

Introduction: Civil Society, Feminism, and the Gendered Politics of War and Peace

GORDANA RABRENOVIC and LAURA ROSKOS

This cluster of articles is comprised of the four talks given at a special plenary session during the NWSA 2000 National Conference at Simmons College, Boston, along with an introductory essay by the session's organizers. The session began from the premise that war and peace are deeply gendered at the conceptual level as well as in their practical effects. In a series of non-technical reports from the field, these feminist activist-scholars map the broad terrain of women's resistance in response to situations of armed conflict. They argue that a self-consciously feminist cultural politics, and in particular the creation of new "public" discursive spaces and processes, are needed to effect substantive change in the way diplomacy is practiced and to undermine the hegemony of war as a popular human activity. From their various points of engagement and expertise, each author suggests some emerging directions for future research on women's organizational practices and networks as they operate to sustain civil society and increase human interaction across national and ethnic borders at the regional level.

The essays in this cluster were written for a plenary session entitled *Feminist Action and Intellect: Subverting the Gendered Politics of War and Peace* convened as part of the NWSA 2000 Annual Conference hosted by Simmons College in Boston, Massachusetts. E-mail made it possible for the four invited speakers (Elise Boulding, Valentine Moghadam, Radha Kumar, and Betty Burkes) to communicate long before the session took place, and it is immediately clear that there is a kind of call-and-response dynamic working among the contributors. It is also imminently clear that these pieces were designed to be delivered orally, as calls to action originating in a common moment. This sense of spoken immediacy and intimacy does not detract from their readability or value as written texts; in fact, as we have read them and re-read them through the editorial process we have come to understand at a deeper level how each speaker articulates multiple tasks for us, as academic women, to carry out in building a more just and peaceful world.

The occasional essay has emerged as a favored vehicle for developments in feminist theory and as a literary form self-conscious of its role in punctuating the ongoing creation of a socially-constructed knowledge aware less of its goal than of its status as *different*. In fact, this plenary occasion marked the convergence of at least five different conversations: the conversations of each speaker with her research partners; the conversa-

tion among the set of speakers temporarily drawn together in anticipation of the plenary session; the conversation among those of us on the plenary planning committee of the Graduate Consortium in Women's Studies¹; the conversation among women doing international peacework in conjunction with the United Nations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs); and the professional conversation about the status and future of Women's Studies that is the NWSA. It is within the distinct trajectory of each of these reference groups that this cluster is situated in time and bound by its appearance as artifact, in print. This introduction hopes primarily to situate the essays that follow within these last two conversations, but is itself a piece of the third conversation referenced above, a conversation among scholars affiliated with the Graduate Consortium in Women's Studies at the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study.

But we begin by calling attention to these distinct conversations as conversations because the figure of the conversation is indicative of both the power and the fragility of feminist peacework, which takes many forms but which is always aware of its temporality. Furthermore, each of the essays in this cluster points to the creation of discursive space as an antidote to war. June Jordan has named such spaces "living room," conversations that are expandable (in constituency, time, and space), which can offer no certain *outcome* or victory, but count as success their ability to sustain more of the same conversation in which diversities are not collapsed into opposing camps of difference (1985).²

Our conversation, in and around the Graduate Consortium, has been about a question Radha Kumar raises here in a slightly different form when she asks, "What is distinctly feminist about civil society?" As researchers and teachers engaged in a collaborative women's studies enterprise, located both within and without the sometimes competing frameworks of several different universities' missions and agendas, in a city rich with feminist history but with a decidedly *post-feminist* political culture, we continually feel the need to question what Women's Studies is, and why it continues to be important enough to engage our energies. For some of us, the answer for the past several years has lain somewhere near our political commitment to a civil society robust enough to challenge *business as usual* on the part of either governmental or corporate elites. Hosting this plenary was one activity we undertook to help us better understand this nexus, and, in turn, for Gordana and Laura, this introduction is an attempt to share—with each other and with the *NWSA Journal's* readership—what we have learned so far.

It could be said that it is the infusion of temporality into the study of war and peace, a vivid awareness that both are human-made processes rather than inherited features of an unchanging landscape, that makes the agency of living women available as a resource for peace building and

theoretical reflection. As the plenary speakers demonstrate, it is throwing these abstract generalities into real time that enables us to observe how they are sustained—or not—and to accumulate the know-how or wisdom that shapes effective intervention at every level. Each of the expert speakers, gathered for this plenary, insists that her research shows that human conflict does not naturally or inevitably follow an innate or predetermined path of escalating violence toward annihilation, and suggests a number of both simple and creative ways in which conflict can be redirected toward non-violent expression. In particular, the speakers concur about the value of creating semi-structured discursive spaces where those in conflict can each speak and be heard. At its best, in contexts lush with overlapping social networks, such redirection as ongoing mediation never assumes the high profile definition and high-stakes drama that feeds a culture of violence.

Elise Boulding opens the session by focusing on three mutually reinforcing themes. Emphasizing that we must persist in gaining greater visibility for women's peacemaking and feminist insights on peacemaking and noting that in the context of unraveling the dynamics of war-making, women have not made sufficient progress, she suggests working with and under the auspices of the U.N. International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World (2000–2010) to achieve recognition and prominence. Her choice of topics reminds one of the widespread resistance at the level of culture and of cultural politics, at least in the United States, to any attempt to discredit force as a legitimate manifestation of power. Yet reading these essays, on the morning and indeed over the months after their delivery, suggests that, despite this resistance, the study of what has sometimes been cast as the eternal themes of war and peace has indeed changed under the pressure of feminist theory. And, that this change has brought with it some substantive changes in the field of Women's Studies as well.

Although feminist research, women's grassroots interventions, and gender analysis are increasingly relied upon in formulating international and domestic security policy, it can hardly be said that feminist approaches have been embraced as mainstream. When these approaches have been adopted by mainstream bodies, they are seldom recognized as feminist, and are often appropriated piecemeal in ways that limit their effectiveness for creating or fostering conditions of what Betty Reardon has called *positive peace* (1993).

Reardon conceptualizes positive peace as a robust set of dynamic "relationships among people and nations based on trust, cooperation, and recognition of the interdependence and importance of the common good and mutual interests of all peoples" (Reardon 1993, 4–5). As defined by Reardon, peace is a fluid, evolving concept fully compatible with,

and indeed dependent upon, feminism's celebration of human diversity, including its sophisticated embrace of conflict as a useful expression of difference. Positive peace illuminates the interconnections among the abstractions—peace, equality, and development—cojoined in the Forward Looking Strategies issued from the Nairobi International Women's Conference held in 1985. Understanding these interrelationships undermines the assumption sometimes made that feminism is a women's project or that feminism is about "the war between the sexes." Contemporary feminisms offer a range of epistemological perspectives and analytic frameworks that should be as appealing and useful to men as they are to women.

However, too often gender, at least in the United States, is used as a synonym for women. Consequently, according to Joan Scott, gender as a term has lost its critical edge. What made gender an important category in the past, she argues, was its ability to transform or destabilize political discourse (Scott 1988, 3). Her point is that it is not enough simply to include women in decision-making processes and international organizations (although gender equity has rarely been achieved in policy-making bodies), thus giving more women access to the resources and status war-making has traditionally been understood to confer upon its perpetrators. Rather, the point of bringing more women into political and military decision-making bodies is to change the scope and tenor of the conversation about war and peace. For this to happen, gender analysis and gender disaggregated data must be used to bring women's experiences to the forefront of the conversation and eventually to recast the very meanings of the topics under negotiation, in this case to challenge the very meaning of war and peace. Current work in Women's Studies, as the essays in this cluster attest, focuses on the edges of war and peace: on processes of militarization that precede military mobilization, on the ways in which negotiated settlements are implemented in communities, on the types of networks that contribute to the resiliency of civil societies. This work destabilizes the definitions of war and peace, and is exemplary of Women's Studies today.

Within academia, the move from Women's Studies to gender studies has been fueled in part by the desire to make a space for men's contributions and for the study of masculinity as a social and cultural construction within feminism. But gender studies, when introduced into institutions still structured around hierarchical gender power relations, risks effacing the historical fact that women's intellectual contributions have shaped the research agenda and undermines the political project underlying the intellectual effort: the project of moving societies toward a fuller realization of equality, development, and peace. These are unacceptable outcomes at an historical moment when the further integration of women leaders and feminist perspectives into the arenas of international policy-

making is both urgent and politically possible. So it seems to us crucial to lay claim to a body of knowledge, both theoretical and applied, as *feminist peace studies* by naming it thus.

Feminist peace studies have psychological, cultural, social, and economic dimensions and take into account both local practices and transnational patterns as they change over time. It could not exist as an area of study and praxis without the dual traditions of taking women's experiences seriously and of interdisciplinary cross interrogation established over the past decades by Women's Studies. While not all feminist scholarship intersects with the concerns outlined in this cluster of essays, taken as a whole, Women's Studies does increasingly grapple with the dynamics of transnational phenomena, such as decolonization, migration, international development, cultural survival, traumatic memory. Additionally, students of Women's Studies are expected to understand themselves as located within a global context. Cynthia Enloe's *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases* (1990) now frequently appears on reading lists for Introduction to Women's Studies courses demonstrating the degree to which Women's Studies has become *internationalized* as well as the epistemological and analytic power of the question at the core of the methodology she uses in studying international relations: "Where are the women?" While there is every reason to think that the future of feminist peace studies lies within mainstream institutions populated by men as well as by women, this very success provides incentives to remember the material conditions that have made its emergence possible.

In her contribution, Val Moghadam argues that women's groups have long been involved in addressing the roots of both local and international conflict and in finding conditions for conflict resolution. Women who shared their ideas and experiences across national borders through the series of U.N. sponsored women's conferences beginning in 1975, made the connections among equality, development, and peace that have begun to reshape all international discussions on security. Last year, the U.N. Security Council, in its Proclamation on International Women's Day, recognized that gender equality is an integral component of peace, and on 24 October 2000 convened a special session of that body to consider the situation of Women in Armed Conflict.

This session was indeed special in that the convening Security Council members, following Cynthia Enloe's methodology, replicated the results of her research. As the diplomats weighed in with their local knowledges, a picture emerged that showed women everywhere in the matrix of international and ethnic relations, in the ebb and flow of war and peace, in the processes of militarization and demilitarization. Women were everywhere, it seemed, except where they are most urgently needed: at the roundtables negotiating settlement agreements and in the delegates' chairs at the Security Council itself. The proceedings of this special

session, and the resolution coming out of it, identify barriers in the form of institutional mechanisms and seek to address them (United Nations Security Council 2000). But there are also cultural factors that put pressure on women to disengage from formal peace processes after an initial cease-fire has been achieved. The speakers invited to the NWSA plenary on the Gendered Politics of War and Peace each insist that women's studies departments should share in the responsibility for changing this situation.

Self-conscious feminist interventions into the seemingly perpetual stream of war alternating with peace have historical roots much deeper than those recalled by the plenary speakers here. We are all familiar with the relationships Jane Addams and Virginia Woolf theorized as bridging the agendas of feminism with the attainment of peace. But it seems that we have only recently, as contemporary feminist networkers find themselves retracing the footsteps of their pre-World War I foremothers, begun to sense the richness and variety of transnational feminist alliances and friendships that existed in an earlier era (McFadden 1999). What has already come into view should reassure us that feminist theory has played a leading role in revealing the interplay among issues of peace, human rights, and social justice. Understanding these connections has led to advances in the recognition and achievement of human rights, and these have in turn continued to broaden the definition of these rights. What has been less well recognized and less attended to are the interconnections among human rights, social justice, and peace. As we deepen our understanding of the structures undergirding our global economy, it becomes clearer that we need to address the important question of how poverty and unequal access to resources by different groups of people undermine national and regional security. The answers to this question will surely be found through the application of feminist methodologies that examine the local and longitudinal effects of war's disruptions on everyday life and in the domestic sphere.

Of course, this research will reveal more than deprivations and absence; it will reveal imaginative cultural responses and alternative practices. These essays, too, illustrate what is missing when women are missing from forums of negotiation by making visible their contributions in other social locations as well as their role in creating social locations for negotiation among adversaries and combatants. This ability to ferret out specific *techne* from the analysis of women's organizing activities in multiple locations rests, though, on the realization of the first project, gaining visibility.

Elise Boulding makes visibility a central theme of her contribution to this volume by urging us all to become more savvy in producing media, more continually and pointedly articulate, and better teachers of the traditions of women's peace work. Similarly, Val Moghadam stresses the

importance of increasing visibility for work of women in both local and international activities. But to succeed in doing this requires not only a hands-on familiarity with the technical aspects of media production but also a deep analytic understanding of aesthetic effects and cultural traditions.

Feminist perspectives on peace, security, and conflict resolution challenge a traditional understanding of peace processes as the expression and ratification of *power over*, such as when one side forces the other to accept the terms of cease-fire, emphasizing instead an understanding of peace as a process of negotiation and conflict resolution where both sides come out as winners. The U.N. has recognized the benefit of such approaches as well, and its efforts to include more women in peacemaking negotiations and peacekeeping forces attest to this recognition. Radha Kumar points to the example of Mary Robinson to show that when you include women who are part of transnational women's networks, they change the organizational practices in profound ways. Kumar goes on to point out the way that such examples can be exploited through creative media campaigns that extend the recognition of the accomplishments of a figure like Robinson while simultaneously putting pressure on the U.N. and its member states to integrate more women more effectively into their international programs.

However, recognition of the importance of including women in peacemaking is not always beneficial to women (see Fukuyama 1998). The attempt to make women's roles in the peace process visible can lead to essentializing women as peaceful and men as warlike. This is often done by reinforcing culturally-defined gender stereotypes. Thus, militarism gets defined as masculine, based on domination and violence, and peacemaking gets defined as feminine, based on compassion and passivity (Tickner 1999). Similarly, women's ability and willingness to cooperate and compromise too easily get attributed to *feminine perspective*, i.e., that this is what women do. However, there is another explanation that takes women's positions in the society and their participation patterns into consideration in explaining women's roles in the peace processes. Because women are more likely to be involved in grass roots efforts and organizations with more inclusive and flexible structures, they learn how to cooperate and compromise. Therefore, women can often bring these skills into peacemaking organizations and this allows them to create the space for dialogue between the warring sides.

The contribution of feminist scholarship in peace studies lies in continually questioning those easy stereotypes and in turning the focus of research away from asking "Why are women peacemakers?" toward the question, "How is peace made?"³ This approach prioritizes the examination of the actual activities involved in stewarding conflicts toward non-violent expression over the heated polemics of trying to explain the gendered nature of war and peace.

Women's organizations have typically fallen outside the main institutional spheres and have enjoyed greater flexibility in practice in part because of this. Women's organizations, at least at the local level, are apt to behave in less rule-bound ways and to value keeping the group together over sticking to a set of founding principles or procedural rules. These are the characteristics of grassroots organizations, nonprofit organizations, and non-government organizations in general. Although these organizations used to be on the margins of the society, they are increasingly seen as important actors in shaping civil society and in creating social capital (Gittell 1999).

Historically, some women in patriarchal societies have been able to improve their status by building family networks to amass human resources and social capital. Cloaked in the private sphere, women's familial and resource networks form the infrastructure of a nascent and under-utilized surplus public sphere/discourse community that can come into play when the other structures of civil society are stressed or destroyed. Similarly, because women's organizations have less access to official resources, their members have learned to make creative use of available resources. Women invest in the social and friendship networks available to them through their organizational affiliations to gain information, know-how, and support. These networks allow for grassroots mobilization and coalition-building in times of crisis, but also, as the example of Women in Black illustrates, the bringing together of disparate groups generates new political imagery and imaginative, new cultural forms for expressing resistance.

Another resource that some women-led organizations utilize is their manipulation of women's traditional roles. Especially in Latin America, women have been able to tap into cultural and religious images of the Virgin Mary in order to create a political space from which to claim their human rights (Gittell, Ortega-Bustamante, and Steffy 1989). In Argentina, the Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo and the Grandmothers of the Plaza de Mayo have not only shown tremendous courage in the face of danger, but have also broken a conspiracy of silence by exposing the hypocrisy of a military junta that would pose as the defender of family and tradition.

Similarly, many women-led organizations use their accepted roles as mothers to fight for social rights. This process of consciously redefining the activities of mothering as public, rather than private, allows women to enter political battles and to change the outcomes of their struggles (Ruddick 1989). In other instances, where women organized around their needs to gain jobs and housing for themselves, they were forced to change "from individual survival strategies to collective ones that place pressure on political parties and government bureaucrats" (Stephen 1992, 90). Temma Kaplan describes the way in which women use the accepted gender roles of wives and mothers to take action on behalf of their families and their communities as "female consciousness" (1997, 6). Women's

participation in collective action is empowering in that it allows them to play a more active role in public life, increases their skills, and turns them from victims to agents actively looking for solutions to their community problems.

Women-led organizations tend to adopt a more participatory model of leadership and women in organizations build on each others' interpersonal connections. Organizational activities are important for the process of creating a sense of community that goes beyond the individual organization. Consequently, the political mobilization that results puts an emphasis on the connectedness of its members, their everyday needs, and on their interpersonal relationships, rather than on obtaining political positions for the individuals involved or on increasing their personal status. This approach strengthens women's ties to the community and further builds their social, and potentially political networks, but it also may mitigate against their being nominated to fill positions of institutional power when these become available.

Carol Hardy-Fanta (1993) argues, based on her research of Latina women's political participation in Boston, that women define *political* differently than men. For men, political is holding office; for women, "political" is making connections. Those connections can take different forms: connections between personal problems (or what Maxine Molyneux calls practical gender issues [1986]) and public issues, between state resources and community needs, and between different groups of people. If politics is understood to be making connections, we would argue, then one's political interests will be less invested in promoting conflict.

While war disrupts the lives of both men and women, to some men it also offers new career opportunities. They might become leaders of military or paramilitary organizations, engage in smuggling operations, or get new positions in provisional governments. The implementation of a settlement agreement often jeopardizes these new endeavors. On the other hand, during armed conflict, women suffer the disruption of services, the shortage of necessary resources, the loss of men's contribution to the household, as well as the ever-present worry for safety of their children. Because they do not have access to the opportunities for achievement some men gain from war, they will again be less likely to invest themselves personally in the conflict. Therefore women have been more likely to seek peaceful solutions to conflict and to turn to compromise and cooperation as tools to achieve them.

As Boulding, Moghadam, and Kumar recognize, more and more women are participating in transnational networks, and are transferring skills and techniques honed in local settings to the international, albeit often unofficial, arena. These networks are serving the same functions that local and national organizations filled in the past, providing venues where women from warring sides enjoy opportunities for outside contact and

creating space for dialogue among opposing parties. Moghadam calls on the example of Kosovar and Serbian women who were able to engage in a dialogue because they were members of such networks and because they shared a feminist framework of understanding. Similar examples can be found among Somali women, women in Northern Ireland, and among Jewish and Arab women. As Kumar reports, networks of women are often the only ones that can survive devastation of civil society in civil war.

But instead of following Kumar in her call for the development of parallel woman-friendly institutions to replace international official organizations such as the U.N. and the World Bank, we would argue for reforming these existing institutions into a more equitable mode and for a revived, but whole, civic sphere. Instead of single sex settings for peacemaking, we would hold out for forums that can tolerate more sexes than two. We believe that it is not women, *per se*, but rather *feminism*, with its dual emphases on equity and diversity, that can transform the parameters of the policy-making conversation.

Recognizing the internationalism at the heart of Women's Studies and mining the know-how of local communities of women has yielded a harvest of speculative theory about the cross-cultural or cross-contextual application of peacebuilding practices. Increasingly and self-consciously, some women's studies departments have been designing graduate programs that can be used advantageously by women interested in filling positions of senior gender specialist with U.N. peacekeeping forces and/or taking a seat at the diplomatic conference tables of the future. But as educators, our point of view must take into account what we know about strategy as well as about curriculum. We now know that if women are to change the outcomes of powerful institutions, they must enter these bodies not as isolated tokens but rather must enter in numbers adequate to unsettle the gendered norms of an institution and must hold themselves accountable to a grassroots constituency.

Most state, military, and male actors involved in processes of peacemaking define the goal of their peacemaking as achieving a cease-fire, or as putting an *end* to the conflict. However, the real challenges arise in the process of rebuilding war-torn countries and in providing them with alternatives to violence when new (or outstanding) conflicts intensify. This is a difficult task and the longer an armed conflict goes on, the more difficult it is to rebuild the society. Cultural reconstruction is based on building a culture of peace but also on the model of a more equal society. Societies where there is greater gender equality are less likely to militarize again. Peace is often imagined as a time when women, mobilized for military production or civil maintenance, return to their homes, sometimes by choice, but often not. Stripped of the more public roles they have assumed during armed conflict, they are often targeted by

pro-natalist campaigns. But their continued activism in the public sphere and community forums can be critical in social reconstruction.

By refusing to forfeit their political roles in political life of their societies, women can transfer their skills from peacework to reconstruction work. They participate in shaping the process of re-establishing the norms of civil society, human rights, and laws. In many war-torn societies this is a formidable task. How do you reconcile the different interests of old enemies? What type of social and economic development will help a country rebuild itself? How can societies deal with dependency on international organizations for keeping order and for providing financial resources? How can governments get a handle on crime without locking people up? Too often women are pushed back to the margins of political life by being allocated minor offices. Many women continue to be involved in grassroots and non-government organizations that produce and deliver public services. However, as seems to have been the case in Colombia, this can also make it possible for governments to abdicate their responsibilities for this type of development.

Micro-lending programs are one of the means being used to increase women's access to resources for post-conflict reconstruction. Although, as Kumar argues, this is only a limited strategy, it does allow women to start to rebuild their families and communities. The role of international organizations is crucial for this process, especially in providing resources for reconstruction and in funding women-led organizations. Successful efforts will also address social justice questions by providing access to resources for a larger number of people. There is evidence to suggest that economic empowerment is linked to inter-ethnic cooperation.⁴

Women who have no access to economic resources during post-conflict periods, have diminished social power at a time when social hierarchies are in flux. During the post-conflict period, the culture of violence that developed during the period of open, armed conflict can continue to make women likely targets of rape and domestic violence. The important question thus becomes how to reintegrate a whole generation of young men who were revenged by violence into peaceful society, without re-establishing gender inequality. Often women want their men to regain their dignity and sense of pride. By healing their men, many women feel they are healing their society. But it takes significant creativity and initiative to find ways of achieving this without reinstalling men in their traditional roles of heads of households and breadwinners. In war-torn countries it is difficult to rebuild relationships without addressing the issues of hatred, animosity, and collective distrust. As Pumla Gobodo-Madikizela and others have pointed out, the South African innovation of establishing public forums for eliciting "truth and reconciliation" deserves careful examination and longitudinal study of its effects (2000).

The scope of cultural reconstruction is illustrated by Betty Burkes's contribution in this volume. She engages us with an intimate glimpse of the daily enactment of practices of re-memory, a conscious and self-conscious cultural project, involving both the practical and tactical mobilization of *sentimental power* and human resources in reshaping everyday life away from the mundane. While looking toward the potential of Women's Studies to record, analyze, and theorize women's traditional peacemaking practices, Burkes is also skeptical that Women's Studies can do more than add new knowledge, skeptical about its transformative claims in light of the academy's history of exclusion. She reminds us that academic knowledge can only exist as such by excluding important parts of life from its canon, by splitting know-how that is only meaningful when grasped whole, and by processes of accreditation and acculturation that are psychically damaging to many.

Like most members of NWSA, Burkes is an educator by profession, the founder of a *free school* on Cape Cod, which she ran with her partner. Until recently, she reports, she saw her peace work as bound up with her identity as a nurturer of children. Her contribution to the plenary, studded with song, is grounded in the myriad opportunities we all enjoy to remake the rituals and passages of life in all its stages with the same kind of loving attunement Sara Ruddick charts in *Maternal Thinking* (1989). Throughout the modern era of public/private dichotomy, women have been, continually and increasingly, authorized to invest this kind of attentiveness in the care of the young. Burkes's talk invites us to transfer that kind of attentiveness to our selves and our adult relationships in all their variety. Doing so, she argues, reweaves the spiritual into the political, and generates a new and irresistible type of power that can draw in the resources we all need to continue to struggle for justice and enlightenment. Burkes's tenure as president of the U.S. section of the WILPF was marked by the coinage, "We have to be the change we want to see," and her essay explicitly models important components of the kind of leadership we hope women will bring to the negotiating table: a loving attunement to the needs of others, creative accommodation of multiple cultural traditions, transparency of motives, and accountability to a local and enduring reference group. As the scope of our professional lives and scholarly interests continue to expand, organizations like NWSA, collaborative structures like consortiums, and non-governmental organizations like WILPF provide welcome frames of reference and structures of accountability. The discursive spaces they create allow for sustained conversations about complex, aggravating issues, like war and peace, which force us to acknowledge the differences among us. The e-mail networks, conferences, and friendships these entities facilitate help bring to the surface of our awareness a wealth of knowledge about international

relations filtered through gendered lenses and articulated from a variety of experiential worlds. The contributors to this cluster—Elise Boulding, Valentine Moghadam, Radha Kumar, and Betty Burkes—challenge us to both get real *and* follow the linguistic turn; to exploit our status as certified experts *and* to practice humility as we listen to others' testimony. While each proposes specific avenues for political intervention, they each also urge us to turn to each other, and to our conversations with each other, in moving between feminist intellect and action.

Gordana Rabrenovic is Associate Professor of Sociology and Education and Associate Director of the Brudnick Center on Violence and Conflict at Northeastern University. She specializes in social analysis in the area of community studies, education institutions, and inter-group conflict and violence. She is the author of *Community Builders: A Tale of Neighborhood Mobilization in Two Cities* (Temple University Press, 1996) and co-editor of *Community Politics and Policy* (JAI Press, 1999) as well as many articles. Correspondence should be addressed to Rabrenovic at the Brudnick Center on Violence and Conflict, Northeastern University, 571 Holmes Hall, Boston, MA 02115; gordanar@neu.edu; www.violence.neu.edu.

Laura Roskos directs the Graduate Consortium in Women's Studies at Harvard University's Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study and produces "Voices of Public Intellectuals," a multi-tiered educational program of public lectures, nationally distributed radio shows, and thematically integrated courses. From 1992–1998, she taught in the Women's Studies and peace studies programs of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and worked with the University of Wisconsin's System's Women's Studies Consortium to develop the curriculum for certified programs in social change. Correspondence should be sent to Roskos at the Graduate Consortium in Women's Studies, Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, Agassiz House, 10 Garden Street, Cambridge, MA 02138; roskos@radcliffe.edu; www.radcliffe.edu/gcws.

Notes

1. Although they alone are responsible for the ideas expressed in this essay, the authors have benefitted from the insights and ongoing collegiality of plenary planning committee members Carol Hurd Green, Modhumita Roy, and Kathleen Weiler, and from the very competent editorial assistance of Alyssa Defrin and Sarah Avery Sullivan in preparing this cluster for publication. We also extend our thanks to Deans Tamar March and Mary Maples Dunn of the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study who have provided the context for this work. Hosted by the Radcliffe Institute, the Graduate Consortium in Women's Studies currently consists of Brandeis University, Boston College,

Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Northeastern University, and Tufts University. Its founding and structure are detailed in Ruth Perry, et al. (1996).

2. In the poem "Moving Towards Home," Jordan draws an analogy between a space for conversation and the space required to sustain life in general:

I need to speak about living room
 where the talk will take place in my language
 I need to speak about living room
 where my children will grow without horror . . .
 Against the relentless laughter of evil
 there is less and less living room. (1985)

3. The move we reference here is a variation on that proposed by Alice Miller in investigating events precipitating trauma and traumatic memory (1990, 184).
4. Rebuilding civil infrastructure was one of the issues discussed by presenters Radha Kumar, Pumla Gobodo-Madizikela, and Marta Segura on the panel "Civil Society's Role in Waging Peace," part of the research symposium segment of the Second Women Waging Peace Colloquium.

References

- Enloe, Cynthia. 1990. *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1998. "Women and the Evolution of World Politics." *Foreign Affairs* 77(5):24–40.
- Gittel, Marilyn, Isolda Ortega-Bustamante, and Tracy Steffy, eds. 1999. *Women Creating Social Capital and Social Change: A Study of Women-Led Community Development Organizations*. New York: Howard Samuels State Management and Policy Center, The Graduate School and the University Center of the City University of New York.
- Gobodo-Madikizela, Pumla. 2000. "Political Memory and the Politics of Memory." Rama Mehta Lecture, 21 March, Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study.
- Hardy-Fanta, Carol. 1993. *Latina Politics, Latino Politics: Gender, Culture and Political Participation in Boston*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Jordan, June. 1985. *Living Room: New Poems by June Jordan*. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press.
- Kaplan, Temma. 1997. *Crazy for Democracy: Women in Grassroots Movements*. New York: Routledge Press.
- Kumar, Radha, Pumla Gobodo-Madizikela, and Marta Segura. 2000. "Civil Society's Role in Waging Peace." Second Women Waging Peace Colloquium, 11 November, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.
- McFadden, Margaret. 1999. *Golden Cables of Sympathy: The Transatlantic Sources of Nineteenth-Century Feminism*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.

- Miller, Alice. 1990. *Banished Knowledge*. Trans. Leila Vennewitz. New York: Doubleday.
- Molyneux, Maxine. 1986. "Mobilization Without Emancipation? Women's Interests, the State, and Revolution." In *Transitions and Development: Problems of Third World Socialism*, eds. Richard Fagen, Carmen Diana Deere, and Jose Luis Coraggio, 280–302. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Perry, Ruth, Joyce Antler, Renee Fall, Laura Levine Frader, Carol Hurd Green, Barbara Haber, Alice Jardine, and Christiane Zehl Romero. 1996. "Inventing a Feminist Institution in Boston: An Informal History of the Graduate Consortium in Women's Studies at Radcliffe College." *NWSA Journal* 8(2):60–83.
- Reardon, Betty. 1993. *Women and Peace: Feminist Visions of Global Security*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Ruddick, Sara. 1989. *Maternal Thinking: Toward a Politics of Peace*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Scott, Joan Wallach. 1988. *Gender and the Politics of History*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Stephen, Lynn. 1992. "Women in Mexico's Popular Movements: Survival Strategies Against Ecological and Economic Impoverishment." *Latin American Perspectives* 19(1):73–96.
- Tickner, Ann J. 1999. "Why Women Can't Run the World: International Politics According to Francis Fukuyama." *International Studies Review* 1(3):3–11.
- United Nations Security Council. 2000. *Resolution 1325*. Retrieved 12 April 2001, from <http://www.un.org/docs/scres/2000/res1325e.pdf>.