifespan. They couldn't - or wouldn't - move toward solidifying their organizational base. They remained loosely structured with a fluctuating membership, and reluctant to plan beyond the immediate situation. Formed to solve particular problems without any reference to the global context, once the problems disappeared, the groups dissolved.[Note 79]

8. Women and Nonviolence

Of course, there are cases where women have used violence in defense of their goals. But much more common has been their commitment to nonviolence, applied in countless creative ways (and largely ignored in the standard works on the subject).

Nonviolence means different things to different people. To some, it means passivity, turning the other cheek, being less militant than those who use violence. To others, it is one of many tactics to use in a struggle. To still others, it is much more than a convenient tactic. It has a spiritual grounding; it is a way of life.

Though nonviolence has a long history, and has been shaped by the words and actions of many people, it is most often associated with Mahatma Gandhi. He saw the essence of nonviolence as *satyagraha* (the life force of truth). His commitment to nonviolence was much more than a tactic. Rather than something for the weak, it was for the powerful, that is, those with truth on their side. In actions and writings over 30 years, Gandhi demonstrated the power of nonviolence, not only to bring about political change, but also to transform lives.

Gandhi attributes much of his learning about nonviolence to the suffragette movement in England. But nonviolent women revolutionaries emerged as leaders of the independence movement long before Gandhi. Elise Boulding also cites the groundbreaking work of Kristo and Kumudini Mitter, Swami Kumari and Saria Devi and Bhikaiji K.R. Cama. More than 60 percent of the participants in the 1930 Salt March organized by Gandhi were women; of the 30,000 arrested in connection with it, 17,000 were women.[Note 80] In 1942, a teenager, Kanak Lata Barua, and a 73-year-old, Manangini Harza, were shot by British forces during separate independence marches in India:

> [They] stand for many women who provided the leadership which helped village women all over India take the courage to engage in civil disobedience against the salt tax and other indignities, face English gunfire unarmed, and accept martyrdom in the hundreds, imprisonment in the thousands.[Note 81]

Gandhi has inspired both men and women to consider ways to use nonviolence in different situations. But women, perhaps more than men, are drawn to his teaching of nonviolence grounded in love, truth, and spirituality. Gandhi himself saw women as offering the best hope for the practice of nonviolence.

However, some feminists have questioned the applicability of Gandhian principles to current women's current struggles. Judy Costello suggests that men and women need to approach nonviolence differently. While Gandhi saw suffering and self-sacrifice as the essence of nonviolence, women have often been too self-sacrificing, too willing to make excuses for abusers, and perhaps need to work more on developing their self-love and self-acceptance.(Note 82)

Other feminists have criticized any practice of nonviolence which does not include a commitment to women's issues:

> In my view, any commitment to nonviolence which is real, which is authentic, must begin in the recognition of the forms and degrees of violence perpetuated by the gender class men. Any analysis of violence, or any commitment to act against it, that does not begin there is hollow, meaningless - a sham which will have, as its direct consequence, the perpetuation of our servitude. In my view, any male apostle of socalled nonviolence which is not committed, body and soul, to ending the violence against us is not trustworthy.... He is someone to whom our lives are invisible.(Note 83)

In spite of these criticisms (primarily from Western women), nonviolence continues to be used by women's groups. It may be, as Birgit Brock-Utne suggests, that in countries where women are associated with nonviolence it is degraded. But, certainly the events of the past few years - the transformation of Eastern Europe, for example - show the power of nonviolence to bring about political and social change.

Of course, in some situations, it is difficult to separate the relative importance in bringing about change of the armed struggle and larger, nonviolent movements. In El Salvador, for example, the success of the guerrilla forces in achieving a military stalemate with the government's troops was undoubtedly a major factor leading to a negotiated settlement. But, the actions of thousands of Salvadorans in nonviolent protests, strikes, demonstrations, and other acts were also crucial. In all of these actions, women played an important role - which they continue to play in many countries.

9. Women's Rights and Social Transformation

As we have seen, women's groups organize for a variety of reasons around a range of issues. In recent years, tension has developed between women who see women's rights as paramount and women who see larger political or national issues as most urgent.

Women working for women's rights tend to see patriarchal structures as the problem, and see that the world will not be changed until all human beings can live in freedom and dignity. This position is associated with Western feminists, though it can be found among women's groups in every part of the world.

They tend to see militarism, authoritarian political structures, and unjust economic and social policies as consequences of male-dominated thinking. As long as patriarchal structures exist, and as long as women's values and perspectives are devalued, political change is meaningless.

Many in this group have had experiences in working with broader peace and justice groups; the chauvinism of some male leaders of progressive movements, the unresponsiveness of the groups to women's demands, the realization that women are often second-class citizens within these groups has brought them to an awareness of the primacy of women's concerns.

Another group of women, equally angry at injustice and violence, judges that the most important issues are not women's rights per se, but other political and social struggles. They may ally themselves with a political party or social movement working for national liberation or political transformation. This approach is often associated with Third World women's groups, though many Western women share these views.

Though often concerned about women's rights, they tend to see the issue in terms of the need for the transformation of oppressive structures. They tend to ally themselves with men working for the same cause. How can women be free, they ask, when the whole country or race or class is oppressed?

Sometimes they perceive that insisting on women's issues will divide a movement or people at a time when unity is necessary to confront oppression. They are often critical of Western feminists working for their own self-interests while ignoring the economic and political structures which condemn a majority of the world's people to poverty and injustice.

Of course, the division between these two groups isn't as clear as depicted here. Many feminists are also working for broader social causes and decry imperialism and interventionist policies. Many women working

for political transformation also carry on their own struggles against sexism within various organizations.

But the tension is real. Western feminists are accused of imposing their agendas on other parts of the world, often in culturally inappropriate ways. Sometimes they feel that if struggles for national liberation do not include a commitment to including women in the new political reality, little will have changed. As Enloe says, if struggles for social change only result in a larger number of patriarchal nation-states sitting around the same table, the international system will remain the same.[Note 84]

At the same time, Third World critics point out that Western feminists must recognize their own complicity in creating and sustaining unjust structures which exploit the majority of the world's people. Unless Western feminists can see US support for the contras, or French nuclear testing in the Pacific, or the mammoth international debt of African countries as women's issues, their efforts to improve the status of women will be perceived as elitist and irrelevant to most of the world's women.

While the tension between these two groups is apparent, increasing numbers of Western feminists and Third World women activists are coming to understand that the struggles against patriarchal structures and injustice are linked. Both issues - social transformation and the place of women in society - must be addressed at the same time.

For Ugandan women in the early 1980s, Karagwa Byanyima writes, there was no alternative for emancipation but to unite with men in guerrilla warfare and fully participate in the armed struggle:

> Ugandan women were not invited to take part in the national resistance war, they forced their way in. There was no women's movement in Uganda to encourage them, no leaders' speeches about women's emancipation, no consciousness-raising groups. The objectives of the struggle - human rights, democracy, nationalism - were clear and close to women's hearts. [And the new government insisted on women's participation in the government by appointing women to nine of the 48 cabinet seats.][Note 85]

Similarly, during the war against the Somoza dictatorship in Nicaragua, women made up 30 percent of the Frente Sandinista de Liberation Nacional and after the revolution both men and women felt women had earned the right to participate in politics. Laws were passed offering support for women's issues.[Note 86]

Likewise, Najjar reports that Palestinian women expect that because of their participation in the struggle, they will be included in the formal Palestinian government structures which emerge.[Note 87]

Other experiences suggest that the link between women's rights and participation in struggles of national liberation is far from automatic. MarieAimée Helie-Lucas writes passionately about the way in which women's contributions to the struggle for Algerian independence were devalued. Women who fought and suffered for Algerian independence hoped that after the revolution women's concerns would be taken seriously. But they were disappointed; the time was never "right" for women's issues to be brought forward:

> We are made to feel that protesting in the name of women's interests and rights is not to be done *now,* it is never, has never been, the right moment; not during the liberation struggle against colonialism, because all forces had to be mobilized against the principal enemy; not after independence, because all forces had to be mobilized to build up the devastated country; not now that racist, imperialist Western governments are attacking Islam and the Third World, and so on.

> Defending women's rights "now" - this now being *any* historical moment - is always a betrayal of the people, of the nation, of the revolution, of Islam, of national identity, of cultural roots, and so on, according to the terminology in use [at the time]...

> In Algeria, many of us, including myself, kept silent for a whole decade after independence, in order not to give ground to the enemies of the glorious Algerian revolution; by so doing, we only have given time to those in power to strengthen and organize, allowing

them, amongst many other things, to prepare and enforce discriminatory laws on women. Even now in Algeria, feminists try to analyze their oppression from within the Algerian context only, refusing to see the international side of it, for fear of being accused of betrayal.[Note 88]

Women from other regions are seeing that positive political change doesn't always mean benefits for women. In eastern Europe, political change has meant a decline in women's political participation. In the old system, quotas ensured that about a third of legislators were women. After the establishment of democratic regimes, the figure fell to about a tenth. Formerly, representatives of women's groups were "tokens," but at least they ensured "that there was a pressure group for implementing women's equality, however narrowly conceived, within the political structures of government."[Note 89]

Official women's unions or leagues were bureaucracies which represented the extended arm of the state. But, with the ending of communist rule, those organizations - like many others - have been discredited. The emerging new organizations tend to be urban based, and more responsive to issues of university-educated women than were the discredited organizations they replaced.

In Poland, estimates are that women were about half of Solidarity's membership. They played supportive roles throughout the struggle. Women saw their interests in the same terms as men. But, even though Solidarity criticized the communist regime, it didn't challenge patriarchy or the power of Roman Catholicism. When round-table negotiations began in February 1989, no women were part of any negotiating group. "The overall women's representation was pathetic. Women were not men's partners in the historical beginning of the collapse of the communist regime."[Note 90]

The political groupings which have lately come to power in eastern Europe are overwhelmingly male. Given the discrediting of the former system, there tends to be a reaction against the "progress" made on women's issues during the communist years. Access to abortion and child care as well as social welfare policies are all threatened under the new governments. In some cases, women themselves are organizing to have the right to stay home with the children, and not have to work outside the home.

Eastern European women are often ambivalent about their relations with Western feminists who don't understand the specific experiences Eastern women went through. In the West, the feminist agenda has included making the personal political; in the East, the family was often the only haven from the interference of the state and so such efforts are resisted by women's groups.

The issue of the relationship between the struggle for women's rights and the struggle for social transformation shows itself in different ways in different contexts. Those struggles must come out of the contexts in which they are born; while women can learn from the experiences of women in other parts of the world, their struggle must be shaped by their own experiences. There is no single model applicable to all groups.

And yet, women's groups of all kinds are focusing on understanding and analyzing connections - between racism and sexism, poverty and decisions made by international bureaucrats, what happens in their families and communities and the rest of the world.

As we have seen, one characteristic of women's groups working for peace and justice is a refusal to separate these issues from family issues. As the Forward-Looking Strategies document adopted at the 1985 meeting of the UN Decade for Women says:

> The questions of women and peace and the meaning of peace for women cannot be separated from the broader question of relationships between women and men in all spheres of life and family.[Note 91]

Increasingly, women are realizing that in order to change society, they must begin within the family and the community, for "women's capacity to

challenge the men in their families, their communities, or their political movements will be a key to remaking the world."[(Note 92)]

10. In Conclusion, 14 Sets of Questions

This essay has looked at several issues related to women, war, and peace. But each issue has meant questions. Some point to areas for further research. Others are political questions for activist groups:

(1) What roles do women play in shaping their children's national, religious, and ethnic identity?

(2) What roles do women play as peacemakers within their communities and families? Most of the literature on women's groups focuses on their efforts to change society or to demand justice for particular grievances. But to what extent are women involved in conflict resolution with the people in their lives? What can be learned from those experiences?

(3) How do women's groups get started? How do they grow? What is the process by which a group organizes a soup kitchen in Santiago and later moves to address political issues?

(4) What happens to women's groups in the long term? Do they fade away when the political situation changes or do they change their focus to address other issues? What is happening now with the large Western women's peace movement now that the threat of nuclear war has diminished? What is happening now with women's groups in Namibia and Nicaragua?

(5) How do women's groups deal with the inevitable conflicts that arise within any organization? Are they more effective at resolving such conflicts than groups made up of men and women or men alone?

(6) What happens to women activists? Do they continue to be active or do they go through cycles of activism and retreat?

(7) How can women's groups be supported more effectively on the national and international levels? Would more publicity about women's groups help them in their struggles, or might it lead to more efforts to repress or coopt them?

(8) How can women's groups which have a holistic vision of inter-connectedness be effective advocates for political change? It may be that groups which have a single issue or focus tend to be more effective in mobilizing support and bringing about change, but it also seems that one of women's strengths is precisely their ability to see interconnections between, say, the environment, militarism, family violence, and international debt. How does a group tackle many problems at the same time?

(9) How can women's groups reach a balance between affirming and respecting one's culture and challenging cultural traditions which oppress women?

(10) How can the issue of violence against women become part of the struggle against militarism?

(11) Are women more effective than men in overcoming North/South divisions?

(12) As energy and time are limited, should women try to make the national/international system more responsive to women, or focus on transforming the system itself? Thus, for example, should US women's groups focus on government assistance with child care, or on getting their country to pay a fair share of UN peacekeeping operations?

(13) How can stories of women's resistance and action be shared and become a part of our world's history?

(14) As just putting more women in positions of power does not mean an automatic transformation of things, what would an international system responsive to women's needs look like? How do we find time to dream, and how do we share our dreams for a world of peace and justice?

Notes

Notes page 1.

Note 1 Barbara Zanotti, "Patriarchy: A State of War," in Pam McAllister (ed.), *Reweaving the Web of Life,* New Society Publishers, Philadelphia, 1982, pp. 16-19.

Notes page 3.

Note 2 Cited in Daniela Gioseffi (ed.), *Women on War: Essential Voices for the Nuclear Age,* Touchstone Books, New York and London, 1988, p. 162.

Note 3 Carol Gilligan, *In a Different Voice,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1983.

Notes page 4.

Note 4 Hilkka Pietila, "Women's Peace Movement as an Innovative Proponent of the Peace Movement as a Whole," paper prepared for the second Interdisciplinary Congress on Women, Groningen (Netherlands), 1984 (also published as IFDP Dossier 43/1984), p. 4.

Note 5 Betty Reardon, *Sexism and the War System,* Teachers College Press, New York, 1985, p. 12.

Notes page 5.

Note 6 Jean Bethke Elshtain, *Women and War,* Harvester Press, Sussex, 1987, p. 193.

Notes page 6.

Note 7 ibid., pp. 169-170.

Notes page 7.

Note 8 Cynthia Adcock, "Fear of 'Other': The Common Root of Sexism and Militarism," in McAllister (footnote 1), pp. 209-219, quote from pp. 214 and 216.

Notes page 8.

Note 9 Cynthia Enloe, *Does Khaki Become You ? The Militarization of Women's Lives,* Pandora Press, London, 1988.

Note 10 Fred Halliday, "Hidden from International Relations: Women and the International Arena," in Rebecca Grant and Kathleen Newland (eds.), *Gender and International Relations,* Open University Press, Milton Keynes and London, 1991, pp. 158-169, quote from p. 164.

Note 11 Erika Duncan, "The Lure of the Death Culture," in McAllister (footnote 1), p. 221.

Notes page 9.

Note 12 Cited in Judith Porter Adams, *Peacework: Oral Histories of Women Peace Activists,* Twayne Publishers, Boston, 1991, p. 188.

Notes page 10.

Note 13 Mallica Vajrathon, "We Superwomen Must Allow the Men to Grow Up," in Robin Morgan (ed.), *Sisterhood is Global,* Anchor Books, New York, 1984, pp. 671-675, quote from pp. 672-673.

Note 14 Scilla Elworthy McLean, "Women and Decisions on Nuclear Weapons," in Eva Isaksson (ed.), *Women and the Military System,* Harvester, Wheatsheaf, 1988, pp. 260-287, quote from p. 273.

Note 15 Reardon (footnote 5), p. 25.

Notes page 11.

Note 16 Reported by Betty Lali in "The Nuclear Threat: A Woman's Perspective," in Gioseffi (footnote 2), pp. 52-55, quote from p. 52.

Note 17 "There is some reason to suspect, too, that women are kept out of disarmament talks because the objective of such talks is clearly not disarmament." Reardon (footnote 5), p. 34.

Notes page 12.

Note 18 Carol Cohn, "Sex and Death and the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals,' in Gioseffi (footnote 2), pp. 84-99, quote from pp. 86-87.

Notes page 13.

Note 19 ibid., p. 93.

Notes page 14.

Note 20 ibid., p. 97.

Note 21 Susan Brownmiller, *Against Our Will,* Bantam Books, New York, 1976, p. 114.

Notes page 15.

Note 22 Grant and Newland, "Introduction,"(footnote 10), pp. 1-7, quote from p. 3.

Note 23 Kathleen Staudt (ed.), *Women, International Development, and Politics: The Bureaucratic Mire,* Temple University Press, Philadelphia, 1990, pp. 9 and 16.

Notes page 16.

Note 24 Karin Himmelstrand, "Can an Aid Bureaucracy Empower Women?" in Staudt (footnote 23), pp. 101-113.

Note 25 Nuket Kardam, "The Adaptability of International Development Agencies: The Response of the World Bank to Women in Development," in Staudt (footnote 23), pp. 114-128, quote from p. 125.

Notes page 17.

Note 26 Grant and Newland (footnote 10), p. 2.

Notes page 18.

Note 27 Cynthia Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics,* Pandora Press, London, 1989.

Note 28 Robert O. Keohane, "International Relations Theory: Contributions of a Feminist Standpoint," in Grant and Newland (footnote 10), pp. 41-50, quote from pp. 42-43.

Note 29 ibid., p. 45.

Notes page 19.

Note 30 Cited by Hilka Pietila, "Patriarchy is a State of War," paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Peace Research Association, Groningen (Netherlands), July 1990.

Note 31 Reardon (footnote 5), p. 70.

Note 32 Birgit Brock-Utne, *Feminist Perspectives on Peace and Peace Education,* Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1989, p. 69.

Notes page 20.

Note 33 Nora Yuval-Davis, "The Gendered Gulf War: Women's Citizenship and Modern Warfare," in Haim Bresheeth and Nira Yuval-Davis (eds.), *The Gulf War and the New World Order,* Zed Books, London, 1991, pp. 219-225.

Notes page 21.

Note 34 Elizabeth Ferris, "Report of an NGO Survey on Refugee Women" (mimeo), World Council of Churches, Geneva, 1987.

Note 35 For example, Aristide R. Zolberg, Astri Suhrke, and Sergio Aguayo, *Escape from Violence: Conflict and Refugee Crises in the Developing World,* Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1989, p. 262.

Notes page 22.

Note 36 Rick Ritter, "Counselling Vets Who Batter," in *Daring to Change: Perspectives on Feminism and Nonviolence,* War Resisters League, New York, 1985.

Note 37 "Militarism and Violence Against Women: The War at Home," in *Daring to Change* (footnote 36).

Notes page 23.

Note 38 Lori Heise, "International Dimensions of Violence Against Women," in *Response,* volume 12, number 1,1989, p. 3.

Note 39 ibid., p. 5.

Note 40 Margaret Bishop, "Feminist Spirituality and Nonviolence," in McAllister (footnote 1), pp. 156-61.

Notes page 24.

Note 41 Heise, (footnote 38), p. 4.

Note 42 ibid., pp. 3-5.

Note 43 Cited by Heise (footnote 38), p. 6.

Notes page 25.

Note 44 Pam McAllister (ed.), *Reweaving the Web of Life* (footnote 1), p. iv.

Note 45 Elise Boulding, "Warriors and Saints: Dilemmas in the History of Men, Women, and War," in Isaksson (footnote 14), pp. 225-246, quote from pp. 228-229.

Notes page 26.

Note 46 "When women get the vote, it's a sign that that country is ripe for permanent peace." Cited by Jill Liddington, "The Women's Peace Crusade," in Dorothy Thompson (ed.), *Over Our Dead Bodies: Women Against the Bomb,* Virago Press, London, 1983, p. 187.

Notes page 28.

Note 47 Pam McAllister, *This River of Courage: Generations of Women's Resistance and Action,* New Society Press, Philadelphia, 1991, pp. 3 and 8.

Note 48 Steve Coll, "The Mothers Who Won't Disappear," in *The Guardian Weekly,* 17 March 1992, p. 19.

Notes page 29.

Note 49 Stasa Zajovic, "Patriarchy, Language, and National Myth," in *Peace News,* March 1992. p. 7.

Notes page 30.

Note 50 Karen Ridd, "Resistance," address to the International Peace Bureau Conference, Toronto, August 1991, reprinted in *Peace Magazine,* November/December 1991, pp. 18-20.

Note 51 Amnesty International, "Women in the Front Line," in *Focus,* February 1991, p. 3.

Notes page 31.

Note 52 Sara Ruddick, *Maternal Thinking: Towards a Politics of Peace,* New York, Ballantine Books, 1989, p. 17.

Note 53 ibid., p. 42.

Note 54 ibid., p. 79.

Note 55 ibid., p. 148.

Note 56 ibid., p. 156.

Notes page 32.

Note 57 Madres de la Plaza de Mayo, cited by Jane S. Jaquette, "Conclusion: Women and the New Democratic Politics," in Jane S. Jaquette (ed.), *The Women's Movement in Latin America: Feminism and the Transition to Democracy,* Westview Press, Boulder, 1991, pp. 185-208, quote from p. 188.

Note 58 Carina Perelli, "Putting Conservatism to Good Use: Women and Unorthodox Politics in Uruguay, from Breakdown to Transition," in Jaquette (footnote 57), pp. 95-113, quote from pp. 107 and 110.

Notes page 33.

Note 59 Orayb Aref Najjar, "Between Nationalism and Feminism: The Palestinian Answer," in Jill M. Bystydzienski (ed.), *Women Transforming Politics: Worldwide Strategies for Empowerment,* Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1992, pp. 143-161.

Note 60 Maria del Carmen Feijoó, "The Challenge of Constructing Civilian Peace: Women and Democracy in Argentina," in Jaquette (footnote 57), pp. 72-94, quote from p. 77.

Note 61 Carolyn Strange, "Mothers on the March: Maternalism in Women's Protest for Peace in North America and Western Europe, 1900-1985," Guida West and Rhoda Lois Blumberg (eds.), *Women and Social Protest,* Oxford University Press, New York, 1990, pp. 209-224, quote from p. 209.

Note 62 ibid., p. 218.

Notes page 34.

Note 63 Maggie Lowry, "A Voice from the Peace Camps," in Thompson (footnote 46), pp. 73-77, quote from p. 76.

Note 64 Ann Bookman and Sandra Morgen (eds.), *Women and the Politics of Empowerment,* Temple University Press, Philadelphia, 1988, p. 14.

Notes page 35.

Note 65 Guida West and Rhoda Lois Blumberg, "Reconstructing Social Protest from a Feminist Perspective," in West and Blumberg (footnote 61), pp. 3-36, quotation from p. 14. Note that Jaquette (footnote 57, p.4) finds a different pattern of women's mobilization in Latin America, where three distinct groupings of women's organizations emerged: human rights, feminist, and urban poor. Ruddick (footnote 52, pp. 222-234) distinguishes between women's politics of resistance and feminist politics.

Note 66 "Feminism and the State of Israel," interviews by Batya Weinbaum, in *Peace Review,* volume 2, number 4, fall 1990, pp. 16-19, quote from p. 17.

Note 67 See, for example, the report on relations between No to Nuclear Arms and the Women's Peace March reported by Birgit Brock-Utne in *Educating for Peace,* Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1985, pp. 67-69.

Note 68 West and Blumberg (footnote 61), p. 39.

Notes page 36.

Note 69 Sonia E. Alvarez, "Women's Movements and Gender Politics in the Brazilian Transition," in Jaquette (footnote 57), pp. 18-71.

Note 70 Ruddick (footnote 52), p. 161.

Notes page 37.

Note 71 Maruja Barrig, "The Difficult Equilibrium Between Bread and Roses: Women's Organizations and the Transition from Dictatorship to Democracy in Peru," in Jaquette (footnote 57), pp. 114-148, quote from p. 138.

Note 72 Ann Snitow, "Holding the Line at Greenham Common: Being Joyously Political in Dangerous Times," February 1985; reprinted in Gioseffi (footnote 2), p. 352.

Note 73 See for example Gay Young, "Hierarchy and Class in Women's Organizations: A Case from Northern Mexico," in Staudt pp. 79-97

Notes page 38.

Note 74 Mallica Vajrathon, "We Superwomen Must Allow the Men to Grow Up," in Robin Morgan (ed.), *Sisterhood is Global,* Anchor Books, New York, 1984, pp. 671-675, quote from p. 674.

Note 75 Claire L. Bangasser, *A Touch of Boldness: The Working Women's Forum, Madras, India: Women's Leadership in the Informal Sector,* MA thesis, Webster University, Geneva, 1991, pp. 1 and 5.

Notes page 39.

Note 76 Wilmette Brown, "Black Women Organizing," *Daring to Change: Perspectives on Feminism and Non-Violence,* War Resisters League, London, 1985.

Notes page 40.

Note 77 Ximena Bunster, "The Mobilization and Demobilization of Women in Militarized Chile," in Isaksson (footnote 14), pp. 210-222.

Note 78 Maria del Carmen Feijoó (footnote 57), p. 72.

Note 79 Perelli (footnote 58), p. 107.

Notes page 41.

Note 80 Brock-Utne, (footnote 67).

Note 81 Elise Boulding, "Warriors and Saints" (footnote 14), p. 232.

Notes page 42.

Note 82 Judy Costello, "Beyond Gandhi: An American Feminist's Approach to Nonviolence," in McAllister (footnote 1), pp. 175-180.

Note 83 Andrea Dworkin, "Redefining Nonviolence," cited in McAllister (footnote 1), p. 6.

Notes page 44.

Note 84 Enloe (footnote 27), p. 17.

Note 85 W. Karagwa Byanyima, "Women in Political Struggle in Uganda," in Bystydzienski (footnote 59) pp. 129-142, quote from p. 142.

Notes page 45.

Note 86 Barbara J. Seitz, "From Home to Street: Women and Revolution in Nicaragua," in Bystydzienski (footnote 59), pp. 162-174, quote from p. 169.

Note 87 Najjar (footnote 59), p. 157.

Notes page 46.

Note 88 Marie-Aimée Helie-Lucas, "The Role of Women during the Algerian Liberation Struggle and After: Nationalism as a Concept and as a Practice towards Both the Power of the Army and the Militarization of the People," in Isaksson (footnote 14), pp. 171-189, quote from pp. 185 and 189, emphasis in the original.

Note 89 Barbara Einhorn, "Where Have All the Women Gone? Women and the Women's Movement in East Central Europe," in *Feminist Review,* number 39, 1991, pp. 16-35, quote from p. 17.

Note 90 Joanna Regulska, "Women and Power in Poland: Hopes or Reality," in Bystydzienski (footnote 59), pp. 175-191, quote from p. 186.

Notes page 47.

Note 91 Report of the Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace (E.85.IV.10), (E.85.IV.10), United Nations, New York, 1985, paragraph 257.

Notes page 48.

Note 92 Enloe (footnote 27), p. 17.·