

frauen in Europa, den USA oder in Südafrika selbst. Südafrikanerinnen würden nicht nur diskriminiert – so die Autorin –, weil sie „weibliche Körper“ hätten, sondern auch dadurch, dass sie einer anhaltenden strukturellen Armut und vielfach einem subtilen ‚neuen‘ Rassismus ausgesetzt seien. Differierende Lebensrealitäten sowohl von Frauen innerhalb Südafrikas (schwarz/weiß, arm/reich) als auch auf globaler Ebene (Nord/Süd) bedingten daher unterschiedliche Perspektiven in Bezug auf die visionär angedachte Etablierung einer geschlechtsegalitären Gesellschaft: „Biologische Geschlechtszugehörigkeiten implizieren nicht Gemeinsamkeitserfahrungen von Frauen, ergo existieren auch keine Simultanitäten von sexistischen Diskriminierungserfahrungen.“ (293)

Beide Veröffentlichungen repräsentieren wesentliche Forschungskonzeptionen und werden für ForscherInnen, aber auch allgemein Interessierte, als Referenzwerke von großer Bedeutung sein. Ihre zentrale Fragestellung richtet sich auf ein *work in progress*, nämlich die gesellschaftliche Transformation Südafrikas in allen Bereichen, auch demjenigen der Genderbeziehungen.

Walter Sauer, Wien

Jennifer A. Davy, Karen Hagemann u. Ute Kätzel Hg., **Frieden – Gewalt – Geschlecht. Friedens- und Konfliktforschung als Geschlechterforschung** (= Frieden und Krieg. Beiträge zur Historischen Friedensforschung; 5), Klartext Verlag: Essen 2005, 404 S., EUR 22,-, ISBN 3-89861-515-4.

Paradoxically, as co-editor Karen Hagemann suggests in her introduction to the volume „Frieden – Gewalt – Geschlecht,“ the recent years rank as the least violent worldwide since 1945 (22). And yet, peace is by no means commonplace. Hardly a day passes without our experiencing war or armed conflict directly (for those living in much of the Middle East, Africa, southeast Asia, or parts of Latin America and southeast Europe) or indirectly, such as through media reports (TV, radio, magazines, blogs), and a steady dose of violence in films.

Writing after the so-called September 11th turn in war and ‘security’ politics, the sixteen authors contributing to this ambitious interdisciplinary volume demonstrate the social and scholarly advantages of integrating gender and peace/conflict studies, as implied as well in the subtitle “Friedens- und Konfliktforschung als Geschlechterforschung.” One of book’s main aims, according to Karen Hagemann, is to stimulate new ways of thinking about war and conflict (50), and as far as women’s pacifist battles are concerned, it is an endeavour the volume well fulfils. The contributions are for the most part relevant, competent, and timely; and if all do not break new ground, they do collectively underscore the point that grasping history is often more complicated than the mere reading of reported facts, even those transmitted by academic texts and policy papers.

Based on lectures presented at a spring 2003 conference in Berlin entitled “Pazifistinnen/Pazifismus,” sponsored by the *Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung*, and focussing in particular on peace and gender research in Germany, the volume is divided into four sections, with articles written either in German or in English. The first section covers a descriptive as well as theoretical and methodological introduction to war, peace, and gender studies; the second and largest section (eight contributions) examines perspectives on women in international and German peace movements from the late 1800s to the 1990s; the third section offers relevant gender-oriented background studies of two current ‘hotspots,’ Israel and Iraq; and, the last section consists of two contributions on existing feminist strategies for peacebuilding and peacekeeping. There are also short abstracts in English of each contribution and a rich 25-page appendix listing relevant literature in the field.

The highlights of the first section are the attempts at discussing the basic premises. These are: (1) new and old definitions of terms (e. g. war, peace, gender, peace research, military research); (2) a clear acknowledgment of violence done by women (e. g. women as perpetrators, the growing number of child soldiers); (3) a refreshing appeal for interdisciplinary approaches to the topic of war and aggression; and (4) a reminder of some of today’s urgent challenges faced by feminists – in particular, how to address internationally the troublesome remilitarization of state security politics. Recognizing, as Hagemann does, that the “*Militärintervention der USA und Großbritanniens in Irak hat einmal mehr deutlich gemacht, dass mit kriegesischen Mitteln Frieden und Freiheit schwer herzustellen sind*” (19), these introductory papers – by Hagemann, Thomas Kühne, and Hanne-Margret Birckenbach – underscore the need for more profound reflection, including from feminists, on safeguarding peace, freedom, and democracy.¹ Although Kühne as well as Birckenbach perceive improvement in this area, much more work needs to be done: very few peace studies publications reflect a gender perspective (and when so, they are mostly written by men); similarly, very few women’s studies publications address peace studies (91).

Part two is organized chronologically. The first section of case studies effectively sheds new light on ambiguities in women’s participation in early twentieth-century peace movements. Heloise Brown vividly investigates differences of opinion, scandals, and rivalries between British feminist pacifist groups and personalities of the late nineteenth century. Annika Wilmers critically examines pacifist women during the First World War. Acknowledging that the need to counter the lack of understanding and massive reproach by much of the European public towards pacifist women’s international peace initiatives during this time led feminists and pacifists in the interwar and postwar years to accentuate their successes, Wilmers nonetheless demonstrates that the atmosphere at these congresses should not be described as harmonious: “*Trotz guten*

¹ Feminist work linking concepts of masculinity and militarism, on the other hand, has become voluminous.

Willens war eine Übereinstimmung auch unter feministisch und pazifistisch gesinnten Frauen keineswegs selbstverständlich, sondern musste über nationale Grenzen hinweg vorsichtig aufgebaut werden” (142). Co-editor Jennifer A. Davy’s contribution on “manly” and “feminine” antimilitarism raises new aspects of the antimilitarist wing of the Weimar peace movement and concludes that although male antimilitarists sought to redefine “heroism” as “belligerent pacifism,” they employed “masculine and militaristic rhetoric.” (A comparison with the term “muscular pacifism,” which Gandhi used at this time, might have strengthened Davy’s chapter.) By contrast, women antimilitarists employed “supposedly ‘feminine’ and ‘mild’ rhetoric” (164f). Glenda Sluga, writing on national sovereignty and female equality in 1919 and 1945, shows how “there was continuity in the ways that women were excluded from both the peacemaking process and attempts to establish frameworks for rights after both wars” (183). This contribution adds a relevant historical bridge to the final section of the volume.

The next three papers, dealing with the second half of the twentieth century, are written by experienced German feminists and peace scholars – Irene Stoehr, Christine Eifler, and Ute Kätzel. Stoehr expertly reviews and offers surprising insights into three stages of West Germany’s women’s movement 1945–1958, examining in detail “wie sich die Diskurse politisch organisierter Frauen in Westdeutschland zum Frieden und zum Verhältnis von Frieden und Geschlecht im Kalten Krieg veränderten” (184). Christine Eifler investigates East Germany and its “armed peace” through gender lenses, recalling that “Neben ‘Antifaschismus’ gehörte ‘Frieden’ zu den Übereinkünften vieler Bürger und Bürgerinnen mit der DDR, die offiziell für sich in Anspruch nahm, der ‘erste deutsche Friedensstaat’ zu sein. ... Frieden und Sozialismus seien eine Einheit” (207). This policy, parallel, it might be added, to that in the Soviet Union, facilitated at the same time, however, an official reinforcement of women’s vulnerability, as Eifler concludes: “Mit ihrer reproduktiven Potenz wurden Frauen in dem Zustand permanenter Verletzbarkeit gehalten, was wiederum der Legitimation des Festhaltens an den militärischen Mitteln in der Friedenssicherung diente” (219). Co-editor Ute Kätzel’s contribution on gender, violence, and pacifism in West Germany in 1968 is in my opinion the most exciting contribution. Her research on violence is based on 33 oral-history narrative interviews taken between 1998 and 2000 with leading 1968 activists. In particular, she questions whether women activists were indeed more inclined to pacifism than men activists. And she reminds us, among other things, that the “Gewaltfrage war präsent in Form von Kriegsbildern aus Vietnam, der Vergangenheit der eigenen Eltern während der NS-Zeit und des Zweiten Weltkrieges, durch autoritäre Erziehungsmethoden und die aggressive Stimmung gegen die APO [Außerparlamentarische Opposition]” (242). Closing this section is Belinda Davis’s examination of gendered language (especially the usage of “victim” or “victimization”) in the West German peace movement of the 1980s.

In part three Uta Klein competently describes the hardships and successes of various Israeli peace and feminist group initiatives, whereby, ultimately, the “Frage der ‘Sicherheit’

des Staates genießt eine Priorität, die bislang andere Fragen der inneren Verfasstheit der Gesellschaft als sekundär erscheinen ließ” (292). Martina Kamp’s extensive research into Iraq’s patriarchal society is also helpful for understanding better the current status quo in this region. In part four, Volker Böge and Martina Fischer’s contribution as well as that of Gitti Hentschel knowledgeably discuss various cultures of violence along with the potentials of “UN Resolution 1325” of October 2000. All three urge feminists to play a greater role in – and redefine the terms of – foreign and security politics. Although a conclusive verdict is still out, there are strong indications that women’s presence in peacebuilding power-broking leads to more stable societies, with benefits for women and men alike.

Perhaps the greatest challenge for feminist as well as peace researchers and activists today is to move beyond black and white dichotomies (good vs. evil, just vs. unjust, friend vs. foe, male vs. female, east vs. west) and begin to analyze more socio-cultural gray zones or ambiguities. Interdisciplinary studies facilitate this. As Kühne points out: “So nötig die Anmahnung analytisch scharfer Kategorienbildung für die Wissenschaft ist, so wichtig ist es doch für die Gesellschaft auch, kognitive Unsicherheiten auszuhalten, mit mentalen Ambivalenzen, symbolischen Gegensätzen, mit Uneindeutigkeit zu leben” (71). What is required is for feminists and feminist-pacifists to continue more broadly and creatively analyzing the roots, causes, and symbolic as well as actual hindrances to peace, freedom, and democracy. “Frieden – Gewalt – Geschlecht” provides a valuable springboard.

Laurie R. Cohen, Innsbruck