Galtung, Violence, and Gender: The Case for a Peace Studies/Feminism Alliance

by Catia C. Confortini

My paper argues for an incorporation of feminist theories into peace theories, by analyzing what is missing by not confronting feminist contributions to a theory on violence. I take Johan Galtung's theory of violence as a point of departure, as a theory that is widely uncontested in peace studies. Galtung's articulation of direct, structural, and cultural violence offers a unified framework within which all violence can be seen. On the other hand, feminism can contribute to and enrich Galtung's theory of violence in four possible ways:

1. Galtung's theory needs to incorporate notions of gender as a social construct embodying relations of power.
2. Dichotomous, mutually exclusive categories that shape our understanding of the world are gendered and they are key to the production and reproduction of violence at all levels.
3. Gendered language defines the possibility and impossibility of pursuing different visions of the social world. Violence and peace can be constituted through language.
4. Violence produces and defines gender identities and, in turn, is produced and defined by them.

These contributions have important implications for peace studies: only by taking gender seriously as a category of analysis, can prescriptions for a violence-free society be more than temporary solutions to deeply ingrained attitudes to accept violence as "natural."

INTRODUCTION

Drawing from a nineteenth- and early twentieth-century feminist tradition, some feminists in the 1970s and 1980s proposed that women were, by nature, upbringing, and/or by virtue of being mothers and caretakers, morally superior to and more peaceful than men.[1] This association of

PEACE & CHANGE, Vol. 31, No. 3, July 2006
© 2006 Peace History Society and
Peace and Justice Studies Association

women with pacifism disconcerted many other feminists. In particular, Jean Bethke Elshtain argued that claims of women's natural or cultural superiority in matters of peace and war only serve to reproduce, if inverted, a world based on gendered dichotomies and power hierarchies.[2] Echoing Elshtain's concerns, Christine Sylvester was critical of the assumptions about women's homogeneity that radical/standpoint feminists implied when generalizing about women's peacefulness.[3] In agreement, Ann Tickner observed that

> The association of femininity with peace lends support to an idealized masculinity that depends on constructing women as passive victims in need of protection. It also contributes to the claim that women are naïve in matters relating to international politics. An enriched, less militarized notion of citizenship cannot be built on such a weak foundation.[4]

These feminists found such association disempowering for both women and peace.[5] While I agree that there are "dangers in merging feminist and peace projects,"[6] I believe that feminism and peace studies have much in common and should not disregard the contributions they can each make to the other's field.

Terrell Northrup observed some similarities between conflict resolution theory and feminism. Conflict resolution theory belongs to the larger peace studies field and many of Northrup's remarks apply equally to peace studies: first, many feminists and peace theorists share a commitment to "new thinking" and alternative ways to look at problems; they both address issues of identity and human needs as opposed to power politics; feminism and a sizable part of the conflict resolution community also recognize the importance of concepts such as relationship, diversity, and interdependence; and they acknowledge the existence of multiple "realities," and of cultural and historical differences in worldviews.[7] Most importantly, both feminism and peace studies, unlike much of the rest of social science, have an explicitly value-laden, normative agenda: their ultimate goals are peace (for peace studies) and gender equality (for feminism). Although the degree of compatibility between the two objectives can be and has been subject to feminist scrutiny, I argue that these two goals can be implemented together.[8]

The first step toward incorporating gender studies into peace theories is to analyze what is missed by not confronting feminist contributions to a theory on violence. I take Johan Galtung's widely accepted

theory of violence as a point of departure, as his conception is one on which much of peace studies research (including feminist peace research)[9] is based.

Johan Galtung formulated a theory of violence based on the recognition that direct, personal violence (from bar brawls to international wars) is only one of three shapes which violence assumes. The other two categories of violence, namely structural (or indirect) and cultural violence are present in society in more subtle, but not less damaging ways. For instance, Galtung acknowledges that poverty (structural violence) or media glorification of violence (cultural violence) are also forms of violence. Furthermore, Galtung conceives of peace as both negative (absence of direct violence) and positive (presence of social justice).[10] Only the elimination of violence at all levels can lead to true peace (negative as well as positive). Understanding how violence originates and operates at all levels, and how and why violence is used as a method of conflict resolution is, therefore, necessary to develop a theory of peace.

The problem is that Galtung fails to explore the role of gender in the social construction of violence, with the consequence that his prescriptions for nonviolent methods can at best be temporary piecemeal solutions to a persistent, deeply ingrained attitude to accept violence as "natural." They cannot effectively transform society's inclination to violence. Feminists in International Relations and in other social sciences argue that gender as a social construct organizes social life in hierarchical, mutually exclusive categories, which are in a relationship of sub/super ordination to one another. This not only means that violence can at times be valued over nonviolence as a way of ending conflicts (as the current war against Iraq has amply showed), but also that the construction (justification?) of this superior status of violence owes much to gender relations. In this paper, I will explore how feminist theories on violence can shed light on the concept and legitimization of violence, in ways important to, yet currently underestimated by, much of the peace studies literature.[11]

I identify four possible interrelated but distinct contributions of feminist thought to Galtung's theory of violence. First, I argue that Galtung's theory would benefit from an understanding of gender as a social construct that embodies power relations, rather than as a synonym for sex. Second, this feminist understanding allows us to see how several categories that shape and permit us to make sense of our social life are deeply gendered and involved in the production and

reproduction of violence at all levels. Third, many feminists see language as constitutive of our social relations and they have successfully shown that language both reflects and reproduces existing gender relations. Furthermore, some feminists have shown that gendered language actualizes possibilities and impossibilities, so that certain social worlds only become imaginable (thus pursuable) through some rather than other forms of verbal communication. Violence or peace can be constituted through language. Finally, recent feminist work on masculinities has presented evidence that violence is deeply implicated in the construction and reproduction of gender relations, and in particular in the construction and reproduction of hegemonic masculinity.

JOHAN GALTUNG'S THEORY OF VIOLENCE

Galtung states that "Violence is present when human beings are being influenced so that their actual somatic and mental realizations are below their potential realizations."[12] The opposite of violence is peace, which encompasses "peace with nature, peace between genders [*sic*], generations and races, where the excluded are included not by force, and where classes, nations and states serve neither direct nor structural violence."[13]

Galtung first elaborated the concept of violence in his "Violence, Peace and Peace Research" in 1969, when he introduced the crucial differentiation between personal and structural violence.[14] In 1990, he introduced the concept of cultural violence.[15] Whereas personal violence is violence *with* a subject, structural violence is violence *without* a subject,[16] and cultural violence serves as legitimization of both personal and structural violence.[17] In structural violence, "violence is built into the structure, and shows up as unequal power and consequently as unequal life chances." It is the unequal distribution of resources, and the unequal distribution of the "power to decide over the distribution of resources" that give rise to structural violence. In this interpretation, resources are seen as not only material or economic, but also nonmaterial, such as education, health care, etc.[18] So, for Galtung, "when one husband beats his wife there is a clear case of personal violence, but when 1 million husbands keep 1 million wives in ignorance there is structural violence"[19] (I will comment on this statement later in this article). Structural violence is impersonal, to the extent that the violence is inherent to the structure of society: whether an actor exists or not, it is irrelevant. Third World feminists are similarly concerned with

structures of inequality and the unequal distribution of material and nonmaterial resources.[20]

In "Typologies of Violence," originally written in 1981, Galtung argues that violence can also be defined in terms of the kind of harm it produces, in terms of what human needs it limits. Both direct and structural violence hamper the need of bodily and psychological integrity, basic material needs (such as the need for sleep, nutrition, movement, health, love, etc.), classical human rights (freedom of expression, need for mobilization, need for work, etc.), and nonmaterial needs (such as solidarity, friendship, happiness, self-actualization, and so on).[21] His focus on human needs, and the various lists of human needs and rights he developed over the years can be viewed as a point of contact between Galtung and feminism.[22] A discussion and comparison between Galtung's and feminist work on development, human needs, and human capabilities goes beyond the scope of this paper. Suffice it to say that Galtung's lists appear to have much in common with a set of criteria for the "good life" that feminist political theorist Brooke Ackerly developed.[23]

Latent violence (violence "that might easily come about")[24] and the threat of violence are also forms of violence. Moreover, a person can be influenced (therefore "violated") through the positive exercise of violence (reward given for obedience to the oppressor's dictates), or through the negative exercise of violence (punishment given for disobedience).[25] These observations resonate with feminist activists and scholars who work with women in battering relationships. For example, the "cycle of violence" in abusive relationships relies on periods in which the batterer does not use force against his victim. These periods, however, are instrumental to tension buildup in a relationship and always lead to more violence. In addition, many women who have experienced abuse report that batterers' threats feel as degrading, intimidating, and hurtful as the actual blows. Finally, batterers commonly rely on "stick and carrot" or "reward and punishment" strategies to force their victim to comply with their demands.

Galtung elaborates on the interaction between agency and structure, between direct and structural violence in *Human Rights in Another Key*.[26] As an example, he identifies the underlying structural elements of torture. He sees torture "not merely as a problem of infraction of human rights in the country where torture shows up, but as one of the strategies of capitalist and social imperialism."[27] Torture is a method of social and political control that depends on the systems that

produce torture hardware (the artifacts used in the torture chambers have to be produced somewhere, most likely by a corporation, and shipped somewhere else), torture software (personnel has to be trained to torture), and torture research (to determine the methods and effectiveness of torture).[28] The structure on which torture depends is sustained because of the economic and political interests of imperialism.

He concludes that the human right of not being tortured is a "shallow" human right. "The deeper right would be the human right to live in a social and world structure that does not produce torture."[29] In other words, direct violence constitutes the tip of an iceberg, while the vast majority of the formation (structural violence) is hidden below the water's surface.[30] He similarly tackles other human rights, such as the right to mental health and the right to a clean environment, underscoring the advantages of a structural approach to them. A structural approach would focus on transformation, rather than "tampering." It would go beyond conception of evil acts by evil actors and highlight how industrialism and commercialism have brought about global economic cycles that make it nearly impossible to detect causes and effects of environmental problems in a linear and clear-cut way.[31]

When talking about war and peace, Galtung reflects on the fact that the "institution of war ... transcend[s] any particular aggressor–victim system."[32] Galtung points out that even in the case of war, violence is rooted in structural and cultural systems, which limit an actor's freedom of choice in regard to the commission of violence.[33] In the same work, he also hints at some "deeper" (i.e., structural) causes of murder,[34] but clings onto the notion that murder can be adequately addressed as a problem "within an actor-orientated paradigm" (idem), thus maintaining a reliance on a direct versus structural dichotomy of violence. In fact, he asserts that "murderers, except at war as soldiers or when hired, cannot claim their innocence as part of structures."[35]

Yet, in the case of murder, as in the case of torture or war, we need to look beyond underlying material structure and into nonmaterial structures or processes. Gender is one of these processes, which would allow us to understand how structures of domination came about. A gender-conscious approach to the relation between direct, structural, and cultural violence would go further than observing that torture chambers must have been built somewhere, or that torturers need to be trained. It would even go beyond relying on the material interests of capitalism to explain the existence of torture hardware. A gender-conscious approach would explore hidden power relations, uncover the ways in which

torture becomes conceivable at the individual and global level, and expose how the system of torture is reliant on gender relations to survive.

Galtung's notion of cultural violence can be useful for looking into the nonmaterial and symbolic systems that provide justification and legitimacy to the use of violence. He opens the door to a nonmaterial approach when he states that,

> [I]f the conflicts are not solved creatively, and the (political) culture defines violence as legitimate in such situations, then structure implies conflict implies violence. But conflicts do not necessarily lead to violence; that depends more on the culture.[36]

Looking for the origins of violence in the nonmaterial sphere, Galtung finds that cultural violence is "those aspects of culture, the symbolic sphere of our existence ... that can be used to justify or legitimize direct or structural violence."[37] Cultural, structural, and personal violence are the three corners of a violence triangle, which is meant to graphically illustrate that all types of violence breed each other in many ways and that violence reproduces itself across all dimensions. Cultural violence, Galtung claims, can be contained in all areas of social life (religion, law, ideology, science, etc.); it serves as a legitimizing factor for both direct and structural violence, whereas it "motivat[es] actors to commit direct violence or [it] omit[s] counteracting structural violence"; and it can be either intended or unintended.[38]

Galtung proposes that a culture of violence stems from a worldview that represents the world in dualistic, mutually exclusive terms: the "Dualism-Manichenism-Armaggeddon"[39] syndrome, where the world is seen in terms of conflict between good and evil.[40] This culture of violence can be derived from certain interpretations of various sacred texts or from ideologies like nationalism, sexism, racism, etc., and provides justification and meaning to violent conflict resolution, insofar as it imbeds the inevitability and righteousness of violence into people's worldviews.[41]

This sort of dualistic thinking has been exposed by feminists as very gendered and the failure to see this gendering has profound consequences for the way we can think about possible solutions to violence. However, the concept of cultural violence constitutes the link, or point of access for a gender-conscious approach to violence. As a matter of fact, feminists think about gender as a symbolic process or system, one that makes other processes or systems possible.

In *Peace by Peaceful Means* Galtung singles out patriarchy as one of the forms of structural violence, having identified gender as one of the "spaces" where violence can be found.[42] Patriarchy is then a vertical structure, with men on top and women on the bottom, expressing itself in many other forms of violence against women, legitimized by cultural justifications. Patriarchy and sexism are also embodied in cultural violence, insofar as certain cultural patterns legitimize the domination of men over women; and in direct violence, insofar as men, rather than women, commit the vast majority of directly violent acts.

But Galtung's explanation of patriarchy leaves much to be desired. He sees it as a system of dominance based on a hierarchical relationship between women and men; he fails to recognize the many forms patriarchy assumes; and he does not acknowledge the ways in which different forms of patriarchy work to regulate relationships between men and between women. Although he does not define gender, Galtung uses the term as a synonym for sex and, more specifically, he sees dubious causal links between male sexuality and male aggressiveness.

Finally he calls for a multidisciplinary approach to addressing gender issues in peace studies, taking into consideration biology, culture, structure, etc., and he uses this argument to dismiss gender as a category of analysis that is valid on its own terms.[43] In this way, he subtly and backhandedly discards studies that focus on gender as a category of analysis. He justifies his own work that "adds women and stirs," without any serious in-depth analysis of how gender works to maintain relationships of subordination and violence at all levels. While decrying the continuous under-representation of women at the higher level of government and business, he himself ignores most feminist works that have looked into the gendering of violence and aggression. He is confused and confusing about whether patriarchy is a cause of violence at all levels or a problem of women–men relationships that makes men violent toward women. Referencing feminist thought would have helped make clear the relationship between violence and gender. I will try to clarify this relationship through the eyes of feminist scholarship in the next section.

GALTUNG AND FEMINIST THOUGHT ON VIOLENCE

Of all of Galtung's works, only in *Peace by Peaceful Means* does he address gender as a "variable" worthy of attention in its own right. While acknowledging that most directly violent acts are committed

by men, his reflections on "this overwhelming correlation" between sex and violence could benefit from feminist insights. In addition, his general theory of violence could also gain insights from feminist theory. Contrary to Galtung's assumptions that "gender" is but one variable in an analysis of violence, feminists would argue that gender is essential to understand the origins of violence and the mechanisms through which it works. I identify four areas of engagement between Galtung's theory of violence and feminism in the four sections below:

1. Gender understood as a social construct
2. The problem with gendered categories
3. The relation between gendered language and violence
4. Gender and violence are mutually constituted

The relationships Galtung sees between direct, structural, and cultural violence need to be revisited in light of feminist contributions. Violence needs to be seen as a *process* rather than as a system or structure. Talking of violence as a structure, or a system, hints at a static and monolithic entity. Conceptualizing violence as a process allows us both to understand the complexities and contestations behind violence as a social practice and to envision possibilities of change.

1. Gender Understood as a Social Construct

Following common understandings, Galtung sees gender as a fault line that separates people into two distinct categories: men and women. Gender for Galtung is a property of individual people and a space where (direct) violence happens. Seen in this way, gender becomes relevant to an analysis of violence insofar as violent men use violence against feeble women or men and/or insofar as there exists a structure that allows for or precipitates men's violence. However, feminists have long argued that gender is only marginally related to biological sex. It is instead a social construct, "socially learned behavior and expectations that distinguish between masculinity and femininity."[44] Gender can be seen as an analytic category, which helps to organize the way people think about the world. People thus come to see social reality as a set of mutually exclusive dichotomous categories, in relationship of super/subordination one to the other.[45]

Essential in contemporary feminist thought about gender is the concept of power. Feminist theories in the social sciences have especially derived theoretical understandings of social phenomena from power

as understood by French philosopher Michel Foucault, who viewed power as a pervasive regulatory system for social control, in which all individuals and social institutions participate.[46] Feminists have also been influenced by Anglo-American reinterpretations of Italian Marxist political philosopher Antonio Gramsci (particularly by Canadian scholar Robert Cox),[47] and especially by these reinterpretations' version of the Gramscian concept of hegemony, which is intended as dominance achieved through a mix of moral persuasion and consent by ruling elites over the majority of society.[48] Regardless of their theoretical inspiration, feminists theorize that power is an essential feature of society and one that maintains relations of domination and subordination between groups of people.[49]

Joan Scott's oft-quoted definition of gender is composed of two interdependent components: "gender is a constitutive element of social relationships based on perceived differences between the sexes," and "gender is a primary way of signifying relationships of power."[50] Gender, intended as the socially constructed dichotomy built upon biological sex differences, is a relation of power, feminists argue, and as such, it shapes, regulates, rationalizes and justifies other social relations of power, which, in turn, are all gendered. From this perspective, gender is "systemic and transformative" as "the world is pervasively shaped by gender meanings."[51]

Failing to understand gender as an analytical category, which has much to do with power in social relations, has profound consequences for Galtung's thought, as it makes him unable to recognize the vast implications gender has for violence and peace as social practices. In the first place, Galtung fails to seriously problematize the equation man : woman = war : peace. Whether by biology or socialization, Galtung concludes that men tend to be more violent and women tend to be more peaceful. With gender understood as sex, Galtung identifies the male sex with aggressiveness and violence and locates the source of violence in male sexuality and socialization. He hypothesizes that male sexuality and violence are neurological neighbors, thus they might be mutually triggered.[52]

It has now been amply demonstrated that genetic and hormonal explanations of aggression and violence are scientifically unsound and have repeatedly failed their own tests of scientific validity and verifiability.[53] Moreover, the supposed biological links between male sexuality and aggression have also been proven weak. Joshua Goldstein surveys scientific findings in this area, and concludes that most men do not find combat sexy/sexual in any way and that testosterone levels are not a

cause of aggression. In addition, maternal behaviors in women (as in the animal world) vastly vary and they include maternal aggression as well as nurturing.[54]

Furthermore, feminists tend to be skeptical of the supposed neutrality of such social science, and claim that all too often "science" has been invoked to justify political and ideological agendas.[55] Betty Rosoff claims that,

> [i]n a sexist society in which war is an instrument of national policy, . . . research attempting to establish a genetically determined role for men in war making would be supported and encouraged.[56]

Such research would serve the double purpose of keeping women out of potentially influential political and military positions and supporting a national agenda where war is always among the policy options in interstate relations.

Most feminist social scientists would not deny the existence of some biological sources of violence, but would also argue that humans have developed social and moral categories that interact with biology in multiple and vastly unknown ways to determine human actions.[57] This is true of sex and sexuality as well, which for humans (and, to a certain degree, for animals too) are profoundly social and moral experiences. Even so, we are still left to explain how violence has come to be seen as socially and morally acceptable by human society. Feminists would argue that gender, not sex, has a lot to do with this process.

An example of the consequences of thinking in sociobiological terms can be found in a controversial 1998 article in *Foreign Affairs* by Francis Fukuyama. Fukuyama proposed that one of the explanations for democratic peace was biology: since Western democracies show a higher level of women's political participation; and since women are biologically less aggressive, adventurous, or competitive than men, Western democracies are more peaceful than authoritarian states. Peacefulness and increased female political involvement could appear as positive developments, Fukuyama argued. However, since most of the world (Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia, i.e., the other-than-white world) will likely continue to be ruled by young males, and since male aggressiveness is rooted in biology, "feminized policies could be a liability"[58] for the future of postindustrial societies. Therefore, "masculine" policies and determined leaders will be necessary to rein in these aggressive men and preserve Western civilization.

Feminists have observed that the argument that men are naturally more predisposed to violence than women has long served to maintain a status quo based on women's (and other categories of people's) subordination. It also underestimates the social realities and innumerable possibilities of peaceful, nonviolent men. In response to Fukuyama's article, J. Ann Tickner suggested that his is an essentially conservative argument, which hides a political agenda of keeping women (and other categories of people who are not identifiable with the white middle-class Western male) in a subordinate position. Not only did Fukuyama's article support female subordination, it also advanced a racist argument according to which non-Western men need to be kept in check, lest they wage wars of conquest against the civilized world.[59]

While this was certainly not Galtung's intention, if a biosocial link between sex and violence is claimed, the bases are laid for a justification of polarization, which, in Galtung's thought, is at the origins of violence itself and might even constitute structural violence, if "those lower down are really hurt/harmed, that is their basic needs are molested or at best left unsatisfied by the structure."[60] In other words, by associating men with a predisposition to violence, Galtung ends up inadvertently supporting the type of thinking which perpetuates violence in society.

Finally, Galtung's particular reliance on a presupposed link between male sexuality and male aggression reveals a heterosexual bias that feminist queer theory has contested. In his discussion about sex and violence, Galtung normalizes male heterosexuality (he talks about "the typical adult human male"),[61] and confines experiences of alternative sexualities to silence. So, for example, when he reflects on the relationship between sexist language and the war system, Galtung assumes that the imagery of "smart bombs" entering targets evokes fantasies of gang rape, thus implying an undefined link between sex/violence language and military might. By doing this, however, he commits the double mistake of thinking that somehow gang rape is sexy or exciting in the minds of military men (implying that they are all possible violent rapists) and denying that the gang rape imagery, instead, serves homoerotic functions, insofar as it allows to "simultaneously affirm and deny the erotic bond in male groups."[62] Moreover, as Carol Cohn has observed, the implications for the use of sexual imagery when referring to the war machine go beyond the display of masculine prowess: the imagery can be interpreted as "a way of minimizing the seriousness of military endeavors, of denying their deadly consequences"[63] (I will return to this point later in this article).

Queer theorists have argued that silence about homosexuality or homoeroticism in male groups is a reflection of heterosexual hegemony, which has its basis in fundamental societal inequalities and gender roles. This heterosexual hegemony "relies not only on consent, legitimation and 'common sense,' but also on moments of denial, silencing and coercion."[64] Thus, relying on heterosexual male experiences to describe their supposed relationship to violent behavior both disempowers "different" masculinities and legitimates their subjugation; it also downplays the innumerable possibilities for a nonviolent sexuality–biology relationship that these alternative models might present.

More compelling, from a "scientific" point of view, are explanations of the sex/violence nexus that are based on socialization. Galtung's assertion that boys are socialized into aggression finds empirical support across cultures, where sex segregation is marked by boys' rougher group play.[65] However, these data are by no means clear on the direction of such supposed causation: is aggression caused by socialization into sex roles or are gender identities produced by different socialization practices?[66] Although within a very different framework, far from the positivist idea of causation,[67] most feminists would be closer to a position that supports the latter statement. I will discuss this further in the following sections.

2. *The Problem of Gendered Categories*

Robert Connell stated that gender "means practice organized in terms of, or in relation to, the reproductive division of people into male and female."[68] As previously mentioned, then, feminists see gender as a way of organizing the world into sets of distinct, mutually exclusive, categories. These categories are in a relationship of super/subordination one to the other and they both reflect and reproduce the gender order. According to Sandra Harding, gender symbolism is the process through which gender metaphors are assigned to various perceived dichotomies, so that when people think in terms of dichotomies, they also associate each of them with either femininity or masculinity. The categories that are associated with femininity are valued less than the ones associated with masculinity.[69] Activity versus passivity, rationality versus emotion, and strength versus weakness are some of these dualisms and so are war/violence versus peace. The first of each pair of terms is usually associated with masculinity and is assigned a higher value than the second term. Many feminists would argue that reversing the hierarchy

implied in each pair would not constitute a solution to existing social inequalities, as each pair would still hide, reproduce, and naturalize unequal social relations of power.[70]

Therefore, when social scientists think in terms of dichotomies, they reproduce gender relations of power in their own theory, thus legitimizing relationships of dominance and subordination at all levels. Galtung is not immune to this, as he frames the concept of violence in dichotomous terms, in opposition to the concept of peace. He relies on a binary opposition, when he defines peace as the absence of violence or violence as the opposite of peace. Although in his view peace and nonviolence are superior to violence, he ends up reproducing theoretically a distinction based on unequal power relations. This is not to say that violence and peace are or should be equally valued. However, a feminist analysis would complicate the relationship between the two terms; look at how violence and peace are not monolithic mutually exclusive categories, and how islands of violence can exist within seas of peace or vice versa.

For example, feminist scholars in international relations have observed that when IR scholars talk about peace, they ignore the wars going on inside the home, in the form of domestic violence. This is due to the fact that nonfeminist IR reproduces the gendered opposition between public and private sphere; it establishes its boundaries at the edge of the public sphere, therefore ignoring the feminized domestic life. This has led the discipline to overlook issues such as rape in wartime, battering in intimate relationships, and other forms of violence against women as they relate to the world of international affairs. However, feminists claim that, far from being strictly domestic or private matters, instances of violence against women are often related to international relations in unsuspected ways.

The wars in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda in the early 1990s have brought to international attention once again the widespread use of rape as part of wartime strategies of conquest. Rather than representing isolated acts by rogue soldiers or troops, rape in wartime has been shown to be a deliberate strategic move. It had and has multiple meanings and sources: it is symbolic, in that rape of one or many enemy women represents conquest and power over the enemy's national and cultural identity; it is constitutive of soldiers' identities insofar as it helps to build and it reinforces a (violent) type of hegemonic masculinity needed for warfare; it is relational, in that wartime rape's construction of hegemonic masculinity depends on the existence of oppositional categories of subjugated women and emasculated enemy men.[71] The

relevance of an analysis of wartime rape for the development of a comprehensive theory of violence goes beyond the violence to which many women are subjected and speaks directly to the way power relations of gender are intertwined with the justifications for and legitimation of war.

Second-generation feminist IR scholars have studied subjects such as military prostitution and domestic work, and they have convincingly subverted the largely artificial distinction between public and private in international relations. Expanding Cynthia Enloe's pioneering work on military prostitution, which showed the interdependence between masculinist ideologies, international politics, and institutionalized sexual relations,[72] Katharine Moon demonstrated that military prostitutes in South Korea

> are more directly involved in international politics than through their part in gendered schemes of power, that their relationships with foreign soldiers *personify and define*, not only underlie, relations between governments.[73]

Within a Coxian-Gramscian framework, Christine Chin investigated Filipina domestic workers in Malaysia and concluded that "transnational migrant female domestic labor has become an integral component in the state elite's strategy of garnering consent for export-oriented development."[74] Both Moon's military prostitutes and Chin's migrant domestic workers are categories of people who are subject to intense exploitation and violence of all kinds, and are players in an extensive network of relations between political and military apparati, private citizens, and economic interests. Yet, they have been overlooked by a discipline whose core principle and purpose is the elimination of violence.

These and other studies show the interaction between seemingly opposing and mutually exclusive arenas, such as domestic and international, private and public. They also highlight the problematic characterization of women (and especially certain women) as victims, rather than agents. The dichotomies victimizer/victim and subject/object, which Galtung adopts as part of his definition of violence, are also profoundly gendered and do not accurately reflect the multiplicity of ways in which people live through and despite violence. The subject/object distinction, in particular, is one that feminists have amply problematized in epistemological and methodological terms. Rejecting claims of objectivity in

science, feminists have questioned the possibility and desirability of separating the knower from the known and have argued for methodologies that are constantly questioning and redefining the relationship between researcher and researched.[75] More importantly for my purposes, feminists contend that the subject/object distinction relies on the assumption that the object is passive, thus rejecting the possibility of her agency and empowerment. The experiences of feminists working on the issue of prostitution can exemplify these points.

Contemporary approaches to sex work fall into three categories. Radical feminists[76] think of prostitution as another example of men's exploitation of women: control over women's sexuality and body is a distinguished feature of the patriarchal system, and prostitution and pornography are manifestations and instruments of such control. In the middle of the 1980s, a newly born prostitutes' rights movement[77] started arguing for a position that would take into consideration prostitutes' views of themselves and their work and, to this end, they introduced a distinction between forced and voluntary prostitution. In response to radical feminists, prostitutes proposed that prostitution was a legitimate occupation, which people could freely choose. However, activists claimed, trafficking and forced prostitution constituted unequivocal examples of violence against women. According to activists, international law should respect the prostitutes' rights to self-determination, while combating the abuse perpetrated by those who force women (and other people) into sex work.[78] This position started to gain prevalence in the international community toward the end of the 1980s and it is still the dominant approach to sex work in international law frameworks and organizations. Either of these two positions would fit into Galtung's analysis of violence: they both posit a clear distinction between victims and perpetrators, and they also both posit the need for protection for one and punishment or determent for the other.

In recent years, however, experiences drawn from more than a decade of antitrafficking measures have prompted a reexamination of the latter framework. Starting from the lives of sex workers in the global South, Third World feminists are not only rejecting radical feminism's claims as yet another attempt to colonize the "other" woman's body, but also the voluntary/forced distinction as harmful for prostitutes' rights and self-determination. In particular, they argue that this distinction leads to the relegation of prostitutes into two mutually exclusive categories, the innocent victim (of sex trafficking) and the self-determined prostitute. Such a division reproduces a Victorian-era distinction that classified

all women either as virtuous madonnas or dirty whores. The only prostitutes in need of protection are those falling into the first category, whereas the others are left to fend for themselves, if their rights are violated. This dichotomization is also problematic for Third World feminists because it focuses on poverty as a factor that "forces" women into prostitution: the "poverty as force" approach hides "underlying racist and classist implications" insofar as it does not "respect the choice of a woman from a developing country."[79] The voluntary versus forced distinction depends on an objectification of certain categories of people and on attempts at establishing social control over them. Thus, for example, repressive policies have been enacted by states against sex workers, using the trafficking issue as a moral and legal justification, whereas prostitutes have remained ignored and their rights unprotected.[80]

Feminist experiences and reflections around sex work issues offer three distinct contributions to Galtung's theory of violence. First, they point to the practical implications of viewing violence within a victim/perpetrator framework, and especially to the dangers of putting people into the "victim" category, without reflecting on the victim's agency and on her own definition of her situation. A true victim-oriented perspective would take into account the experience of violence from the point of view of all those who suffer it. The idea of seeing the world in terms of victims versus aggressors, and not in terms of agents (which can simultaneously be victims and aggressors) is a flawed one: it does not allow the exploration of possibilities beyond paternalistic interventions, which at best might not be effective, and at worst might be the cause of further violence.

Sex workers' theorizing also reveals the deeply gendered nature of the violence/peace dichotomy, which reproduces relations of power and subjugation in society. Putting peace as the superior category just reverses the power relation between the two, leaving a structure of domination in place. Sex workers have shown that states of peace and violence coexist in a continuum. In some cases, one may be the precondition for the other. Within this continuum, spaces can be and have been created in all situations for the subversion of the unequal social structure and the establishment of potentially transformative relationships. When women create spaces within a potentially or actually exploitative system, they carve out opportunities and come to see their work as empowerment and emancipation. Efforts at eliminating such spaces are, in turn, seen as domination or colonization of women's bodies, as yet

another form of violence.[81] Protection needs to be seen in the context of women's agency, needs, and self-definition.

Finally, Third World feminists have articulated a view of sex work in the context of women's agency that complicates the direct–structural–cultural violence triangle posited by Galtung. Although he recognizes that different types of violence are mutually reinforcing, feminist scholarship has further shown that direct violence is a method for the social control of both men and women and, in particular, of specific categories of human beings. Direct violence as a method of social control (thus, of structural and cultural violence) is seen, for example, in domestic violence, where battering is used to maintain a structure of domination within the family. Galtung's example of domestic violence as a case of direct violence (which I mentioned earlier) is one of the few references to gender in Galtung's early works, but it is revealing of the way he thinks about gender (as a biological category). It also speaks to his underestimation of both the pervasiveness of domestic violence and the tight connections existing between wife abuse and structural violence against women. In fact, feminist research on domestic violence has amply shown that violence in the home is an instrument for the social control of women. Abusive men use direct violence to control and/or prevent women's access to education, work, social relations, etc.[82] In other words, direct violence is a tool used to build, perpetuate, and reproduce structural violence.

Violence as a method for social control is also seen in rape, which, rather than being an individual's aberration, is "deeply embedded in power inequalities and ideologies of male supremacy."[83] In the case of sex work, attempts at "saving" prostitutes are, themselves, viewed by prostitutes as another form of control, violence, and colonization. Feminist analysis posits a mutually reinforcing relation between the different kinds of violence and all interact to maintain social relations of power. The gender order makes violence possible and, as I will later show in further detail, violence acts as a constitutive element of the gender order. One of the vehicles through which this relationship is worked out is gendered language, a mechanism through which violence is legitimated in society.

3. The Relation Between Gendered Language and Violence

Feminists contend that gender relations are embedded in the legitimation of violence. One of the channels through which legitimation occurs

is language. Galtung recognizes the role that language plays in breeding a culture of violence. In *Peace by Peaceful Means*, he sees language as one element of cultural violence, which serves to legitimize all other types of violence. So, in Galtung's view the language of sex serves to legitimize the biologically and socially derived association between (hetero)sexual acts and violence. Violence becomes sexy as it is associated with copulation.[84] A look at feminist works on the gendering of language again offers a more sophisticated and more troubling view of the role of language in the reproduction of violence. In particular, Galtung doesn't talk about the mechanisms through which violence discourse gets abstracted, and which not only serve to justify violence as domination (and sex as domination), but also to limit our choices for political options.

Through an analysis of the discourse of high-level officials involved in the planning and operation of the Vietnam War, Jennifer Milliken and David Sylvan reconstructed the world as seen by U.S. foreign-policy-makers. They argued that the gender order defined their foreign policy in such a way that targets were treated differently according to the sex with which they were identified. So U.S. policy-makers viewed female-identified South Vietnamese adversaries in a relationship of subordination to them; the South Vietnamese were viewed as bodies to dominate. On the other hand, male-identified North Vietnamese targets were viewed as sources of competition, thus seeing annihilation as the option in relation to them.[85] One can easily see that, not only did gender relations of power have a great deal to do with the way in which the war in Vietnam was conducted, but also that, in the minds and imagination of U.S. policy-makers, the war in Vietnam was a reflection of the gender order as they lived it. In enacting the war, strategists were also recreating the existing gender order. Violence then reproduced the gender order and language was a medium through which this process was enacted.

Through her experiences working and studying with defense intellectuals, Carol Cohn discovered that the "elaborate use of abstraction and euphemism" in the "technostrategic" language used by these intellectuals "never forced the speaker or enabled the listener to touch the realities of nuclear holocaust that lay behind the words."[86] In addition to abstractions, defense strategists used a sexually charged language to describe bombs and missiles. However, resisting the temptation that led some earlier feminists to associate the arms race with "phallic worship" or "missile envy," Cohn also went beyond Galtung's idea that there is a connection between male sexuality and bombs. While

observing the deeply homoerotic function of imageries such as "patting the missile," Cohn hypothesized that, because one pats what is harmless and little, the act and imagery of patting represented a way to minimize or deny the deadly impact of weapons of mass destruction.

For Cohn, however, one of the most surprising discoveries was when she heard defense analysts speak about weapons and war strategies with domestic metaphors:

> [i]n the ever-friendly, even romantic world of nuclear weaponry, enemies "exchange" warheads; one missile "takes out" another; weapons systems can "marry up"; "coupling" is sometimes used to refer to the wiring between mechanisms of warning and response, or to the psycho-political links between strategic (intercontinental) and theater (European-based) weapons.[87]

On the one hand, these metaphors allow people to "think the unthinkable," to minimize and make more comfortable the possibilities that nuclear arms embody; on the other, images of male birth and religious images seemed to act like a contorted replacement of the power to create with the power to destroy. These and other images acted as powerful and seducing tools, to allow both speaker and listener to talk about nuclear destruction from the point of view of the user, the controller of nuclear weapons, and not their victims.[88] The highly abstract and specialized language of nuclear strategists simply does not have words that speak about human suffering and burning flesh, but it offers distance from and control of nuclear arms and the consequences of their use. Insofar as it cannot describe emotions, as it is highly abstract and clinical, and insofar as its utterance is distanced and dispassionate, technostrategic language is gendered and it is based on the suppression, silencing, and delegitimation of all that is feminine.[89]

Most importantly, learning to understand and use technostrategic language is a process through which the mind becomes militarized, even when the intent is to outsmart or get the better of nuclear strategists at their own game:

> The activity of trying to out-reason defense intellectuals in their own games gets you thinking inside their rules, tacitly accepting all the unspoken assumptions of their paradigms. You become subject to the tyranny of concepts. The language shapes your categories of thought ... and defines the boundaries of the imagination.[90]

This highly gendered discourse is also a curtain behind which political decisions are made, and it is used to legitimize such decisions. Debunking its rationality myth and exposing its highly gendered nature and dependence on denigration of the feminine, fear of death, homoeroticism, heterosexism, and the enjoyment of belonging to a privileged community, is an important way to challenge the power of such discourse and the destructive possibilities it creates.

In summary, feminist analysis is important to underscore the ways in which language both legitimizes and creates certain realities, rather than others. Because it allows us to see the processes through which language is constitutive as well as reflective of reality, gender analysis also permits us to imagine ways in which alternative realities can be created. This is especially relevant when thinking about the language that creates and recreates violence as a real possibility in people's lives, whether it is war or battering of intimate partners.

4. Gender and Violence Are Mutually Constituted

Galtung relies on biological sex to understand the process by which violence becomes acceptable and accepted in society. Feminists talk about masculinities and femininities. Masculinity and femininity are not biologically determined categories. They are, instead, socially constituted ideal types to which "real" men and women must conform.

Drawing on Robert Connell's influential work on *Gender and Power*, many feminists see the gender order as constituted by and dependent on a power hierarchy of masculinities and femininities, at the top of which stands the ideal of hegemonic masculinity. This, in turn, "is always constructed in relation to various subordinated masculinities as well as in relation to women."[91] For most contemporary feminist social scientists, violence is a socially learned expression of this specific kind of masculinity (i.e., hegemonic masculinity).[92] Furthermore, violence is seen as implicated in the construction of hegemonic masculinity. Since gender is a practice,[93] produced and reproduced through social relations, violence can be seen as a method for the reproduction of the "gender order."

In his research on men in sports, for example, Michael Messner situated "sports violence as a practice which helps to construct hegemonic masculinity."[94] Historically, violent sports were instituted as a response to women's increasing power in society and the corresponding loss of male privilege; moreover, they were created expressly as a training ground

for the battlefield and for the shaping of the male body into a "manliness" ideal.[95] Correspondingly, war,

> was widely believed to develop those martial qualities in men that were seen to be needed in the struggle for life, and it was widely thought that there was an inseparable link between the fulfillment of martial ideals for the individual man and imperialism abroad.[96]

Soldiering and the associated capacity for violence as a practice has historically been constitutive of masculinity, at least a particular kind of masculinity.[97] In addition, the training of soldiers has been as much about regulating, categorizing, shaping, and modifying men's bodies for battle as it has been about establishing and normalizing gender relations of power. Military training is designed to force men to develop a tolerance for violence toward oneself and toward others. Scandals raised by several spousal murders involving military families in Fort Bragg army base in 2002 have brought the attention of the U.S. public to the under-researched and under-reported problem of domestic abuse in the military. Although incomplete, comparative studies consistently show a higher incidence of spousal and intimate partner abuse in the military than among the civilian population.[98] In April 2000, the Department of Defense created a Task Force devoted to the study and prevention of, and struggle against, the battering of intimate partners, which has been recognized as a "pervasive problem" among military ranks.[99] The Department of Defense attributes the frequency of spousal abuse to the stresses peculiar to the military lifestyle, such as frequent deployments, dangerous duty, long job hours, and the like.

Official sources would obviously deny that violence is endemic to the military as an institution. A theory consistent with Johan Galtung's definition of violence could claim that the military inherently possesses a culture of violence that legitimates violence against women. However, feminists would go further than that and contend that the building of a violent culture and behavior *depends* on the building of a hatred and subjugation of the feminine. Thus, violence is involved in the construction of masculinity through the shaping of the male body and the domination of women, the female body, and all that is associated with the feminine. "The threat of feminization is a tool with which male conformity to a hegemonic ideal is policed,"[100] and strategies of feminization are used in the formation of "hierarchies of masculinities," thus in the subordination of groups of men by other men.[101]

Furthermore, military service has served as a rite of passage for young men in many societies and has been linked to the privileges and power associated with modern citizenship. In contemporary U.S. society, having served in the military and having been in combat are seen as important for the establishment of a high-ranking political career, for example. This rite of passage has long depended on an exclusionary process which denied women and categories of men that did not fit the hegemonic ideals access to the military and to the associated citizenship rights.[102] In sum and most importantly, the links between military service, citizenship, and the modern state establish a connection between violence, citizenship, and hegemonic masculinity, so that all depend upon each other for permanence and recreation. The capacity or potential for violence is then indissolubly associated with citizenship and the state through an appeal to "manliness."

Feminization as an exclusionary and policing process has also served as a tool of state policies, more generally. Feminization has been essential in the justification of imperialism. Western state creation and identification depended on a binary construct that juxtaposed the "civilized" world with the "uncivilized" and feminized "other" so as to make possible, justify, and legitimize colonization in its various (violent) forms.[103] For example, Mrinalini Sinha showed that imperialism was inextricably connected to and dependent on gender relations and identities, through the development and manipulation of an ideal of manliness on the part of the ruler. Sinha saw British opposition to self rule in the nineteenth-century province of Bengali as linked to a Victorian ideal of manliness which was reflected in the British construction of Bengali men as effeminate, lustful, primitive, thus incapable of self-restraint and self-government. Victorian hegemonic masculinity models thus served to justify and legitimize the retention of exclusive political and economic power over Bengali society at the exclusion of Bengali men.[104] In other words, imperialism as form of direct violence with structurally violent consequences is itself dependent on gender relations for its existence and perpetuation.

This discussion about violence and masculinities reveals that more than constituting the cultural environment that makes violence acceptable and legitimate, as Galtung claims, gender relations are implicated in the very creation of violence. Violence is both made *possible* by the existence of power/gender relations, and power/gender relations *rely on* violence for their reproduction. Violence and gender are involved in a relationship of mutual constitution.

A PEACE STUDIES/FEMINISM ALLIANCE? CONCLUSIONS

Many scholars have problematized the relationship between women and peace. Christine Sylvester, Jean Elshtain, J. Ann Tickner, and Berenice Carroll, among others, have correctly pointed out that the association of women with peace is disempowering and harmful for both women and peace. It is also disempowering for men who are peacemakers, because somehow, according to this view, they have to accept the idea that they are emasculated males.

My contention is that an alliance between peace studies and feminism is possible only if peace studies scholars start taking feminism seriously and undertake reformulations of their theories, concepts, and categories, based on the premise that gender is an important and useful category of analysis. By reexamining Johan Galtung's theory of violence with "gender lenses" we can see that this alliance is indeed in the best interest of both peace studies and feminism.

Galtung's theory of violence offers theorists and practitioners in the field of violence against women a framework within which violence against women can be seen in the larger context of societal violence. While feminists have variously theorized about the subjects of war and violence, and have found links and continuities between all forms of oppression, a feminist theory of violence that takes into account violence of different kinds does not exist. Galtung and the peace studies framework provide us with one. Moreover, Galtung's violence triangle maintains a critical focus on systems and structures of inequality, while allowing for the discussion of differences and identities that is so crucial to feminism.

On the other hand, feminism contributes to Galtung's theory by seriously tackling issues of power and gender, which are essential to an understanding of violence as a complicated process through which social relations of power are built, legitimized, reproduced, and naturalized. By viewing gender as a social construct, a gender-sensitive theory of violence dispels the myth of a peaceful or peace-prone femininity (and correspondingly a warrior, or war-prone masculinity). We are then able to see that a variety of masculinities and femininities exist, which experience violence in different terms and from different positions of power. Moreover, relations of gender permeate all other social forms of organization, which therefore depend on hierarchical gender notions to exist and be justified. Gender as a symbolic construct allows us to break down gendered dichotomies such as violence/peace, victim/

perpetrator, and subject/object and focus on continuities, complexities, and contestations when looking at social phenomena and social relations. The dismantling of binary categories also lets us envision avenues for change and empowerment.

Furthermore, feminists have shown that the gender order makes violence possible by operating through language metaphors. Gendered language shapes our view of the world in such a way that only certain worlds are made imaginable, where other visions are erased from the realm of possibilities. Gendered language legitimates and naturalizes worlds that are based on domination and violence. Finally, a gender-sensitive theory of violence posits that socialization methods rely on violence to determine gender identities and that hegemonic masculinities are shaped by violence. Violence is involved in the creation of masculinities in such a way that it then becomes equated with "being a man." Violence is to be found at the basis of our social organization, as it produces and reproduces the gender order. On the other hand, the gender order naturalizes and reproduces unequal and violent social relations. With a gender lens, we can understand how violence and (gender) power relations are mutually constituted in all spheres of social life.

Gender lenses also allow us to see how the three components of the violence triangle posited by Galtung (direct, structural, and cultural violence) are related to each other, and contribute to the preservation of violence in society. The different levels of violence cannot be viewed in isolation from each other, and they cannot be viewed as independent from the social construction of hegemonic identities, be it hegemonic masculinities or hegemonic races.

In opposition to IR theorists of various shapes, Christine Sylvester asserted that security is an ever-contested, ever-moving process, a site of struggles, partial achievements, and incoherences. Against a universalizing, timeless, either-or approach to international security, Sylvester suggested that security "is always partial ... both elusive and mundane."[105] I propose that, similarly, violence can be seen as a process that involves different, at times contradictory, practices, at different but coexisting and interdependent levels. Violence is not a static entity: it involves constant change and adaptation to society's new requirements. Violence is aided, sustained, and reproduced through institutions, practices, and discourses. It is in a relationship of mutual constitution to institutions, practices, and discourses.[106] It is not a static system, thus it also embodies change and the elements of its own dismantling as a practice or process. Violence as a process is embedded in language and

in all social institutions. It is constituted by and constitutive of gender relations of power. It depends on gendered dichotomies for its existence. The different levels at which violence manifests itself might well be exemplified by Galtung's violence triangle, but they cannot be divorced from gender.

NOTES

For assistance in this project, I thank J. Ann Tickner, my dissertation advisor, as well as Hayward R. Alker, Steven Lamy, Daniel Lynch, Nelly Stromquist, and Brooke Ackerly. I am also grateful to Evelyn Boyd, Melissa Ince, K. Alan Kronstadt, Laura Landolt, Serena Simoni, Laura Sjoberg, and Leslie Wirpsa, as well as two anonymous reviewers from *Peace & Change*, and panel participants from the 2003 (West) and 2004 International Studies Association Conferences. The USC College of Letters Arts & Sciences' School of International Relations and the USC Graduate School provided financial and institutional assistance. I especially acknowledge Linda Cole. Clients and fellow counselors from WomenShelter, Long Beach, have provided me with invaluable insights into the dynamics of violence. Finally, kudos to Bruce and Alessandro for their love and support.

1. Betty Reardon, *Sexism and the War System* (New York: Teachers' College Press, 1985); Birgit Brock-Utne, *Feminist Perspectives on Peace and Peace Education* (New York: Pergamon Press, 1989); Sara Ruddick, *Maternal Thinking: Toward a Politics of Peace* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1989). Ruddick is generally cited as belonging to this tradition. Her work points out, rather, that the practice of mothering offers a set of skills and tools that are useful and necessary to peacemaking. Therefore, while peacemaking "is rooted in the daily lives of many women" (p. 219), men, too, can and have engaged in peace-fostering maternal thinking. For a critique to Ruddick, see Nancy Scheper-Hughes, "Maternal Thinking and the Politics of War," in *The Women and War Reader*, eds. Lois Ann Lorentzen and Jennifer Turpin (New York and London: NYU Press, 1998), 227–233; and Bayard de Volo, "Drafting Motherhood: Maternal Imagery and Organizations in the United States and Nicaragua," in *The Women and War Reader*, eds. Lois Ann Lorentzen and Jennifer Turpin (New York and London: NYU Press, 1998), 240–253.

2. Jean Bethke Elshtain, "The Problem with Peace," in *Women, Militarism, and War: Essays in History, Politics, and Social Theory*, eds. Jean Bethke Elshtain and Sheila Tobias (Savage, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1990), 255–266.

3. Christine Sylvester, "Some Dangers in Merging Feminist and Peace Projects," *Alternatives* 12 (1987): 493–509.

4. J. Ann Tickner, *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992), 59.

5. See also Berenice A. Carroll, "Feminism and Pacifism: Historical and Theoretical Connections," in *Women and Peace: Theoretical, Historical and Practical Perspectives*, ed. Ruth Roach Pierson with the assistance of Johanne Thompson, Somer Brodribb, and Paula Bourne (London, New York, and Sydney: Croomm Helm, 1987).

6. Christine Sylvester, "Some Dangers in Merging Feminist and Peace Projects," *Alternatives* 12 (1987): 493.

7. Terrell Northrup, "The Uneasy Partnership Between Conflict Theory and Feminist Theory," unpublished manuscript, 2–5.

8. Berenice Carroll describes moments of theoretical contact between pacifism and feminism and suggests further study and conversations about the ways gender relations and patriarchy (or, I would argue, different versions of patriarchy) are related to violence and war: Berenice Carroll, "Feminism and Pacifism." Sara Ruddick argues that "feminist maternal peace politics" participates in "continuous inventions of 'peace' ": Sara Ruddick, *Maternal Thinking*, 245. Though I disagree with parts of their arguments, this article is offered as a contribution to, and a continuation of, the conversation initiated and hoped for by Carroll, Ruddick, and other feminist peace historians and researchers about the ways in which feminist insights can contribute to a theory of peace and peacemaking. See also Jeanne Vickers, *Women and War* (London: Zed Books, 1993); Mary K. Burguieres, "Feminist Approaches to Peace: Another Step for Peace Studies," *Millenium: Journal of International Studies* 19, 1 (1990); *Rocking the Ship of State: Toward a Feminist Peace Politics*, eds. Adrienne Harris and Ynestra King (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1989).

9. See, for example, Jeanne Vickers, *Women and War*.

10. Galtung makes these concepts the centerpieces of his peace theory. Both concepts are accepted and widely used by a variety of scholars, including feminists: see, for example, Cordula Reimann, "Engendering the Field of Conflict Management: Why Gender Does Not Matter! Thoughts from a Theoretical Perspective," in *Common Ground or Mutual Exclusion? Women's Movements and International Relations*, eds. Marianne Braig and Sonja Wölte (London and New York: Zed Books, 2002), 99–128.

11. While I take Galtung as a point of departure, I need to stress that conflict and peace theory in general ignore or pay only lip service to feminist theory. See Cordula Reimann, "Engendering the Field of Conflict Management."

12. Johan Galtung, "Structural and Direct Violence: Note on Operationalization," in *Peace: Research Education Action. Essays in Peace Research Vol. I* (Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers, 1975), 110–111.

13. Johan Galtung, "TRANSCEND: A Philosophy of Peace—And One Way of Enacting It," in *Searching for Peace: The Road to TRANSCEND*, 2nd edn., eds. Johan Galtung, Carl G. Jacobsen, and Jai Frithjof Brand-Jacobsen (London and Sterling, VA: Pluto Press, 2002), xiii.

14. Johan Galtung, "Structural and Direct Violence."

15. Johan Galtung, "Cultural Violence," *Journal of Peace Research* 27 (1990): 291–305.

16. See also Johan Galtung, "Conflict, War and Peace: A Bird's Eye View," in *Searching for Peace: The Road to TRANSCEND*, 2nd edn., eds. Johan Galtung, Carl G. Jacobsen, and Jai Frithjof Brand-Jacobsen (London and Sterling, VA: Pluto Press, 2002), 4.

17. Johan Galtung, "Cultural Violence."

18. Johan Galtung, "Violence, Peace and Peace Research," *Journal of Peace Research* 6 (1969): 171.

19. Johan Galtung, "Structural and Direct Violence," 114.

20. See, for example, the excellent edited volume *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, eds. Chandra Talpade Mohanty. Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991).

21. Johan Galtung, "Typologies of Violence," in *Transarmament and the Cold War. Essays in Peace Research Vol. VI* (Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers, 1988), 271–272.

22. See for example Johan Galtung, *Human Rights in Another Key* (Cambridge, UK, and Cambridge, MA: Polity Press, 1994), 116–146.

23. Brooke A. Ackerly, *Political Theory and Feminist Social Criticism* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2000). Ackerly is one of the most recent in a series of feminist (and nonfeminist) scholars who have developed a set of criteria deemed necessary for a fulfilling life as humans. Among her predecessors are feminist philosopher Martha Nussbaum and Nobel Laureate economist Amartya Sen, who have developed the "human capabilities" approach to questions of development and human rights: Martha C. Nussbaum and Amartya Sen, *The Quality of Life* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993); see also *Women, Culture, and Development: A Study of Human Capabilities*, eds. Martha C. Nussbaum and Jonathan Glover (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995). For a list of other scholars, activists and international instruments that have preceded and inspired her, see Brooke A. Ackerly, *Political Theory,* 113–114.

24. Johan Galtung, "Structural and Direct Violence," 115.

25. Ibid., 112–113.

26. Johan Galtung, *Human Rights in Another Key*.

27. Ibid., 133.

28. Johan Galtung, *Human Rights in Another Key*, 133–134.

29. Ibid., 134.

30. Jai Frithjof Brand-Jacobsen, "Peace: The Goal and the Way," in *Searching for Peace: The Road to TRANSCEND*, 2nd edn., eds. Johan Galtung, Carl G. Jacobsen, and Jai Frithjof Brand-Jacobsen (London and Sterling, VA: Pluto Press, 2002), 17.

31. Johan Galtung, *Human Rights in Another Key*, 136.

32. Ibid., 138.

33. Ibid., 139.

34. Ibid., 136.

35. Ibid., 139.

36. Ibid., 141.

37. Johan Galtung, "Cultural Violence," 291.

38. Johan Galtung, *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization* (Oslo, Norway: International Peace Research Institute; and London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1996), 31.

39. Johan Galtung, "Conflict, War and Peace," 5.

40. Johan Galtung, "Cultural Violence," 301.

41. Ibid., 296–301; Johan Galtung, "Conflict, War and Peace," 5–6.

42. Johan Galtung, *Peace by Peaceful Means*, 30 and 33.

43. Ibid., 30–42.

44. V. Spike Peterson and Anne Sisson Runyan, *Global Gender Issues: Dilemmas in World Politics*, 2nd edn. (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1999), 5.

45. Ibid., 5–10; see also J. Ann Tickner, *Gender in International Relations*, 5–9.

46. See for example Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Vol. I: An Introduction* (New York: Vintage, 1980), 97–98.

47. See Robert W. Cox, "Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations: An Essay in Method," *Millenium: Journal of International Relations* 12, 2 (1983).

48. Antonio Gramsci, *Prison Notebooks* (New York and Oxford: Columbia University Press, 1992); also see Joseph V. Femia, *Gramsci's Political Thought: Hegemony, Consciousness, and the Revolutionary Process* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 23–60; Roger Simon, *Gramsci's Political Thought* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1982), 21–28; Robert W. Connell, *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1987), 183–188.

49. See Charlotte Hooper, *Manly States: Masculinities, International Relations, and Gender Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), ch. 2.

Seen from Foucauldian and Gramscian perspectives, gender as power explains how women and subordinated men can consent to or be persuaded to participate in their own subordination.

50. Joan Wallach Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 42.

51. V. Spike Peterson, "Introduction," in *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory*, ed. V. Spike Peterson (Boulder, CO, and London: Lynne Rienner, 1992), 8–9.

52. Johan Galtung, *Peace by Peaceful Means*, 42.

53. *On Peace, War, and Gender: A Challenge to Genetic Explanations*, ed. Anne E. Hunter (New York: Feminist Press at CUNY, 1991); see also Robert W. Connell, "Masculinity, Violence, and War," in *Men's Lives*, 3rd edn., eds. Michael A. Messner and Michael S. Kimmel (Boston, London, and Toronto: Allyn and Bacon, 1995), 125–130; and Robert W. Connell, "Arms and the Man: Using the New Research on Masculinity to Understand Violence and Promote Peace in the Contemporary World," in *Male Roles, Masculinities and Violence: A Culture of Peace Perspective*, eds. Ingeborg Breines, Robert Connell, and Ingrid Eide (Paris: UNESCO, 2000), 21–34.

54. Joshua S. Goldstein, *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 403–405; see also Suzanne R. Sunday, "Biological Theories of Animal Aggression," in *On Peace, War, and Gender: A Challenge to Genetic Explanations*, ed. Anne E. Hunter (New York: CUNY Press, 1991), 50–63.

55. See J. Ann Tickner, "You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements Between Feminists and IR Theorists," *International Studies Quarterly* 41 (1997): 619–623.

56. Betty Rosoff, "Genes, Hormones, and War," in *On Peace, War, and Gender: A Challenge to Genetic Explanations*, ed. Anne E. Hunter (New York: CUNY Press, 1991), 39.

57. Dave Grossman observed that soldiers show a "natural" reluctance to kill even in face of a danger for themselves or their friends. This reluctance, however, can and has been effectively overcome in the U.S. military by intensive training and conditioning to kill. While the firing rate (the percentage of times soldiers actually fired their guns) in the Second World War was 15–20 percent, the percentage had increased to 55 during the Korean War and to 90–95 during the Vietnam War. This was accomplished, however, at enormous psychological costs for the veterans of that war: David A. Grossman, *On Killing: The Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society* (Boston, New York, Toronto, and London: Little, Brown & Company, 1995). Berenice Carroll also rightly notes that "pacific behavior is actually the human norm, for both men

and women" and that "the very notions of 'courage' and 'heroism' in battle imply that these are characteristics out-of the ordinary for men as well as women": Berenice A. Carroll, "Feminism and Pacifism," 16.

58. Francis Fukuyama, "Women and the Evolution of World Politics," *Foreign Affairs* 77 (September/October 1998): 36.

59. J. Ann Tickner, "Why Women Can't Run the World: International Politics According to Francis Fukuyama," *The International Studies Review* 1 (1999): 3–11.

60. Johan Galtung, "Conflict, War and Peace," 5.

61. Johan Galtung, *Peace by Peaceful Means*, 42.

62. Michael A. Messner, "Studying Up On Sex," *Sociology of Sport Journal* 13 (1996): 234.

63. Carol Cohn, "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals," *Signs* 12 (1987): 696.

64. Gary Kinsman, cited in Robert Judge and Ann-M. Field, "Queerly Rethinking Security," paper presented at the International Studies Association Convention (March 14–18, 2000): 4.

65. Johan Galtung, *Peace by Peaceful Means*.

66. It is interesting to note that a 1994 cross-cultural quantitative study on the causes of interpersonal violence found that, although "socialization for aggression in boys in late childhood is by far the strongest socialization predictor of higher rates of homicide and assault ... socialization for aggression is a likely consequence, not a cause, of war:" Carol R. Ember and Melvin Ember, "War, Socialization, and Interpersonal Violence: A Cross-Cultural Study," *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 38 (1994): 620.

67. By positivism I mean the social scientific practice based on the beliefs that the social world follows regularities not unlike the natural world; that social scientific phenomena can be explained by following the methodologies provided by the natural sciences; and that facts can be objectively observed and described. This epistemological stance is in general incompatible with feminist epistemologies, which center on a deep-seated skepticism toward positivism's claims about the neutrality of facts and the possibility of objective research: see J. Ann Tickner, "You Just Don't Understand," 617–623; J. Ann Tickner, "What Is Your Research Program? Some Feminist Answers to International Relations Methodological Questions," *International Studies Quarterly* 49 (2005): 1–22; and Martin Hollis and Steve Smith, *Explaining and Understanding International Relations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press and New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

68. Robert W. Connell, *Gender and Power*, 140.

69. See J. Ann Tickner, *Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post-Cold War Era* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 15.

70. Jean Bethke Elshtain, "The Problem with Peace," in *Women, Militarism, and War: Essays in History, Politics, and Social Theory*, eds. Jean Bethke Elshtain and Sheila Tobias (Savage, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1990). Some cultural feminists, however, would argue that a world where feminine values are placed at the top of the social hierarchy is both a revolutionary subversion of the gender order and a desirable outcome: Jodi York, "The Truth About Women and Peace," in *The Women and War Reader*, eds. Lois Ann Lorentzen and Jennifer Turpin (New York and London: NYU Press, 1998), 19–22.

71. See Catharine MacKinnon, "Crimes of War, Crimes of Peace," in *On Human Rights: The Oxford Amnesty Lectures 1993*, eds. Stephen Shute and Susan Hurley (New York: Basic Books, 1994); and Alexandra Stiglmayer, *Mass Rape: The War Against Women in Bosnia-Herzegovina* (Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1994).

72. See Cynthia Enloe, *Does Khaki Become You? The Militarization of Women's Lives* (London: Pandora Press/Harper Collins, 1988); Cynthia Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches & Bases. Making Feminist Sense of International Politics* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990); Cynthia Enloe, *The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993); and Cynthia Enloe, *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000).

73. Katharine H. S. Moon, *Sex Among Allies: Military Prostitution in U.S.-Korea Relations* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), 12.

74. Christine Chin, *In Service and Servitude: Foreign Female Domestic Workers and the Malaysian "Modernity Project"* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 16.

75. See, for example, Rosalind Edwards, *Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research: Public Knowledge and Private Lives* (London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1999); Donna Haraway, "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective," *Feminist Studies* 14 (1988): 575–599; Sandra Harding, *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991); Sandra Harding, *Is Science Multicultural? Postcolonialisms, Feminisms, and Epistemologies* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1998); Gesa Kirsch, *Ethical Dilemmas in Feminist Research: The Politics of Location, Interpretation, and Publication* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1999); Ann Oakley, "Interviewing Women: A Contradiction in Terms," in *Doing Feminist Research*, ed. Helen Roberts (London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981); Judith Stacey, "Can There Be a Feminist Ethnography?" *Women's Studies International Forum* 11 (1988), 21–27; Mary Margaret Fonow and Judith A. Cook, *Beyond*

Methodology: Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1991); *Feminist Dilemmas in Fieldwork*, ed. Diana Wolf (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996); J. Ann Tickner, "What is Your Research Program?"; Mary Margaret Fonow and Judith A. Cook, "Feminist Methodology: New Applications in the Academy and Public Policy," *Signs* 30, 4 (2005).

76. See, for example, Kathleen Barry, *The Prostitution of Sexuality: The Global Exploitation of Women* (New York: NYU Press, 1995); *In Harm's Way: The Pornography Civil Rights Hearings*, eds. Catharine MacKinnon and Andrea Dworkin (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997).

77. See, for example, *Good Girls: Feminists and Sex Trade Workers Face to Face*, ed. Laurie Bell (Toronto, ON: The Women's Press, 1987); and *A Vindication of the Rights of Whores*, ed. Gail Pheterson (Seattle, WA: The Seal Press, 1989).

78. See, for example, Asia Watch and Women's Rights Project, *A Modern Form of Slavery: Trafficking of Burmese Women and Girls into Brothels in Thailand* (New York: Human Rights Watch Publications, 1993); and Hnin Hnin Pyne, "AIDS and Gender Violence: The Enslavement of Burmese Women in the Thai Sex Industry," in *Women's Rights Human Rights: International Feminist Perspectives*, eds. Julie Peters and Andrea Wolper (New York and London: Routledge, 1995), 215–233.

79. Kemala Kempadoo and Jo Doezema, "Forced to Choose: Beyond the Voluntary v. Forced Prostitution Dichotomy," in *Global Sex Workers: Rights, Resistance, and Redefinition*, eds. Kemala Kempadoo and Jo Dozema (New York and London: Routledge, 1998), 43.

80. Ibid., 44–46.

81. Cordula Reimann makes similar observations when referring to international conflict management theory and practice most of which, she claims, ignores that conflicts can embody occasions for radical social change: "[d]uring violent conflict situations, many women take over traditionally male-defined tasks and—notwithstanding gross human rights violations and responsibilities everyday brutality—break with the old social order": Cordula Reimann, "Engendering the Field of Conflict Management," 111.

82. See, for example, Michael Kaufman, "The Construction of Masculinity and the Triad of Men's Violence," in *Gender Violence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, eds. Laura L. O'Toole and Jessica R. Schiffman (New York and London: NYU Press, 1997), 30–51; R. Emerson Dobash and Russell P. Dobash, *Violence Against Wives* (New York: The Free Press, 1979) and *Women, Violence and Social Change* (New York and London: Routledge, 1992); bell hooks, "Violence in Intimate Relationships: A Feminist Perspective," in *Gender Violence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, eds. Laura O'Toole and Jessica R. Schiffman

(New York and London: NYU Press, 1997), 279–284. I would like to point out that attention to direct violence as an instrument of gendered social control might also help us to understand violence perpetrated by women against other women or against men.

83. Robert W. Connell, *Gender and Power*, 107.

84. Johan Galtung, *Peace by Peaceful Means*.

85. Jennifer Milliken and David Sylvan, "Soft Bodies, Hard Targets, and Chic Theories: U.S. Bombing Policy in Indochina," *Millenium: Journal of International Studies* 25, 2 (1996): 321–360.

86. Carol Cohn, "Sex and Death," 690.

87. Ibid., 698.

88. Carol Cohn, "Sex and Death."

89. Carol Cohn, "Wars, Wimps, and Women: Talking Gender and Thinking War," in *Gendering War Talk*, eds. Miriam Cooke and Angela Woollacott (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), 227–246.

90. Carol Cohn, "Sex and Death," 714.

91. Robert W. Connell, *Gender and Power*, 183.

92. I have to note, however, that the relationship between masculinities and violence that I posit might well be culturally and historically specific to the Euro-American context. In fact, Robert Connell problematizes the use of the concept of masculinity to deal with non-Euro-American cultures: masculinity as a quality of an individual is linked to the growth of individualism and a concept of the self that emerged in early modern Europe: Robert W. Connell, "The Big Picture: Masculinities in Recent World," *Theory and Society* 22 (1993): 597–624. Suzanne Hatty also suggests that violent behavior has much to do with modern Western gendered conceptions of Self and Other: Suzanne E. Hatty, *Masculinities, Violence, and Culture* (Thousand Oaks, London, and New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2000), ch. 1. Further research should address the ways in which violence is socially constituted in other cultures and in what ways (if any) gender is related to violence in these cultures.

93. Robert W. Connell, *Gender and Power*, 140.

94. Michael A. Messner, "When Bodies are Weapons: Masculinity and Violence in Sports," *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 25, 3 (1990): 203; see also Michael A. Messner and William S. Solomon, "Outside the Frame: Newspaper Coverage of the Sugar Ray Leonard Wife Abuse Story," *Sociology of Sport Journal* 10 (1993): 119–134; Michael A. Messner, *Politics of Masculinities: Men in Movements* (London, Thousand Oaks, and New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1997); and Michael A. Messner, *Taking the Field: Women, Men, and Sports* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2002).

95. Michael A. Messner, "When Bodies Are Weapons," 204–205.

96. Alan Petersen, *Unmasking the Masculine: "Men" and "Identity" in a Skeptical Age* (London, Thousand Oaks, and New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1998), 52.

97. Robert W. Connell, "Arms and the Man"; Hooper, Charlotte, *Manly States*, 47.

98. Christopher Cronin, "Adolescent Reports of Parental Spousal Violence in Military and Civilian Families," *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 10, 1 (1995): 117–122; and Linda D. Kozaryn, "DoD Targets Domestic Violence," *U.S. Department of Defense News*, July 30, 1996, available online at www.defenselink.mil/news/Jul1996/n07301996_9607301.html.

99. Defense Task Force on Domestic Violence, "Initial Report," February 28, 2001, available online at www.dtic.mil/domesticviolence.

100. Hooper, *Manly States*, 70.

101. Ibid., ch. 2.

102. Ibid., 83–84.

103. Tickner, *Gendering World Politics*, 56.

104. Mrinalini Sinha, *Colonial Masculinity: The "Manly Englishman" and the "Effeminate Bengali" in the Late Nineteenth Century* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press); see also Hooper, *Manly States*, ch. 2.

105. Christine Sylvester, *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 183–184.

106. Idem.